

<p style="text-align: center;">Court File No. CV-18-00602494-0000</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE</p> <p>B E T W E E N :</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ROCCO ACHAMPONG</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Applicant</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- and -</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ONTARIO (HON. DOUG FORD, PREMIER OF ONTARIO), ONTARIO (ATTORNEY-GENERAL), and CITY OF TORONTO</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Respondents</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Court File No. CV-18-00603797-0000</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE</p> <p>B E T W E E N :</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CITY OF TORONTO</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Applicant</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- and -</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Respondent</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Court File No. CV-18-00603633-0000</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ONTARIO SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE</p> <p>B E T W E E N :</p> <p style="text-align: center;">CHRIS MOISE, ISH ADERONMU and PRABHA KHOSLA on her own behalf and on behalf of all members of WOMEN WIN TO</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Applicants</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- and -</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO and THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF TORONTO</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Respondents</p>	

**RECORD OF THE INTERVENORS,
JENNIFER HOLLETT, LILY CHENG, SUSAN DEXTER,
GEOFFREY KETTEL and DYANOOSH YOUSSEFI
(Volume 2 of 2)**

August 22, 2018

**PALIARE ROLAND ROSENBERG
ROTHSTEIN LLP**

155 Wellington Street West
35th Floor
Toronto, ON M5V 3H1

Donald K. Eady (LSO #30635P)
don.eady@paliareroland.com

Caroline V. (Nini) Jones (LSO #43956J)
nini.jones@paliareroland.com

Jodi Martin (LSO# 54966V)
jodi.martin@paliareroland.com

Lawyers for the Intervenors, Jennifer
Hollett, Lily Cheng, Susan Dexter, Geoff
Kettel, and Dyanoosh Youssefi

TO:

ROCCO K. ACHAMPONG
Barrister & Solicitor
Dundas Street West, Suite 2500
Toronto, ON M5G 1Z3

Rocco Achampong (LSO# 57837J)
roccoachampong@gmail.com

Gavin Magrath (LSO# 51553A)
gavin@magraths.ca

Selwyn Pieters (LSO# 50303Q)
Selwyn@SelwynPieters.com

Applicant /Lawyers for the Applicant

AND TO:

GOLDBLATT PARTNERS LLP
20 Dundas Street West, Suite 1039
Toronto, ON M5G 2C2

Howard Goldblatt (LSO# 15964M)
hgoldblatt@goldblattpartners.com

James McDonald(LSO# 17518T)
jmcdonald@goldblattpartners.com

Steven M. Barrett (LSO# 24871B)
sbarrett@goldblattpartners.com

Simon Archer (LSO# 46263D)
sarcher@goldblattpartners.com

Heather McConnell (LSO# 54357O)
hmccConnell@goldblattpartners.com

Christine Davies (LSO# 57390F)
cdavies@goldblattpartners.com

Geetha Philipupillai (LSO# 74741S)
gphilipupillai@goldblattpartners.com

Lawyers for the Applicants,
Moise et al

AND TO:

THE CITY OF TORONTO
City Solicitor's Office
City of Toronto
Stn 1260, 26th Floor
Metro Hall, 55 John Street
Toronto, ON M5V 3C6

Diana W. Dimmer (LSO #24932L)
Diana.Dimmer@toronto.ca

Glenn K. L. Chu (LSO #40392F)
Glenn.Chu@toronto.ca

Phillip Chan (LSO #68681S)
Phillip.Chan@toronto.ca

Lawyers for the Respondent/Applicant,
City of Toronto

AND TO: **MINISTRY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL**

Crown Law-Civil
McMurtry-Scott Building
720 Bay Street
Toronto, ON M7A 2S9

Robin Basu (LSO# 32742K)
Robin.Basu@ontario.ca

Yashoda Ranganathan (LSO# 57236E)
Yashoda.Ranganathan@ontario.ca

Audra Ranalli (LSO# 72362U)
Audra.Ranalli@ontario.ca

Lawyers for the Respondent,
Province of Ontario

AND TO: **DLA PIPER (CANADA) LLP**
Suite 6000, 1 First Canadian Place
PO Box 367, 100 King St W
Toronto, ON M5X 1E2

Derek Bell (LSO # 43420J)
derek.bell@dlapiper.com

Ashley Boyes (LSO# 74477G)
ashley.boyes@dlapiper.com

Lawyers for the Intervenor,
The Canadian Taxpayers Federation

AND TO: **TORONTO DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD**
Legal Services
5050 Yonge Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, ON M2N 5N8

Patrick Cotter (LSO# 40809E)
Patrick.cotter@tdsb.on.ca

Lawyers for the Intervenor,
Toronto District School Board

AND TO: **DIMITRE POPOV**

Dimitre Popov
viapopov@yahoo.com

Self-Represented Intervenor,
Dimitre Popov

INDEX

Tab

Volume 1

Affidavit of Jennifer Hollett, sworn August 21, 2018	A
Exhibit 1: Curriculum Vitae of Jennifer Hollett.....	1
Exhibit 2: NDP Publication: Building a Better Toronto	2
Exhibit 3: Toronto Ward Boundary Review – Final Report.....	3
Exhibit 4: Ward 21 Demographic Census Information	4
Exhibit 5: Media Reports re: Jennifer Hollett Running for City Council	5
Exhibit 6: Media Report: “Doug Ford’s shocking council cut pits longtime councillors against one another”, July 27, 2018	6
Exhibit 7: City of Toronto Clerk’s Office updates.....	7
Exhibit 8: Media Reports: Jennifer Hollett commentary on her views of proposed changes.....	8
Exhibit 9: Maps Showing Impact of Ward Boundary Changes.....	9
Affidavit of Lily Cheng, sworn August 21, 2018	B
Exhibit 1: Maps Showing Ward 47 Municipal Boundaries and Provincial Boundaries.....	1

Volume 2

Affidavit of Susan Dexter, sworn August 21, 2018	C
Exhibit 1: Toronto Ward Boundary Review - Ward Population Background Brief.....	1
Exhibit 2: Toronto Ward Boundary Review - Background Research Report	2
Exhibit 3: Toronto Ward Boundary Review - Round One Report.....	3
Exhibit 4: Toronto Ward Boundary Review - Options Report.....	4
Exhibit 5: Toronto Ward Boundary Review - Final Report.....	5

Exhibit 6: Letter from HVRA to Executive Committee of City Council (Ward Boundary Review Recommendations), incorrectly dated May 24, 2016 (should have been dated October 26, 2016)	6
Exhibit 7: Toronto Ward Boundary Review - Additional Information Report.....	7
Exhibit 8: Toronto Ward Boundary Review - Supplementary Report	8
Exhibit 9: Maps of Ward 24 Split.....	9
Affidavit of Geoffrey Kettel, sworn August 21, 2018	D
Exhibit 1: Letter from LPAO to Executive Committee of City Council (Ward Boundary Review Recommendations), dated October 25, 2016.....	1
Exhibit 2: Maps of Ward 33 Split.....	2
Affidavit of Dyanoosh Youssefi, sworn August 22, 2018	E
Exhibit 1: Maps of Ward 14 and new Eglinton-Lawrence Ward	1
Exhibit 2: Press Release.....	2

Court File No. CV-18-00602494-000

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

BETWEEN:

ROCCO ACHAMPONG

Applicant(s)

and

**ONTARIO (HON. DOUG FORD, PREMIER OF ONTARIO), ONTARIO
(ATTORNEY-GENERAL), and CITY OF TORONTO**

Respondent(s)

Court File No. CV-18-00603633-0000

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

BETWEEN:

**CHRIS MOISE, ISH ADERONMU, and PRABHA KHOSLA, on her own
behalf and on behalf of all members of Women Win TO**

Applicants

and

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondent

-2-

Court File No.

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

B E T W E E N:

CITY OF TORONTO

Applicant

and

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondent

AFFIDAVIT OF SUSAN DEXTER

I, Susan Dexter, of the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, AFFIRM AS FOLLOWS:

1. I am a resident and voter in Toronto. I have been authorized to speak on behalf of the Harbord Village Residents' Association ("HVRA"), which took part in the most recent Toronto Ward Boundary Review.
2. As such, I have knowledge of the matters set out in this affidavit, except where I have indicated that my statements are made on information and belief, in which case I have stated the source of my information and I believe this information to be true.

-3-

Background

3. I grew up in Ottawa, Ontario, and I have resided in Toronto since 1963. I have lived at 97 Willcocks Street since 1980. My home was located in Ward 20 under the 44-ward system that was in place before January 1, 2018. Between January 1, 2018 and August 14, 2018, my home ward was Ward 24. I live in the federal and provincial electoral district of University-Rosedale.

4. I have been a board member of HVRA since 1995. During my time with HVRA, I have worked with four councillors: Olivia Chow, Adam Vaughan, Ceta Ramkhalawansigh, and Joe Cressy. My current responsibilities include sitting as the HVRA representative on the City of Toronto's University of Toronto Area Liaison Committee. I have also participated in various municipal studies, planning matters, and proceedings of the Ontario Municipal Board (now known as the Land Planning Appeal Tribunal).

5. The HVRA has a catchment area between Bloor Street on the northern edge to College Street on the south, and Spadina Ave in the east to Bathurst Street in the west. This is approximately one square kilometer. The neighbourhood has approximately 1,600 houses, mostly Victorian row and semi-detached houses. The area also boasts two heritage conservation districts, five main streets, five local roads, and around 4,000 trees. Our councillor must respond to the demands of a varied population, including families, seniors (living both independently and in our neighbourhood long-term care facility), University of Toronto students, renters, and homeowners.

-4-

6. As a downtown neighbourhood, there is considerable competition for use of land, given proximity to the University of Toronto, car traffic, bike infrastructure, highrise developments, and greenspace.

Participation in the Toronto Ward Boundary Review

7. The HVRA became aware of the Toronto Ward Boundary Review (the "Review") when it was first discussed by Toronto City Council ("Council") in 2014. Council issued a Request for Proposal ("RFP") to run a public consultation process that would result in a report recommending ward boundaries to Council. The RFP was eventually won by a partnership of consultants comprising Beate Bowron Etcetera, the Canadian Urban Institute, and the Davidson Group. I had previously worked with Beate Bowron in her role as a planner to a local development. The HVRA has previously hired Ms. Bowron to advise the HVRA for two cases at the Ontario Municipal Board / Land Planning Appeal Tribunal.

8. The HVRA was fully engaged throughout the Review process. We filled out an online questionnaire provided by the Review, and attended two meetings. Prior to participating, we had reviewed two documents prepared by the Review: the Ward Population Background Brief, and the Background Research Report. I attach the Brief and the Report as **Exhibits 1 and 2** to this Affidavit, respectively.

9. The first meeting of the Review we attended took place January 10, 2015, at Trinity St. Paul's Church. I attended that meeting personally, along with another HVRA board member. The first meeting was a more general meeting that solicited broad feedback

-5-

about both boundaries and process. This first round of consultation resulted in the Round One Report, which I attach as **Exhibit 3** to this Affidavit.

10. Based on the first round of consultations, the Review also produced an Options Report, which I attach as **Exhibit 4** to this Affidavit.

11. The Options Report first raised the possibility of 47 wards. The HVRA supported adding wards to the existing 44-ward system due to population growth and the need for more councillors to focus on local issues. However, we had serious concerns about the boundaries that were being proposed. In our view, it unacceptably split our community. First of all, the Annex neighbourhood to the north, with whom we share common interests, would be cut off from our ward. Second, the proposed map would have split the Grange Village neighbourhood in two, resulting in the loss of their south end. Third, the boundary was extended across Yonge Street, which was surprising since we had never shared a ward with them previously.

12. We raised these concerns at another public consultation of the Review, which was held October 7, 2015 at Metro Hall. I attended that meeting personally with another HVRA board member. Through both small group and plenary discussion, the HVRA was vocal about our perceptions that the ward proposals would negatively impact our residents and our representation.

13. The Final Report of the Review clearly acknowledged these concerns, and made changes to the ward boundaries as a result. Ward 20 was split to preserve our historic relationships, and no longer extended across Yonge St. We were extremely pleased that our participation had made a difference in order to ensure the communities of interest in

-6-

our neighbourhood remained together. We viewed the Final Report as having been the product of an intensive and meaningful engagement with our community, which balanced the important considerations of voter parity, councillor workload, and effective representation. I attach the Final Report as **Exhibit 5** to this Affidavit.

14. Throughout the Review, we corresponded with our board, our membership, other residents' associations, and the consultants responsible for the Review. We regularly discussed the Review with our councillor. We encouraged our residents to participate directly in the process. On October 26, 2016, the HVRA laid out its position to the Executive Committee of City Council in a written representation. I attach that letter as **Exhibit 6** to this Affidavit. Note that I incorrectly dated the letter "May 24, 2016". It should have been dated "October 26, 2016".

15. I understand that the Executive Committee of City Council subsequently directed the Review to examine whether Toronto's ward boundaries could be consistent with the 25 federal and provincial riding boundaries. It is worth noting that the Review did not necessarily contemplate a limit of 25 councillors, but also examined whether 50 councillors would be feasible — two per ward for each of the 25 wards. This resulted in the Additional Information Report, which I attach as **Exhibit 7** to this Affidavit. The Additional Information Report was accompanied by the Review's Supplementary Report, which is attached as **Exhibit 8** to this Affidavit.

16. I believed that once Council passed a by-law instituting the 47-ward system, and the appeals of that decision had been exhausted, that the 47-ward system was permanent and would remain in place until Council directed a new consultation.

-7-

Media Reports and Introduction of Bill 5

17. On the evening of Thursday, July 26, 2018, I became aware of media reports that suggested the Government of Premier Doug Ford (the “Government”) wanted to change the ward boundaries to match federal and provincial riding boundaries, effectively resulting in a 25-ward, 25-councillor model. I did not know if that was possible since the municipal election was underway. I knew nominations were due to close the next day. Further, Ward boundaries had been in place since January 1, 2018. I had thought that once the appeals of Council’s decision were exhausted, those ward boundaries could be relied on and would be permanent.

18. I called my councillor, Joe Cressy, for more information. He was unable to provide answers. I attended the City of Toronto Council meeting on Friday, July 27, 2018, in order to learn more about the proposed changes. It seemed to me there was considerable uncertainty as to what would happen to the election. Council itself seemed unaware of the proposed changes.

19. I followed news reports of the legislation, Bill 5, *Better Local Governments Act, 2018* (“Bill 5”). I was surprised that Bill 5 passed so quickly and with very little public discussion. I was not aware of any provincial consultation similar to the Review that sought public input on balancing the factors relevant to drawing municipal ward boundaries.

20. I knew that there had been a federal riding redistribution process between 2012 and 2014. I understand this process was based on 2011 census data. The HVRA did not participate in this process because federal and provincial ridings are not as relevant to our

-8-

work. We did not believe that those boundaries would be applied on a municipal level. If we had known that those boundaries would become the municipal boundaries, we would have actively participated in the federal redistribution process as well.

Concerns with Bill 5

21. Having been involved with the Review from inception to completion, the HVRA has significant concerns with the impact of Bill 5 in terms of how our community will be represented on council.

22. As noted above, my ward under the 47-ward system was Ward 24. Bill 5 moved part of Ward 24 into the Spadina-Fort York ward, and part into the University-Rosedale ward. As a result, I do not know if all of the potential candidates who were previously running under Ward 24 will now be running in my new ward, University-Rosedale, or in the Spadina Fort York ward instead. The maps showing how Ward 24 has been split up are attached as **Exhibit 9** to this Affidavit.

23. First, we worry that our councillor will not be able to attend to our local issues. Within the past few weeks alone, our councillor has worked on files and attended meetings on matters with the HVRA such as: a settlement at the Land Planning Appeal Tribunal of a 23-story university residence, a development proposal at Knox Church, a traffic signal at the intersection of Robert Street and Harbord Avenue arising from a safety study conducted by the HVRA, a speed-bump from a local petition on Robert Street, an interim report on the Bloor Street United Church tower development, a brief on the ongoing Westbank/Mirvish Village construction, two movement studies, parkspace

-9-

design at 666 Spadina, the interim report of the University of Toronto Campus rezoning, and the second phase of the Harbord Village Green Master Plan.

24. The scope of a councillor's work is very specific and relates to subject matter that affects our day-to-day lives. Based on my calculations using publicly available 2011 census information and ward population data extrapolated from the 2011 census made available by the City of Toronto, the HVRA represents only about 6.8% of Councillor Cressy's ward. Given his active engagement in the considerable workload from our neighbourhood alone, we seriously doubt that he, or any successor, would be able to continue to engage with our concerns under a 25-ward system.

25. The HVRA does not find it suitable for a councillor's staff to handle these issues. Office staff would not have the weight of the councillor dealing with the bureaucracy or with powerful outside interests. We value our direct connection to our elected representative. It is important that our councillor hear our concerns directly and understand the issues in our community. This way, our councillor can respond to them effectively and raise germane issues to staff, council and in committee meetings.

26. Second, it became apparent through our participation in the Review that there is a serious voter parity issue with the 25-ward system. Through the Review I learned that there are high population growth centres, notably along the waterfront downtown and in Etobicoke, that have excessively high populations in a 25-ward system. There are other wards that are under-populated relative to the norm. These imbalances will be more serious over time and must be addressed for fairness. This is made evident by the reports drafted by the Review.

-10-

27. In contrast, the 47-ward system addressed the ongoing demographic changes in the City of Toronto through the lens of providing municipal services. I am not aware of any provincial study of how these growth centres should be properly represented on council.

28. Further, the HVRA does not understand why Toronto alone was subject to the Government's legislation. Bill 5 has a disproportionate effect on Toronto in terms of representation. Even under the 47-ward model, a Toronto councillor represents a very high number of residents compared to other municipalities. That ratio worsens when the 25-ward model is introduced. Using publicly available data from 2016 census data from Statistics Canada and publicly available information on city council composition, I calculated the following ratio of average population per councillor:

Municipality	Average population per Councillor (2016)
Toronto (25 wards)	109,624
Mississauga	65,600
Toronto (47 wards)	61,000
Brampton	59,363
Ottawa	40,619
Vaughan	38,279
Hamilton	35,794
Markham	27,414
London	27,416
Kitchener	23,322
Oakville	16,153
Barrie	14,143
Kingston	10,316

29. Third, the 25-ward system does not respect our communities of interest. Though the federal and provincial ridings may respect communities of interest for their own legislative purposes, municipal communities of interest are different. Combining areas

-11-

with different zoning regimes, built forms, and land pressures does not make sense. I am not aware of any study or work conducted recently by the province to identify relevant communities of interest as defined by municipal issues in order to ensure that these communities are respected.

30. For example, I recently spoke with the executive of the Grange Community Association, the residents' association for the neighbourhood that is directly south of the HVRA. As a result of the change to the 25-ward system, their community will be cut in two. The northern portion of the community will be in University-Rosedale, while the southern portion of the community will be in Fort York-Spadina. Under both 44 and 47-ward systems, the Grange community was in a single ward.

31. Fourth, in my experience, increased responsibilities have devolved to the volunteers who are the backbone of residents' associations. At present population levels, our volunteers are working almost full-time on City Hall matters. To compensate and share the load, we have formed coalitions. Even these will not meet the increased demand. I have spoken with the executive of several residents' associations and they are likewise concerned about increased demands on residents' associations to step in and supplement work.

32. Fifth, the HVRA and other neighbourhood organizations participated in good faith in the Review. We attended meetings, wrote briefs, consulted with our residents, informed our members of updates, and we trusted the process would honour our commitment to, and investment in, building the City of Toronto. We were satisfied the consultants respected our input, balanced competing interests, and arrived at a fair result.

-12-

33. When the Government voided this commitment with no notice, I felt that our rights as electors and participants in a democratic process were violated. The entire electoral process seemed to fall into disarray.

34. Finally, the changes have resulted in considerable confusion amongst our residents, and residents throughout the city.

Conclusion

35. We see Councillor Cressy about every two weeks, often more. I am in touch with his office twice a week, on files from individual homeowner concerns to local planning matters, committee of adjustment applications, development proposals, University of Toronto initiatives, and policy initiatives at Community Council, Executive, and other Committees. We also focus on major municipal initiatives such as the Vision Zero road traffic safety project and laneway housing. We count on the councillor's assistance and support.

36. Now, however, we worry that we will lose connection with our elected representative, and that our concerns will not be heard at council. The Government's direct intervention in the election has made our municipal democracy feel uncertain and unstable.

37. I swear this affidavit for the sole purpose of intervening in an application in respect of Bill 5, and for no other improper purpose.

AFFIRMED BEFORE ME at the City of
Toronto, in the Province of Ontario on
August 21, 2018



Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or as may be)

}



SUSAN DEXTER

This is **Exhibit 1** refer to in the Affidavit of
Susan Dexter, sworn August 21, 2018



WHY IS TORONTO DRAWING NEW WARD BOUNDARIES?

Ward Population Background Brief

Revised, July 2015

**WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
REVISED, JULY 2015**

CONTENTS

Why is Toronto Drawing New Ward Boundaries?	2
Alignment with Federal and Provincial Electoral Districts.....	3
Growth Has Influenced “Effective Representation”	6
And the City Will Continue to Grow.....	13
Potential Variance in Voter Parity	15
The Status Quo Is Not an Option	20

TABLES

Table 1: Population counts and future projections for the City of Toronto and current wards.	3
Table 2: Population counts and future projections by existing wards 2014 - 2030	21

MAPS

Map 1: Toronto Wards Overlaid on Federal Ridings, 2014.....	4
Map 2: Toronto Wards Overlaid on Provincial Ridings, 2014.....	5
Map 3: Toronto Wards Above and Below Average Population, 2001	7
Map 4: Toronto Wards Above and Below Average Population, 2011	9
Map 5: Residential Development Projects Completed May 2011-Dec 2013	11
Map 6: Toronto Ward Variance by Current Ward, 2014	12
Map 7: Residential Development Projects Current Pipeline	14
Map 8: Toronto Wards Variance by Current Ward, 2018.....	16
Map 9: Toronto Ward Variance by Current Ward, 2022	17
Map 10: Toronto Ward Variance by Current Ward, 2026	18
Map 11: Toronto Ward Variance by Current Ward, 2030	19

WHY IS TORONTO DRAWING NEW WARD BOUNDARIES?

Toronto has been managed by an elected Council based on wards since early in the last century, and necessarily has a long history of adjusting ward boundaries to reflect population growth and the physical development of the City. In 1997, the 28 wards existing in the six former municipalities were used to elect the first Council of 56 representatives (2 per ward) to govern the first term of amalgamated Toronto. Since these wards had not been adjusted since direct election to Metro Council was introduced, these boundaries were reviewed, and the size of Council reduced to 44 representatives, for the election in 2000. Five elections later, these boundaries are still in effect.

This research paper looks at the dynamics of population change and the effects these changes can have on the principle of effective representation. Reviewing the boundaries of electoral districts is something that all levels of government undertake to ensure that electors in different parts of the city, or province, have an equivalent influence through their democratic franchise. This review of Toronto's ward boundaries is limited to the addressing effective representation such that electors across Toronto will have equivalent influence on public affairs through the ballot box. This project will not look at other issues that have been raised in public discourse such as:

- Voter eligibility;
- How Councillors are chosen – e.g. ranked ballot
- Governance issues; or
- How Council operates

Toronto has grown considerably since 2000, with the population increasing from 2.48 million in the 2001 Census to 2.61 million in the 2011 Census. Notably, as the City is fully built out to its municipal boundaries, much of this growth has been due to intensification as Toronto's fabric has redeveloped again and again. Given the stable nature of Toronto's low scale neighbourhoods and the direction to protect them given through the Official Plan, development has been focused in key areas of the City. This is most readily noticed in Downtown where population has grown by 29% since 2001. In fact, since 2000 when the current wards were adopted there have been over 171,000 new housing units built across Toronto; that is more than the entire housing stock of Brampton or London, Ontario, and almost as much housing as exists in Halifax, Nova Scotia. Furthermore, the City will continue to grow as there are over 132,000 residential units proposed to be built over the next 10 to 15 years.

A general principle of equal representation is to design electoral districts with roughly equal populations. As Toronto has grown, the equity of representative democracy across wards has changed as some wards now have considerably higher populations, and some lower, than the average ward population. Under the City of Toronto Act, Toronto City Council has the authority to make changes to ward boundaries through the passage of a by-law. Given the population growth that has taken place since 2000, Council has initiated this current review of ward boundaries, recognizing that the growing imbalance is not conducive to effective representation for the residents of Toronto. Table 1 illustrates how the gap between the least populous ward and the most populous ward has grown over time. There has been an 8% increase in the average ward population to 2014. If the ward boundaries are not



**WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
REVISED, JULY 2015**

adjusted, population projections prepared by Toronto City Planning indicate that the average ward population could grow by 31% by the year 2031.

Table 1: Population counts and future projections for the City of Toronto and current wards.

Year	Total Population	Minimum Ward Population	Maximum Ward Population	Average Ward Population
2001	2,481,420	46,960	66,835	56,396
2006	2,503,345	44,850	79,520	56,894
2011	2,701,560	44,935	88,435	61,399
2014	2,798,255	44,404	94,597	63,596
2018	2,913,665	44,245	109,447	66,220
2022	2,997,198	44,142	121,105	68,118
2026	3,082,930	44,265	129,992	70,067
2030	3,172,218	44,412	138,489	72,096


ALIGNMENT WITH FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL ELECTORAL DISTRICTS

Toronto is represented by 22 members in the provincial legislature and will be represented by 25 federal members of Parliament as of the next federal election. With 44 wards, each Councillor represents roughly one-half the population of his or her provincial or federal counterpart. As Maps 1 and 2 show, Toronto's ward boundaries do not currently align with federal or provincial electoral district boundaries; nor are they required to. There is no statutory requirement or guidance that suggests that wards should have some relationship with those electoral districts. Map 1 illustrates how the current ward boundaries compare with the new federal electoral ridings that will be in effect for the next federal election, while Map 2 overlays the current ward boundaries with the provincial electoral districts used during the provincial election of 2014.

As Toronto's wards share the names of the provincial ridings, one might think that there is a standard relationship between the wards and the provincial ridings such that their boundaries are coterminous. However, Map 2 shows that, while this may have been one organizing concept at the outset of the last ward boundary review, clearly other factors were taken into account in settling on the final boundaries. The current exercise of determining ward boundaries for future elections is not taking any of the current federal or provincial boundaries as a starting point. A broad based consultation program will canvas opinions of Toronto residents to determine options for consideration.


WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
REVISED, JULY 2015

MAP 1. TORONTO WARDS OVERLAID ON FEDERAL RIDINGS, 2014



WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
 REVISED, JULY 2015

MAP 2: TORONTO WARDS OVERLAID ON PROVINCIAL RIDINGS, 2014



Contains information licensed under the Open Government Licence - Toronto

GROWTH HAS INFLUENCED “EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION”

Since Toronto’s current ward boundaries were established in 2000, a number of municipal ward boundary exercises have been undertaken across Ontario and across the country. Some attempts to delineate ward boundaries have been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board and to the courts. This litigation has resulted in the establishment of a number of parameters which should be followed in any new ward boundary review.


While the City of Toronto Act sets out the statutory requirements for enacting boundaries, through appeals, the Supreme Court of Canada has established “effective representation” as the fundamental principle to be adhered to when considering new ward boundaries. While reflecting voter parity and major physical features as traditional inputs, the Supreme Court acknowledges other factors that may come into play in determining effective representation. These factors can include geography, ward history, communities of interest and minority representation.¹

The Ontario Municipal Board has determined that any individual ward population, as a rule, should not deviate from the average population across all wards by more than plus or minus 25% save for exceptional circumstances involving major communities of interest.

Toronto’s current wards were established generally respecting the principles of voter parity by minimizing the degree of variation from the average ward size at that time, as well as considering major physical features and community input. Using the 2001 Census as a benchmark, the average ward population at that time was 56,400 for a population of 2,481,000. Only eight wards had populations that were more than 10% above the average ward population, or greater than 10% below the average, as can be seen on Map 3.

¹ Reference re: Prov. [Sask], [1991] 2 S.C.R. 158

WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
 REVISED, JULY 2015




**WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
REVISED, JULY 2015**

From 2001 to 2006 Toronto's total population did not increase by a substantial amount. A rise of under 1% yielded a total population of 2,503,000 with an average ward size of 56,890 residents. This growth of just under 22,000 was surpassed by the growth from 2006 to 2011 of 111,740. The 2011 total population of 2,615,000 represented considerable growth of 4.46% over 2006 and 5.39% over 2001. The average population of the 44 wards was 59,430 in 2011.

By 2011, 15 wards varied from the average by more than +/- 10%, while 4 wards had populations more than 25% above the average. Map 4 reveals that the four wards exhibiting the largest variation from the average were located in high growth areas in Downtown, North York Centre and north-east Scarborough.

WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
 REVISED, JULY 2015

MAP 4: TORONTO WARDS ABOVE AND BELOW AVERAGE POPULATION, 2011



**WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
REVISED, JULY 2015**

Statistics Canada prepares annual population estimates for major urban areas. Toronto's population for 2013 is estimated at 2,771,770, yielding an average ward population of 62,995. Map 5 illustrates the location of major residential development that has taken place since 2011. Over the past few years this magnitude and locational concentration of development has continued.

To understand how well the current ward system serves voter parity, Map 6 illustrates how much the estimated population for each ward for the 2014 election varies from the overall City average ward population. Generally, ward boundary reviews evaluate this relationship by looking at the following range of difference:

- **Range 1** plus or minus 10% of the city-wide average ward population;
- **Range 2** 10% to 15% above the city-wide average;
- **Range 3** 10% to 15% below the city-wide average;
- **Range 4** 15% to 20% above the city-wide average;
- **Range 5** 15% to 20% below the city-wide average;
- **Range 6** 20% to 25% above the city-wide average;
- **Range 7** 20% to 25% below the city-wide average;
- **Range 8** 25% or more above the city-wide average; and
- **Range 9** 25% or more below the city-wide average.

WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
REVISED, JULY 2015


MAP 5: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS COMPLETED MAY 2013 - DEC 2013



Data: Development Projects Revealed Between May 1, 2013 and Dec 31, 2013.
Source: Toronto City Planning Division, Toronto's Information Hub, July 2014.

WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
 REVISED, JULY 2015

MAP 6: TORONTO WARDS VARIANCE BY CURRENT WARD, 2014



WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
REVISED, JULY 2015


AND THE CITY WILL CONTINUE TO GROW

As of year-end 2013, 132,100 residential units were still in the development pipeline; either under review or approved but not yet built.² Map 7 illustrates the location of these major residential projects. While the distribution indicates that much of this new development is clustered in focused areas across the City, as prescribed by the Official Plan, demographic change in established neighbourhoods will also continue, and as the overall average ward population grows, even those wards with little new development could demonstrate significant variance outside an acceptable range for future municipal elections.

² Profile Toronto: How Does the City Grow? Toronto City Planning, July 2014

WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
REVISED, JULY 2015

MAP 7: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS CURRENT PIPELINE



POTENTIAL VARIANCE IN VOTER PARITY

In 2006, the Ontario Government adopted the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) under the authority of the Places to Grow Act, 2005. The Growth Plan assigned forecasts of population and employment for all regional and single-tier municipalities within the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The Growth Plan estimated that Toronto's population in 2031 would be 3.08 million. The legislation calls on all municipalities to put in place policies to accommodate this growth outlook and municipalities amended their Official Plans to come into conformity with the Growth Plan. Toronto's Official Plan, approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in 2006, incorporated this population target as guidance for planning policy.

In 2013, the Province amended the Growth Plan, updating the growth outlook to 2031 and extending the planning period with population and employment forecasts to 2041. Toronto is now expected to grow to 3.19 million by 2031. This is the target population that the City must plan to accommodate through the current Official Plan Review. The Research and Information Unit of the City Planning Division prepared population projections to serve as base information for infrastructure planning. These projections are based on demographic trends observed up to the 2011 Census as well as known development potential. By employing the Growth Plan amended outlook for the City of 3.19 million as a control total for modeling, these projections are the best estimate of how population growth, or decline, might play out across the City.

Maps 8, 9, 10 and 11 illustrate for each election year, the degree of potential variance from the city-wide average ward population, should the current set of ward boundaries remain in place for the next four municipal elections: 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030.³ Table 2 documents the potential variance by ward for these future election years. Since Toronto is fully built-out with growth largely driven by redevelopment and infill, the geographic pattern of growth is similar for each future election year, but Table 1 demonstrates that the degree of variance continues to grow. Similarly, for wards that have experienced stable or declining population, as the City grows in total, their degree of variance below the city-wide average also continues to increase.


By 2026, the target election year for this exercise (Map 10), Toronto is anticipated to have a total population of about 3,082,930, and an average ward population of around 70,067. At that time, with the current ward system, only 17 wards would be within the ideal range of +/- 10%, with only 5 wards between 10% and 15% above or below the average.

By the 2030 election (Map 11), only 15 wards would be within the ideal range of +/- 15% variance.

³ The City of Toronto population projections are based on Census data and hence project population and households for future Census years. The TWBR team have interpolated the growth pattern between successive Census horizon years to estimate the population for each future election year.


WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
 REVISED, JULY 2015

MAP 8: TORONTO WARDS VARIANCE BY CURRENT WARD, 2018




WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
 REVISED, JULY 2015

MAP 9: TORONTO WARDS VARIANCE BY CURRENT WARD, 2022




WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
 REVISED, JULY 2015

MAP 10: TORONTO WARDS VARIANCE BY CURRENT WARD, 2026



WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
 REVISED, JULY 2015



**WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
REVISED, JULY 2015**

THE STATUS QUO IS NOT AN OPTION

While the current ward allocation has served Toronto well through 5 election cycles (including 2014), the magnitude and distribution of growth that has taken place over the past 14 years suggests that, in terms of voter parity, the City is becoming less equitable. With over 132,000 residential units which could be built over the medium term, it seems clear that Toronto is well on track to grow to the 3.19 million population prescribed by the Growth Plan for 2031. The magnitude of growth on the horizon, and its uneven distribution across the City, indicate that the status quo with respect to existing ward boundaries will not serve to ensure representative democracy for Toronto in future elections. New ward boundaries are necessary and should stand the test of effective representation for at least three election cycles: the status quo is not an option.

This growing disparity in effective representation is not lost on Councillors or the electorate. In fact, a petition was submitted to City Council advocating for one specific option for new ward boundaries. Council turned down this petition recognizing that a new model for ward boundaries should be based on a broad-based consultation with the public and a rigorous research program that would ensure effective representation and consider communities of interest across Toronto.

WARD POPULATION BACKGROUND BRIEF
REVISED, JULY 2015

Table 2: Population counts and future projections by existing wards 2014 - 2030

WARD	2014	VARIANCE	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
1	60,577	-0.06%	60,154	-4.38%	59,918	-7.35%	60,122	-9.57%	60,412	-11.59%
2	59,263	-2.22%	59,298	-5.74%	59,205	-8.46%	59,935	-9.85%	60,886	-10.90%
3	53,165	-12.29%	54,520	-13.33%	55,155	-14.72%	55,675	-16.26%	56,229	-17.71%
4	51,762	-14.60%	53,237	-15.37%	54,403	-15.88%	54,768	-17.62%	55,253	-19.14%
5	70,448	16.23%	76,653	21.85%	81,776	26.44%	90,056	35.45%	98,527	44.19%
6	61,460	1.40%	65,500	4.12%	67,540	4.43%	69,434	4.44%	71,557	4.72%
7	54,860	-9.49%	57,080	-9.26%	57,624	-10.90%	59,105	-11.10%	60,807	-11.01%
8	48,065	-20.70%	48,362	-23.12%	49,568	-23.36%	53,030	-20.24%	56,873	-16.77%
9	47,784	-21.16%	48,278	-23.26%	48,596	-24.86%	49,048	-26.23%	49,899	-26.98%
10	63,469	4.72%	64,410	2.39%	64,986	0.48%	66,096	-0.59%	67,360	-1.42%
11	61,579	1.60%	61,420	-2.37%	61,923	-4.25%	64,304	-3.28%	66,844	-2.18%
12	53,346	-11.99%	53,654	-14.71%	54,097	-16.35%	55,261	-16.88%	56,729	-16.98%
13	53,891	-11.09%	55,548	-11.70%	56,943	-11.95%	57,505	-13.51%	58,045	-15.05%
14	52,480	-13.42%	52,814	-16.04%	53,079	-17.93%	53,747	-19.16%	54,520	-20.21%
15	61,872	2.08%	63,527	0.98%	64,327	-0.54%	67,025	0.81%	69,969	2.40%
16	56,365	-7.01%	57,292	-8.93%	58,002	-10.32%	58,560	-11.92%	59,156	-13.43%
17	50,426	-16.80%	50,302	-20.04%	50,294	-22.23%	50,719	-23.71%	51,210	-25.06%
18	45,440	-25.03%	46,450	-26.16%	47,060	-27.24%	47,482	-28.58%	47,862	-29.96%
19	57,789	-4.66%	59,124	-6.01%	60,058	-7.14%	61,179	-7.98%	62,219	-8.94%
20	85,291	40.72%	99,949	58.88%	112,475	73.91%	125,578	88.88%	132,910	94.51%
21	46,230	-23.73%	46,697	-25.77%	46,977	-27.36%	47,100	-29.16%	47,198	-30.93%
22	66,932	10.43%	72,086	14.59%	76,647	18.51%	78,291	17.76%	79,856	16.86%
23	93,687	54.57%	96,342	53.15%	97,520	50.79%	100,999	51.91%	104,934	53.57%
24	68,014	12.21%	73,948	17.55%	76,083	17.64%	77,416	16.44%	78,865	15.41%
25	59,899	-1.17%	62,046	-1.37%	63,179	-2.31%	63,583	-4.36%	63,975	-6.38%
26	63,173	4.23%	63,987	1.72%	65,004	0.51%	65,933	-0.83%	66,834	-2.19%
27	94,597	56.07%	109,447	73.98%	121,105	87.25%	129,992	95.52%	138,489	102.67%
28	72,917	20.30%	92,129	46.45%	109,024	68.57%	116,872	75.79%	124,848	82.71%
29	44,404	-26.74%	44,245	-29.67%	44,142	-31.75%	44,265	-33.42%	44,412	-35.01%
30	52,458	-13.45%	53,086	-15.61%	53,685	-16.99%	53,785	-19.10%	53,877	-21.15%
31	54,446	-10.17%	54,931	-12.68%	55,141	-14.74%	55,540	-16.46%	56,083	-17.93%
32	57,345	-5.39%	58,285	-7.35%	58,779	-9.12%	59,224	-10.92%	59,634	-12.73%
33	58,089	-4.16%	59,614	-5.23%	60,701	-6.14%	61,471	-7.54%	62,300	-8.83%
34	61,668	1.74%	63,367	0.73%	63,604	-1.65%	64,046	-3.67%	64,572	-5.50%
35	61,443	1.37%	61,940	-1.54%	62,821	-2.87%	64,495	-2.99%	66,757	-2.30%
36	51,233	-15.47%	51,902	-17.49%	53,102	-17.89%	55,546	-16.45%	58,331	-14.64%
37	66,797	10.21%	67,199	6.82%	68,105	5.31%	71,022	6.82%	74,709	9.33%
38	67,911	12.04%	68,561	8.99%	69,062	6.78%	70,617	6.21%	73,610	7.73%
39	53,015	-12.53%	52,711	-16.21%	52,472	-18.87%	52,392	-21.20%	52,323	-23.43%
40	60,000	-1.01%	61,855	-1.67%	63,362	-2.03%	64,451	-3.06%	65,598	-4.00%
41	69,302	14.34%	69,787	10.94%	70,019	8.26%	69,989	5.27%	70,250	2.81%
42	78,339	29.25%	79,120	25.77%	79,633	23.13%	79,511	19.59%	79,719	16.67%
43	54,296	-10.42%	54,969	-12.62%	55,937	-13.51%	57,086	-14.14%	58,384	-14.56%
44	61,351	1.22%	62,105	-1.28%	62,519	-3.33%	63,099	-5.09%	63,765	-6.68%

This is **Exhibit 2** refer to in the Affidavit of
Susan Dexter, sworn August 21, 2018



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

Background Research Report

Updated December 2014

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW **DRAW THE LINES**
Looking at the size and shape of Toronto's wards. www.drawthelines.ca





TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 About the Toronto Ward Boundary Review.....	1
1.2 Purpose of the Review.....	1
1.3 Context	1
1.4 About this Report	2
2.0 LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK	2
2.1 Historical Electoral Boundary Legislation	2
2.2 Federal and Provincial Redistribution Process	2
2.3 Regulatory Framework for Municipalities in Ontario.....	4
2.4 Regulatory Framework for Municipalities Across Canada	5
2.4 Regulatory Framework for Municipalities Outside North America	7
2.5 Supreme Court of Canada Rulings.....	10
3.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES: THE FOUNDATION OF WARD BOUNDARY REVIEWS	12
3.1 Overview	12
3.2 Common Guiding Principles	14
3.3 Additional Principles and Considerations	18
3.4 Use of Guiding Principles in Ward Boundary Reviews	22
4.0 LEARNING FROM OTHER MUNICIPALITIES	23
4.1 Overview of Ward Boundary Reviews in Ontario	23
4.3 Ontario Municipal Board Appeals.....	24
4.4 Population and Council Composition Comparisons.....	29
5.0 TORONTO'S WARD BOUNDARIES	30
5.1 History of Toronto's Wards.....	30
5.2 Current Ward and Governance Structure	34

5.3	Local Boundaries and Considerations	36
5.4	Population Growth and Development	40
5.5	Local Electoral Issues and Interests	41
6.0	CONCLUSION	42

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As a result of significant growth in the City over the past several years there are some wards that have considerably higher populations, and some lower, than the average ward population. This means that the equity of representative democracy across wards has been compromised. The Toronto Ward Boundary Review is looking at the size and shape of Toronto's wards in order to address this inequity and ensure that all Toronto residents are fairly represented at City Council.

The City of Toronto Act (2006) gives City Council the authority to make changes to its ward boundaries. It does not, however, provide specific instructions for how the ward boundary review should be undertaken or the parameters that should be followed. Municipalities in Ontario look to past Supreme Court cases and Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) decisions for guidance. The historic Carter Case, which was one of the first electoral boundary cases to be taken to the Supreme Court, set the precedent for ward boundary reviews in Canada by establishing the principle of "effective representation" as the basis for making ward boundary adjustments.

The Carter Case established that there are two interrelated principles that must be considered when carrying out ward boundary reviews: 'effective representation' and 'voter parity.' The primary test for effective representation is voter parity, but it must also take into account a variety of other factors such as geography, community history, community interests and representation of minorities.

While there are differences in how municipalities in Ontario conduct their ward boundary reviews, there are some common guiding principles, stemming from the Carter Case decision that are the foundation of successful ward boundary reviews. These include:

- **Representation by Population:** In a successful ward system, every Councillor will represent generally the same number of people. This is often referred to as 'voter parity'. Usually, population variations of up to 25% above or below the average size are considered acceptable.
- **Consideration of present and future population trends:** A ward boundary review must consider future increases or decreases in population in order to ensure that wards continue to meet the representation by population criterion as the City grows. The goal is to design a system that can be used for three elections.
- **Consideration of natural and physical boundaries:** Natural and physical boundaries shape patterns of life in cities, and so ward designs should respect these features.
- **Communities of Interest:** Ward boundaries should consider settlement patterns, traditional neighbourhoods and community groupings in specific geographic locations. Where possible, ward boundaries should not fragment a community.
- **Effective Representation:** Considered the ultimate goal of all ward boundary reviews, effective representation aims at achieving fair and equal representation for voters to the greatest extent possible. The primary consideration is voter parity, but effective representation also takes into account the all other criteria.

In addition, there are several other criteria that municipalities in Ontario have used to evaluate their ward boundaries, such as Composition of Council, Density, Simplicity, Compact and Contiguous, Ward History,

Gerrymandering and Public Consultation. What constitutes ‘effective representation,’ and how these principles are used when evaluating ward boundary options is discussed in Section 2.

Composition of Council has particular significance in Toronto, given the size, complexity and diversity of the city. Although the Toronto Ward Boundary Review is looking specifically at the configuration of Toronto’s ward boundaries, and not how municipal government is organized, given that the goal of the ward boundary review is to achieve effective representation to the greatest extent possible, the number of councillors and how they operate as a government system are nevertheless important considerations in designing the ward boundaries. It is quite common in cities, especially outside of Ontario and in the UK, to look at the number of councillors simultaneously and as part of the review of an area’s electoral boundaries.

It is not easy to make direct comparisons between Toronto and other Canadian or international municipalities, because every city and their council operate differently. It is nevertheless helpful to look at the ward boundary review regulatory framework, as well as the ward size of other municipalities. Toronto’s average ward population in 2014 is 60,958 people per ward, which is similar to the cities of Vancouver, Brampton and Mississauga. The range in ward size in Toronto (44,280 – 93,784) is similar to the City of Mississauga (42,700 - 79,890). These comparisons are discussed further in Section 3. Section 3 also examines municipalities where the ward boundary reviews resulted in appeals to the OMB. This provides several key insights useful for Toronto’s review.

For the 2000 elections, the size of Toronto’s Council was reduced to 44 representatives, which altered the configuration of the ward boundaries. Five elections later, these boundaries are still in effect and do not align with federal or provincial electoral district boundaries. The history of Toronto’s ward boundaries and the relationship to the federal and provincial boundaries, as well as several other official and unofficial boundaries, is discussed in Section 5.

The final section (Section 6) of this report includes a summary of the key lessons learned from the research and how these might affect the Toronto Ward Boundary Review.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 About the Toronto Ward Boundary Review

The Toronto Ward Boundary Review is looking at the size and shape of Toronto's wards. It is being conducted by a team of independent consultants, who have been asked to propose changes to the current ward boundaries in order to ensure each person in Toronto is fairly represented at City Council. The Review process, which consists of research, two rounds of public consultation and civic engagement, and a final report with recommendations to Council, must be complete by 2016. Toronto City Council will then make the final decision on whether or not to accept the recommendations made by the consultant team and must pass a by-law to implement the new ward structure. The changes that occur as a result of the Review will come into effect for the 2018 municipal election.

1.2 Purpose of the Review

Effective representation is the goal of all ward boundary reviews. The primary consideration when it comes to effective representation is 'voter parity' (often also referred to as representation-by-population). This is the principle that all votes should have equal weight and therefore the number of people living in each voting area (i.e. ward) should be similar. However there are other factors used by the courts and the Ontario Municipal Board to define effective representation, including protection of communities of interest and neighbourhoods, respect for natural and physical boundaries, ward history, and recent and projected population growth. These principles are discussed at length throughout this report.

The Toronto Ward Boundary Review does not cover items such as: how municipal government is organized (e.g. whether there should be political parties or whether there should be more community representation); how people vote; who votes (e.g. Canadian citizens only or all Toronto residents); the quality of a job a Councillor is doing; or how City departments operate.

1.3 Context

Based on the current distribution of ward populations, Toronto's ward structure does not meet the requirements of 'effective representation'. Over the past several years, as the City of Toronto has grown, the equity of representative democracy across wards has been affected. The best estimate of the City's population for the 2014 election year is 2.743 million with an average ward population of 60,958. Some wards have considerably higher populations (30% to 45%), and some lower (around 10% below the average).

Council has recognized that the growing imbalance is not conducive to effective representation for the residents of Toronto and has initiated this current review of its ward boundaries. Additionally, Council has responded to the fact that the populations of Toronto's current wards have already been challenged at the Ontario Municipal Board. This means that if Toronto does not review the current size and shape of its wards, a new ward structure could be imposed by the Ontario Municipal Board without the public's involvement and without City Council approval.

In 2013, the City Manager authorized City Council to hire an independent consultant to undertake a review of Toronto's current ward structure. The Terms of Reference for the Review states that the objective is to: undertake a review process for Toronto, including broad engagement and consultation with Toronto public, communities,

key stakeholders, the Mayor and City Councillors and develop ward boundary options and recommendations for City Council's consideration.

1.4 About this Report

This report was developed to provide the Toronto Ward Boundary Review consultant team, as well as the general public and city staff and council, with information that will help the team to make informed decisions and recommendations about changes to Toronto's ward boundaries. It is meant to strengthen the team's understanding of Toronto's ward boundaries by examining precedents, best practices, the regulatory context, as well as Toronto-specific issues that might influence the size and shape of the City's wards. The research is meant to supplement insights gained through consultation and engagement and will support the development ward boundary options which will be presented in the Options Report (forthcoming in April 2015).

The report includes a review of the underlying legislation and regulations that govern ward boundary reviews in Ontario, as well as a comparison of legislation from other municipalities in Canada and around the world (Section 2). Section 3 examines common guiding principles or criteria used for ward boundary reviews and Section 4 includes a comparison of other municipalities in Ontario and across Canada that have undergone a review process. Section 4 looks specifically at the City of Toronto in the context of a ward boundary review and includes an historical overview of Toronto's ward boundaries, a description of the current ward structure and review of local issues that might affect a possible new ward system. Section 6 includes an overview of the lessons learned and key findings from the research.

2.0 LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

2.1 Historical Electoral Boundary Legislation

The Constitution Act (1867) was the first piece of legislation in Canada to address the issue of representation. The 'Fathers of Confederation' wanted to ensure that each region of the country had a fair say in the daily workings of the new country and adopted the basic working principle of "representation by population". The authors of the Act allocated a certain number of seats to each province and designed a formula for distributing seats among the provinces based on the proportional populations. This principle has been carried forward into many pieces of Canadian legislation and electoral districting processes.

The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (1982) was created to guarantee political and civic rights to people in Canada. The Charter provided the first constitutional mechanism for challenging electoral boundaries. Under Section 3 of the Act, every citizen of Canada is given the right to vote. Although not specifically stated, the Supreme Court has ruled that this section also guarantees a measure of equality in voting, which is the basis for arguments about voter parity and effective representation.

2.2 Federal and Provincial Electoral Boundary Review Legislation

There are three orders of government in Canada and three levels of electoral districts: federal, provincial and municipal. The process of redistribution and in some cases the boundaries themselves are different at each level of government.

Federal Redistribution

The process and responsibility for boundary redistribution at the federal level has been altered numerous times over recent decades. In the early 1900s special all-party committees of the House of Commons were charged with redrawing the maps. In the 1960s the responsibility was given to Electoral Boundary Commissions independent of Parliament and parliamentarians. There were ten commissions (one for each province) which are still in place today. Today, each Commission is composed of three members, is chaired by a judge appointed by the chief justice of the province and has two other members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons.

The *Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act*¹ (1985) sets out several rules for the boundary commissions. It was passed in attempt to address some of the problems associated with electoral redistribution in Canada, such as the tendency for the exercise to be overly partisan and the frequent discrepancies in the geographic size and population of constituencies at the federal level.²

The Act's primary rule is that the population of each electoral district shall be as close as reasonably possible to the electoral quota for the province. Other rules relate to accounting for community of interest, community of identity, historical patterns, and a manageable geographic size for electoral districts in sparsely populated, rural or northern regions of a province. The Act states that a variance from the population equality rule is limited to 25% (plus or minus), except in extraordinary circumstances. Interestingly, the Act does not explicitly list population forecasts as a means for drawing electoral boundaries.³ The Act also requires that federal boundaries be revised every 10 years to reflect population shifts and growth following the completion of the census⁴. The federal government recently undertook a boundary review, and the new ridings will take effect at the time of the next federal election (2015).

Provincial Redistribution

The provincial government is responsible for passing legislation to define electoral boundaries at the provincial level. In 1996, the *Representation Act* divided Ontario into electoral districts with identical names and boundaries to the federal electoral districts. The Act required redistribution whenever a readjustment took place at the federal level.

The *Representation Act* (2005) took a different approach. It divided Ontario into 107 electoral districts, 22 of which are in Toronto.⁵ The Act does not require Provincial boundaries to be the same as federal boundaries, or require that they be reviewed when the federal boundaries are reviewed. It is unclear when the Provincial government will next review their ward boundaries, or whether the Provincial government will adopt the new federal riding boundaries as the provincial boundaries.

¹ Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, R.S.C., 1985, c.E-3 <<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/E-3/FullText.html>>

² Courtney: page 60.

³(74)

⁴ Parliament of Canada, 2009 <<http://www.parl.gc.ca/procedure-book-livrc/document.aspx?sbidid=2ac20cbe-c824-466b-b37c-8941bbc99c37&sbpidx=3>>

⁵Election Statute Law Amendment Act, 2005, c. 35, Legislative Assembly of Ontario
<http://www.onla.on.ca/web/bills/bills_detail.do?locale=en&BillID=171&detailPage=bills_detail_about>

2.3 Regulatory Framework for Municipalities in Ontario

In Ontario, the Municipal Act (2001) provides the regulatory framework for conducting municipal ward boundary reviews. In Toronto, however, the City of Toronto Act⁶ (2006) takes the place of the Municipal Act and provides the authority for Toronto City Council to establish its ward boundaries. There are no substantive differences between the Acts in terms of the framework for ward boundary reviews.⁷

Section 222 of the Municipal Act (2001) and Section 128 of the City of Toronto Act (2006) give municipal councils the power to divide or re-divide the municipality into wards, following the passage of a by-law. Both Acts prescribe a process and a timeline that must be followed in order to pass the by-law:

- Within 15 days of the passage of a by-law, a municipality must give notice of the passing of the by-law and details for filing a notice of appeal.
- The notice must provide 45 days after by-law passing for notice of appeal to the OMB
- Appeals must be sent to the OMB within 15 days after the last day for notice of appeal.
- Once passed, a bylaw comes into force during the next election, or after the subsequent election in the case of the bylaw is passed after January 1st of the year of the election.

The Acts also prescribe a process where an elector can present a petition to a city council asking the council to pass a by-law dividing or re-dividing the city into wards or dissolving the existing wards. The petition requires the signatures of 500 electors in the city. If City Council does not pass the by-law within 90 days after receiving the petition, any of the electors who signed the petition may apply to the Ontario Municipal Board.

Neither the City of Toronto Act (2006) nor the Municipal Act (2001) includes specific guidelines or criteria for municipalities in regards to conducting ward boundary reviews. Therefore ward boundary review processes in Ontario must take into consideration the legislative framework explained above, as well as past OMB cases which are described in section 4.3.

The Municipal Act (2001) and the City of Toronto Act (2006) give the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) the authority to hear appeals of ward boundary by-laws and to make an order affirming, amending or repealing the by-law. The Board's authority when it comes to ward boundary reviews is limited to the by-law itself. Generally, the Board does not interfere with decisions made by the elected municipal council unless there are clear and compelling reasons to do so. When evaluating appeals, the Board looks to the Constitution Act and the criteria developed in the Carter Case in making its decisions. The Board expects municipalities to develop and follow sound guiding principles that are aligned, or consistent with the Carter Case.

The City of Toronto Act and the Municipal Act also give city councils the authority to change the composition of council, which refers to the size of Council and the method of selecting members.⁸ Some basic requirements for the Composition of Council are described in the City of Toronto Act (Section 135):

⁶http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_06c11_e.htm

⁷Ontario Municipal Act, SO 2001, c.25 s.222 <http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_01m25_e.htm>

⁸ The City of Barrie, May 2013. "Staff Report Re: Ward Boundary Review Recommendation"

<<http://www.barrie.ca/City%20Hall/MayorCouncil/Documents/CLK006-13%20Ward%20Boundary%20Review%20Recommendation.pdf>>

1. There shall be a minimum of five members, one of whom shall be the head of council.
2. The members of council shall be elected in accordance with the Municipal Elections Act, 1996.
3. The head of council shall be elected by general vote.
4. The members, other than the head of council, shall be elected by general vote or wards or by any combination of general vote and wards. 2006, c. 11, Sched. A, s. 135 (3).

A separate by-law must be created if a ward boundary review also results in the change in the number of wards; however, unlike the process for ward boundary reviews, a by-law outlining the composition of council cannot be appealed to the OMB.

2.4 Regulatory Framework for Municipalities Across Canada

The legislation for municipal ward boundary reviews is different in each province in Canada. Generally, it is the Municipal or Local Government Act that contains the guidelines for municipalities in undertaking their ward boundary reviews and it is up to the local Council to adopt the new ward boundaries. The following is an overview of the guiding legislation from each province.

*Saskatchewan*⁹

The Saskatchewan Municipalities Act (2005) differs from the Ontario Municipal Act significantly in that it lays out how a review should be carried out, what criteria should be considered, and puts more emphasis on public participation and awareness.

For example, Section 83 (3) states that the public must be given notice before considering re-dividing the wards. The Saskatchewan Municipalities Act also states that the population of any of the wards cannot exceed or fall short of an equal division of population between the wards by more than 25%.

A council-appointed municipal wards commission is in charge of establishing ward boundaries. At the request of the council or on its own initiative, this commission can review the wards of the municipality at any time and must review the wards of the municipality at least once every three election cycles.

This commission cannot be composed of council or employees of the city in question, except the administrator. The municipal wards commission must hold public hearings and consultations; and takes into consideration current and prospective geographic conditions, such as density and communities of interest. On completion of its duties the municipal wards commission must file a report with the municipality laying out the new boundaries before they are put in place.

Interestingly, the ward commission is also tasked with determining the number of councillors to be elected for each ward.

⁹The Municipalities Act, c. M-36.1 of the Statutes of Saskatchewan, 2005
<<http://www.qp.gov.sk.ca/documents/English/Statutes/Statutes/M36-1.pdf>>

*Alberta*¹⁰

The laws regarding ward boundary reviews in the Alberta Municipal Government Act (2000) are brief. The Act states that a city council has the power to divide the municipality into wards and establish their boundaries, change the number of wards and their boundaries, give a name or number to each ward established or changed, decide on the number of councillors to be elected for each ward (established or changed), or eliminate wards in the city. The Act is significantly less detailed than both the Saskatchewan and Ontario Acts, with no mention of how a ward boundary review is to be conducted or which criteria should guide the ward boundary review.

*Manitoba*¹¹

For the Province of Manitoba, the Municipal Act (1996) states that councils have the ability to divide, establish or change the number of wards or ward boundaries. In making these changes, a council “must try to achieve an approximately equal number of residents in each ward”. Councils are not obligated, but may take into consideration ‘community or diversity interests’, ‘topographical features’, ‘settlement patterns’, and ‘population trends’ in determining ward boundaries. Thus, representation by population is paramount to the preparation of a successful ward boundary by-law in Manitoba.

Similar to Ontario, Manitoba has a municipal board. Section 89 of the Act states that if a request or petition is made in writing by a minimum of 25 voters within the municipality in question, the Municipal Board may review the by-law that divides, eliminates, or otherwise alters the wards or the ward boundaries of a municipality in the province. If upon review of a by-law, the Municipal Board is not satisfied that the by-law is appropriate, the Board has the power to refer the by-law back to council for further consideration, or can require that council amend the by-law as directed by the Board.

*British Columbia*¹²

British Columbia differs significantly from the other provinces discussed in this section because municipal elections are typically at large and there is generally no ward system. The Local Government Act of British Columbia (1996) allows for a municipality to implement a by-law that permits councillors to elect on a neighbourhood constituency basis under subsection (2) of Section 36.1. This section also states that a by-law that establishes these neighbourhood constituencies must lay out the areas that they are to be composed of and provide for a relatively smooth transition into a municipal election under the ward system. If a by-law under this section is proposed it must be approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council before it is adopted. While the Act does not state the criteria that the Lieutenant Governor is to use, ultimately any proposition for changes to a neighbourhood constituency system must be accepted by the Lieutenant Governor.

¹⁰Municipal Government Act, c. M-26, 2000 <<http://www.qp.alberta.ca/documents/acts/m26.pdf>>

¹¹Local Government Act, RSBC 1996, c. 323, s 36.1. <http://www.bclaws.ca/Recon/document/ID/freeside/96323_00>

¹² Municipal Government Act, SNS 2001, c. 26. ss 1-28. <<https://www.canlii.org/en/ns/laws/rcgu/ns-reg-24-99/latest/ns-reg-24-99.html>>

*Nova Scotia*¹³

Section 369 of the Municipal Government Act requires each council to conduct a study of the number and boundaries of polling districts in the municipality, their fairness and reasonableness and the number of councillors, every eight years. In the same year that the study is conducted, the municipal council must apply to the Board to confirm or to alter the number and boundaries of polling districts and the number of councillors. The Board may make an order granting the whole or part of an application, and has the power to make further alterations as considered appropriate. Interestingly, the Board expects variances for relative parity between polling districts to be within +/-10%, only allowing variances up to +/-25% in extraordinary circumstances. The council must assess the number and boundaries of polling districts in the municipality, their “fairness and reasonableness” as well as the number of councillors for the municipality in question. The Board recommends municipalities use a two-step process, starting with the determination the desired number of councillors (involves the consideration of the desired style of Council, the governance structure of Council, and a determination of an effective and efficient number of councillors) and then addressing the distribution of polling districts in the second stage.¹⁴

2.4 Regulatory Framework for Municipalities Outside North America

Manchester, United Kingdom

The City of Manchester has a population of 514,400 and is made up of 32 wards served by 96 representatives. As of 2006, each ward had three elected councillors who represent an estimated average of 3284 constituents.¹⁵

The Local Democracy Economic Development and Construction Act (2009) sets out the provisions of local government, including a review of the electoral districts “from time to time”. This review is referred to as a Periodic Electoral Review. A review can also be triggered if there is a notable electoral variance. This occurs either when over 30% of wards have an imbalance of more than 10% of the average representative ratio; one or more of the wards have an imbalance greater than 30% that is unlikely to be corrected in a foreseeable time period; or if the local governing body requests a review. The Local Electoral Commission is an independent body set up by the UK Parliament and is responsible for electoral reviews, including the number of councillors, the names, number and boundaries of wards and electoral divisions and the number of councillors to be elected to each.

Between 1996 and 2004 a country-wide review of all electoral districts took. Local authorities completed forms providing electoral information and polling areas as the basis of the review. Recommendations took into account public consultation which occurs both during a preliminary stage and after the development of ward options are prepared.

Ultimately decisions must be agreed upon by the local authority. Emphasis is put upon electoral equity; the effort to equalize the number of electors represented by a member of council, defined through a ratio of average level of

¹³Municipal Government Act, RSA 2001, c. M-26, s 148. <<https://www.canlii.org/en/ns/laws/regu/ns-reg-24-99/latest/ns-reg-24-99.html>>

¹⁴Municipal Government Act, RSA 2001, c. M-26, s 148. <<https://www.canlii.org/en/ns/laws/regu/ns-reg-24-99/latest/ns-reg-24-99.html>>

¹⁵City of Manchester. “Public Intelligence- Manchester’s Population, Ethnic Groups, and Ward Map” <http://www.manchester.gov.uk/info/200088/statistics_and_census/438/public_intelligence/3>

representation to ward level representation. But similar to Canada/Ontario, the process takes into consideration community identity, as well as convenient and effective local government and the electoral cycle of the authority under review.¹⁶

The City of London, United Kingdom

The City of London, which is the small city within the Greater London area, is made up of 25 wards. It serves around 9,000 residents and 340,000 workers.¹⁷ Each ward is comprised of one alderman and two or more councilmen (typically up to 8), depending on the population size. Ward Boundary Reviews look at the boundaries of each ward and the number of voters and Common Councilmen in each. The number of council members (councilmen) was agreed at the time of franchising the city and is not altered during a ward review.¹⁸

The Review is undertaken by a Boundary Review Panel comprising the Town Clerk and Chief Executive, the Recorder of London and the Common Serjeant (the two most senior judges at the Old Bailey). Their main objective is to try to ensure 'electoral equality', whilst also reflecting communities in the area and providing for effective and convenient local government. They also seek to fix boundaries which are and will remain clearly identifiable. The Panel's review takes several factors into consideration 1) protection of residential ward boundaries, 2) increasing the size of smaller wards and 3) Creating clearly identifiable and common sense boundaries.

Interestingly, there are 4 residential wards and 21 non-residential wards in the City of London. It is the only area in the UK in which the number of workers significantly outnumbers the residents and therefore, in effort to be truly representative of its population, the City offers a vote to City organizations so they can have their say on the way the City is run. This has led to several rules in the allocation of council members. For example, 20 out of every 100 council members must represent residential interests. With a minimum of 2 members per ward (times 4 wards) the additional 12 seats are allocated based on the size of the ward.

The ward system in London has been controversial due to the nature of the representation of businesses. The numbers of votes for business are based on the number of bodies employed. This led to significant impacts on the election system as the numbers of representatives (based approximately on the number of registered voters) is impacted by economic decisions made. The 2010 review for the 2013 election made minor revisions to internal format of members.

Sydney, Australia

With over 183,000 residents, Sydney (and here we refer to only the local government area covering the Sydney central business district and surrounding inner city suburbs of the greater metropolitan area of Sydney) is represented by a Lord Mayor and 9 Councillors, elected on a 4 year term. The Councillors elect a Deputy Mayor annually. The Council represents the entire city, as there are no ward divisions. Currently, 33 suburbs and 23

¹⁶The Local Government Boundary Commission for England. 2012. "Electoral Reviews- Technical Guidance" <http://www.lgbce.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0014/10391/electoral-review-guidance-august-2012.pdf>

¹⁷City of London. 2014. "Ward Elections" <<http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/about-the-city/how-we-work/elections-and-wards/wards/Pages/ward-elections.aspx>>

¹⁸City of London."City of London Ward Boundary Review Final Recommendations" <<https://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk/about-the-city/how-we-work/elections-and-wards/Documents/ward-boundary-review-final-recommendations.pdf>>

localities are under Council authority. The Local Government Act (1993) outlines how elections are run, and how and when councils meet.¹⁹

Since 1900, governing parties have regularly changed Sydney's city boundaries in effort to slant the vote in their favour. This had a dramatic effect on the number and characteristics of people entitled to vote. In 1900, The Greater Sydney movement emerged with a focus on expanding Sydney's boundaries. Due to population growth and sprawl, Sydney was surrounded by small municipalities. In 1909, these municipalities were amalgamated and de-amalgamated several times²⁰. As of 2004, the area that became known as South Sydney is once again under control of Sydney Council. Local politics also impeded boundary changes. When Council was dissolved in 1932, city boundaries that were slated for review after a unanimous City Council vote remained unchanged due to the opposing political affiliation of areas immediately surrounding Sydney. Most recently, in 2004 Sydney and South Sydney were amalgamated without a ward system.²¹

The Sydney Act 1988 provided the most recent significant changes to Sydney's local government structure. Boundaries were redrawn to reflect the division between the Central Business District of Sydney and the inner suburbs. There was the creation of a nine-member body known as the Central Sydney Planning Committee, to dictate and streamline future development²².

Adelaide, Australia

Adelaide has a 12 member City Council, comprised of a Lord Mayor and 11 Councillors representing a population of 1.2 million. There are two types of councillors; area and ward councillors. The 5 area councillors represent the City of Adelaide. There are three wards within the city boundaries with 2 Councillors per ward.²³

The boundary review process is mandated by the Government of South Australia. Every council in the state is required to review its representation structure after every two election cycles. During the review, the number of wards and number of elected councillors are considered.²⁴

Reviews can also be undertaken through other mechanisms. The council can decide to review its representational structure at any time; the Electoral Commissioner may require a review if the representation for a ward varies from the ward quota by over 20%, or if a group of at least 20 electors make a submission to the council. If the council does not support the proposal and the electors are dissatisfied with the decision, the group can then make a submission to the Boundary Adjustment Facilitation Panel who can decide whether or not it appears appropriate to conduct its own review based on the electors' submission.

¹⁹ City of Sydney. "Civic History" <<http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/learn/sydneys-history/civic-history>>

²⁰ Golder, Dr. Hilary. 1995. "A Short Electoral History of the Sydney City Council- 1842-1992" <http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/65549/hs_chos_electoral_history.pdf>

²¹ City of Sydney. <http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0010/138259/Documentation-6067_Update-to-Governance-at-the-City-Report-Document-website-copy.PDF>

²² Golder, Dr. Hilary. 1995. "A Short Electoral History of the Sydney City Council- 1842-1992" <http://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0011/65549/hs_chos_electoral_history.pdf>

²³ City of Sydney. "Representation Structure Proposal" Retrieved from <www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/>

²⁴ Government of South Australia. "How Councils Work- Council Boundary Changes and Representation Reviews" <http://www.localgovt.sa.gov.au/how_councils_work/council_boundary_changes_and_representation_reviews#6>

Glasgow, United Kingdom

With a population of 598,830, the Glasgow City Council has 79 elected members representing 21 multi-member wards. Scotland is currently divided into 32 local authority areas that contain electoral wards.²⁵ Each ward has 3 or 4 Councillors. The Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland (LGBC) is the public body responsible for reviewing electoral arrangement: the number of councillors on each council, the number of wards, and the boundaries of those wards²⁶. They make recommendations to Scottish Ministers.

The LGBC derives its power from the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973. By law, the Commission is required to review electoral arrangements every 8-12 years. The LGBC objective, as mandated, is to ensure each ward has “as nearly as may be”, referred to as electoral parity. The number of electors in each ward is carefully considered during review, as well as special geographic considerations, community ties, changes to electorates over the following five years. Preference is also given for easily identifiable boundaries. The optimum number of electors each Councillor should represent is determined by dividing the total number of electors by the Councillor numbers. The LGBC seeks to create a ratio of councillors to electors in each ward that is as close to the average as is practical.²⁷ Reviews outside of the required interval may be undertaken if variations in levels of representation become “notable”.

Lessons from Cities in the UK and Australia

The decision to review cities in the Commonwealth was based on the potential compatibility of municipal systems in the UK and Australia. The single most useful insight from reviewing cities in the UK and Australia is that because the processes and principles guiding boundary reviews are strictly prescribed by national or state electoral commissions, there is a willingness to consider varying the number of councillors per ward where voter parity cannot reasonably be achieved. What in Canada is termed ‘effective representation’ is achieved through regular mandatory reviews to ensure that changes in population – up or down – are reflected in the level of political representation. It is also common practice to have party politics at the local level. In the City of London (a tiny microcosm of the larger geography of Greater London), there are specific wards for businesses, where companies are able to vote based on the number of employees.

2.5 Supreme Court of Canada Rulings

The Dixon Case (1989)

The first case in Canada addressing fairness of an electoral boundaries map is the Dixon v. Attorney General of British Columbia, decided in 1989. The British Columbia Supreme Court found that the province's electoral districts, varying in population from 5,511 to 68,347, violated the right to vote guaranteed by Section 3 of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The Court ruled that a new set of districts with more equitable populations must be created. The Province had used a ‘complex quota system’ rather using the typical 25 percent variance rule.

²⁵ City of Glasgow. “Council and Committees” <<https://www.glasgow.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=2952>>

²⁶ Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland. “LGBC Publications” <<http://www.lgbc-scotland.gov.uk/publications/>>

²⁷ Local Government Boundary Commission for Scotland. June 2014.

“Information Paper- The Commission: A General Guide” Retrieved from <www.lgbc-scotland.gov.uk/>

The case established that equality of voting power was the single most important factor to be considered in determining electoral boundaries.²⁸

The Carter Case (1991)

The ‘Carter Case’ is the widely referred to ruling of the Supreme Court of Canada on electoral boundaries and the right to vote.²⁹ The case was first raised in front of the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal and was eventually taken to the Supreme Court of Canada.

The objection heard by the Saskatchewan Court of Appeal referred to having electoral areas that ranged from 6,309 to 12,567 electors. The Court concluded that deviations from voter parity were acceptable in two northern ridings where population was extremely sparse; however, in the southern ridings the Court of Appeal found that voter population disparities between ridings violated S.3 of the Charter and could not be justified under S.1.

The decision was subsequently appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada, which went on to reverse the lower court’s decision. The Supreme Court found that a violation of S.3 of the Charter was not established³⁰. It stated that the actual allocation of seats between urban and rural areas closely followed the population distribution between those areas and effectively increased the number of urban seats to reflect population growth in urban areas.³¹

The Court found that variations between boundaries in the southern part of the province appeared to be justifiable on the basis of factors such as geography, community interests and population growth patterns and that the variance fell within plus or minus 25 percent of the provincial quotient. The northern boundaries were appropriate, given the sparse population and the difficulty of communication in the area. The Court noted that it is more difficult to represent rural ridings than urban because of challenges related to transportation and communications. The Court also held that because rural voters make greater demands on their elected representatives, the goal of ‘effective representation’ may justify somewhat lower voter populations in rural areas.³²

In the decision case, Madame Justice Beverly McLachlin stated that the “purpose of the right to vote enshrined in S.3 of the Charter [that is, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms] is not equality of voting power per se but the right to ‘effective representation.’ ”

The Carter Case established the following conditions to define effective representation:

- **The relative parity of voting power:** a person’s voting power is diluted if a person’s access to a representative or ability to receive assistance from the representative is reduced. When this is the case, the result is deemed to be uneven and unfair representation.

²⁸ ACE Electoral Knowledge Network, “The Role of the Courts in Electoral District Delimitation”: <http://aceproject.org/main/english/bd/bdb06.htm>

²⁹The Attorney General for Saskatchewan v. Roger Carter, Q.C., 1991, S.C.R. 158. “Reference re Prov. Electoral Boundaries (Sask.)” <<http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/766/index.do>>

³⁰Ibid

³¹Ibid

³²Ibid

- **Taking into account countervailing factors:** geography, community history, community interests and minority representation may need to be taken into account to ensure that legislative assemblies effectively represent the diversity of Canada's social mosaic.

Impact on Electoral Boundary Reviews

The Carter Case rejected the principle of "one person, one vote," established by the United States Supreme Court, and substituted it with the principle of "effective representation." In the case ruling, it was argued that the Canadian background is different from the American one in which Canadians "have never insisted upon precise equality of voting power, but instead have traditionally placed greater emphasis on the representation of community interests and given wider recognition to geographic considerations".³³ This ruling altered the criteria for drawing electoral boundaries in Canada.

Such terms like community history, geography and community of interest were not completely new and had served as guidelines by electoral boundary commissions as early as the 1950s but the Carter Case cleared the way for commissions to accept deviations from relative parity of voting power when the move could be justified on grounds of minority representation and cultural and group identity.

According to John Courtney, senior policy fellow at the University of Saskatchewan and author of the book *Commissioned Ridings*, the Supreme Court of Canada Carter Case ruling was especially significant because it shifted the argument in the direction of representing minorities. In Courtney's opinion, the Carter decision reflected changes occurring to the representational agenda in Canada during the two years that separate the Dixon and Carter cases, including hearing of the Lortie Committee, and the attention it gave to Aboriginal representation. When the Supreme Court chose in the Carter Case to favour minority representation, it was possibly anticipating future legal challenges that might be launched on either side of the issue of accommodating minority groups through guaranteed electoral districts. According to Courtney, although the Carter Case was the best known, it was only one of several influences on legislators, parliamentarians, and electoral boundary commissions in the 1990s.³⁴

3.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES: THE FOUNDATION OF WARD BOUNDARY REVIEWS

3.1 Overview

Although legislation in Ontario does not specify the criteria for conducting ward boundary reviews, there are some generally accepted principles that are considered when defining or refining ward boundaries. The principles can vary from municipality to municipality, but all take into consideration the Carter Case decision, previous Ontario Municipal Board decisions, and ultimately, Section 3 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

³³Ibid

³⁴ Courtney, John C. 2001. "Commissioned Ridings: Designing Canada's Electoral Districts," Montreal & Kingston: McGill – Queen's University Press. [p 167-169]

No ward system design can uniformly meet all of the guiding principles set out by a municipality. The ward design ultimately adopted will be the one that best fulfills the guiding principles used for that particular review.³⁵

Table 1 below shows a comparison of the principles used by 12 different municipalities in Canada that have undergone Ward Boundary Reviews. There are strong similarities among Ontario municipalities showing the common regard for the Carter Case and past OMB decisions.

Table 1: Guiding Principles from other Municipal Ward Boundary Reviews in Ontario

Municipality	Year Completed	Pop.	Guiding Principles					Other Principles Used
			Effective representation	Communities of interest	Representation by population	Population trends	Natural & physical features	
Barrie	2013	187,013	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	• Communication and Accessibility
Brantford	2013	135,501	✓	✓		✓	✓	• Communication and Accessibility • Density
Brampton	2013	523,911	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Georgian Bay	2013	17,204	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	• Simplicity • Accountability and Accessibility • Composition of Council
Cambridge	2009	126,748	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	• One person, one-vote • Compactness • Protect against Gerrymandering
Kitchener	2008	219,153	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	• Compactness • Variation is acceptable
Kingston	2013	159,561	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	• Variation is acceptable • Learn from others
Markham	2013	301,709	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	• ER is considered overriding principle
Oakville	2012	182,520	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	• ER is considered overriding principle
Ottawa	2005	883,391	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Vaughan	2010	288,301	✓	✓		✓	✓	• ER is a primary goal for the WBR • Variation is acceptable • Public Consultation

³⁵ Williams, Dr. Robert J. February 2013. "Final Report on Markham Ward Boundary Review"
<http://www.markham.ca/wps/wcm/connect/markhampublic/5361f59f-4936-40fa-b8b4-fa0c4f545420/ward_boundary_final_report.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=5361f59f-4936-40fa-b8b4-fa0c4f545420>

Municipality	Year Completed	Pop.	Guiding Principles					Other Principles Used
			Effective representation	Communities of interest	Representation by population	Population trends	Natural & physical features	
Windsor	2009	210,891	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ER is considered a riding principle • Relationships between neighbourhoods should be respected as much as possible

3.2 Common Guiding Principles

This section describes the five most commonly used guiding principles among municipalities in Ontario, which are based on the Carter Case ruling.

Representation by Population

'Representation by Population' is related to the basic democratic idea that each person should get one vote and that all votes should count equally. Based on these principles, every elected official should represent generally the same number of constituents.

Representation by population is of prime importance in achieving effective representation. Deviations are allowed in some cases – where parity of voting power would detract from effective representation. The Supreme Court suggests that only those deviations from absolute voter parity that lead to more effective representation (i.e. geography, community history, community interests and minority representation) should be allowed.³⁶ Usually, population variations of up to 25% above or below the optimal size are considered acceptable. This range is consistent with the legislated federal redistribution provisions, the Carter Case and past OMB decisions³⁷.

It is important to note that this principle is concerned with representation not just by electors but also non-electors. This is because the process of representation implicates all residents of the municipality not just the persons who vote. The reasons for this are explained in the ward boundary review recommendation report for the City of Barrie Ward Boundary Review Final Report:

1. Issues and problems dealt with on a routine basis by municipal governments and elected officials do not only arise from electors but from citizens, including children and youth or newcomers to the municipality, none of whom would have had a vote in the previous election.

³⁶ Elections Canada, 2013. "Enhancing the Values of Redistribution, Chapter 2- Making Representation More Effective" http://www.elections.ca/content.aspx?section=res&dir=rep/ol/recom_redis&document=ch2&lang=e

³⁷In Canada, ward boundary commissions are allowed to may depart from the quotient by more than 25%.

2. It corresponds to the guiding principle that ward boundaries should consider future population growth, which would include non-electors.³⁸

Protection of Communities of Interest

The protection of communities of interest refers to recognizing settlement patterns, traditional neighbourhoods and community groupings (social, historical, economic, religious, and political diversities).³⁹

Applying this principle to a ward boundary configuration means that communities of interest should not be divided by a ward. As a rule, lines are drawn around communities, not through them. Secondly, wards should group together communities with common interests, where there is some identifiable similarity such as age, assessed value and configuration of housing, the life-stage and demographics of the residents, and municipal service provisions and amenities. It is often considered specifically to include linguistic, ethnic, or racial minorities⁴⁰.

In John Courtney's book on designing electoral districts, he provides three reasons that account for the importance attached to communities of interest;

1. If a community of interest was not taken into account, and if electoral districts were constructed solely on the basis of largely equal populations, the results could be both absurd and unfair to individuals, groups, and communities.
2. A great number of individuals identify with geographically defined communities of some sort. It is natural to want to extend that sense of being part of a community to ensuring that that community becomes a part of a larger electoral district with which there is also some affinity.
3. A community of interest can enhance citizen involvement in politics. It has been demonstrated that voter turnout is positively affected when boundaries are redrawn in such a way as to place voters in a riding with they share a strong community of interest.⁴¹

The concept does however lend itself to multiple interpretations and is perhaps the least clearly defined of the principles. Since people don't live in easily identifiable communities, recognizing 'communities of interest' has proven to be challenging. Elections Canada states:

Examples of communities of interest:

- Neighbourhoods
- Heritage Conservation Districts
- Business Improvement Areas
- Ethno-cultural groups that live in the same area

³⁸The City of Barrie Ward Boundary Review. May 2013. <http://www.barrie.ca/City%20Hall/MayorCouncil/Documents/CLK006-13%20Ward%20Boundary%20Review%20Recommendation.pdf> Prepared by: Watson and Associated Economists Ltd. In association with Robert Williams.

³⁹ The City of Barrie, May 2013. "Staff Report Re: Ward Boundary Review Recommendation" <<http://www.barrie.ca/City%20Hall/MayorCouncil/Documents/CLK006-13%20Ward%20Boundary%20Review%20Recommendation.pdf>>

⁴⁰ Courtney, John C. 2001. "Commissioned Ridings: Designing Canada's Electoral Districts," Montreal & Kingston: McGill – Queen's University Press. [page 225]

⁴¹ Ibid [page 209,211]

The difficult task of an electoral boundaries commission is to determine which of the many overlapping communities that exist in our society (if any) is most salient to people's effective representation and to balance that determination with the predominant goal of population equality⁴².

Mindful of the difficulties surrounding the concept, the Lortie Commission [The Royal Commission on Electoral Reform and Party Financing] as quoted in Courtney (2001) concluded that “community of interest cannot be interpreted other than on a case-by-case basis.”⁴³

‘Communities of interest’ is linked to the idea of “neighbourhoods”, especially in the municipal context since the neighbourhood is the most identifiable geographic point in most people’s lives and it is for the most part, how people experience their city. Also, the responsibilities of a municipality are closely linked to neighbourhoods: how people get around; the social, cultural, and recreational services that are available; the provision of utilities and public spaces. In Kitchener, for example, the 34 neighbourhood associations that operate across the city were the communities of interest used to inform its ward boundaries⁴⁴.

The City of Barrie’s ward boundary review used the following factors to evaluate the location of communities of interest;

- Demographic and sociological characteristics;
- Boundaries of local government and administrative units;
- Housing stock of similar age and style;
- Economic ties; and
- Any other factor that can be looked at as demonstrative of the existence of a community.⁴⁵

Communities of interest was a widely debated issue in Ottawa’s 2005 ward boundary review, particularly the idea that rural, urban and suburban communities represented distinctly different communities of interest. Opinions were somewhat divided as to whether a mix of suburban and rural communities in the same ward is desirable. In the end, the rural, suburban and urban areas were grouped into separate wards, rather than mixed together in order to account for the differences between these communities.

Consideration of Present and Future Population Trends

This principle refers to accommodating for and balancing future increases or decreases in population to maintain a general equilibrium in representation by population. Of course it is not practical to change electoral boundaries

⁴² Elections Canada Official Website: http://www.elections.ca/content.aspx?section=res&dir=rep/off/recom_redis&document=ch2&lang=c

⁴³ Courtney, John C. 2001. "Commissioned Ridings: Designing Canada's Electoral Districts," Montreal & Kingston: McGill – Queen's University Press. [page 214]

⁴⁴ Williams, Dr. Robert J. June 2008. "City of Kitchener Ward Boundary Review Final Report"
<<http://imis.amcto.com/imis15/CMDownload.aspx?ContentKey=dc05f78a-6402-427c-ae31-47207091054c&ContentItemKey=97e9cfd4-472e-4ca5-8bec-a178f1727485>>

⁴⁵The City of Barrie, May 2013. "Staff Report Re: Ward Boundary Review Recommendation"
<<http://www.barrie.ca/City%20Hall/MayorCouncil/Documents/CLK006-13%20Ward%20Boundary%20Review%20Recommendation.pdf>>

for every election, so ward structure design needs to accommodate anticipated changes in the size and distribution of the population. The goal is to design a system that will withstand a minimum of two elections.⁴⁶

Typically population projections are used to assess how the community will change and evaluate how the various ward configuration options would affect population distribution among wards over the next several election cycles. Population projections typically take into account growth from expected new development projects, intensification and other factors, or in some cases reductions in population.

Population projections are usually provided by the municipality or other regional bodies as part of growth management studies. For example, in Kingston, staff utilized the most recent Residential Development Potential Report prepared by the City's Planning Department for determining the areas of current and future growth potential, together with a map generated from CityView data showing the number of building permits issued for new residential units. In the case of Barrie, the consultant utilized the City's Growth Management Strategy to determine a population and household forecast.

Consideration of Natural and Physical Boundaries

Geographical, topographical and man-made features are also considered when designing ward systems. The principle recognizes that natural and physical boundaries shape patterns of life in cities, so ward designs should work within these features to keep wards contiguous and group communities of interest.⁴⁷

Robert Williams, a consultant retained by a number of municipalities who have undertaken a ward boundary review in Ontario, states that: "these are considered suitable boundaries because they already separate residents from one another who happen to live on opposite sides of the boundaries".⁴⁸ The goal is not to create areas that look logical on a map, but rather to create wards that group communities together and to facilitate effective representation by a councillor.

Examples of natural and physical boundaries:

- Hills, valleys, rivers
- Man-made boundaries such as highways, railways
- Green spaces such as parks, trails

Some municipalities call this principle 'accessibility and communication', referring to arranging ward boundaries by road patterns, railway and public transit accesses and servicing capabilities to help foster communication and ensure a councillor is accessible to his or her constituents .

Effective Representation

Effective representation is the overriding principle and ultimate goal of all electoral boundary reviews. It encompasses all the other principles. Effective representation aims at achieving equal representation for voters to the greatest extent possible.⁴⁹ The primary consideration is voter parity, but it also takes into account the other criteria, such as geography, community history, community interests and minority representation. In the Carter

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ The Attorney General for Saskatchewan v. Roger Carter, Q.C., 1991, S.C.R. 158. " Reference re Prov. Electoral Boundaries (Sask.)" < <http://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/766/index.do>>

Case and many subsequent OMB cases, the Court has cautioned that only those deviations from absolute voter parity that lead to more effective representation should be allowed.⁵⁰

The concept of effective representation is somewhat ambiguous because it incorporates the other criteria, but to what extent each criteria is weighted is unclear.”⁵¹ It leaves open several questions about how a ward system can ensure that all citizens are effectively represented. For example, if representation is deemed to be effective for one group then why not another? If the interests of one minority group are acknowledged and accepted as critical to the construction of a ward system, what is the impact on some other group? If gender, race, and language can be factored into the equation, could religion not be too?⁵²

In evaluation of the ward system options for the City of Markham, Dr. Williams sets three tests to define the “facets of effective representation”.

- Do the wards constitute politically meaningful units of representation? This requires looking at ward design to evaluate the groups of communities and neighbourhoods that are likely to hold reasonable, coherent perspectives on municipal issues.
- The capacity of elected councillors to represent a ward that is home to a large population, with the associated calls, consultants and communications that go with political life.
- The density of population in wards. The relationship between area and population is inherent in the interpretation of the principle of ‘effective representation’ and is stated in the Supreme Court’s Carter Case.⁵³

3.3 Additional Principles and Considerations

In addition to the most common guiding principles, there are several other criteria that municipalities in Ontario have used to evaluate their ward boundaries.

Composition of Council

A municipality’s ward boundaries and the composition of its council (i.e. the number of councillors and structure of council) are closely related issues. Obviously, the configuration of a municipality’s wards can affect the number of councillors. And perhaps more importantly for this discussion, the composition of council will affect the ability of a councillor to effectively represent his or her constituents.

Referring to the issue of “effective representation”, in the 1992 Carter decision, Madam Justice McLachlin stated;
*Ours is a representative democracy. Each citizen is entitled to be represented in government.
 Representation comprehends the idea of having a voice in the deliberations of government as well as
 the idea of the right to bring one’s grievances and concerns to the attention of one’s government*

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Courtney, John C. 2001. "Commissioned Ridings: Designing Canada’s Electoral Districts," Montreal & Kingston: McGill – Queen’s University Press. [page 204]

⁵² Ibid. [page 233]

⁵³Williams, Dr. Robert J. February 2013."Final Report on Markham Ward Boundary Review"at:http://www.markham.ca/wps/wcm/connect/markhampublic/5361f59f-4936-40fa-b8b4-fa0e4f545420/ward_boundary_final_report.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=5361f59f-4936-40fa-b8b4-fa0e4f545420

representative; as noted in Dixon v. B.C. (A.G), [1989] 4 W.W.R. 393, at p. 413, elected representatives function in two roles- legislative and what has been termed the “ombudsman role.”⁵⁴

This statement refers to the fact that councillors play both a legislative role (i.e. considering and establishing policies) and a constituency role (i.e. consulting with and answering to their constituents).

The ratio of ‘councillor to residents’ is one indication of how well a councillor can perform the constituency role. A councillor has only a certain amount of time in each day to deal directly with the residents and electors and thus, the larger the population a councillor represents, the less time is available for direct contact with each constituent.

The size of council can also affect local representation and governmental capacity. Courtney states: “A legislature’s size bears directly on its capacity to function effectively and to represent the public interest. In Madison’s words, a legislature must be large enough “to possess a due knowledge of interests of its constituents”, yet small enough “to avoid the confusion and intemperance of a multitude”.⁵⁵

There is no clear, universally accepted answer to the question of how large or small a council or assembly should be. At the municipal level, the number of councillors and their level of effort range significantly across Canada. The daily schedule of a councillor consists of dealing directly with residents and electors of their ward, responding to emails, phone calls, and visits to the representative’s office, attending community meetings and events, reading staff reports, and preparing for council meetings. The question is: how do councillors remain accountable to the public?

Besides the number of constituents, there are several other factors that can influence the ability of a councillor to effectively represent constituents. A councillor’s workload, the geographic size of the ward and the number of staff support people a councillor has access to, can also affect the ability of a councillor to maintain contact with issues and people in the ward.

In a city like Toronto, there can be considerable variation among different wards in terms of the number of development applications, the number of demands to meet the councillor, and the rate of growth in the designated area – all of which may affect an ability to address ward issues⁵⁶. It is generally understood that it is easier to represent mature, stable urban wards than fast-growing suburban wards or inner city wards which deal with higher concentrations of city-wide problems such as homelessness, transportation issues, high concentration of social services and the like.

In *Commissioned Ridings*, John Courtney discusses this topic. He argues that the community of interest criteria for constructing seats for a provincial assembly are different from local government districts as well as those of

⁵⁴ The Attorney General for Saskatchewan v. Roger Carter, Q.C., 1991, S.C.R. 158. “Reference re Prov. Electoral Boundaries (Sask.)” <<http://scc-esc.lexum.com/scc-esc/scc-esc/en/item/766/index.do>>

⁵⁵ Courtney, John C. 2001. “Commissioned Ridings: Designing Canada’s Electoral Districts,” Montreal & Kingston: McGill – Queen’s University Press. [page 19],

⁵⁶ Williams, Dr. Robert J. February 2013. “Final Report on Markham Ward Boundary Review” at: http://www.markham.ca/wps/wcm/connect/markhampublic/5361f59f-4936-40fa-b8b4-fa0c4f545420/ward_boundary_final_report.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=5361f59f-4936-40fa-b8b4-fa0c4f545420

the Federal Parliament, because the division of powers presents different issues for consideration and legislative action at the federal and at the provincial levels. This therefore affects the representational demands placed on elected members by constituents and the various local districts contained in a riding. What is a community of interest for an MPP is different from that for an MP or a City Councillor.

Subject matter expert Robert Williams has stated, in his final report for the City of Markham Ward Boundary Review, that the decision to change the composition of Council is better done through a separate review before initiating a ward boundary review.⁵⁷ Many municipal ward boundary review processes in Ontario and others across Canada have opted to examine the composition of council prior to or as a component of their ward boundary reviews, including: Brantford, and Cambridge. These municipalities evaluated factors such as cost, efficiency, workload, constituency, accountability, communication with constituency, and committee structure in order to determine the best composition of council. The City of Calgary has also initiated a ward boundary review that will look at the size of council before considering the boundaries of the wards, compare with other North American cities and comment on what reform would mean for the city's future budget.

Other municipalities consider councillor workload or composition as part of the evaluation of various ward boundary options. For example, in Georgian Bay 'Composition of Council' was used as a criteria or guiding principle for evaluating various options. The Terms of Reference states: "Composition of Council: Consideration will be given to the appropriate size of council to ensure that both the municipal corporation can be governed effectively and also that the community can be well represented in the decision making process".

Wards Should Recognize Density

Adjusting for differences in ward density is one of the reasons the courts have allowed deviation from voter parity, based on the notion that a ward with fewer people spread over a large geographic area is not equivalent to a ward with same number of people in a small geographic area. This is evident in several electoral boundary reviews of the past including the Carter Case and more recently Ottawa, where rural wards are drawn larger with lower populations to account for their geographic size. As noted in the Carter Case decision, rural ridings can also be harder to serve because of difficulty in transport and communications.

Simplicity

The principle of simplicity suggests that the boundaries should be straightforward and easily distinguishable, so that the community can easily understand and participate in the electoral process. This was a guiding principle used by the Town of Georgian Bay and is reflected in several other reviews.⁵⁸

Compact and Contiguous Wards

Two other factors occasionally considered in the redistricting process are the degree of 'compactness' and whether areas are 'contiguous' with each other. Advocates of these criteria suggest that districts should not be

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Williams, Dr. Robert J. August 2013. "Supplementary Report External Review Ward Boundary Options- Township of Georgian Bay" <<https://georgianbay.civicweb.net/document/85363/SupplementaryRepor%20Williams%20t.pdf?handle=580990432D0B4646BB7EDD007538F329>>

oddly shaped and that individual pieces of a district should be inter-connected.⁵⁹ A district is considered contiguous if a resident can travel from any point in the district to any other point in the district without crossing the district's boundary. Put differently, all portions of the district are physically adjacent.

Protect Against Gerrymandering

Gerrymandering is the practice of deliberate manipulation of district boundaries to enhance the probability of electing one's own party or class.⁶⁰ Compared to the United States, gerrymandering is much less common in Canada and the Supreme Court has a much lower tolerance for it. However, detecting gerrymanders can still be somewhat complicated and difficult to detect since political bias in an electoral boundary review may not become evident until after an election.⁶¹

There is also an issue that has been termed, 'unintended gerrymandering,' which describes the partisan bias of electoral districts that occurs organically as a by-product of the boundary readjustment process. For example, when wards or electoral districts group together people with common social, linguistic or cultural characteristics (i.e. unintended gerrymandering); this can represent a genuine community of interest, which is welcomed by the courts. A question that is often discussed in the literature is "should we favour the cultural community or linguistic group, and guarantee it an electoral district where it would be in the majority, even if it means introducing a form of "gerrymandering" aimed at social advancement or affirmative action?"

In an article published in *The Canadian Geographer* in 2012 Benjamin Forest suggests ways to accentuate minority representation is by drawing districts with super-majorities (65% or more of any minority group), majorities (50-64.9%), pluralities, or influence (39-49.9%). Doing so can give minority groups more power in terms of electing representatives.

Another example of where intentional gerrymandering can have a positive effect on representation, is in Montreal. In this case, one of the poorest areas of the city, St. Henri, is combined with the largely Anglophone and wealthy Westmount in a single federal electoral district (St-Henri--Westmount). This was conscious attempt to combine communities in order to reduce social cleavage and support councillors in effectively representing their constituents, which largely contrasts with the approach typically taken in the U.S., where districts are organized to reflect racial or ethnic concentrations.⁶²

Public Consultation

Public consultation is an important part of all ward boundary reviews. It is both civically responsible and reasonable to involve citizens in the decisions that affect their electoral system. There are no specific

⁵⁹The Electoral Knowledge Network. 2012. "Geographic Criteria for Delimiting Electoral Districts- Boundary Delimitation" <<http://aceproject.org/ace-en/topics/bd/bdb/bdb05/bdb05b>>

⁶⁰ Courtney, John C. 2001. "Commissioned Ridings: Designing Canada's Electoral Districts," Montreal & Kingston: McGill – Queen's University Press. [page 11]

⁶¹Horn, M. "GIS and the Geography of Politics" <http://www.geos.ed.ac.uk/~gisteac/gis_book_abridged/files/ch67.pdf>

⁶²Hicks, B. November 2006. "Are Marginalized Communities Disenfranchised? Voter Turnout and Representation in Post-merger Toronto" IRPP Working Paper Series. <<http://irpp.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/research/strengthening-canadian-democracy/are-marginalized-communities-disenfranchised/wp2006-03.pdf>>

requirements for public consultation in Ontario's legislation; the process and approach varies depending on the municipality and the terms of reference for the ward boundary review.

Markham's ward boundary review terms of reference included a requirement for consultation "with the public, including current Members of Council, throughout the review process". It also required to "extensive advertising of the ward boundary review to ensure that a wide cross section of Markham is engaged in the process." In Ottawa, the goal of the public consultation process was to 'build consensus' and achieve solutions for new ward boundaries that satisfy the various stakeholders and avoid lengthy and costly adversarial appeals.⁶³ It included several public meetings, feedback forms, and a website with information made available to the public.

Despite not being a legal requirement, the OMB has made it clear that it expects municipalities to include public consultation as part of the review process. In the 2009 OMB Case in the Town of Innisfil vs. Hambly, the OMB stated:

While the Municipal Act no longer requires a public meeting to inform and hear from the public prior to the Council decision, the common practice of holding public meetings on a variety of matters that come before a municipal council creates an environment and reasonable expectation that the municipality will hold a public meeting to hear from residents on a ward boundary proposal.⁶⁴

Interestingly, under the former Municipal Act (1990) there was a requirement that before a municipality passed a ward boundary by-law it had to give notice of its intention to pass the by-law and hold at least one public meeting to consider the matter (section 13(4)). However, this public consultation requirement was later removed.

3.4 Use of Guiding Principles in Ward Boundary Reviews

Some municipalities clearly prioritize certain guiding principles or explicitly acknowledge that one or more principles may need to be compromised for the purpose of the boundary review. These decisions depend on the particular city and the structure of its wards.

As noted earlier, 'effective representation' is seen as a fundamental or guiding principle. For example, in Barrie, 'effective representation' was considered the "final test of any proposed ward system"⁶⁵. In Oakville, Council directed that three of the guiding principles of the review be prioritized in the following order: Effective representation; the protection of communities of interest and neighbourhoods; and consideration of physical features as natural boundaries.⁶⁶

In another example, the Task Force created by the City of Cambridge to review its ward boundaries decided that 'protecting communities of interest' and 'consideration of physical features as natural boundaries' are two principles that must be compromised since blending areas across boundaries was necessary to address a sense of

⁶³ City of Ottawa. "Public Involvement Process" <<http://ottawa.ca/en/city-hall/official-and-master-plans/ward-boundary-review/40-public-involvement-process>>.

⁶⁴ *Hambly, Re*, 64 OMBR 36, 2009 CarswellOnt 7748, at para 8.

⁶⁵ City Staff Report on Ward Boundary Review Recommendations for the City of Barrie.

⁶⁶ Town of Oakville. April 2012. "Ward Boundary Review- Final Report" <http://www.oakville.ca/assets/general%20-%20town%20hall/2012WBR_FinalReport.pdf>

parochialism that had developed since amalgamation and to enhance the perception of Cambridge being “one City.”⁶⁷

4.0 LEARNING FROM OTHER MUNICIPALITIES

There are many important lessons to be learned from the experience of other municipalities in Ontario, across Canada and cities in other parts of the world that have undergone ward boundary reviews.

4.1 Overview of Ward Boundary Reviews in Ontario

Table 2 below provides an overview of 12 municipalities in Ontario that have undergone ward boundary reviews and the outcome of those reviews. It shows that almost all ward boundary reviews result in a reconfiguration of a municipalities ward boundaries. One exception is in Oakville, where Council voted to keep the status quo until such time as Halton Region awards the City an additional seat on Regional Council. It is also worth noting, that none of the ward boundary reviews examined led to a reduction in the number of wards.

Only three of 12 ward boundary reviews resulted in both a change to the composition of Council and the number of ward. Five out of the 13 ward boundary reviews examined resulted in an appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board, suggesting that the majority of ward boundary reviews in Ontario are completed successfully without the involvement of the Ontario Municipal Board. Each of these OMB cases is examined and summarized in Section 4.3.

Table 2: Outcomes of Ontario Municipal Ward Boundary Reviews

Municipality	Year Completed	Population as of 2011	Outcomes
1. Barrie	2013	187,013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council approved the re-division of the existing 10 ward boundaries into 10 new wards. • No appeals.
2. Brantford	2013	135,501	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council approved a redistributed 5-ward option and to maintain the 2 councillors per ward. • No appeals.
3. Brampton	2013	523,911	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council approved redistribution of the existing 10 wards, and to maintain a representative structure of 1 City Councillor and 1 Regional Councillor per 2 wards. • No appeals.
4. Georgian Bay	2013	17,204	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council approved the adoption of a 4 ward structure (previously 3 wards) and a subsequent change of council composition, with the addition of 1 ward Councillor. • Appealed to the OMB by resident: dismissed.
5. Cambridge	2009	126,748	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council passed two by-laws, to establish a new 8 ward structure, and to alter Council composition with the addition of 1 Councillor. • No appeals.
6. Kitchener	2008	219,153	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council structure was reviewed as part of the process, with an additional 4 councillors added. • Concern that the ward structure did not meet all the guiding principles. • No appeals

⁶⁷ City of Cambridge “Ward Boundary Changes for 2010”

http://www.cambridge.ca/mayor_city_council/cambridge_city_council/ward_boundary_changes_for_2010

Municipality	Year Completed	Population as of 2011	Outcomes
7. Kingston	2013	159,561	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council approved by-law in conformity with OMB amendments, to redistribute 9 of the 12 wards. • Appeal made to the OMB regarding the exclusion of post-secondary student estimates in the population numbers used; appeal upheld.
8. Markham	2013	301,709	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council approved the re-division of the 8 wards; no changes to Council composition (deemed a separate matter). • Appeal made to the OMB on the basis that all options to increase the number of wards were not considered; dismissed on failure of Appellant to provide grounds and evidence worthy of the adjudicative process.
9. Oakville	2012	182,520	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council voted to maintain the status quo (6 ward system) until Halton Region awards Oakville an additional seat on Regional Council. • An addition of 1 ward is recommended by Council once the regional seat is secured.
10. Ottawa	2005	883,391	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial boundary review process in 2002 was appealed to the OMB on the grounds that effective representation was not adhered to; no changes to boundaries were made. • 2005, Council approved the adoption of a 23 ward system- with an additional 2 councillors and 2 wards. • Appeal filed on the basis of rural representation concerns; appeal dismissed.
11. Vaughan	2010	288,301	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council approved the redistribution of the existing 5 ward system. • Appeal made to the OMB on the basis of the review process and outcome; appeal allowed in part, with two boundary divisions amended by the OMB to accommodate natural boundaries.
12. Windsor	2009	210,891	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ward structure was reviewed as part of the process. Council approved a by-law to redivide 5 wards into 10 single-member wards. • No appeals.
13. Innisfil			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appealed to the OMB

4.3 OMB appeals

The proceedings of the five ward boundaries reviews that were appealed to the OMB were examined in detail to identify key lessons, and to help avoid making procedural errors or offering options that could be appealed. This is summarized below.

City Of Kingston (2013)

The by-law passed by City Council to change its ward boundaries in 2012 was appealed to the OMB on the basis that it did not provide effective representation. The appellant's main concern was that the review used the projected number of electors rather than total population, and excluded post-secondary students from the review process. In addition, they appealed on the basis that the by-law failed to recognize communities of interest, by splitting a neighbourhood association area.

Prior to the appeal, Council had directed staff to seek advice from experts on how to complete population numbers including post-secondary students and children and how these might best be reflected in the district boundaries. A Technical Advisory Team was established and provided several options using estimates of the post-secondary students. Surprisingly, on a 7-6 vote, Council passed a motion to re-divide the electoral boundaries in accordance with Option 1, which did not include post-secondary student estimates in the total population counts.

The OMB sided with the appellant, agreeing that total population and not electors should be the basis for determining ward boundary reviews. They found that Council acted unreasonably in adopting an option that did not include post-secondary students when determining electoral districts. It should be noted that these students represent more than 20% of the City's population. The Board stated in its decision report that "Whether that population votes or does not vote is not the issue". The role of the councillor is to represent his or her constituency or the residents in the ward, not just those who are able to vote. In addition the by-law was amended to account for the Sydenham Neighbourhood Association.⁶⁸

"While it may be difficult to make an accurate determination of the student population ... this should not be the basis for leaving this sector of the community out of the determination of the electoral system. Furthermore, the notion that they can be basically ignored in this exercise because they are not voters is unsound...."

-OMB Member, Sylvia Sutherland

Georgian Bay (2013)

The Town of Georgian Bay undertook a review of its ward boundaries in 2013. Prior to the review, Council consisted of three area councillors (one from each ward), two district councillors (one from Ward 3, which is the former Baxter Township, and one from Wards 1 and 2 combined), and the Mayor, who is elected at-large.

After a lengthy review process and several public meetings, general consensus was not reached on any of the options presented. Concerned that this matter would not be finalized in time for a new by-law to take effect for the 2014 municipal election, a local citizen filed an appeal with the OMB.

Council adopted a four ward system which results in a seven member Council. The appellant was seeking Board approval for a two ward system, with a six member Council. The appellant's case was premised on the proposition that fair representation is achieved through voter parity. In support of this, the appellant contended that "the critical question which must be determined by this Board is whether "parity of voting" is to be determined in this Municipality by reference to the number of electors in the wards or by reference to total population."

"Firstly, it is to be understood that the Board is reluctant to interfere with decisions made by the duly elected municipal Council unless there are clear and compelling reasons to do so. The fact that one takes issue with the review process and/or prefers a different ward system is not justification for overturning the decision of Council."

-OMB Member, M. A. Sills

⁶⁸ City Solicitor Information Report to City Council of Kingston, November 2013, Copy found at: https://www.cityofkingston.ca/documents/10180/3050121/COU_A2413-13388.pdf/c25ca606-d7ca-47e3-a7c2-e3f3f67398c1

The OMB found that although it had not been specified in provincial legislation, OMB case law has upheld the use of population figures.

As the Board explained in the course of the hearing, other than compliance with the statutory requirements, the process, and conduct of members of Council are not factors which have a bearing on the Board's decision. The number of elected officials and/or composition of Council are not matters for which the Board has jurisdiction. The Board set the appeal aside, and the four ward system was adopted.

City Of Markham (2013)

The City of Markham conducted a ward boundary review in 2012-2013. Dr. Robert Williams was again the main consultant on the project. Based on his recommendations in the final report, Council's decision was to maintain the current number of wards and among other changes, merge Wards 1 & 2 in Thornhill, which would reduce Thornhill to a single representative on Council as of the following municipal election.⁶⁹

Councillor Howard Shore, a regional councillor for the area, appealed the by-law to the OMB. His argument was that City of Markham and the consultants did not follow the original mandate of the review which was to include options showing the possibility of additional councillor representatives. Both Councillor Shore and Ward One (South) Thornhill Residents Inc. (WOSTRI) stated that they felt Thornhill was losing its voice on Council.

The OMB dismissed Councillor Shore's appeal. The key to the Board's decision was that Councillor Shore was not arguing against the by-law itself, but rather that the consultants had only partially followed the terms of reference, and by not providing an option which added additional wards, the public did not have the proper opportunities to provide input⁷⁰.

In his Final Report, Robert Williams stated that option for adding additional councillors was not considered in detail as part of the review because persuasive evidence or a reasoned argument based on the guiding principles was not offered. Robert Williams also stated that although the decision to change the composition of Markham Council (either an increase or a reduction) can be made, the Review was not designed to make such a recommendation. He further advised the City to undertake a separate review that establishes the number of positions to fill before next initiating a ward boundary review.

⁶⁹ Final Report on Markham Ward Boundary Review, Dr. Robert J. Williams, Feb. 2013, P.11. Full report found at: http://www.markham.ca/wps/wcm/connect/markhampublic/5361f59f-4936-40fa-b8b4-fa0c4f545420/ward_boundary_final_report.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=5361f59f-4936-40fa-b8b4-fa0c4f545420

⁷⁰ Full copy of the OMB Report is available on the City of Markham website at: <http://www.markham.ca/wps/wcm/connect/markhampublic/1bd27fca-4daf-4f89-8e8c-ff1b63324cd2/MM130043.Decision+%28October+24%2C+2013%29.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CACHEID=1bd27fca-4daf-4f89-8e8c-ff1b63324cd2>

"The Interim Report does not, then, include nine- or ten-ward alternatives; the 2012 Ward Boundary Review will not do so unless council specifically directs that it wishes to add the composition of council question to this Review. For one thing, the analysis presented so far suggests that a viable eight-ward design is available. For another, there is no guarantee that additional nine- or ten-ward options will be any better at "ticking all of the boxes" associated with the guiding principles than the eight-ward options."

-OMB Member, R. Rossi

City Of Vaughan (2009)

In May 2009, City Council in Vaughan adopted By-law 89-209, redrawing the boundaries for its five wards. It was the fourth ward redraft in 15 years, intended to set ground rules for the 2010, 2014 and 2018 municipal elections. The by-law was appealed to the OMB and a hearing was held in October, 2009. The Appellant, a local resident, disagreed with both the process and outcome⁷¹. Other participants also came forward.

“Among a range of problematic alternatives which are a challenge to effective representation, this outcomes appears to be the one which best respects Carter, at least at his time.”

-OMB Member, M.C. Denhez

The appeal was based on the argument that although the new ward boundaries produced favourable figures for voter parity (variances all under 25%), the failures of process invalidated the review. Several complaints were brought forward, such as:

- Population projections omitted several approved projects, which would add more than 37,000 people;
- Mapping assumed intensification in the Oak Ridges Moraine;
- There was no record of any response to the public board;
- Too many options were presented at the Open House;
- The public was asked to rank the guiding principles/criteria rather than provide input on the ward boundaries themselves;
- The public wasn't given access to the maps until months into the project;
- Lack of consistency of information communicated by the clerk (i.e. the criteria was changed and certain comments were recorded while other were not);
- Council did not re-circulate its final preferred option;
- Council did not rely on staff's recommendation;
- And, the evaluation criteria were submitted for official approval after the team had already prepared its projections, scenarios, and maps.

Two issues with the by-law itself were also presented: one ward boundary disregarded the natural boundary of Highway 407 and another divided a rural area.

Although the Board found many of the procedural issues concerning, it stated that its main issue was that the City failed to conduct a proper analysis using the factors described in Carter.

The Board ordered that the by-law be allowed with two small amendments to incorporate changes to the maps, based on the issues with the law itself. Its decision was based on the fact that despite the legitimate concerns over process, the new ward boundaries were an improvement over the status quo and therefore would not compromise voters' constitutional rights.

In response to the OMB ruling, with continuing concerns about the previous process, and with the rapidly expanding population in Vaughan, in the fall of 2011 electors undertook a petition for Vaughan City Council to proceed with a new Ward Boundary Review Process. In early-2012, the petition was presented to the Vaughan

⁷¹ Details of case and decisions available on OMB website: <https://www.omb.gov.on.ca/ecs/CaseDetail.aspx?n=MM090024>

City Council. However, City Council declined to proceed with a new review process.⁷² The City has committed to conducting a thorough review in advance of the 2018 municipal election.⁷³

Town Of Innisfil (2009)

The 2009 case of *Hambly vs. Town of Innisfil*⁷⁴ is worth noting because it reiterated the tendency of the OMB to only amend or repeal a decision on ward boundary matters if there is a compelling reason to do so. It also offers confirmation for the Board's expectation that the public be involved in the ward boundary review process.

In the decision report, the OMB states that in determining whether such a compelling reason is present the Board would consider the process, criteria, and result of the proposed ward boundary changes and whether effective representation would be achieved. The Board described the test as follows⁷⁵:

- The criteria used by the municipality, the studies undertaken to inform the application of those criteria, and the appropriateness of the proposed implementation of those criteria;
- The process followed by the municipality, particularly in terms of the extent to which steps were taken to inform the public and provide an opportunity for public comment; and
- The grounds of the appeal against the municipality's decision and any additional grounds advanced at the hearing of the merits.

City Of Ottawa (2005)

The City of Ottawa attempted to redefine its ward boundaries twice; both attempts resulted in appeals to the OMB. The first attempt failed and the second was successful.

Regarding the first attempt: a volunteer Citizens' Task Force conducted the ward boundary review, with City staff contributing substantial components and with Council-imposed constraints, which included a requirement that there be no new wards; there should be adjustments to the existing system, rather than fundamental restructuring; and achievement of a plus or minus 33% variation in population among the 21 restructured wards.

The Board repealed the municipality's ward boundary by-law because it held that the review did not properly take into consideration importance of communities of interest within rural wards and put too much emphasis on representation by population, rather than effective representation.⁷⁶ The Board also held that the Terms of Reference were flawed because they precluded the opportunity to increase the number of wards, even though this was a legally viable option. It also noted that the public process had been too limited and that, in particular, there had been no opportunity for the public to discuss options for specific ward boundary proposals.

In the second attempt, the City hired outside consultants to undertake a comprehensive, objective and transparent ward boundary review. This time there were no Council-imposed constraints, except that the principle of effective

⁷² Campaign Website: <http://www.vaughanwardboundaryreview.ca/index.php/review-process/public-ward-boundary-review>

⁷³ Details on the case and court decision available on OMB website at: <http://www.omb.gov.on.ca/e-decisions/mml30047-Nov-01-2013.pdf>

⁷⁴ Primer on Municipal Ward Boundary Reviews, Q.M. Annibale, Loopstra Nixon Legal Solutions, <http://www.loopstranixon.com/files/L0245561.PDF>

⁷⁵ Ibid.

⁷⁶ A Message from the Osgoode Rural Communities Association, Ottawa Rural Communities: <http://www.ruralcouncil.ca/ORC/ORCA.htm>

representation had to be respected and that any new ward structure should be viable for at least 10 years. Staff support, while dedicated and essential, was limited to the provision of data and logistics. In spite of considerable consensus achieved throughout the extensive process, two individuals and one citizen association launched appeals at the OMB. After a one week hearing, the Board upheld Ottawa's by-law with no changes, allowing it to be implemented in time for the 2006 municipal election.

4.4 Population and Council Composition Comparisons

Table 3 below compares the size, ward structure, and population ranges of the 10 most populous cities in Canada. The analysis provides some insight into the average size and typical composition of councils as well as the average number of people per ward or electoral district.

It is important to understand that every municipality is different: the way councillors operate, their level of compensation and their workload. For example, in Mississauga, councillors sit on both the City Council and the Peel Regional Council. In Vancouver, there are 10 councillors at-large who represent the entire City. It is also somewhat problematic to compare Toronto to other Canadian cities because of its size; the next largest city is Montreal which is smaller by a million people.

It is nevertheless worthwhile to look at how other municipalities compare. The lowest average population per ward is 34,663 people in Hamilton and the highest in Calgary at 78,345 people per ward. Toronto's average ward population is in the middle of that range at 60,958 people per ward. This is similar to the cities of Vancouver, Brampton and Mississauga. The range in ward size in Toronto (44,280 – 93,784) is also similar to the City of Mississauga (42,700 - 79,890). Although the two cities are adjacent, their densities and nature of the urban fabric are very different.

Although Montreal has a very different council structure than Toronto, making it difficult to make direct comparisons, it is worth noting that Montreal has significantly more elected officials and much lower population per electoral district compared to Toronto. Calgary is the second closest to the City of Toronto in terms of population, as well as size. It has larger average ward sizes and a much smaller variance in the size of its wards.

Table 3: Population and Ward Size of Canada's Largest Municipalities

Municipality	Population	Number of Councillors	Average Population Per Ward	Average Population Per Councillor	Range in Ward Population	Difference btw. Largest & Smallest Ward
1. Toronto, ON	2,615,060	44	60,958	59,433	44,280 – 93,784	43,440
2. Montreal, QUE	1,649,519	65 Elected Officials; 19 borough mayors, 46 city councillors	Borough: 86,816 Electoral District: 28,439	65 Elected Officials; 25,377 46 City Councillors: 35,859	3,640-47,985 (Electoral Districts)	44,345
3. Calgary, AB	1,096,833	14	78,345	78,345	71,251-89,862	18,611

4. Ottawa, ON	883,391	23	38,408	38,408	23,055-50,795	27,740
5. Edmonton, AB	812,201	12	67,683	67,683	60,475 - 80,664	20,189
6. Mississauga, ON	713,443	11	64,858	64,858	42,700 - 79,890	37,190
7. Winnipeg, MAN	663,617	15	44,241	44,241	31,915- 54,194	22,279
8. Vancouver, BC	603,502	10 councillors at-large	60,350	60,350	n/a	n/a
9. Brampton, ON	523,911	10	52,391	52,391	38,210 - 93,770	55,560
10. Hamilton, ON	519,949	15	34,663	34,663	17,634 - 62,179	43,384

5.0 TORONTO'S WARD BOUNDARIES

Toronto City Council is the main governing and legislative body of the City of Toronto. The City of Toronto's governance model relies on a balance between local democracy, public service and the Mayor and Council.

- **Local Democracy** - a diverse, active, engaged public identifies issues, gives input and feedback, partners with the City on local matters, and plays an important role in shaping the city. The public is encouraged to get involved, speak to or submit comments to a Committee of City Council, attend meetings, and vote in municipal elections.
- **Public Service** - City staff provides objective, professional advice to Council, and implements Council's decisions according to City policy and standards and principles of effective public service.
- **Mayor and Council** – as the legislative body for the City, Council has a duty to find consensus while balancing city-wide and local considerations. The Mayor fulfills a city-wide mandate, leading Council in strategic and fiscal planning and representing the City to other governments.⁷⁷

5.1 History of Toronto's Wards

In 1953, the upper-tier Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto (Metro Toronto) was created, with 13 area municipalities. In 1966 these 13 municipalities were reconfigured into six larger units (the City of Toronto, and the boroughs of Etobicoke, York, North York, East York and Scarborough), all of which functioned as independent municipalities. Metro collectively provided specific “regional scale” services such as transportation, public works, police, and welfare, while governance responsibilities were divided between Metro and the area municipalities. Metro’s budget, which included the management and operations of trunk infrastructure, accounted for approximately 75% of total expenditures.

⁷⁷City of Toronto. “Learning Guides: Decision-Making”

<[url="http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=c26d0f1025c21410VgnVCM10000071d60f89RCRD&vgnextchannel=96c28b640c21410VgnVCM10000071d60f89RCRD">

In 1994, there were 93 representatives in the City of Toronto, including 25 Metro Councillors, 68 Local Councillors and 1 Mayor in each of the 6 municipalities.

Table 4: Number of Representatives in Metro Toronto, 1994

	Metro	Local	Mayor	Total by Municipality
East York	1	4	1	6
Etobicoke	2	12	1	15
North York	7	14	1	16
Scarborough	6	14	1	21
Toronto	7	16	1	24
York	2	8	1	11
TOTAL	25	68	6	93

Amalgamation and the City of Toronto Act (1997)

In December 1996, Queens Park announced that it planned to disband the Metro Toronto government and the six municipalities, and create one municipal government by way of the City of Toronto Act (1997). The Act underscored the concept that municipalities are “creatures of the province.” The move was controversial and its impact is still being felt.

The Act established 28 wards and a council composition of one mayor and 56 Councillors, two for each of the 28 wards. The ratio of elected representatives to population in the pre-amalgamated City of Toronto was 1:25,416. After amalgamation for the entire City it was 1:39,926, an increase of 57 per cent, as shown on the chart below.

Table 5: Number of Representatives Pre and Post Amalgamation

Jurisdiction	Elected Regional Representatives	Elected Municipal Representatives	Total # Elected Representatives	Population	Ratio All Representatives to Population
<i>Metro Toronto (prior to January 1, 1999)</i>					
(Chair)	1	-	1	-	-
East York	1	9	10	102,696	1:10,270
Etobicoke	4	13	17	309,993	1:18,235
North York	7	15	22	562,564	1:25,571
Scarborough	6	15	21	524,598	1:24,981
Toronto	8	17	25	635,395	1:25,416
York	2	9	11	140,525	1:12,775
TOTALS	29	78	107	2,275,771	-

Amalgamated Toronto (since January 1, 1999)	-	57	57	2,275,771	1:39,926
---	---	----	----	-----------	----------

Several arguments were made about the effects of amalgamation on local democracy and representation, including:

- A council of 57 would make the Canadian local government tradition of face-to-face debate in council chambers unworkable, a system where “honourable compromises” were meant to be made in the full light of public scrutiny.
- An executive committee system would therefore be needed to move along the business of the city, a form of government that diminishes the influence of councillors who are not on the executive;
- A single large bureaucracy would potentially be less responsive to the needs of individual citizens and require extra layers of management to run it. Both complexity and cost would thereby be increased (CLC 1997a: para 18-23).
- Because of the size of the council and the bureaucracy, standardized solutions that are insensitive to diversity, community specificity and that are resistant to innovation are more likely to result.⁷⁸

(Almost) Redrawing the Boundaries from 2 to 1 Councillor per Ward (1999)

In the years following amalgamation, there was a desire on behalf of the City to move to single member wards, an authority it obtained through the City of Toronto Act (1997). According to a March 1998 staff report, the purpose of moving to a single member ward structure was to increase the accountability of Members of Council and reduce confusion on the part of residents. Five possible approaches to refining ward boundaries within the City of Toronto were considered at that time:

- Dissolving the existing boundaries and creating new ones;
- Adopting the 22 Federal Electoral Districts as ward boundaries;
- Dividing each Federal Electoral District in two, thus creating 44 wards;
- Accepting current City boundaries and reducing elected representation to 1 councillor per ward; or
- Accepting existing boundaries and identifying options for dividing each ward in two to create single member representation.

It was subsequently recommended that the existing 28 wards should be divided into two to create 57 new wards. According to the staff report from this review:

“Splitting each of the existing City wards in two resolves these issues and is the most viable of the five options presented for splitting ward boundaries. The average ward population per elected official would

⁷⁸Milroy, B.M. March 1999. “Toronto’s Legal Challenge to Amalgamation” http://www.vrm.ca/documents/seminaire_Milroy.pdf Urban Affairs: Is It Back on the Policy Agenda? McGill-Queen’s University Press.

remain at its current level of around 39,000. A minimal number of wards would slightly exceed the 25% guideline, with the largest being Scarborough Malvern with approximately 54,500 residents per councillor. (The ward with the smallest population per representative is York Eglinton with a ratio of roughly 32,500 residents per councillor. This is well within the 25% norm.)”

On May 12, 1999 Council enacted By-law No. 275 which dissolved the existing wards to divide the City of Toronto into 57 new single-member Wards; however, the by-law was never put into effect, and so there were never 57 councillors.

Fewer Municipal Politicians Act (1999) and Toronto’s Current 44 Wards

In December 1999, the Province of Ontario introduced the “Fewer Municipal Politicians Act, 1999 or Bill 25, to amend the City of Toronto Act (1997), the Municipal Act and various other Acts in connection with municipal restructuring.⁷⁹ The Act prescribed a new ward structure for the City of Toronto, which had to include no more than 44 single-member wards. The Bill also took away Council’s authority to enact a by-law to change the ward structure or Council composition.

The City Clerk led the ward boundary review process. Public open houses were held to gather public input concerning ward boundaries and to discuss the Province’s Bill 25 in January 2000. After the ward boundary review process conducted by the City, 44 single member wards were drawn to create the existing City’s current boundaries.

Many people acknowledged that the change process provided insufficient time for effective public input, and expressed concerns over reduced access to municipality councillors. Council had requested that the City Solicitor report on the legality of certain elements of Bill 25, primarily the use of regulatory power to overrule provincial legislation. The City Solicitor explained that the province was acting within its legal jurisdiction to pass legislation reducing the number of wards in the City of Toronto and conferring on the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing an authority to determine municipal election boundaries in the City of Toronto. Moreover, the Solicitor made clear that the Act gives the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing the authority to prescribe the number and boundaries of wards, for municipal election purposes, in the City of Toronto by regulation.

⁷⁹Full text available on Legislative Assembly of Ontario Website:

http://www.ontla.on.ca/web/bills/bills_detail.do?locale=en&BillID=732&isCurrent=false&ParlSessionID=37:1

Guiding Principles Used for the Dividing of Toronto's 44 Wards (1999)

The following principles were considered in dividing the City's 22 federal ridings to create Toronto's 44 wards in 2000, which remain as the current ward boundaries. ¹

- Representation by population;
- Representation of communities;
- Recognition of distinct geographic and infrastructure elements; and
- Future population growth.

Options also had to consider that population should be within +/- 25 percent variance from the average ward population) and in compliance with the provincial government decision to establish wards based on the 22 federal ridings. 'Representation by population' was considered the overriding principle for determining ward options. The administrative committee considered the principle of future growth as the fourth priority which was considered qualitatively since definitive small area projection data was not available across the entire city.

Based on the notion of representative population, two overriding decision-making principles were chosen to assist Council in resolving any disagreement between ward boundary options;

- The ward populations (1996 Census estimate) within each riding should be as close to the 1996 Census ward average population (54,200 based on 44 wards) as possible; and
- The 1996 Census population estimates for the ward divisions within each riding should be as close to parity as possible.

5.2 Current Ward and Governance Structure

In June 12, 2006 the City of Toronto Act (2006) received Royal Assent. It was the result of the Ontario Liberal government's promise of "more power for cities."⁸⁰ Under the new Act, City Councils were given back the power to establish their ward boundaries and their composition. The City of Toronto Act (discussed in section 2.3) is the current governing legislation in Toronto. ⁸¹

Today, Toronto City Council is composed of the Mayor and 44 councillors. The Mayor and councillors each have one vote at Council – no one can overrule the other members. The mayor runs on a citywide basis while each councillor is elected in a local ward. The mayor and local councillors are elected for a four year term of office.

Councillors play both a legislative role and a constituency role. In their legislative role they are responsible for considering and establishing policies and by-laws to implement Council's decisions. In their constituency role they are responsible for consulting with the constituents of their ward and for ensuring that all sides of an issue are considered in the decision making process. The City of Toronto does not elect at-large councillors.

⁸⁰ Legislative Assembly of Ontario:

http://www.ontla.on.ca/web/bills/bills_detail.do?locale=en&BillID=342&isCurrent=false&ParlSessionID=38%3A2

⁸¹ City Staff Report on Ward Boundary Review Process dated March 12, 1998

A typical councillor's workload in Toronto includes acting as chair or member in a standing committee, a community council, or sub-committees, advisory committees, task forces, boards of management, and program operating boards⁸². The City of Toronto Act (2006) defines the role of Council as⁸³:

- to represent the public and to consider the well-being and interests of the City;
- to develop and evaluate the policies and programs of the City;
- to determine which services the City provides;
- to ensure that administrative policies, practices and procedures and controllership policies, practices and procedures are in place to implement the decisions of Council;
- to ensure the accountability and transparency of the operations of the City, including the activities of the senior management of the City of Toronto;
- to maintain the financial integrity of the City; and
- to carry out the duties of Council under this or any other Act.

The range of issues that need to be addressed varies from ward to ward. As discussed in section 3.3: Composition of Council, there can be significant differences in the issues a particular ward faces that require the attention of a councillor. Inevitably, there are also different approaches to performing their duties. Whereas some councillors are more engaged with local issues, others take a more strategic role.

In 2014, a Toronto councillor's salary is \$105,397 per year. This is comparable to other municipalities of similar size. Before the beginning of each term of Council, a study is conducted by an external consultant to determine an appropriate comparator group, from which salaries are calculated. Each councillor is also provided with an annual staff budget of \$224,264.25, which is equivalent to the top of the salary range of an Executive Assistant, an Administrative Assistant and a Constituency Assistant⁸⁴. Councillors can choose to hire full or part-time staff.

Community Councils

Councillors sit on one of four area or Community Councils, which represent different geographic areas of the City.⁸⁵ The Community Councils are responsible for making recommendations and decisions on local planning and development, and other neighbourhood matters. While the Community Councils report to City Council, they have been delegated final decision-making power on certain local items.

⁸² City of Toronto Official Website:

<http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=eb6d0f1025c21410VgnVCM10000071d60f89RCRD&vgnextchannel=9632acb640c21410VgnVCM10000071d60f89RCRD>

⁸³ Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in Ontario. "Municipal Councillor's Guide- Role of Council, Councillor, and Staff" <<http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/Page8390.aspx>>

⁸⁴ In 2010, City staff reported on a formula that would provide additional staff support for wards where population growth and the number of households exceeded 50% of the median. The report, dated April 12, 2010, noted that Ward 23 met these criteria. Council received the report for information, resolving to address the mechanism in the next term of Council.

⁸⁵ Map of the current community councils available on city website at:

<http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=91a998b613412410VgnVCM10000071d60f89RCRD&vgnextchannel=1e68f40f9aac0410VgnVCM10000071d60f89RCRD>

Standing Policy Committees

Standing Policy Committees discuss certain services and issues and typically make recommendations to City Council. When City Council meets, they consider these recommendations from the Standing Policy Committees to help with their decision-making.

Party Politics

In Ontario, candidates for municipal election run as individuals, without political party affiliation.

Who Votes

Municipal elections are held every four years in Ontario. Voters must meet a set of criteria, which include:

- be a Canadian citizen, and
- at least 18 years old, and
- a resident of the City of Toronto, or
- a non-resident owner or tenant of land in the City of Toronto, or their spouse, and
- not prohibited from voting under any law.⁸⁶

5.3 Local Boundaries and Considerations

The City Toronto is made up of many different communities and includes numerous official and unofficial ‘boundaries’ such as federal and provincial riding boundaries and neighbourhoods. Below is a description of some of the communities and boundaries that may come into play when defining ward boundaries and identifying communities of interest as part of the review.

Federal and Provincial Electoral Boundaries

Ontario’s federal and provincial electoral districts are similar to each other and to Toronto’s ward boundaries, but not identical. In Toronto, there are currently 25 federal electoral districts, 22 provincial ridings and 44 wards.

The most recent federal redistribution exercise occurred in 2012, which gave Toronto two and a half additional electoral districts for a total of 25.⁸⁷ These changes will officially come into place as of the next general federal election.

As part of the redistribution exercise, the Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission for Ontario conducted two days of public hearings in Toronto, where it heard and received more than 100 submissions each day. According to the summary report on the public hearings, the focus of the submissions was on communities of interest. With a

⁸⁶ City of Toronto. “Learning Guides- Elections”

<<http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=386d0f1025c21410VgnVCM10000071d60f89RCRD&vgnextchannel=9632ac b640c21410VgnVCM10000071d60f89RCRD>>

⁸⁷Redistribution- Federal Electoral Districts. February 2013. “Initial Report to the House of Commons- Ontario, Overall Approach”


<<http://www.redecoupage-federal-redistribution.ca/content.asp?section=on&dir=now/reports&document=page2&lang=e>>

few exceptions, there was little concern expressed for balanced population or correspondence with the provincial quota.⁸⁸

The Commission recommended several changes to the ward boundaries in Etobicoke, Scarborough, Don Valley and York and Central Toronto to account for population changes, as well as two additional electoral districts. One of the new electoral districts is Don Valley North. Located above Highway 400, the electoral district is composed of part of the current electoral district of Willowdale and part of the current electoral district of Don Valley East. The second new electoral district is University-Rosedale, which is composed of part of the current electoral district of Trinity—Spadina, part of the current electoral district of Toronto Centre, and part of the current electoral district of Don Valley West.

The Boundary Commission also recommended a change to include a portion of an electoral district which previously crossed the east city boundary into the City of Pickering. The Commission proposed to honour city boundaries, and therefore assigned the portion of the electoral district in Toronto's city boundary to the adjacent Scarborough wards and the Pickering population to the proposed electoral district of Pickering—Brooklin.


Map 1: Proposed Federal Electoral Districts and Toronto Ward Boundaries (2014)



At the Provincial level, Ontario's last redistribution exercise occurred in 2004 and came into place for the October 10, 2007 provincial general election. With the passing of Bill 214 and the *Representation Act, 2005*, Ontario was divided into 107 electoral districts including 22 MPPs for Toronto. These electoral boundaries will remain until

⁸⁸Redistribution- Federal Electoral Districts. February 2013. "Initial Report to the House of Commons- Reasoning and Outcome by Region" <<http://www.redecoupage-federal-redistribution.ca/content.asp?section=on&dir=news/reports&document=page3&lang=e>>

Map 3: City of Toronto Community Council Areas



School Boards

There are 22 Toronto District School Boards (TDSB) wards and six Toronto District Catholic School Board (TDCAB) wards. School Board trustees in each ward are elected for the purpose of planning or directing activities relating to their ward. School Boards are important stakeholders in the ward boundary process as School Board wards will have to adjust to any ward boundary changes.

Neighbourhoods

The City of Toronto recognizes 140 neighbourhoods, the boundaries of which are determined by census tracts defined by Statistics Canada. The neighbourhood profiles were developed to help government and community agencies with local planning. The City of Toronto maintains these neighbourhood profiles so that they can collect and compare data over time⁹⁰. Not all people define neighbourhoods the same way, but many of these neighbourhood names are used by residents when referring to areas of the city when identifying their community.

⁹⁰ Map and info of the current neighbourhoods available on city website:

<http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=ae17962e8c3f0410VgnVCM10000071d60f89RCRD>

In 2014, 31 neighbourhoods were designated as Neighbourhood Improvement Areas under the Toronto Strong Neighbourhoods Strategy 2020 (TSNS 2020). These neighbourhoods have the lowest overall Neighbourhood Equity Scores, a measure that signals that the overall burden of inequities faced by a neighbourhood requires action. It is important to recognize the location and significance of these NIAs when developing the ward boundary options.

Downtown, Mid-town, Uptown and the Inner-Suburbs

There are also informal boundaries between areas of the City that reflect both its historical growth patterns and the role played by amalgamation. For example, the downtown (the area bounded by Lake Ontario to the south, Bathurst to the west, the rail corridor and Rosedale Valley Road to the north and the Don River to the east, as defined by the Official Plan) has a different social-demographic conditions, ethno-cultural concentrations as well as differences in the availability of social services, transit service and affordable housing stock, compared to midtown (Bloor to Eglinton), and Uptown (Eglinton north to Sheppard) and the inner suburbs. The suburbs, built for the most part after the Second World War, are also physically different and distinct from the rest of the City terms of street patterns, density and the type of built form.

BIAs and Resident Associations

In partnership with Toronto City Council, local commercial property owners and tenants can work together to form a Business Improvement Area (BIA) to enhance the safety, look and feel of their neighbourhoods to attract more visitors to shop and dine, as well as to draw new businesses to their area. There are currently 78 BIAs in the City of Toronto.

Aboriginal trade routes and historical sites

Toronto is home to several significant aboriginal sites which are officially recognized by the City of Toronto, including Birkdale Ravine, L'Amoureux Park, Old Mill Park and Taber/Tabor Hill Park.

5.4 Population Growth and Development

In 2012, Toronto surpassed Chicago to become the continent's 4th largest municipality by population. The 2012 post-census estimate of the Toronto population was 2,791,140.

The City has grown considerably over the past several years, with the population increasing from 2.48 million in the 2001 Census to 2.61 million in the 2011 Census. The estimated actual population in 2011 was 2.75 million (plus/minus 15,400). Given the stable nature of Toronto's low scale neighbourhoods and the direction to protect them given through the Official Plan, development has been focused in key areas of the City.

Our best estimate of the City's population for the 2014 election year is 2.743 million with an average population of 60,958 per ward. Population projections to 2031 were prepared as background to the Official Plan that Council adopted in 2003 and which came into force in 2006.

Based on these projections, by 2021, the maximum growth scenario would see Toronto with a population of about 3,017,900, and an average ward population of around 68,590. By 2031 this projection of growth would see the average ward population grow to around 73,860 as the City grows to an anticipated 3,249,700.

Table 6: Population Counts and Future Projections for the City of Toronto and Current Wards

Year	Total Population	Lowest Ward Population	Highest Ward Population	Average Ward Population
2001	2,481,420	46,690	66,835	56,396
2006	2,503,345	44,850	79,520	56,894
2011	2,615,090	44,935	88,435	59,434
2014 estimated	2,682,137	44,280	93,784	60,958
2021 projected	3,017,895	47,064	97,522	68,589
2031 projected	3,249,666	48,086	131,065	73,856

The magnitude of growth on the horizon, and its uneven distribution across the City, indicate that the status quo with respect to existing ward boundaries will not serve to ensure representative democracy for Toronto in future elections. New ward boundaries are necessary and should stand the test of effective representation for at least three election cycles: the status quo is not an option. Further analysis of Toronto's population growth is included in the *TWBR Population Background Brief (November 2014)*.

5.5 Local Electoral Issues and Interests

Toronto Taxpayer Coalition Petition to Re-divide Ward Boundaries (2013)

On June 27th 2013, a petition was submitted by the 'Toronto Taxpayer Coalition' (under Section 129 of the City of Toronto Act) asking City Council to redraw its ward boundaries to mirror the newly redrawn federal riding boundaries as set out by the 2012 Federal Electoral Boundaries Commission. City Council decided on a 25 to 13 vote, not to adopt the requests set out in the petition and subsequently, the Taxpayer Coalition announced on their website that they would take the issue to the OMB. In response to The Taxpayer's Coalition's petition, the Corktown Residents & Business Association (CRBA) wrote to the City Council in objection to the realignment the City's boundaries to align with the Federal boundaries, since it would split a number of cohesive established communities and join the severed parts with communities on the other side of Yonge Street. A second appellant also made an appeal to the OMB regarding Toronto's ward boundaries. The Toronto Taxpayers Coalition and the second appellant both withdrew their appeals to the OMB, which means that there is currently no Board referral that could be resurrected or a referral that has been adjourned pending the Review.

Fair Vote Canada (FVC)

Fair Vote Canada is a grassroots, multi-partisan citizens' campaign for voting system reform. They are promoting the introduction of an element of proportional representation into elections for all levels of government and

throughout civil society and advocating for voting systems that are designed to produce a representative body (like a parliament, legislature, or council) where seats are more or less in proportion to votes cast.

Movement for Voter Equality Statement (MoVE)

MoVE is another organization committed to voter equality in Canada. They are primarily concerned with the legislation related to sections 128, 129 and, especially 135 of the City of Toronto Act which stipulate that Council may devise a voting system using any combination of single- and multi-member wards. MoVE wrote a letter to the City of Toronto in February 2014, stating that they have been following the current Toronto Ward Boundary review process since its inception on June 11th, 2013. The group noted they had reviewed the TWBR report, work plan and engagement/consultation recommendations. The letter states: “Given the very real possibility that the next election will be conducted under a voting system other than SMP, it is our view that the commission’s TOR should be modified to produce electoral maps for use under all of the systems the city will be permitted to enact”. They offer their services to the City Council in many issues regarding the election process including this ward boundary review.

6.0 CONCLUSION

Noting the differences and similarities between Toronto’s situation and other places has helped to illuminate the foundational components or guiding principles for an electoral boundary review, as well as what is unique about the Toronto context. Looking at the Ontario municipal ward boundary reviews that led to appeals at the OMB provided important insights into the criteria used to judge the merits of a ward boundary review and appeals. Looking at the history of Toronto’s ward boundaries was also significant as it provides the necessary perspective about why our current boundaries are in place. Below is a summary of the key lessons learned from the research:

- **Complexity of ward boundary reviews in an urban environment:** The Carter Case altered the criteria for electoral boundary reviews in Canada and established that effective representation, which aims at achieving fair and equal representation for voters to the greatest extent possible, must be considered the ultimate goal of all ward boundary reviews. The primary consideration when it comes to effective representation is voter parity or representation by population, but the Carter Case also took other criteria into account, including: communities of interest, natural and physical boundaries, and population growth. More than 20 years later, effective representation remains the goal of all ward boundary reviews and these principles are the foundation of any ward boundary review in Ontario.

However, Toronto today is a much different place that rural Saskatchewan was in 1991. Although there is no doubt that effective representation and voter parity remain paramount, how municipalities arrive at effective representation is changing. Drawing ward boundaries to ensure each person is effectively represented is arguably more complex in dense, diverse and rapidly growing urban environment.

- **Sound methodology and public consultation:** Based on the review of the OMB cases from the past several years, there are several key conclusions that can be drawn about the ward boundary review process and methodology, including:

- Municipal ward boundary reviews must account for the entire population and not only voters. This includes students, children, and part-time residents.
 - The number of elected officials and/or composition of Council are not matters for which the Board has jurisdiction.
 - In making its decision, the Board looks to: a) the criteria used by the municipality, the studies undertaken to inform the application of those criteria, and the appropriateness of the proposed implementation of those criteria; b) the process followed by the municipality, particularly in terms of the extent to which steps were taken to inform the public and provide an opportunity for public comment.
- **Number of councillors is important as it relates to effective representation:** It is common to look at the composition of council or the number of councillors in conjunction with the ward boundaries themselves. This is especially evident when looking at the ward boundary review frameworks from municipalities inside as well as outside of North America. In many of the Ontario ward boundary reviews, looking at the composition of council has been considered a separate process. Ward boundary review expert Robert Williams stated that these processes should be considered separately. However, it is important to consider the number of councillors as part of a ward boundary review, in so much as it relates to effective representation and helps to ensure that a community or individual can be well represented in the decision making process.
 - **The importance of accounting for communities of interest:** Accounting for communities of interest when drawing ward boundaries is a common standard in Canada and other commonwealth cities in the UK and Australia. It is fair and logical to group communities together, but it can also encourage participation in civic life. However, the concept leaves some room for interpretation, in terms of which communities of interest to consider – a challenge the Toronto Ward boundary Review will certainly have to address. The research suggests that originally the idea of communities of interest was based partly on the need to protect minorities and ethnic populations. The location of ethnic communities is a factor that must be given special consideration as part of Toronto’s ward boundary review process.
 - **The Status Quo is Not an Option:** Toronto’s 44 ward boundaries were forced on the City by the Province for the 2000 election. At that time there were concerns about the level of representation that would occur as a result of moving from 57 to 44 wards. Nearly 15 years later, these boundaries are still in place. Today, Toronto’s ward boundaries do not meet the principle of effective representation. The magnitude of growth on the horizon, and its unequal distribution across the city, suggest that the status quo with respect to existing ward boundaries will not serve to ensure representative democracy for Toronto in future elections. New ward boundaries are necessary in order to move close to voter parity, and these boundaries should stand the test of effective representation for at least three election cycles.

This is **Exhibit 3** refer to in the Affidavit of
Susan Dexter, sworn August 21, 2018



ROUND ONE REPORT

***CIVIC ENGAGEMENT +
PUBLIC CONSULTATION***

**TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
MARCH 31, 2015**

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31



CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1 TWBR Approach.....	i
1.2 Key Findings	2
2. INTRODUCTION	4
3. APPROACH	5
4. WHO WE HEARD FROM	7
5. WHAT WE HEARD	9
5.1 Input from Survey	9
5.2 Input from Public Meetings.....	16
5.3 Input from Members of Council.....	21
5.4 Stakeholders' Input	27
6. CONCLUSIONS	31
7. NEXT STEPS	33
APPENDIX A	34
APPENDIX B	35
APPENDIX C	36
APPENDIX D	40

The **Toronto Ward Boundary Review (TWBR)** is looking at the size and shape of Toronto's wards. Learn more about the consultant team, process and timeline, visit: www.drawthelines.ca



1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This document summarizes the results of Round One of the civic engagement and public consultation process of the Toronto Ward Boundary Review (TWBR).

The TWBR is to bring a recommendation to Toronto City Council on a ward boundary configuration that respects the principle of “effective representation”, as defined by the Supreme Court of Canada and the Ontario Municipal Board.

1.1 TWBR APPROACH

Round One of the civic engagement and public consultation process collected opinions about the current alignment of Toronto's 44 wards and took place between July 2014 and January 2015. In total we heard from 910 individuals:

PUBLIC MEETINGS 192 people attended the twelve public meetings in December 2014 and January 2015, with some attending more than one meeting. Attendance by Community Council area was as follows:

- Scarborough Community Council area (27 individuals)
- Etobicoke York Community Council area (23 individuals)
- Toronto East York Community Council area (65 individuals)
- North York Community Council area (77 individuals)

SURVEY 608 people responded to the Survey (591 responded online and 17 submitted hard copies). Nine people submitted detailed analyses and comments via mail, e-mail, Twitter or the website contact form. See **Appendix A** for the survey questions.

MEMBERS OF COUNCIL INTERVIEWS Forty-four members of the 2010-2014 City Council and 7 new (2014-2018) Council members were interviewed individually to solicit their perspective on the issues related to the current Toronto ward configuration.

STAKEHOLDER GROUPS AND SCHOOL BOARDS Thirty-five individuals from various stakeholder groups and 24 school board representatives (mostly Trustees with a few support staff) participated in discussions about the current Toronto ward system. See **Appendix B** for a list of stakeholder groups.



1.2 KEY FINDINGS

The following key findings have been identified from the responses received from the various participant groups:

Summary of Key Findings from Survey

- Thirty-nine percent of the survey responses are in favour of between 45,000 and 60,000 people per ward. An additional 10% prefer smaller wards between 20,000 and 45,000 people. This suggests that most people would be comfortable with wards that are around the current average ward size or smaller. Only 14% of the responses suggest large wards of 90,000 up to 105,000 and more.
- A majority of responses (47%) to the survey are in favour of increasing Toronto's current number of wards to between 54 and 75. Twenty-two percent of the responses suggest fewer wards, with only 8% indicating 22 to 25 wards, i.e. creating one ward for each of the federal/provincial ridings.
- Opinions on whether there is value for Toronto's ward boundaries to be similar to provincial or federal riding boundaries are split, with slightly more than half (57%) saying yes and slightly less than half (43%) saying no.

Summary of Key Findings from Public Meetings

- The majority of public meeting responses favour a ward population of up to 60,000.
- A majority of public meeting responses favour keeping the current number of wards or adding more wards.
- A slight majority of public meeting responses favour Toronto's ward boundaries aligning with those of the federal or provincial ridings.

Summary of Key Findings from Council Members' Interviews

- Based on the current situation, there is overwhelming support for not increasing average ward size.
- A minority of Members of Council favour larger wards in the 90,000 to 120,000 range, even with additional staff resources. A large majority suggests slightly larger or smaller wards.
- The majority opinion suggests that using provincial or federal riding boundaries should not be a determining factor in re-aligning ward boundaries.



- The largest number of responses (27) favour between 44-50 wards in a re-aligned ward structure.

Summary of Key Findings from Stakeholders' Input

- Most stakeholder comments appear to favour wards around the current average size or smaller.
- There is little support for 22 to 25 wards.
- An overwhelming majority of stakeholder responses suggest that Toronto's ward boundaries should follow those of federal or provincial ridings.

When comparing the responses to the various questions across participant groups, the following conclusions can be drawn:

Ward Size

- Generally, there seems to be consensus across all participant groups regarding ward size. Responses from all groups are comfortable with a ward size close to the current average of 60,000. Comments suggest 'up to 60,000 people per ward' and 'current size or slightly smaller or larger'.
- A small minority favours large wards in the 90,000 to 105,000 plus range, accompanied by additional resources to be allocated to Members of Council.

Number of Wards

- Public meeting responses agree with the majority of Council members that there should be 44 wards or more (44 - 50).
- Survey responses favour even more wards, i.e. 54 - 75.
- A small minority of survey and Council members' responses suggest 22 - 25 wards to mirror provincial or federal ridings.

Follow Provincial or Federal Riding Boundaries

- Opinions across the participant groups are divided among survey and public meeting responses, with Members of Council suggesting that this should not be the major criterion for re-aligning Toronto's wards boundaries.
- Stakeholder group responses are overwhelmingly in favour of following provincial or federal riding boundaries.



2. INTRODUCTION

In June 2014 Toronto City Council approved *Draw the Lines: Toronto Ward Boundary Review Project Work Plan and Civic Engagement and Public Consultation Strategy*. The goal of the Toronto Ward Boundary Review (TWBR), generally stated, is to bring a recommendation to Toronto City Council on a ward boundary configuration that respects the principle of “effective representation”, as defined by the Supreme Court of Canada and the Ontario Municipal Board.

Based on the distribution of ward populations at present, Toronto’s ward structure does not meet the requirements of effective representation. The populations of the current wards range from 45,000 to 94,000.


Effective representation is a combination of a number of elements – voter parity, protection of communities of interest and neighbourhoods, physical and natural boundaries, ward history and capacity to represent. While some of the elements may alter strict voter parity, sometimes referred to as “rep-by-pop”, voter parity is a major criterion. It forms the basis for representative democracy. There needs to be some assurance that one elector’s vote is similar in weight to another person's vote.

Among the stated objectives of the TWBR are the following:

- include civic engagement and public consultation approaches that educate, inform and involve residents of Toronto, stakeholders and Council members;
- consider in detail the growth that Toronto has experienced and will experience over the coming years;
- respect Toronto’s equity policies; and
- carry out the project in an objective, neutral and independent fashion.

The civic engagement and public consultation process of the TWBR consists of two rounds. Round One collected opinions about the current alignment of Toronto's 44 wards and took place between July 2014 and January 2015. Round Two will solicit feedback on a number of options for re-aligning Toronto's ward structure and is scheduled for July to October 2015.

This report summarizes the results of Round One of the TWBR process.



3. APPROACH

In line with the Council approved civic engagement and public consultation strategy, the TWBR established a project website, www.drawthelines.ca, which was launched in March 2014. The website initially contained information about the project, including FAQs, the Round One Consultation Guide and the online survey. The Consultation Guide and survey were offered in eleven languages other than English.

As documents and further information became available, they were posted to the website. This included the Population Background Brief (posted in November), the Background Research Report (December 2014), the dates and locations of the Round One public meetings, and the Round One public meeting presentation. The [project website](#) provides links to the City of Toronto website and City of Toronto information on individual wards. Website visitors can join the mailing list for the TWBR and between March 2014 and February 2015 85 individuals requested to be added to the over 3,000 names on the project 'master contact' list.

The TWBR project team sought input on the current ward boundary structure from members of the 2010-2014 City Council and the new 2014-2018 Members of Council as well as a number of stakeholder groups (see **Appendix B**). The project established a database of 59 different Toronto-based ethno-cultural groups and encouraged these groups to share information about the TWBR with their networks.

Three public meetings were held in each Community Council area - 6 in December 2014 (Scarborough Community Council area and Etobicoke York Community Council area) and 6 in January 2015 (Toronto East York Community Council area and North York Community Council area). The schedule of the public meetings was constrained by the 2014 municipal election. Community meetings could not begin until after the new City Council formally took office in early December. ASL interpretation was available at all public meetings. The team did not receive any requests for interpretation services for any of the public meetings.

The public meetings were advertised online and in print as follows:

- Toronto Star
- The Weather Network
- Etobicoke Guardian
- North York Mirror
- Scarborough Mirror
- Toronto Metrolands
- Posters displayed in all 99 Toronto Public Library branches

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION

DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31



The project created a Twitter profile ([@DrawTheLinesTO](#)) in March 2014 and a [Facebook](#) profile in early December 2014. Several Councillors helped promote the public meetings via their constituent networks, as did the City of Toronto through their website and social media.

Five TWBR news releases and a number of City of Toronto releases were sent out to highlight the Round One public process and the following outlets provided press coverage: National Post; Inside Toronto.com; Radio Canada; Now Magazine; Toronto Star; Urban Toronto; and Metro News.



4. WHO WE HEARD FROM

In total we heard from 910 people during Round One of the civic engagement and public consultation process.

192 people attended the 12 public meetings in December 2014 and January 2015 with some attending more than one meeting. Attendance ranged from a low of 5 persons at the very first meeting in Scarborough to a high of 33 in North York. Attendance by Community Council area was as follows:

- Scarborough Community Council area (27 individuals)
- Etobicoke York Community Council area (23 individuals)
- Toronto East York Community Council area (65 individuals)
- North York Community Council area (77 individuals)

Discussions at all of the public meetings were lively and engaging.

608 people responded to the survey (591 participated online and 17 completed hard copies). Nine people submitted detailed analyses and comments via mail, e-mail, Twitter or the website contact form.

Forty-four members of the 2010-2014 City Council and 7 new 2014-2018 Members of Council were interviewed individually to solicit their perspective on the issues related to the current Toronto ward configuration.

Meetings were held with the following stakeholder groups: Civic Action (Emerging Leaders Network); Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI); Social Planning Toronto; Toronto Association of Business Improvement Areas (TABIA); and United Way. The Toronto Region Board of Trade was unable to participate. In all, 35 individuals were involved in these stakeholder discussions.

Since school boards have to adjust their wards whenever municipal ward boundaries are changed, a special attempt was made to obtain their input. Meetings were held with Trustees and a few support staff of the Toronto District School Board, the Toronto Catholic District School Board and the Conseil Scolaire de District Catholique Centre-sud (French Catholic School Board). The Conseil Scolaire Viamonde declined to participate. A total of 24 school board representatives (mostly Trustees with some support staff) took part in these discussions.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31



The civic engagement and public consultation process used the same or similar questions throughout to make the resulting data comparable (see **Appendix A**).



5. WHAT WE HEARD

This section of the report divides the input received through the various means of engagement and consultation into: Input from Survey; Input from Public Meetings; Council Members' Input; and Stakeholders' Input. Individual submissions have been incorporated into the Stakeholders' Input section, as appropriate, since their number (9) was too small to warrant an independent category.

As expected, the public process produced many comments that are outside of the scope of the TWBR. The project team agreed in advance to report these comments and suggestions separately. They have been consolidated in **Appendix C**.

Responses from all of the participant groups are assembled under the survey questions and frequencies of responses are noted in brackets, where applicable. Not all public meeting participants have expressed opinions on the various matters discussed, which accounts for the low frequencies of responses to some of the questions (relative to the number of attendees). Percentages have been calculated only for the responses to the survey. Like participants at public meetings, survey respondents also have not answered all of the questions in each case.

An analysis of the responses is provided in 'Observations' under each question and specific statements quoted reflect the flavor of the comments received. Key Findings are then distilled and summarized by participant group. The Conclusions to this report compare the Key Findings from the various participant groups and establish an overall direction for the creation of options for re-aligning Toronto's wards.

Ward-specific suggestions, comments regarding communities of interest and general comments related to ward configurations from the various participant groups have been consolidated and are attached as **Appendix D**.

5.1 INPUT FROM SURVEY

The number of responses to the survey questions varies, i.e. not every participant has answered every question.

Current Toronto wards range in population between approximately 45,000 and 94,000. What do you think the population of a Toronto ward should be, so that a Councillor can effectively represent the ward?

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31



The 582 responses to this question can be grouped into the following categories:

SUMMARY OF RESULTS		
WARD POPULATION	#OF RESPONSES	%
20,000 - 45,000	59	10%
45,000 - 60,000	227	39%
60,000 - 75,000	105	18%
75,000 - 90,000	15	3%
90,000 - 105,000	39	7%
105,000 +	38	7%
Don't know	35	6%
Depends	20	3%
Other	44	8%
TOTAL:	582	100%

Observations:

The largest individual category of responses (227 or 39%) suggest between 45,000 and 60,000 people per ward. A variety of explanations are provided, with the most common related to Councillors' workload or their ability to represent people in their ward at the local level. Other common themes among the explanations are that it is a practical or reasonable number that will ensure effective representation and keep up with population growth without making City Council too large.

Eighteen percent (105) of the comments suggest that wards should be between 60,000 and 75,000 people, which is higher than the current average, but still within the range of many of the city's larger wards. Many of the responses note that this ward size is halfway between the current largest and smallest ward. Others state that this is a reasonable number given Toronto's expected population growth.

Ten percent of responses (59) suggest that a ward should be between 20,000 and 45,000 people, which is smaller than most of the wards in the city today. The explanations given are similar to those given in the previous category, focusing on the need for Councillors to maintain a

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31



connection with their constituents and effectively manage the issues in their ward.

Only 15 responses (3%) suggest that wards should be between 75,000 and 90,000 with people noting that wards of this size would help to ensure Council didn't get too large, while others state that a Councillor could easily manage a ward this size.

More responses suggest that wards should be between 90,000 and 105,000 (7%) or more than 105,000 people per ward (7%). There is a range of explanations again with the most common being that this would result in a smaller Council and less dysfunction at City Hall. Several responses also suggest that this ward size would match the current federal ridings.

KEY FINDING >

Thirty-nine percent of the survey responses are in favour of between 45,000 and 60,000 people per ward. An additional 10% prefer smaller wards between 20,000 and 45,000 people. This suggests that most people would be comfortable with wards that are around the current average ward size or smaller. Only 14% of the responses suggest large wards of 90,000 up to 105,000 and more.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31



By 2031 Toronto's population is expected to grow to 3.2 million people. In your opinion, what should be the total number of wards for Toronto to achieve good representation?

The 556 responses to this question can be grouped into the following categories:

SUMMARY OF RESULTS		
	#OF RESPONSES	%
FEWER WARDS	121	22%
22-43 wards*	105	19%
Less than 22 wards	16	3%
MORE WARDS	260	47%
45-54 wards	150	27%
55-64 wards	68	12%
65-74 wards	19	3%
75 or more wards	23	4%
SAME NUMBER OF WARDS	69	12%
Don't know	38	7%
Other	68	12%
TOTAL:	556	100%

*Note: Of those who suggest fewer wards, 44 (8% of the total responses) favour 22 to 25 wards to match the current federal or provincial ridings.

Observations:

Overall, 121 (22%) of the survey responses suggest that Toronto should have fewer wards, 260 (47%) state that there should be more wards and 69 (12%) say the number should stay the same.

When the responses are broken down into smaller categories, the highest number of responses falls between 45 and 54 wards (150 or 27%). Many of the responses base their answers on an ideal ward population size or emphasize the need for people to have access to their Councillor and to keep a ward size manageable for a Councillor. Another common explanation is that having this many wards would allow the City to keep up with population growth. An additional sizeable group (110 or 19%) suggests between 55 and 75 plus wards to allow for better representation and a stronger local democracy.



Of the 121 responses (22%) who are in favour of fewer wards, the majority suggests between 22 and 43 wards. A total of 44 responses (8%) favour 22 or 25 wards and want the wards to correspond to the provincial/federal ridings. The most common explanation among those in favour of fewer wards is that it would result in fewer Councillors and better decision-making at City Hall. A few responses also state that having fewer wards would reduce costs or create efficiencies.

Sixty-nine responses (12%) want to keep the current number of wards (44). They feel that the current number of wards and size of Council work well. Others are concerned about the effects of adding more Councillors. A few comments connect their answers to creating 2 wards in each of the federal government's previous 22 ridings.

KEY FINDING >

A majority of responses (47%) to the survey are in favour of increasing Toronto's current number of wards to between 54 and 75. Twenty-two percent of the responses suggest fewer wards, with only 8% indicating 22 to 25 wards, i.e. creating one ward for each of the federal/provincial ridings.

Is there value for Toronto's ward boundaries to be similar to the boundaries of provincial or federal ridings?

Responses to this question can be grouped as follows:

SUMMARY OF RESULTS		
ANSWER	#OF RESPONSES	%
Yes	341	57%
No	255	43%
TOTAL:	596	100%

Observations:

Slightly more responses (341 or 57%) state that there is value in having ward boundaries similar to the federal or provincial ridings, compared to 255 (43%) who say there is not.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION

DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31



The most common explanation given by those who are in favour of aligning the boundaries is that it would reduce confusion and promote collaboration between the various levels of government.

Some respondents also note that it would promote civic engagement, would avoid duplication or could result in cost savings and efficiencies. The most common explanation by those that are against following federal/provincial riding boundaries is that the issues are different at the local level.

Responses note that municipal issues have a much greater impact on people's lives, that neighbourhoods and communities are more important at the ward level and that Councillors have very different responsibilities and need to be more directly in touch with their constituents. Another common complaint is that the federal government makes mistakes when drawing Toronto's riding boundaries. Some responses state that following the provincial or federal boundaries is simply not relevant and that other criteria should be more important.

KEY FINDING >

Opinions on whether there is value for Toronto's ward boundaries to be similar to provincial or federal riding boundaries are split, with slightly more than half (57%) saying yes and slightly less than half (43%) saying no.



Other Comments (Related to the TWBR)

Responses to this question mostly re-enforce suggestions made in the context of the other survey questions. The responses have been distilled into 5 groups and the frequency of the comments is included in brackets:

1. TWBR PROCESS (44)

This category summarizes advice received about the ward boundary review process. Comments relate to the timing or frequency of the ward boundary review, how to encourage more community engagement and participation, improve the survey, etc. Several responses also stress that the process is very important.

2. PRINCIPLES/CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPING WARD BOUNDARIES (34)

Responses also make suggestions about how to prioritize the key principles when developing options for re-aligning Toronto's wards (communities of interest, voter parity, natural or physical boundaries or ward history). For example, several suggest that major roads should not be used as boundaries, while others are of the opinion that they are good boundaries. Many comments also emphasize the importance of voter parity.

3. GROUP COMMUNITIES TOGETHER (18)

A smaller number of responses stress the importance of keeping similar communities together and creating wards that are homogenous to provide for the best possible level of representation. However, an equal number warn against creating wards that are too homogenous.

4. AVOID POLITICAL INFLUENCE (10)

Responses in this category emphasize the importance of keeping the Toronto Ward Boundary Review process independent from City Council.

5. COUNCILLOR WORKLOAD (5)

Five responses note that the workload of a Councillor is an important consideration in the ward boundary review process and that some wards are more complex/more difficult to manage than others, especially the downtown wards.



Summary of Key Findings from Survey

- Thirty-nine percent of the survey responses are in favour of between 45,000 and 60,000 people per ward. An additional 10% prefer smaller wards between 20,000 and 45,000 people. This suggests that most people would be comfortable with wards that are around the current average ward size or smaller. Only 14% of the responses suggest large wards of 90,000 up to 105,000 and more.
- A majority of responses (47%) to the survey are in favour of increasing Toronto's current number of wards to between 54 and 75. Twenty-two percent of the responses suggest fewer wards, with only 8% indicating 22 to 25 wards, i.e. creating one ward for each of the federal/provincial ridings.
- Opinions on whether there is value for Toronto's ward boundaries to be similar to provincial or federal riding boundaries are split, with slightly more than half (57%) saying yes and slightly less than half (43%) saying no.

5.2 INPUT FROM PUBLIC MEETINGS

Current Toronto wards range in population between approximately 45,000 and 94,000. What do you think the population of a Toronto ward should be, so that a Councillor can effectively represent the ward?

Comments to this question can be distilled into 5 groups (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):

1. Larger wards (larger than the current average of 61,000)

- 90,000 - 100,000 (4)
- 65,000 - 75,000 (3)

Note: 4 comments specifically state that much larger wards, i.e. around 94,000, are not desirable.

2. Between 50,000 and 60,000 (8)

3. Smaller wards

- 25,000 (1)
- 40,000 (1)
- Current wards are too big (1)
- Smaller wards (2)



4. Ward size and resources

- Increasing ward size requires increased resources (4)
- The 311 service may be helpful (1)

5. Ward size and workload

- Ward size should depend on diversity of issues (8)
- Ward size may depend on Councillors' effectiveness (3)
- Ward size should depend on geography (3)
- Ward size should depend on urban form (condos are easier to service than single family areas) (6)

Observations:

Eight comments suggest that a ward should be between 50,000 and 60,000, primarily because this will be a comfortable number of people for a Councillor to represent and can help to ensure a personal relationship with constituents. If taken together with the 5 responses that favour smaller wards, the majority opinion at the public meetings is in favour of a ward population of up to 60,000. A small number of comments (7) favour larger wards.

Many responses (20) suggest that the ideal size of a ward depends on what the ward is like (e.g. diversity of issues, size, geography and housing type). They note that the workload of a Councillor in some wards is much heavier, and that this can affect their capacity to represent their constituents. These participants feel that workload should be a consideration when developing new ward boundaries.

Another theme discussed is the relationship between the size of a ward and the resources available to Councillors. Increasing the number of people in a ward will require an increase in office resources.

KEY FINDING >

The majority of public meeting responses favour a ward population of up to 60,000.



By 2013 Toronto's population is expected to grow to 3.2 million people. In your opinion, what should be the total number of wards for Toronto to achieve good representation?

Responses to this question can be grouped as follows (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):

1. Fewer than the current number of wards

- 22 to 25 (2)
- 32 to 35 (2)
- 40 (2)
- Fewer wards (3)

2. Keep the same number of wards/ don't reduce (11)

3. More than the current number of wards

- 50 (8)
- 55 to 60 (1)
- More wards (2)

Observations:

Eleven responses suggest that the number of wards should remain the same or not be reduced, given that it is already difficult for some Councillors to represent their ward. An equal number of responses state that there should be more wards with 50 being a common suggestion. Direct access to Councillors is considered critical to local democracy. Taken together, a majority of public meeting comments favour keeping the current number of wards or adding extra ones.

Nine responses would like to see fewer wards. The most common reason given is that it would reduce the size of Council and lead to better decision-making and governance.

KEY FINDING >

A majority of public meeting responses favour keeping the current number of wards or adding more wards.



Is there value for Toronto's ward boundaries to be similar to the boundaries of provincial or federal ridings?

Responses to this question can be distilled into the following 4 groups (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):

1. No - different roles and issues (8)

2. Yes

- Yes (10)
- Reduces confusion (13)
- Improves collaboration (9)

3. Should not be the most important criterion (10)

4. Be careful - different system for changing federal/provincial riding boundaries (9)

Observations:

Overall, most comments are in favour of ward boundaries having similar boundaries as the federal/provincial ridings (32). However, 10 comments suggest that this should not be the most important criterion and another 9 warn of the likely difficulties in following a system that changes regularly and more frequently than Toronto's ward boundaries. Responses note the mistakes made by the federal government during the last redistribution in terms of splitting communities and caution against making these same mistakes.

If the latter 19 comments are added to the 8 'no' responses, 27 responses caution aligning Toronto's ward boundaries with those of federal/provincial ridings.

KEY FINDING >

A slight majority of public meeting responses favour Toronto's ward boundaries aligning with those of the federal or provincial ridings.



Other Comments (Related to the TWBR)

Responses to this question are wide-ranging and have been distilled into 4 groups to reflect common concerns. The frequency of the comments is included in brackets:

1. COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST/NEIGHBOURHOODS (24)

Responses in this category recognize the importance of communities of interest in a ward boundary review and suggest that schools be considered such communities. There is disagreement as to whether ethno-cultural groups or Neighbourhood Improvement Areas should be contained in one ward and an acknowledgement that it may be difficult to avoid dividing communities. Other comments suggest that wards should contain a mix of communities and consider new neighbourhoods.

2. COUNCILLOR WORKLOAD – DOWNTOWN AND SUBURBS (24)

The focus of this group of comments is that wards are diverse in geography and population and that new ward boundaries should recognize the workload and types of issues a Councillor has to deal with. Responses zero in on the different issues in the downtown versus those in the suburbs and suggest that downtown wards should have less population to enable Councillors to better represent their constituents. There is a concern that the TWBR will result in more downtown Councillors. A few responses also suggest that there should be more flexibility regarding Councillors' resources.

3. PRINCIPLES/CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPING WARD BOUNDARIES (22)

Comments in this category range from using natural boundaries and major roads to balancing populations among wards and aiming for a variance in voter parity of 10-15% among them rather than 25%. There are also suggestions to stagger the changes and other advice on how to create options for re-alignment. A specific concern relates to the population projections used for the initial ward analysis, especially for Ward 30, and the importance of the TWBR to be based on good evidence.

4. TWBR PROCESS (9)

Public meeting participants have various suggestions on how to improve the process around the meetings including outreach to specific groups.



Summary of Key Findings from Public Meetings

- The majority of public meeting responses favour a ward population of up to 60,000.
- A majority of public meeting responses favour keeping the current number of wards or adding more wards.
- A slight majority of public meeting responses favour Toronto's ward boundaries aligning with those of the federal or provincial ridings.

5.3 INPUT FROM MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

Is the size of your Ward appropriate for representing residents at the municipal level?

Responses to this question address both the population size of the specific ward and the workload generated by the various local and city-wide issues that make demands on a Council member's time. While workload is a significant component of the 'capacity to represent', it can only be taken into account indirectly within the allowed flexibility of voter parity, i.e. 10% - 25% above or below the average.

For example, a ward may be 20% above average, if it is fairly homogenous and not much growth is projected. On the other hand, a ward can, perhaps, be 20% below average, if it contains regional facilities such as tourist attractions, different day- and night-time populations, etc. The latter add to the complexity of the 'capacity to represent'.

In terms of ward size and manageability, responses to the question can be distilled into 3 groups (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):

1. **The existing size of the ward (population) is manageable (19)**
2. **The existing size of the ward (population) is not manageable or just manageable (26)**
3. **The existing size of the ward (population) could be larger (4)**

Observations:

Four responses suggest that their wards could be larger. Forty-five responses speak to retaining the same size or reducing ward size. Their responses refer to existing ward size and do not reflect any growth that will occur.



However, the group that feels their wards are 'not manageable or just manageable' (26) now would likely maintain this position if their wards grew.

What is unknown is at what size the respondents that now find their wards manageable would find them unmanageable.

KEY FINDING >

Based on the current situation, there is overwhelming support for not increasing average ward size.

Current Toronto wards range in population between approximately 45,000 and 94,000. What do you think the population of a Toronto ward should be, so that a Councillor can effectively represent the ward?

The current average ward size is approximately 61,000. Responses to this question fall into 3 groups related to population size and population size combined with additional staff resources (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):

1. Larger wards (mostly related to 2015 federal ridings)

- 80,000 – 100,000 (1)
- 100,000 – 120,000 (4)
- 90,000 – 120,000 (with additional staff resources) (6)


Note: Three comments state explicitly that they could not handle a ward of 100,000, even with additional resources

2. Slightly larger wards

- 60,000 – 70,000 (11)
- 70,000 – 75,000 with additional staff resources (7)

3. Smaller wards

- 50,00 - 60,000 (23)



Observations:

The discussion around larger wards mostly focuses on the size of current federal and provincial ridings with 11 responses favouring wards in the 90,000 to 120,000 range. Six of the responses suggest that these larger wards would only work in combination with additional staff resources. Three responses explicitly reject larger wards even with additional resources.

Eighteen responses suggest slightly larger wards, while 23 favour smaller wards than exist now.

KEY FINDING >

A minority of Members of Council favour larger wards in the 90,000 to 120,000 range, even with additional staff resources. A large majority suggests slightly larger or smaller wards.

Is there value for Toronto's ward boundaries to be similar to the boundaries of provincial or federal ridings?

Responses to this question fall into 3 categories (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):

1. Yes, convenient; less confusing (21)
2. Convenient, but not necessary (8)
3. No, not necessary, immaterial, not a determining factor (22)

Observations:

Opinions on this topic are split. 21 responses are definitive that Toronto's ward boundaries should be similar to those of provincial or federal ridings. 22 Members of Council are definitive that riding boundaries should not determine ward boundaries.

An additional 8 comments indicate that while similarity with provincial or federal ridings might be convenient, it should not be a deciding factor.



KEY FINDING >

The majority opinion suggests that using provincial or federal riding boundaries should not be a determining factor in re-aligning ward boundaries.

By 2031 Toronto's population is expected to grow to 3.2 million people. In your opinion, what should be the total number of wards for Toronto to achieve good representation?

Responses to this question frequently connect to the previous question regarding the appropriate population size for Toronto's wards, although individual responses are not always consistent. Generally, 4 groups can be distilled (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):

1. Fewer wards (based on 22 provincial or 25 federal ridings)

- 22 to 25 (5)
- 22 to 25 with added resources (3)

Note: Two responses specifically indicate that 22 - 25 wards are too few.

2. About the same number of wards (17)

3. More wards

- 47 or 48 (3)
- 50 (7)
- 53 - 57 (3)
- 75 (2)
- add wards (3)

Observations:

There is not much support among Members of Council for a reduction in the number of wards to 22 or 25. Only 8 suggest this approach, while 2 state specifically that this number of wards would be too small. Seventeen responses indicate that the present 44 wards (approximately) should be maintained and another 18 suggest more wards.

If one assumes that "about the same number of wards" implies a willingness to add some wards, the largest number of responses (35) indicates that 44 or more wards would be acceptable. The largest number of responses (27) favour between 44 and 50 wards.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31



This likely reflects the projected growth of the city over the study period (to 2030) and current and expected workload. Also, Council members who want to base a new ward system on the 2015 federal ridings, splitting them in two, would accept 50 wards.

KEY FINDING >

The largest number of responses (27) favour between 44 and 50 wards in a re-aligned ward structure.



Other Comments (Related to the TWBR)

The “other comments” related to the TWBR are mostly unique and cover a broad range of topics and issues. Often, these comments re-enforce responses to earlier questions. They can be grouped into 5 categories. The frequency of the comments is included in brackets:

1. COUNCILLORS' ROLE AND WORKLOAD (34)

Comments emphasize that the current ward alignment is unfair and has resulted in a disproportionate volume of work in some wards vis-a-vis others. There is a realization that Toronto is a very big, diverse city and that the range of issues in many wards is different. Hence, Councillors' offices interpret their roles differently as well.

Members of Council focus on the fact that they have to combine a legislative "city-building" function with a constituency function, which makes their work very complex. "There is a disconnect among the electorate in terms of them wanting everything to be simple and the reality of the complex government of the City of Toronto and what Councillors do." Many Councillors feel underfunded and undervalued.

2. PRINCIPLES/CRITERIA FOR DEVELOPING WARD BOUNDARIES (16)

Comments in this group range from the type of data on which to base a new ward system through emphasis on appropriate representation rather than only on voter parity and “as little change as necessary” to “good luck”. Several Councillors expect that the TWBR may result in wards with different population numbers.

3. DEVELOPMENT PRESSURES (11)

Somewhat related to workload, current and projected development affects some wards more than others. Councillors are well aware where development is likely to occur in their wards.

4. SUPPORT SERVICES (7)

Comments in this category focus mainly on the success and limitations of Toronto's '311' service. While the introduction of this service has been helpful, responses indicate that many Council members feel they still have to get involved in many service issues.

5. PUBLIC PROCESS (7)

Comments on the TWBR public process include suggestions for meeting locations and public advertising.



Summary of Key Findings from Council Members Interviews

- Based on the current situation, there is overwhelming support for not increasing average ward size.
- A minority of Members of Council favour larger wards in the 90,000 to 120,000 range, even with additional staff resources. A large majority suggests slightly larger or smaller wards.
- The majority opinion suggests that using provincial or federal riding boundaries should not be a determining factor in re-aligning ward boundaries.
- The largest number of responses (27) favour between 44 and 50 wards in a re-aligned ward structure.

5.4 STAKEHOLDERS' INPUT

Discussions with most of the stakeholder groups followed the survey questions and are reported accordingly. The frequencies of suggestions are low, since few participants have opinions on all of the questions. Discussions with school boards that differed from the survey questions are summarized in a more general way. As mentioned previously, submissions from individuals have been incorporated into the Stakeholders' Input section, as appropriate, since their number (9) was too small to warrant an independent category.

During many of the stakeholder meetings specific comments were made relating to various wards. These comments and the ones from individuals have been integrated into the suggestions from the other participant groups in **Appendix D**.

Current Toronto wards range in population between approximately 45,000 and 94,000. What do you think the population of a Toronto ward should be, so that a Councillor can effectively represent the ward?

Responses to this question have been grouped as follows (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):

- 1. 50,000 - 64,000 (4)**
- 2. Keep wards as small as possible (2)**



3. The larger the ward, the less representation (5)
4. Already too large (2)
5. 105,000 - 125,000 (same size as federal ridings) with extra resources (2)
6. Should have fair distribution of workload among wards (7)

Observations:

Stakeholders' comments suggest the size of a ward should be appropriate for good representation and easy access for constituents. If the first four groupings are taken together, most stakeholder comments appear to favour wards around the current average size or smaller.

KEY FINDING >

Most stakeholder comments appear to favour wards around the current average size or smaller.

By 2031, Toronto's population is expected to grow 3.2 million people. In your opinion, what should be the total number of wards for Toronto to achieve good representation?

Responses to this question have been distilled into 2 groups (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):

1. Fewer wards

- 22 - 25 (2)

Note: One specific comment suggests 22 wards are a very bad idea.

2. More wards

- 50 - 53 (3)
- 55 - 60 (1)
- More wards; it's a myth that fewer wards save money (1)

Observations:

Stakeholders generally lean towards more wards, rather than fewer wards. There is little support for 22 to 25 wards.



KEY FINDING >

There is little support for 22 to 25 wards.

Is there value for Toronto's ward boundaries to be similar to the boundaries of provincial or federal ridings?

Responses to this question have been grouped as follows (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):

1. Yes - convenient, less confusing (21)
2. Helpful, but not necessary (2)
3. No (3)
4. Need different names (1)

Observations:


An overwhelming majority of stakeholder responses suggest that Toronto's ward boundaries should follow those of federal or provincial ridings. All school board comments fall into this category. Reasons refer to less confusion and making the system less complicated and more convenient.

KEY FINDING >

An overwhelming majority of stakeholder responses suggest that Toronto's ward boundaries should follow those of federal or provincial ridings.

Other Comments (Related to the TWBR)

Responses to this question mostly re-enforce suggestions made in the context of the other questions. There are concerns about the accuracy of Census data, uneven growth in various parts of the city and a recommendation to allow some degree of difference in voter parity based on geography and communities of interest.



5.4.1 STAKEHOLDERS – SCHOOL BOARDS

Comments by school board representatives related to the TWBR focus on Census data and potential undercounting of newcomers to the city who have to be served; Trustees' workload; differences in 'culture' between downtown and Scarborough; and the confusion created by using ward numbers both for the TDSB's 22 wards and the 44 municipal wards. School board responses do not agree on an appropriate population number for Toronto's wards. Their responses range from 60,000 being reasonable to 75,000 maximum, to 100,000 plus (25 wards) with staff support.

Summary of Key Findings from Stakeholders' Input

- Most stakeholder comments appear to favour wards around the current average size or smaller.
- There is little support for 22 to 25 wards.
- An overwhelming majority of stakeholder responses suggest that Toronto's ward boundaries should follow those of federal or provincial ridings.



6. CONCLUSIONS

This section of the report brings together the summaries of the key findings from all of the participant groups and compares the results across the groups.

Summary of Key Findings from Survey


- Thirty-nine percent of the survey responses are in favour of between 45,000 and 60,000 people per ward. An additional 10% prefer smaller wards between 20,000 and 45,000 people. This suggests that most people would be comfortable with wards that are around the current average ward size or smaller. Only 14% of the responses suggest large wards of 90,000 up to 105,000 and more.
- A majority of responses (47%) to the survey are in favour of increasing Toronto's current number of wards to between 54 and 75. Twenty-two percent of the responses suggest fewer wards, with only 8% indicating 22 to 25 wards, i.e. creating one ward for each of the federal/provincial ridings.
- Opinions on whether there is value for Toronto's ward boundaries to be similar to provincial or federal riding boundaries are split, with slightly more than half (57%) saying yes and slightly less than half (43%) saying no.

Summary of Key Findings from Public Meetings

- The majority of public meeting responses favour a ward population of up to 60,000.
- A majority of public meeting responses favour keeping the current number of wards or adding more wards.
- A slight majority of public meeting responses favour Toronto's ward boundaries aligning with those of the federal or provincial ridings.

Summary of Key Findings from Council Members' Interviews

- Based on the current situation, there is overwhelming support for not increasing average ward size.
- A minority of Members of Council favour larger wards in the 90,000 to 120,000 range, even with additional staff resources. A large majority suggests slightly larger or smaller wards.
- The majority opinion suggests that using provincial or federal riding boundaries should not be a determining factor in re-aligning ward boundaries.
- The largest number of responses (27) favour between 44 and 50 wards in a re-aligned ward structure.



Summary of Key Findings from Stakeholders' Input

- Most stakeholder comments appear to favour wards around the current average ward size or smaller.
- There is little support for 22 to 25 wards.
- An overwhelming majority of stakeholder responses suggest that Toronto's ward boundaries should follow those of federal or provincial ridings.

When comparing the responses to the various questions across participant groups the following conclusions can be drawn:

Ward Size

- Generally, there seems to be consensus across all participant groups regarding ward size. Responses from all groups are comfortable with a ward size close to the current average of 61,000. Comments suggest 'up to 60,000 people per ward' and 'current size or slightly smaller or larger'.
- A small minority favours large wards in the 90,000 to 105,000 plus range accompanied by additional resources to be allocated to Members of Council.

Number of Wards

- Public meeting responses agree with the majority of Council members that there should be 44 wards or more (44 - 50).
- Survey responses favour even more wards, i.e. 54 - 75.
- A small minority of survey and Council members' responses suggest 22 - 25 wards to mirror provincial or federal ridings.

Follow Provincial or Federal Riding Boundaries

- Opinions across the participant groups are divided among survey and public meeting responses, with Members of Council suggesting that this should not be the major criterion for re-aligning Toronto's ward boundaries.
- Stakeholder group responses are overwhelmingly in favour of following provincial or federal riding boundaries.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31



7. NEXT STEPS

The results of the Round One civic engagement and public consultation will form the basis for developing a variety of options for ward re-alignment. A report on these options will be available in July 2015. The Options Report will be the focus of the Round Two consultation process. Public meetings to discuss the options will be held in September and October 2015.



ROUND ONE REPORT

***CIVIC ENGAGEMENT +
PUBLIC CONSULTATION***

APPENDIX A

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
MARCH 31, 2015

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31



APPENDIX A

Questions for Round One of Civic Engagement and Public Consultation

Do you have any concerns related to the current boundaries of your Ward?

Survey Q1; Public Meetings Q1; Council Members Q1

"Communities of interest" are neighbourhoods or specific ethno-cultural groups that live in the same area. Do the boundaries of your Ward divide any communities of interest?

Survey Q2; Public Meetings Q2; Council Members Q2

Is the size of your Ward appropriate for representing residents at the municipal level?

Not in Survey or Public Meetings; Council Members Q3

Current Toronto wards range in population between approximately 45,000 and 94,000. What do you think the population of a Toronto ward should be, so that a Councillor can effectively represent the ward? Survey Q3; Public Meetings Q3; Council Members Q4

From your point-of-view, are there any issues regarding the boundaries of any other Ward or Wards? Not in Survey or Public Meetings; Council Members Q5

By 2031 Toronto's population is expected to grow to 3.2 million people. In your opinion, what should be the total number of wards for Toronto to achieve good representation?

Survey Q4; Public Meetings Q4; Council Members Q7

Is there value for Toronto's ward boundaries to be similar to the boundaries of provincial or federal ridings? Survey Q5; Public Meetings Q5; Council Members Q6

Do you have any other comments regarding Toronto's ward boundaries? Please describe:

Survey Q6; Public Meetings Q6; Council Members Q8



ROUND ONE REPORT

**CIVIC ENGAGEMENT +
PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

APPENDIX B

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
MARCH 31, 2015

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31



APPENDIX B

Stakeholder Groups

Civic Action (Emerging Leaders Network)

Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI)

Social Planning Toronto

Toronto Association of Business Improvement Areas (TABIA)

United Way

Conseil Scolaire de District Catholique Centre-sud (French Catholic School Board)

Toronto Catholic District School Board

Toronto District School Board



ROUND ONE REPORT

***CIVIC ENGAGEMENT +
PUBLIC CONSULTATION***

APPENDIX C

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
MARCH 31, 2015



APPENDIX C

Comments outside of the Scope of the TWBR

The focus of the TWBR is to determine the geographical area from which residents elect their Councillor. However, many comments received during Round One of the TWBR process see a close connection between the number of wards, i.e. the number of Councillors, and the functioning of the Community Councils and Toronto City Council. The project team agreed in advance to report these comments and suggestions separately.

Comments outside of the scope of the TWBR are summarized below by participant group.

1. **Survey** The comments from survey respondents outside the scope of the TWBR relate mainly to governance. They have been grouped as follows (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):
 - 1.1 **Governance (34)** A large number of responses suggest a range of new models of governance, such as multi-member districts, a stronger mayor system, the election of Councillors-at-large, a regional council or more powerful Community Councils.
 - 1.2 **Staff and Resources (8)** Several responses suggest that additional staffing or other resources would help to address issues related to Councillors' workload.
 - 1.3 **School Board Boundaries (6)** A few comments suggest that school board boundaries should not have to match ward boundaries, since school boards have a different focus than City Council.
 - 1.4 **Ward Names (6)** A few respondents note issues with or make suggestions related to the names of Toronto's wards.
 - 1.5 **Voting (5)** Some responses are concerned about voting rights and opportunities for improving the voting system, such as proportional voting.
2. **Public Meetings** Public meeting participants express frustration that any reference to governance, electoral reform or the operations of Community Councils are outside the scope of the TWBR and that the review will not make any recommendations in this regard. Their comments have been grouped as follows (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):



2.1 General Governance (13) Comments suggest focusing on other governance models and possibly re-introducing a two-level system of government akin to the pre-amalgamation Metro and local levels of government.

2.2 Community Boards (13) A representative from the Lakeshore Planning Council in Etobicoke has raised this issue at 9 of the 12 public meetings and the above frequencies include these comments. The proposal is for a New York style community board system with appointed volunteers, specified responsibilities and separate staff and budget. With community boards in existence, ward boundaries could follow those of federal/provincial ridings and Councillors could handle the resulting populations of 105,000 plus per ward.

2.3 Multi-Member Districts and Electoral Reform (12) Fair Vote Toronto has suggested multi-member districts for better representation and a ranked-ballot system at a number of the public meetings. This category also includes comments favouring the election of Councillors-at-large.

2.4 Community Councils (8) Comments in this category are in favour of stronger Community Councils with greater delegated authority and propose the creation of a Midtown Community Council.

2.5 Other (7) Other comments focus on creating unique ward names, how well Councillors represent all of their constituents and differences in levels of service.

3. Members of Council Comments from Members of Council outside the scope of the TWBR also overwhelmingly relate to governance. Members of Council have varying opinions on how Toronto's civic government could be improved. Thirty-nine responses related to 'governance' have been distilled from the "Other Comments" section of the Round One interviews. The majority falls into the following 5 categories (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):

3.1 Role of Council/Community Councils (15) The main focus in this category is the suggestion to delegate more powers to Community Councils, so that City Council does not have to deal with so many local issues. This suggestion is mitigated, however, by a concern for Community Councils becoming potentially very parochial and losing a city-wide approach to issues. Comments also raise the question of additional Community Councils and Community Council boundaries.



3.2 Ward Names (7) Suggestions in this category are not unanimous. Some comments find the current system confusing, but want to maintain some connection with federal/provincial riding names. Others favour new names independent of the current federal/provincial ridings.

3.3 De-amalgamation (5) Several comments raise the issue that there were many more elected politicians before the City of Toronto was amalgamated and that the former municipalities have 'lost their identity'. In this context the old 'Metro' model of local and regional representation is held up as a preferred alternative.

3.4 Councillors' Pay and Resources (5) Comments range from having to be competitive with the private sector to attract competent candidates to municipal office to holding a referendum on Council members' pay and resources during each municipal election.

3.5 A New Government Structure (4) Responses in this category suggest a number of different approaches:

- A strong Mayor/Community Council Chair able to veto Council/Community Council votes.
- A Board of Control with Councillors elected at large plus Ward Councillors.
- Two Councillors elected at large for each Community Council area to deal with city-wide issues; Mayor and at large Councillors would form the Executive Committee; 22-30 Ward Councillors to deal with local issues.


4. Stakeholders Like the other participant groups stakeholders have many suggestions about improving Toronto's governance system. The following specifics are proposed (the frequency of comments is included in brackets):

- Implement electoral reform (ranked ballots; term limits). (4)
- Should have regional level of government. (2)
- Twenty-five local Councillors plus 5 senior Councillors (elected from 5 wards each); senior Councillors could chair Community Councils and they plus the Mayor would form the Executive Committee.
- Do not implement model of 25 local plus 10 at-large Councillors.
- Five wards; 5 Deputy Mayors plus 10 Councillors (2 Councillors per ward) or 20 Councillors (4 Councillors per ward).
- More power to Community Councils.
- Establish a separate Council Committee on Social Development.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION

DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31



4.1 School Boards Comments by school board representatives outside the scope of the TWBR centre on how to identify various school supporters (lack of training of poll clerks; how to ensure registration for French Catholic School supporters; default registration to TDSB). Some Trustees believe their positions should be full-time in order to attract good candidates and recall a pre-amalgamation situation with many more representatives. TDSB representatives suggest that very few functions could be delegated to the equivalent of the City's Community Councils.



ROUND ONE REPORT

***CIVIC ENGAGEMENT +
PUBLIC CONSULTATION***

APPENDIX D

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
MARCH 31, 2015



APPENDIX D

Ward-specific comments from all participant groups regarding ward boundaries and communities of interest

The Table below is followed by a summary of general suggestions relating to the size and shapes of future Toronto wards.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS	
WARD	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
<p>WARD 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good natural and physical boundaries. • Could combine Wards 1 and 2. • Albion is a major road. 	
<p>WARD 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All boundaries ok. • Add the area south of Eglinton to Ward 2 to keep up with population growth – areas are similar. • Could combine Wards 1 and 2. 	
<p>WARD 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend Ward 3 down Bloor to Kipling. (2) • Keep Kipling and south side of Eglinton; move Burnhamthorpe boundary south to Bloor Street (like federal riding) (from Ward 5); this would put apartment buildings east and west of 427 (between Bloor and Burnhamthorpe) into one ward - Ward 3, instead of splitting them. (2) • Southern boundary could also be Dundas, but Dundas east of 427 is very different. • 427 has different neighbourhoods on either side; Kipling is ok, has always been a dividing line. • Royal York should be the boundary of TDSB ward 2. • Increase City Ward 3 and decrease City Ward 4; go across Eglinton to Islington instead of Kipling. 	
<p>WARD 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporate area west of the Humber north of Eglinton (north of La Rose Avenue), south of Dixon Road into Ward 4; this 	



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31

WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<p>change would join this community with the existing one in Ward 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For western/SW boundary use Hydro ROW or Mimico Creek. • In NE part of ward an apartment area north of Eglinton does not have to be part of Ward 4. • Area in the SE (south of CP tracks) could be part of Ward 5. • Ward 4 should not cross 427. • Increase City Ward 3 and decrease City Ward 4; go across Eglinton to Islington instead of Kipling. 	
WARD 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the rail line as a boundary, similar to Ward 11. • Burnhamthorpe could be moved south to Bloor Street. • Area in the SE (south of CP tracks) could be part of Ward 5. • Ward 5 should include both sides of Dundas, because of development. Will become a "Main Street". • Perhaps the Queensway should be the southern boundary (instead of the QEW). • Divide riding east-west, rather than north-south as is the case now? • Royal York should be the boundary of TDSB ward 2. 	
WARD 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QEW boundary works well, except for a few residential buildings near Sherway Gardens Shopping Centre, which are very isolated. • Extend northern boundary west along Evans Avenue. • The northern boundary should stop at the south side of the Queensway instead of the QEW. • Royal York should be the boundary of TDSB ward 2. 	
WARD 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ward 7 and 8 are split between two Community Council areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Jane and Finch neighbourhood is split between several wards and two Community Council areas. The boundaries criss-cross



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31

WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend ward boundary along Jane up to Steeles in north-east corner; would unite the communities north and south of Finch (between 400 and Jane). Should not run east of Highway 400, but then its population drops, since it cannot go east of the Humber. Reduce number of Councillors in this part of the city (Wards 7, 8, and 9). 	<p>Jane, which is the central spine of the community; Councillors do not talk to each other and do not work together. (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Southeast Asian (Filipino, Vietnamese) and Black (Jamaican, West African) community at the south-east corner of Ward 7, the southwest corner of Ward 8, the northwest corner of Ward 12 and the northeast corner of Ward 11
WARD 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ward 7 and 8 are split between two Community Council areas. Dufferin is an ok boundary. CNR line is not a firm boundary (people who work in Employment Area live on the other side of Keele). Area south of Grandravine Drive west of Keele north of Sheppard could be in Ward 8, perhaps along Sheppard to Jane (area east and west of Jane very different here). Reduce number of Councillors in this part of the city (Wards 7, 8, and 9). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jane-Finch community is divided (2); area north of Eddystone south of Finch (between Jane and 400) could be added to Ward 8 - it's different from south of Eddystone. Southeast Asian (Filipino, Vietnamese) and Black (Jamaican, West African) community at the south-east corner of Ward 7, the southwest corner of Ward 8, the northwest corner of Ward 12 and the northeast corner of Ward 11.
WARD 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't change southern, eastern and western boundary. Change northern boundary to include area north of Dovehouse Avenue (continuation of Grandravine Avenue line); would include the new William Baker community (3,500 units). (3) Ward 9 is smaller and could take some extra population - northern boundary splits Grandravine community, which extends up to Finch Avenue. Highway 400 might be a natural boundary for Ward 9. Railway line is boundary in other wards - move area east of CNR line into Ward 10. (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> York University is split now, should all be in Ward 9. Jane-Finch community is split between 3 Councillors (2), Ward 9 only has Jane-Sheppard now; there should be only 2 Councillors.



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31

WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ward 9 boundaries should be: 401 (south); Jane and railway line (west); Steeles (north) (including York University); CNR line (east). Reduce number of Councillors in this part of the city (Wards 7, 8, and 9). 	
WARD 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move section of the ward east of Bathurst to the district to the east (i.e. the square at the top right side of Ward 10 will disappear and it will be a big square). Railway line is boundary in other wards - move area east of CNR line from Ward 9 into Ward 10. (2) 401, Allen Road, Steeles make sense; boundaries cluster social groups. Ward 10 should not go all the way to Yonge. Perhaps various areas from Ward 23 should be added: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> in north-east corner extend Steeles to Cactus Avenue and Carney Avenue down to Drew Avenue; and/or add area east along Drew to Grantbrook Street south to Sheppard Avenue; and/or add area south of Sheppard Avenue to Yonge Street. Boundaries of Ward 23 are confusing because of how the shape of the ward interplays with Ward 24 and Ward 10. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bathurst Street splits a community between Ward 10 and 23. Existing boundary at Chelmsford splits a neighbourhood.
WARD 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ward is pinched in the middle between the Humber River and the rail line. There is a big difference between socio-economic status of the population in Ward 11 and 13. Consider keeping those groups together/separate from each other. Boundaries are hard boundaries and are fine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People north of Dundas and railway tracks consider themselves as part of the Junction, but no problem re boundary along tracks. Mount Dennis community should stay together (2), could be moved into Ward 12 from Ward 11. Weston community should stay together. Southeast Asian (Filipino, Vietnamese) and Black (Jamaican, West African) community at the south-east corner of Ward 7, the



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western boundary is partly Jane, partly railway tracks in Ward 12; could go south on Jane to Black Creek in Ward 11. South-east corner of the ward is more connected to Junction/High Park. (2) Ward 11 has a lot of the old City of York, don't split along arterial roads, use school catchment areas. Railway track between Wards 11 and 12 is not a good boundary, use Black Creek instead. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> southwest corner of Ward 8, the northwest corner of Ward 12 and the northeast corner of Ward 11. Southeast corner of Ward 11 on Mullock Avenue (SE corner of Keele and St. Clair) - is considered to be in the Junction, but is in Ward 11. Should be included with Ward 13. (4)
WARD 12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not change boundaries. The people who live on Hilary Street at the corner of Ward 12 are confused about where they belong and don't know who their Councillor is. 401 in north and railway tracks in east are reasonable; form a good "hard" edge. Small ward, so could be expanded. Southern boundary is jagged and could run along Rowntree Avenue in Ward 17. Move areas south of the ward boundary into Ward 12 since the communities are quite similar in terms of socio-demographics and ethnicity (Italian/Portuguese/Philippine). Western boundary is partly Jane, partly railway tracks; could go south on Jane to Black Creek in Ward 11. Railway track between Wards 11 and 12 is not a good boundary, use Black Creek instead. Add areas from Ward 17: Eglinton/Rogers Road to Earls Court Park and/or add area south of Rogers Road, west of CNR tracks, north of Hydro right-of-way, east of Photography Drive. Add to Ward 12 from Ward 15: CNR tracks/Eglinton/Castlefield/Dufferin. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mount Dennis community should stay together, could be moved into Ward 12 from Ward 11. Southeast Asian (Filipino, Vietnamese) and Black (Jamaican, West African) community at the south-east corner of Ward 7, the southwest corner of Ward 8, the northwest corner of Ward 12 and the northeast corner of Ward 11. Portuguese/Italian/Philippine communities stretch south and east outside of ward boundary. Strong Portuguese community just south of us and the boundary divides us where we should be one community.



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
WARD 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add area west of CN tracks to Kane, north of Rogers Road to Eglinton (to Ward 17 from Ward 12), as well as Rogers Road/Kane till it meets the CP tracks. • There is a big difference between socio-economic status of the population in Ward 11 and 13. Consider keeping those groups together/separate from each other. • All boundaries make sense (Lake; Humber River; Parkside Drive/Keele; railway tracks north of Dundas). • If ward were to be enlarged, it would have to go east. • Residents of lower Swansea have affinity to the Queensway area of Ward 5. But, historically, Rynnymede, Annette, Bloor West Village, Swansea, High Park and Parkdale have a greater affinity with each other. Suggest taking in areas west of Roncesvalles to Ward 13 that are currently part of Ward 14. Ward 14 could take in parts of the Davenport Ward 18. • Boundary of Keele/Parkside on the west side of the ward does not make sense. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Junction is split between Ward 13 and 14 along Keele Street. (3) • Southeast corner of Ward 11 on Mullock Avenue (SE corner of Keele and St. Clair) - is considered to be in the Junction, but is in Ward 11. Should be included with Ward 13. (5) • Ward currently sits within Etobicoke /York Community Council jurisdiction; however, it is more similar to City of Toronto in terms of geography and population. (5) • Some Caribbean communities in Parkdale are divided by Ward 13/14.
WARD 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ward functions as its own village, with a sensible geography. • Parking lot for Medieval Times should move into Ward 19 (from Ward 14). • Suggest taking in areas west of Roncesvalles to Ward 13 that are currently part of Ward 14. Ward 14 could take in parts of the Davenport Ward 18. • The boundary north of Bloor that follows the Rail Line is strange. Bloor Street feels like a solid end to the community. • Laidlaw Street has more in common with Liberty Village or West Queen West than Parkdale-High Park. The boundary should be Dufferin instead of the railway. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Junction is split between Ward 13 and 14 along Keele Street. (3) • Liberty Village is split between Wards 14 and 19. (5) Should be in one ward. • Liberty Village and Junction BIA are split, but no problem. • Some Caribbean communities in Parkdale are divided by Ward 13/14. • Parkdale tends to dominate issues in the ward, so High Park/Bloor West is less represented. (3) • Do not divide Parkdale.



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
WARD 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not change boundaries. Add to Ward 12 from Ward 15: CNR tracks/Eglinton/Castlefield/Dufferin. 401 ok; CNR tracks ok - both are hard boundaries. Allen Road should be the eastern boundary between east-west CNR line and Eglinton. Add area to Bathurst (north of this CRN line) to Ward 15 from Ward 21; communities north and south of the railway line are similar. Fix area at Marlee and Holland Park, there are 3 Councillors. Add area Eglinton/CNR tracks/Rogers Road/Dufferin to Ward 15 from Ward 17. Add area Eglinton/Dufferin/Rogers Road/Holland Park Avenue/Winona (from Ward 15 to Ward 21). Dufferin would be a better boundary in the west. Ward cuts across the Dufferin / Eglinton intersection in a very unsuitable way. Subway could be a boundary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Vaughan and Oakwood neighbourhood is split between several wards. It is difficult to get political support. (3) If Allen Road (the ward's greatest boundary) became eastern boundary of Ward 15, Lawrence Heights would be split; this might not matter so much, since there are only two crossings of the Allen north of Lawrence; LH already split by Census tracts and local perceptions - i.e. Canada and America on either side. Neighbourhood south of Eglinton and east of Dufferin should not be included with area north of Eglinton. (3) Orthodox Jews are divided by Bathurst Avenue, between Ward 15 and 16.
WARD 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are issues with the Yonge street boundary because of all the development, which affects both sides. The Yonge and Eglinton area is a growth centre. There are 3 Councillors and 2 Community Councils for this area. This makes it difficult to coordinate. (5) Using the main streets (Yonge/Eglinton) as boundaries creates issues in this area. (4) Generally boundaries are fine; irregularity at south-west corner (Bathurst and Eglinton). (2) Yonge Street boundary fits with school boundaries, nobody east of Yonge goes to school west of Yonge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Yonge and Lawrence community is split by Ward 16 and 25. Yonge Street is a strong retail strip and has a BIA. (2) Bathurst Street divides the Jewish community. (2) The Yonge-Eglinton area is split by three wards and 2 Community Councils. (6) The south end of the ward is very different from the north, especially north of Lawrence. The community identifies more with the Toronto-East York Community Council area. (3) Historic community of Bedford Park centred along Yonge Street is divided north of Lawrence Avenue. (2)



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
WARD 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could add all of Leaside to North Toronto (to Ward 16 from Ward 25). • The parts of Wards 25 and 16 near Yonge should be paired together. • Do not change boundaries. • The boundary should go up to Eglinton. • The northeastern boundary should go up to Eglinton Avenue. • Instead of Winona, the boundary should use Oakwood. It is a major artery, so residents would be more likely to know. (4) • The Winona boundary does not make sense. It's a secondary artery and confusing for people. (4) • Oakwood/Dovercourt should be the eastern boundary of Ward 17 (with Ward 21). East side is Oakwood Village / Cedervale neighbourhood, the west side is Corso Italia. (4) • Boundaries on the east side of the ward do not make sense. Dufferin Street or Oakwood Ave would be better. • Dufferin is a better boundary because the communities on either side are different. (4) • Once you get to Davenport Road and Oakwood Avenue, you could keep the boundary line at Ossington, or move it west to Dovercourt Road. • Southern boundary of Ward 12 is jagged and could run along Rowntree Avenue in Ward 17. • Add areas from Ward 17 to Ward 12: Eglinton/Rogers Road to Earls Court Park and/or add area south of Rogers Road, west of CNR tracks, north of Hydro right-of-way, east of Photography Drive. • Add area Eglinton/CNR tracks/Rogers Road/Dufferin to Ward 15 from Ward 17. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vaughan and Oakwood neighbourhood is split between several wards. It is difficult to get political support. (3) • The Wychwood/Hillcrest neighbourhood is cut in half. (3) • Regal Heights doesn't fit the typical demographics of the ward. Attach the Regal Heights neighbourhood to Hillcrest/Wychwood. • The Italian/Portuguese communities south and west of Ward 15 are divided by 17 and 21.



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31

WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CP tracks to the south make sense. • SW boundary should follow Weston/Keele, to include that missing section just east of Keele. • Extend the north-west section of the ward and reduce the east end (east of Dufferin). • Eglinton is a good boundary. • Add area west of CN tracks to Kane, north of Rogers Road to Eglinton (to Ward 17 from Ward 12), as well as Rogers Road/Kane till it meets the CP tracks. • Extend northern boundary of Ward 18 up to Davenport north of the railway tracks (into Ward 17); residents association between Dupont and Davenport straddles two wards. • Perhaps the western boundary of Ward 18 should go down Lansdowne to Queen (from Ward 17). • Issue with gap along the St. Clair corridor east of Oakwood to Winona Drive. This section should become part of Ward 21 and then fall within the catchment area of the Hillcrest Village BIA. 	
WARD 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dupont boundary is problematic. There is one residents association but two Councillors. • There are issues around Lansdowne and the Salem, West Moreland neighbourhoods. They are part of the same community, but in different wards because the boundary is on Dupont. • Western boundary and Dovercourt are good. • Extend northern boundary of Ward 18 up to Davenport north of the railway tracks (into Ward 17); residents association between Dupont and Davenport straddles two wards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Davenport Village north of the tracks has same developer and is building same kind of development as south of the tracks. (3) • 'Triangle' West Queen West (south of Queen between tracks and Dovercourt) fits well into Ward 18. • The ward is very long and narrow, but very different communities north-south. (2) • Parkdale is split.



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31

WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perhaps the western boundary of Ward 18 should go down Lansdowne to Queen (from Ward 17). Dufferin Street is a really big boundary (it's in Ward 18). Suggest taking in areas west of Roncesvalles to Ward 13 that are currently part of Ward 14. Ward 14 could take in parts of the Davenport Ward 18. Boundaries should not follow the rail line. 	
WARD 19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bathurst Street and tracks north of Dupont are fine. Dufferin Street is a really big boundary (it's in Ward 18). Seaton Village neighbourhood might be added to Ward 19 from Ward 20 (Bathurst/railway tracks/Christie/Bloor). (2) Parking lot for Medieval Times should move into Ward 19 (from Ward 14). Sometimes a bit tricky, if boundary straddles a main street like Dovercourt. Stadium Rd. area is part of Ward 20 but is more closely related to Ward 19, as is Coronation Park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ward is a little thin and tall - thus it divides neighbourhoods. Liberty Village is split between Wards 14 and 19. (5) Should be in one ward. Difference between Liberty Village and other areas of the ward - design, density and traffic issues are different. Should not ever split Trinity-Bellwoods Park. Bathurst Quay (east of Bathurst) is very different from Fort York neighbourhood (in Ward 19). The new built areas of Liberty Village, Fort York and City Place together create a community of interest. Differences between condominium areas (south part of ward) and northern parts. (5) Chinese, Vietnamese, Portuguese, etc. are divided by the current Bathurst St. boundary. Students and University staff are divided by Bathurst St. The eastern boundary cuts through Little Portugal, north-south between Queen and Dundas. Koreatown, Little Italy, Harbord Village are split. There are commonalities between the communities on either side of Bathurst Street. (3) There are commonalities between the communities on either side of Bathurst Street. (3)
WARD 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ward is too diverse/complex; difficult for one Councillor to manage. (18) 	



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People down on the lake (mostly young urban singles) have different needs than people in the Annex (mostly families). Also there is a difference in the transit. • Queen Street would be a logical boundary. People south of Queen Street don't tend to have daily activities north of Queen. (2) • Major differences between condo/waterfront communities and rest of the ward (21) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ North and south of Queen (4) ◦ North and south of Bloor (3) ◦ North/south of Dundas (2) • Established neighbourhoods are north of Queen. • Seaton Village is at north end of Ward 20. It should stay with Ward 20. • Seaton Village neighbourhood might be added to Ward 19 from Ward 20 (Bathurst/railway tracks/Christie/Bloor). (2) • Some U of T residences east of the University should be reassigned to Ward 20 from Ward 27. • Use Grace Street as a boundary. • Odd piece at bottom of Bathurst is in Ward 20, also dog park (access to Billy Bishop airport). • Stadium Rd. area is part of Ward 20 but is more closely related to Ward 19, as is Coronation Park. • Condo community starts south of Queen Street; Queen and Bloor are natural dividing lines. • Boundaries need to be natural features, i.e. Davenport hill; or physical, i.e. Avenue Road; or railway tracks; also historic. • Could there be an east-west ward south of King? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the new federal boundaries – Chinatown and The Grange were split. • The University of Toronto main campus community is split (by Wards 20 and 27). It should be in one ward. (2) • Profs/ Students at UofT communities are split; should be in one ward. (3) • Island airport access is properly in Ward 20, because of impact on neighbourhoods to the north. • The Toronto Island Airport should be part of Ward 20, not Ward 28, as it affects Ward 20 most. Also access to the airport is through Ward 20. • Waterfront is divided at York Street; Entertainment District is divided; BIAs are split across University Avenue/Avenue Road; institutional community is split across University Avenue. • Sharing of institutional areas between Ward 27 and Ward 20, ok. • Bathurst Quay (east of Bathurst) is very different from Fort York neighbourhood (in Ward 19). • South Core neighbourhood is split by York Street; Harbour Square has two buildings west of York Street and one east of York Street. • The new built areas of Liberty Village, Fort York and City Place together create a community of interest. • Koreatown is split along Bloor St W between Christie Pits and Bathurst St. (2) • Parts of Little Italy, Little Portugal straddle Ward 20. • Neighbourhoods, from Davenport to Queen, and Grace to University, especially the University district are split. • Christie Pits community is split as are Waterfront, Cityplace, Harbourfront/Entertainment District/Fashion District/Queen West



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Or a southern ward in the Ward 20 area focused on the waterfront ? • Create a condo/waterfront ward. (4) i.e. [west: Bathurst, north: Queen, east: Simcoe, south: Lake]. This encompasses the Cityplace, Wellington Place, Fashion District, and Harbourfront communities. • Queens Quay waterfront dwellers specifically at Queens Quay and York east to Bay should also be part of Ward 20. • Seems to be a problem with Ward 28 around Union Station. 	
WARD 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ward is too diverse for a Councillor to adequately represent everyone. • The areas around the railway tracks in the south of the hill do not receive as much focus. Create a separate, longer and narrower ward running on either side of Davenport Rd. • The railroad track at the south border of Ward 21 is an arbitrary boundary. Cedarvale ravine is a better, natural divider. • Hill and railway tracks could make good natural boundaries. • Border should not be the CP rail lines (2) but rather Davenport as it is a major thoroughfare and a historical landmark (Lake Iroquois shore line). • The north and south areas of Ward 21 are different. • Ward 21 should continue further south rather than include communities to the north. • The federal boundary of St. Paul's goes to Dufferin and Eglinton. It is arbitrary to cut at Rogers Road. It would make more sense to go to St. Clair. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Vaughan and Oakwood neighbourhood is split between several wards. It is difficult to get political support. (3) • Forest Hill Village - both sides of Spadina - should perhaps be in Ward 21. • The Italian/Portuguese communities south and west of Ward 15 are divided by 17 and 21. • Ward should not extend to Spadina and Dupont. The area south and west of Davenport and over to Avenue Road (commonly called the Republic of Rathnelly) is unnaturally split at Spadina. • Humewood and Cedarvale are two very different neighbourhoods. (2) • Cedarvale is much more closely connected to Forest Hill (north of Eglinton between Allen Rd. and Bathurst St.) than it is to Humewood or Oakwood-Vaughan. (3) • The areas north of Cedarvale Ravine are distinct from the areas south of it (east of Manlee). Might be better paired with areas further west, or south. (4) • Northern areas of the ward might better be paired with Forest Hill, or areas further north or northeast. • The south end is more similar to Seaton Village.



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add area to Bathurst (north of this CRN line) to Ward 15 from Ward 21; communities north and south of the railway line are similar Oakwood/Dovercourt should be the eastern boundary of Ward 17 (with Ward 21). East side is Oakwood Village / Cedervale neighbourhood, the west side is Corso Italia. (4) Issue with gap along the St. Clair corridor east of Oakwood to Winona Drive. This section should become part of Ward 21 and then fall within the catchment area of the Hillcrest Village BIA. Eglinton would be a good dividing line in the north. Add area Eglinton/Dufferin/Rogers Road/Holland Park Avenue/Winona (from Ward 15 to Ward 21). Add Casa Loma from Ward 22, since the 'campus' is already in Ward 21. Spadina Road boundary seems arbitrary. Needs of communities on either side are similar. Avenue Road and Oriole Parkway would be a better eastern boundary than Spadina.(2) Ward should be divided into a north and south half rather than east and west half. Could encompass Cedarvale, Forest Hill North and Forest Hill South. City Wards 21/22 boundaries are appropriate. Strange boundary between Wards 22, 26 and 27. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Humewood and the areas south of the ravine east of Bathurst are much more connected to St. Clair. The eastern boundary of Ward 21 runs through the middle of Forest Hill, along Spadina (4) Less of an issue south of St. Clair. (2)
WARD 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is a bit odd that it goes up to Broadway and cuts through Fairfield. (3) There are a number of bizarre squiggles between 22 and 27. (3) The boundary between Ward 22 and 25 creates confusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A community is divided by Broadway, between 22 and 25. Forest Hill Village - both sides of Spadina - should perhaps be in Ward 21. Sharing of Yonge Street BIA between Ward 22 and Ward 25 frustrating for retailers.



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Yonge and Eglinton area is a growth centre. There are 3 Councillors and 2 Community Councils for this area. This makes it difficult to coordinate. (5) • Using the main streets (Yonge/Eglinton) as boundaries creates issues in this area. (4) • Add Casa Loma from Ward 22, since the 'campus' is already in Ward 21. • Ward 22 should include the portion of Forest Hill and Casa Loma that is between Bathurst and Spadina Ave (currently in Ward 21). (3) • Maybe Avenue Road should be western boundary. • Yonge-Eglinton Centre in 3 different wards; Ward 16's portion seems ok, but Ward 25's portion should be in Ward 22. • The north boundary of Ward 22 should simply continue along Eglinton Avenue from Yonge to Bayview Avenue. • Add area in north-east up to Erskine and across to Bayview (to Ward 22 from Ward 25) = part of Yonge-Eglinton Growth Centre. • Make Avenue Road/St. Clair/current Ward 27 boundaries, north of Davenport a second ward; would keep Rosedale together; residents north of tracks, east of Avenue Road, south of St. Clair are orphaned right now (in Ward 22). • Ward 22 should expand north to include some of 16 and some of 25 (2), and the parts furthest south and west should be removed and paired with other wards. • Summerhill / Shaftesbury and adjoining streets north of CPR line are excluded from Ward 22. (2) Extend boundary along the CPR line to Bayview or cutting off at St. Clair. • Lower part of the ward below the Avenue Road/Rathnelly is disconnected from the rest of the ward. • Don't add Ward 22 with suburban ward north of Eglinton and east of Mt. Pleasant; not the same. • City Wards 21/22 boundaries are appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Yonge-Eglinton area is split by three wards and 2 Community Councils. (6) • Sherwood Park is split along Broadway. (2)



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
WARD 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ward 23 may have to be divided. (2) • The communities on either side of Yonge are similar. But 10 blocks east is a much different community. • There are distinct differences between the people along Yonge (condos) and surrounding neighbourhoods (single-family homes). (5) • The Finch Hydro corridor could be a good natural boundary. • Area north of HydroCorridor (north of Finch) is different than south of Finch; no residents association; could move either east or west. • Area west of Bathurst (current western boundary) north and south of Finch is very different from Ward 23; should not be incorporated. • Create a condo ward that starts at Beecroft and Finch run south to Sheppard Ave West, from there it would move to Yonge St.; down to the 401 across the highway to Leslie up to Sheppard Ave E.; west to Doris Ave. north to Finch and back to Beecroft Road. (2) • Perhaps various areas from Ward 23 should be added to Ward 10: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. in north-east corner extend Steeles to Cactus Avenue and Carney Avenue down to Drew Avenue; 2. and/or add area east along Drew to Grantbrook Street south to Sheppard Avenue; 3. and/or add area south of Sheppard Avenue to Yonge Street. Area Finch/Bayview/401/Willowdale should move east into Ward 24 (from Ward 23). • Area Steeles/Willowdale/Finch/Bayview could go to adjacent ward (to Ward 23 from Ward 24). • Willowdale should have 3 wards, existing Ward 24 (with the changes); two wards out of current Ward 23; should run east-west, no cut at Yonge Street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bathurst Street splits a community between Ward 10 and 23. • Must not split two sides of Yonge Street at Sheppard; network of amenities and gathering spots with Yonge as the hub; condos between Beecroft (west of Yonge) and Doris (east of Yonge) unified by Yonge Street. • Yonge corridor is a new neighbourhood; growing Farsi/Jewish/Chinese communities. • The Jewish community along both sides of Bathurst Ave. and Bayview Ave are divided. • Willowdale - Bayview Village has much in common and historic ties to west of Bayview (Ward 23), yet Ward 24 links it to east.



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
WARD 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The boundaries should continue all the way up from Hwy 401 up Bathurst to Steeles. Boundaries of Ward 23 are confusing because of how the shape of the ward interplays with Ward 24 and Ward 10. Communities east of Yonge are more impacted by issues in Ward 24. (3) City Wards 23 and 24 should be divided at Yonge Street. Western boundary should be Bayview (a main street), not Willowdale (a secondary street). Ward 24 goes to Yonge Street, but it should stop at Bayview Avenue. That is what the federal government has done. The ward is too big for a Councillor to represent the people. The Bridlebrook area is in Ward 33, between the ravine and railroad. (2) The community is closely tied to Bayview Village Association (Ward 24). The rail line should be the boundary between Ward 24 and 33. Area Finch/Bayview/401/Willowdale should move east into Ward 24 (from Ward 23). Area Steeles/Willowdale/Finch/Bayview could go to adjacent ward (to Ward 23 from Ward 24). Willowdale should have 3 wards, existing Ward 24 (with the changes); two wards out of current Ward 23; should run east-west, no cut at Yonge Street. Boundaries of Ward 23 are confusing because of how the shape of the ward interplays with Ward 24 and Ward 10. City Wards 23 and 24 should be divided at Yonge Street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perhaps a community is split along Sheppard, east and west of Bayview. Area east of Ravine to 404, north of 401 is a different community. One ratepayers association covers Finch/Bayview/401 and Ravine; focus on community centre; must be kept together. North-eastern industrial-commercial area (east of 404) can go anywhere; no residents. Willowdale - Bayview Village has much in common and historic ties to west of Bayview (Ward 23), yet Ward 24 links it to east.
WARD 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area that goes above Eglinton to Roehampton gets ignored. The boundary should be down Eglinton (at the bottom of Ward 25). The boundary between Ward 22 and 25 creates confusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Yonge and Lawrence community is split by ward 16 and 25. (2) Yonge Street is a strong retail strip and has a BIA. (2)



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Yonge and Eglinton area is a growth centre. There are 3 Councillors and 2 Community Councils for this area. This makes it difficult to coordinate. (5) Using the main streets (Yonge/Eglinton) as boundaries creates issues in this area. (4) Could add all of Leaside to North Toronto (to Ward 16 from Ward 25). Yonge-Eglinton Centre in 3 different wards; Ward 16's portion seems ok, but Ward 25's portion should be in Ward 22. Ward 22 should expand north to include some of 16 and some of 25. Add area in north-east up to Erskine and across to Bayview (to Ward 22 from Ward 25) = part of Yonge-Eglinton Growth Centre. 401 ok. Move the eastern boundary to Leslie St. Use Eglinton as the consistent southern boundary. (3) Southern boundary of Ward 25 is strange should go south to Eglinton from Yonge to Don Mills Road, would include Celestica development at Eglinton and Don Mills Road (from Ward 26 to Ward 25). (2) Make Lawrence the northern boundary of Ward 26 by adding area Leslie/Lawrence/Ravine/CPR tracks (from Wards 25 and 34); condo dwellers north and south of the tracks are similar. If the ward population is too large, then narrow it on the eastern boundary by moving that line from the CNR line and Don Mills Rd. over to Leslie Street from top to bottom. Will be easier for residents to understand and will also eliminate the split in the middle of the Donway community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Yonge-Eglinton area is split by three wards and 2 Community Councils. (6) A community is divided by Broadway, between 22 and 25. Don Mills community is split between Wards 25 and 34. Sharing of Yonge Street BIA between Ward 22 and Ward 25 frustrating for retailers Don Mills has 3 Councillors, but maybe nothing can be done about that; too large; can never be all in one ward. (2) The old Toronto/North York border, which is the southern boundary of the ward, divides the neighbourhood north of Eglinton and south of Mount Hope Cemetery.



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
WARD 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The parts of Wards 25 and 16 near Yonge should be paired together. The parts of the ward around Lawrence Park (south west of the Don River) are much more similar to the nearby parts of Ward 16 than to the rest of the ward. Leaside and Don Valley West is divided by federal boundaries. The Leaside community could be added to Ward 29; historically they were one community. Leaside and Bennington Heights belong in a ward that includes some, or all, of the following: Davisville Village, Moore Park, North Toronto. (2) Right now the boundary is delineated by rail line. The Moore Park ravine is a better boundary because the ground is 200 feet lower on one side. There is no communication across that line. Southern boundary of Ward 25 is strange should go south to Eglinton from Yonge to Don Mills Road; would include Celestica development at Eglinton and Don Mills Road (from Ward 26 to Ward 25). (2) Might add area east on CNR tracks to Don Mills Road to Ward 25 (from Ward 34). DVP is not a barrier, the ravine to the east of it is. Make Lawrence the northern boundary of Ward 26 by adding area Leslie/Lawrence/Ravine/CPR tracks (from Wards 25 and 34); condo dwellers north and south of the tracks are similar. The western boundary should maybe be Mount Pleasant; same issues as North Toronto. Could add Thorncliffe Park (to Ward 29 from Ward 26). Add area Eglinton/DVP/CPR tracks/valley to Ward 34 (from Ward 26); cut off by DVP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don Mills is split, but makes no difference. South Eglinton Resident & Ratepayers split by the federal boundaries. There are distinct communities - the affluent neighbourhoods of Leaside, Bennington Heights and Wynford Heights and the severely disadvantaged, more populous and ethnic neighbourhoods of Thorncliffe Park and Flemingdon Park. Demographically, they are very different – can create issues for representation and equitable distribution of recreation and cultural facilities in the ward. (3) Don't split the Bridle Path. Most important change: add area from Redway Road to DVP (from Ward 29 to Ward 26); current boundary splits Bennington Heights neighbourhood. Flemington Park and Thorncliffe Park residents are combining their associations. Muslim population in Thorncliffe Park and Flemingington Park divided by new federal riding boundary . Leaside is a natural community; Bayview is a good boundary, but can also be crossed (1/4 of Leaside is in Ward 26). East York is broken up between Wards 26, 29 and 31. Wynford/Concorde is its own enclave (north of Eglinton, east of DVP), but they shop in Don Mills. (2)



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31

WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
WARD 27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strange boundary between Wards 22, 26 and 27. • High density and development disproportionate to other wards – under representation/councillor workload too high (6) • Rosedale Valley Ravine is the divider. The politics on either side of the ravine are different. • There are a number of bizarre squiggles between 22 and 27. (2) • Create a mid-town ward north of Bloor. • Communities north and south of Bloor are very different. Bloor is a logical ward boundary. (8) • Bloor Street is not a natural boundary, north and south sides are similar, including Yorkville. Davenport is the real boundary; different built form north and south of Davenport. • Sharing of institutional areas between Ward 27 and Ward 20, ok. • Make Queen/University-Avenue Road/Davenport one ward; do not go west of University (do not split U of T area). • Some U of T residences east of the University should be reassigned to Ward 20 from Ward 27. • Communities east of Jarvis Street have more in common with those east of Sherbourne. • Ward 27 could also go east to Parliament to include St. James Town in Ward 28. Area between Sherbourne and Parliament is similar, urban culture changes east of Parliament (not at Sherbourne). • Make Avenue Road/St. Clair/current Ward 27 boundaries, north of Davenport a second ward; would keep Rosedale together; residents north of tracks, east of Avenue Road, south of St. Clair are orphaned right now (in Ward 22). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The University of Toronto main campus community is split (by Wards 20 and 27). It should be in one ward. (3) • Has a lot of community associations, and BIAs/diversity that need to be accounted for. • Do not split Regent Park (Parliament - Gerrard - River - Shuter). • Should probably keep North and South Rosedale together. • Ward 27's northern boundaries separate Rosedale and Moore Park from natural communities of interest in Deer Park and Bennington Heights. • Church and Wellesley neighbourhood is split. • LGBT community split. LGBT cluster east of ward boundary (residential Cabbagetown) is cut off. • Sherbourne Street neighbourhood is split. It has many social services, care centres, homeless shelters, group homes, etc. Shared identity among new Canadians. (2) • Communities above Bloor, Bloor to Dundas from University to the DVP and below Dundas are split.



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
WARD 28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very disparate socio-economic status between neighbourhoods (i.e. Rosedale, Yorkdale, Moss Park, St. Jamestown, etc.). Communities would be better served if separated. (15) • Strange boundary between Wards 22, 26 and 27. • Diverse and complex ward, difficult for Councillor to manage. (5) • Differences between residents in high rises vs single family dwellings. (2) • Rosedale and St. James Town / Regent Park / Moss Park should be split in half to better serve the 2 distinct ethno-cultural and socio-economic populations. • Ward should be oriented east – west, rather than north-south. (2) • People north and south of Queen St. don't have a lot in common. • Use the railway corridor (3) or Lakeshore Boulevard/Gardiner Expressway instead of the Esplanade. • Ward 27 could also go east to Parliament to include St. James Town in Ward 28. Area between Sherbourne and Parliament is similar, urban culture changes east of Parliament (not at Sherbourne). • Bayview/DVP/Rosedale Valley Road ok. • Sherbourne is a natural boundary of St. James Town (north of Wellesley). • Don't use Carlton or Wellesley as a boundary; perhaps Gerrard, but that will cut Parliament BIA and Cabbagetown north and south. • Differences between residents at Bloor and Parliament and at Lake Shore and Parliament. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new federal boundaries split the St. Lawrence neighbourhood along the Esplanade. (42) • The Distillery District has also been split at Trinity Street – the historic area. (2) • Concern that Ward 28 will be split – it is a cohesive community. (2) • Cabbagetown / Corktown residents can sometimes override the needs of vulnerable populations. • Toronto Islands belong to Toronto Centre at the municipal level, but provincially and federally it belongs to Trinity-Spadina. • Castle Frank community is isolated, but belongs properly with Rosedale. • Rosedale school should go to Rosedale. • St. James Town should not be in Rosedale. • Islands and Ferry Docks have to be in one ward; Island residents relate to St. Lawrence and parts of East Bayfront. • If Queen is used as a boundary, Moss Park and Regent Park stay together in Ward 28. • 'Cabbagetown' is Sherbourne/Wellesley/Bayview/ Dundas; Regent Park is integrated into Cabbagetown; Parliament is the main street of Cabbagetown. • West Don Lands communities are becoming more cohesive (Corktown; St. Lawrence; Distillery District).



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend ward toward Yonge but shorten it so it does not go to waterfront. Development along Queen's Quay and around Bay/Harbour has more in common with waterfront community to the west. Seems to be a problem with Ward 28 around Union Station. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Toronto Island Airport should be part of Ward 20, not Ward 28, as its affects Ward 20 most. Also access to the airport is through Ward 20.
WARD 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Danforth and Coxwell are ok; splitting Danforth between two wards is not the end of the world. Could add Thorncliffe Park (to Ward 29 from Ward 26). If Ward 29 boundary were to be pushed to Woodbine, that would be too far. If Ward 29 is to be expanded make Midland or Brimley the eastern boundary. The former East York boundary used to be Greenwood. Consider that as a boundary. Small area near O'Connor and Coxwell should be added to Ward 31 (from Ward 29) - Taylor Drive. The southern portion of Ward 29 has more in common with Ward 30 (Riverdale) than with the old City of East York. (2) The northwest part of the ward seems geographically disjointed. Provincial boundaries of "Toronto Danforth" or Toronto District School Board Ward 15 make more sense. Better to redraw Wards 29-32 in east west tranches instead of the 2x2 square grid, based around streets of key interest. Use Dundas as one boundary and Mortimer, stretching from the DVP to Victoria Park as another. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor's Bridge is actually in Ward 29, but federally and provincially it has gone to Toronto Centre. It should remain in East York. Historically it has been in East York. (2) Governor's Bridge is on the opposite side of the Don Valley from the main area of Ward 29 (Toronto Danforth); physically detached and separate socially, culturally and economically; leads to underrepresentation of area. Change Governor's Bridge neighborhood (Ward 29) to Toronto Centre at the municipal level. Greektown is split between Wards 29 and 30. Most important change: add area from Redway Road to DVP (from Ward 29 to Ward 26); current boundary splits Bennington Heights neighbourhood. East York is broken up between Wards 26, 29 and 31. Four Councillors deal with Danforth Mosaic BIA (all along the Danforth) Wards 29, 30, 31, 32. The community on either side of Danforth is split. (4) The Danforth BIA is split. Coxwell Ave. splits the old town/borough of East York, whose residents historically have common values. Danforth splits "Riverdale north" residents from what is officially called Riverdale.
WARD 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Danforth and Don River ok; Lake ok; all of the Port Lands are in Ward 30. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four Councillors deal with Danforth Mosaic BIA (all along the Danforth) Wards 29, 30, 31, 32.



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31

WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
WARD 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eastern boundary of Ward 30 should go down Coxwell all the way to the Lakeshore, like the federal riding. Would include the Leslie Street Bams south of Lakeshore (to Ward 30 from Ward 32). The eastern border zig-zags; should be corrected. (2) Another option for the Gerrard boundary is Greenwood. You could take it to the natural break at the rail, which would allow that strip of Gerrard to remain as a community. On west side of Ward 32 maybe straighten some jogs - over to Greenwood Avenue (in Ward 30). Ward 32 residents use Monarch Park and students attend Monarch Park High School. Two distinct communities in the ward: very affluent condo-dwellers on and south of Queen, and more blue-collar and immigrant communities along Gerrard. Lower part of the ward (Port Lands, etc.) is very different than Riverdale, Leslieville, the Danforth. The southern portion of Ward 29 has more in common with Ward 30 (Riverdale) than with the old City of East York. Better to redraw Wards 29-32 in east west tranches instead of the 2x2 square grid, based around streets of key interest. Use Dundas as one boundary and Mortimer, stretching from the DVP to Victoria Park as another. The boundary along Gerrard in Ward 32 puts the main commercial street within two wards. The area south of Gerrard and west of Coxwell should be in Ward 30 not 32. There is a little sliver of the Beaches ward that sticks into the Ward 30. On Highfield Rd. west of Coxwell - surrounded by Ward 30 practically, but is in Ward 32. Victoria Park, Danforth and Coxwell all clear boundaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greektown is split between Wards 29 and 30. Gerrard Indian Bazaar is split between Wards 30 and 32. (10) Leslieville is now divided; it ends at Coxwell. Gerrard- Ashdale is divided north-south. Eastern Avenue Employment area is now split between Ward 30 and 32. Some community associations are shared between Ward 32 and Ward 30: GECO (Gerrard East Community Organization); DECA. "Greenwood-Coxwell" split between Ward 30 and Ward 32. Large Chinese community is divided along Gerrard.



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small area near O'Connor and Coxwell should be added to Ward 31 (from Ward 29) - Taylor Drive. • Not sure about going south of the Danforth to railway tracks; but this would keep Danforth all in one ward, which would be nice. • If Victoria Park were to be crossed, ward would have to go as far as Pharmacy. • The corner at Sunrise and Vic Park - should be squared off. • Cannot do anything in north-east corner; a fence separates TCHC buildings from residences to the south - Holland Avenue. • Area west of Victoria Park and O'Connor is 'orphaned' community, stronger relationship to East York - move south from Ward 34 to Ward 31? • Better to redraw Wards 29-32 in east west tranches instead of the 2x2 square grid, based around streets of key interest. Use Dundas as one boundary and Mortimer, stretching from the DVP to Victoria Park as another. • Area in Ward 32 south of Danforth Avenue to the Railway Tracks would be better represented in Ward 31 since Ward 32 represents the Beaches. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four Councillors deal with Danforth Mosaic BIA (all along the Danforth) Wards 29, 30, 31, 32. • East York is broken up between Wards 26, 29 and 31. • Community north of St. Clair west of Victoria Park has more of a Scarborough orientation. • DECA is split (Danforth East Community Association): Monarch Park (west); Main (east); Mortimer/Lumsden (north); GO train tracks (south of Danforth). • The community south of Danforth Ave. is excluded from Ward 31 but the same demography. • South Asian immigrant community in high-rise buildings just south of Danforth Ave, near Main St., are split from those who live in the areas just north of Danforth (high-rises near Dawes Road, etc.).
WARD 32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victoria Park south of Bracken - boundary goes through a ravine; should be Victoria Park to Queen, then south on Nursewood. • Six buildings on Queen St, west of Victoria Park are included in Ward 36 and not in Ward 32, with Beaches-East York. This is an anomaly. • Happy with boundaries, do not go down Coxwell. • South side of Danforth ok. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riverdale is split by the Danforth boundary. • Four Councillors deal with Danforth Mosaic BIA (all along the Danforth) Wards 29, 30, 31, 32. • Gerrard Indian Bazaar is split between Wards 30 and 32. (10) • Eastern Avenue Employment area is now split between Ward 30 and 32. • Should piece of E.T. Seaton Park north of railway tracks be with Thorncliffe Park?



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On west side of Ward 32 maybe straighten some jogs (2) - over to Greenwood Avenue (in Ward 30). Ward 32 residents use Monarch Park and students attend Monarch Park High School. It would be helpful if the boundaries were along a major street like Greenwood. Eastern boundary of Ward 30 should go down Coxwell all the way to the Lakeshore, like the federal riding. Would include the Leslie Street Barns south of Lakeshore (to Ward 30 from Ward 32). Better to redraw Wards 29-32 in east west tranches instead of the 2x2 square grid, based around streets of key interest. Use Dundas as one boundary and Mortimer, stretching from the DVP to Victoria Park as another. The boundary along Gerrard in Ward 32 puts the main commercial street within two wards. The area south of Gerrard and west of Coxwell should be in Ward 30 not 32. The CNR tracks to the north would be a more natural ward boundary than Gerrard. The train tracks just south of the Danforth are in fact the natural transition point between the south and north (i.e. the proper northern boundary for Ward 32) Part of the ward west of Coxwell is in another federal riding. There is a little sliver of the Beaches ward that sticks into the Ward 30. On Highfield Rd. west of Coxwell - surrounded by Ward 30 practically, but is in Ward 32. Demographics in areas south of Kingston Road between Victoria Park and the western boundary of the Hunt Club property fit better with the Beach (from Ward 36 to Ward 32) than areas north of Gerrard Street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ward 32 should keep small part of Leslieville that's in Ward 32 as well as Gerrard Street Indian Bazaar. Some community associations are shared between Ward 32 and Ward 30: GECCO (Gerrard East Community Organization); DECA. Residents in north end of Ward 32 have been ignored in favour of Beach residents. (11) Divide ward? Communities north and south of Gerrard "Little India"/India Bazaar are split between Ward 30 and Ward 32. (9) "Greenwood-Coxwell" split between Ward 30 and Ward 32. Large Chinese community is divided along Gerrard. Fallingbrook is in Scarborough Community Council Area but part of the Beaches and Queen St. E. community. Eastern portion of Queen Street should be inside Ward 32, which should extend to include Fallingbrook Drive. (2) Greektown/the Danforth community - above and below Danforth Ave. is divided (17) West of Woodbine is separate.



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31

WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area in Ward 32 south of Danforth Avenue to the Railway Tracks would be better represented in Ward 31 since Ward 32 represents the Beaches. • Better boundary would run along the lake, either Beaches-Leslieville or Beaches-Birchcliffe. Federal and provincial boundaries run this way. 	
WARD 33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the Hydro corridor, north of Finch, as a dividing line instead of Finch. (2) • Concern with the boundary of Finch Avenue, crossing in front of Seneca College and the community, where students live – Ward 24. Commercial area – there. Development on one side of street affects the other. (2) • The Bridlebrook area is in Ward 33, between the ravine and railroad. The community is closely tied to Bayview Village Association (Ward 24). The rail line should be the boundary between Ward 24 and 33. (7) • You could move Ward 33 boundary up to Steeles Ave. • Use the Hydro corridor in the north and then the railway on the east. • Create a new ward that includes part of 33 and part of 23, and 24 as one ward. • Victoria Park is a legacy boundary and maybe should be changed. Students travel across Victoria Park to high school in Scarborough and catholic school; interact as far east as Pharmacy. • DVP/404 is a very strong barrier; divides two different populations. • The River is not a good boundary. It is a gathering spot. Railroad is the natural divider. (3) 	



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31

WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
WARD 34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Might add area east on CNR tracks to Don Mills Road to Ward 25 (from Ward 34). • Make Lawrence the northern boundary of Ward 26 by adding area Leslie/Lawrence/Ravine/CPR tracks (from Wards 25 and 34); condo dwellers north and south of the tracks are similar. • 401 and CNR tracks are hard boundaries; also Victoria Park is a strong boundary for residents. • Area west of Victoria Park and O'Connor is 'orphaned' community, stronger relationship to East York - move south from Ward 34 to Ward 31? • Add area Eglinton/DVP/CPR tracks/valley to Ward 34 (from Ward 26); cut off by DVP. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don Mills community is split between wards 25 and 34. (2)
WARD 35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Victoria Park is a hard boundary; even though built form looks similar on both sides, it's still a real psychological boundary. • Eglinton ok; good boundaries, cohesive communities. • The boundary goes too far north. • Boundaries follow old Scarborough boundaries but the city is now "one" city. 	
WARD 36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hill Crescent is a funny boundary between 43 and 36. One Councillor has south of Hill Crescent and another Councillor has the north. Then it goes up Golf Club Road to Kingston Road. (2) • OK boundaries, except confusion on Victoria Park south of Kingston Road; houses should all be in Ward 36. • Six buildings on Queen St, west of Victoria Park are included in Ward 36 and not in Ward 32, with Beaches-East York. This is an anomaly. 	



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
ROUND ONE REPORT CIVIC ENGAGEMENT + PUBLIC CONSULTATION
 DATE ISSUED: 2015-03-31

WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small triangle towards north-east, which should follow the railway line instead of running along Eglinton Ave. and up Markham. • Not sure why area west of Livingston Road is not in Ward 36 (now in Ward 43). • Demographics in areas south of Kingston Road between Victoria Park and the western boundary of the Hunt Club property fit better with the Beach (from Ward 36 to Ward 32) than areas north of Gerrard Street. 	
WARD 37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a square of Ward 40, below the 401, which would be better as part of Ward 37. (2) • It would be better to make Ward 37 a square shape. • Issues with federal Scarborough Centre Electoral district around Wexford/Agincourt, which is part of Ward 37. (3) • 401 and Victoria Park are hard boundaries. • East side of Brimley in Ward 38, but no problem. • Expanded Ward 37 up Victoria Park to 401 - Merryvale community is north of Ellesmere, but their community centre is south of Ellesmere; IC area in the middle (from Ward 40). • Boundary should extend to cover both south and north of 401. • South of the Hydro corridor doesn't feel like the same neighbourhood - acts as a physical and psychological barrier. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Andrews Community Association crosses Brimley, but no real problem except occasional mix-up of newsletters (Ward 37 and 38).
WARD 38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brimley Road ok; 401 like the Berlin wall; Highland Creek ok. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Andrews Community Association crosses Brimley, but no real problem except occasional mix-up of newsletters (Ward 37 and 38).



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
WARD 39	<p>If you wanted to increase the ward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Square off the ward west along Huntingwood to Victoria Park in south-west area [streets do not go through]; make Huntingwood the southern boundary. • Square ward off along Sheppard Avenue to Victoria Park and CNR tracks. • Move triangle in south-west corner of Ward 39 to Ward 40. • Add area Steeles/404/Hydro right-of-way; would violate Victoria Park as an immovable boundary; Victoria Park is still a hard boundary. • Southern boundary could be Finch or Huntingwood Avenue. • HAVE to keep Victoria Park as western boundary rather than DVP; Scarborough was always defined as east of Victoria Park. (2) 	
WARD 40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand Ward 37 up Victoria Park to 401 - Merryvale community is north of Ellesmere, but their community centre is south of Ellesmere; IC area in the middle (from Ward 40). • Move triangle in south-west corner of Ward 39 to Ward 40. • 401 is a really hard boundary; Ward 40 should end at 401. • Different communities north and south of 401, especially north of Sheppard. (2) • 401 is not an obstacle, not really a boundary. 	
WARD 41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities east and west of McCowan Road relate to each other; could add area 401/McCowan/Sheppard/Markham. 	



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
WARD 42	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cut 42 by going down Markham and include areas east of Markham – south of Sheppard. • There may be some sense in adding Dean Park/the area north of the 401 to Ward 42. • The Rougeville community north of Sheppard and the community to the south are similar. • Pre amalgamation – Markham Road was the boundary for Ward 42. • 401 is a hard boundary. • Make Neilson Road the western boundary. • 401 could be the northern boundary of Ward 44 - area north of 401 to go to Ward 42. • West portion of ward has much different demographics than east portion (i.e. income, immigration, rates of crime, etc.). • Eliminate the section within the borders of McCowan, Sheppard, 401 and Markham Road and add the section between the 401/Sheppard/Morningside & the Scarborough/Pickering border. • Some areas north of the 401 in Ward 44 are more closely linked to neighbourhoods in Ward 42. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sheppard East BIA is split at McCowan. One Councillor should have the Sheppard West BIA and then another Councillor have the BIA east of Markham Road. (2) • Malvern is split by the federal riding. • New federal riding boundary splits Morningside Heights; should all be in one ward [Neilson Road as boundary contradicts that]; could draw the boundary around the community?? • Tamil, Filipino, Chinese, Muslim communities are split.
WARD 43	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hill Crescent is a funny boundary between 43 and 36. One Councillor has south of Hill Crescent and another Councillor has the north. Then it goes up Golf Club Road to Kingston Road. (2) • The boundary should go straight up Markham Road to 401. Then people would understand they belong to Ward 43. • Not sure why area west of Livingston Road is not in Ward 36 (now in Ward 43). • Ward has a weird shape/should be square. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Hill neighbourhood/area is split – half in Ward 43 and half in 44 – on either side of Morningside. • Guildwood is split in half. • Muslim community is split. • The communities of Manse Valley and Coronation in West Hill are divided between Wards 43 and 44.



WARD	WARD BOUNDARIES	COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities interact east-west in this area, not so much north-south. • Concern Guildwood will get moved from Ward 43 where it should be and added to 44. • Areas north of the 401 in Ward 44 have a stronger affinity to the far-eastern portions of Ward 43 (western portion of West Hill) and even Guildwood 	
WARD 44	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ward should have a more west-east orientation rather than north-south. • Create new Ward 44: Morningside - Sheppard Avenue/Twyn Rivers Road - City boundary - Lake. • 401 could be the northern boundary of Ward 44 - area north of 401 to go to Ward 42. • Some areas north of the 401 in Ward 44 are more closely linked to neighbourhoods in Ward 42. (2) • Areas north of the 401 in Ward 44 have a stronger affinity to the far-eastern portions of Ward 43 (western portion of West Hill) and even Guildwood. • If Ward 44 ends at 401, extend Morningside Avenue south and incorporate East Guildwood into Ward 44. • Concern Guildwood will get moved from Ward 43 where it should be and added to 44. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West Hill neighbourhood/area is split – half in Ward 43 and half in 44 – on either side of Morningside. • The communities of Manse Valley and Coronation in West Hill are divided between Wards 43 and 44.



General Suggestions Relating to the Size and Shapes of Future Toronto Wards

Suggestions can be summarized in the following categories:

1. Boundaries

- Change as few boundaries as necessary.
- Boundaries should be simple.
- Many major streets divide communities.
- Ward boundaries should stay on main streets.
- Laneways, ravines or Hydro corridors can also be boundaries.
- Don't divide communities like the new federal ridings have done.
- Create 'compact' wards, rather than long, narrow ones.
- The Don Valley Parkway/404 and the 401 are hard boundaries.
- The 401 is a more firm boundary in the west of Scarborough than in the east.
- 'Bust' the Victoria Park legacy boundary.
- Use Warden Avenue instead of Victoria Park.
- Victoria Park is a hard, historic boundary for Scarborough.
- Yonge Street as a firm boundary would help the TCDSB and French Catholic School Board.
- TDSB school catchment areas cross Yonge Street.

2. Mix of Communities in Wards

- Group similar communities together.
- Create 'condo only' wards.
- When a ward is overly diverse, some communities are underrepresented.
- Wards should strive for mixed income neighbourhoods. A mix of different communities avoids segregation.
- Some communities do not fit into only one ward (Jane-Finch; Don Mills; U of T).
- Physical coherence of wards is important (built form; transportation patterns).



3. Cultural Differences

- Wards should fit into their Community Council areas so that those with shared values are grouped together.
- Different worlds between downtown and suburban wards and Councillors.
- Don't only look at number of residents; issues vary among wards.

4. Workload of Councillors

- Downtown wards should be smaller than suburban wards to account for diversity/complexity of issues.
- City-wide issues should be the responsibility of more than one Councillor.
- Homogenous wards create less work for Councillors.
- Development moves from ward to ward (in some areas of the city).

This is **Exhibit 4** refer to in the Affidavit of
Susan Dexter, sworn August 21, 2018



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

OPTIONS REPORT

AUGUST 11, 2015
Revised Oct 16, 2015

www.drawthelines.ca



CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	12
2. CONTEXT	13
2.1 Effective Representation.....	13
2.2 Why a Review is Necessary.....	16
3. METHODOLOGY FOR DEVELOPING THE OPTIONS	23
3.1 Toronto’s Population Growth.....	23
3.2 Four Municipal Elections.....	24
3.3 Unique Options.....	25
3.4 Balanced Ward Population Sizes.....	25
3.5 Effective New Boundaries.....	26
4. SCREENING POTENTIAL OPTIONS	27
4.1 Ward Population Size 60,000.....	28
4.2 Federal Riding Boundaries.....	28
4.3 Provincial Riding Boundaries.....	30
5. THE OPTIONS	31
5.1 Option 1: Minimal Change.....	31
5.2 Option 2: 44 Wards.....	36
5.3 Option 3: Small Wards – 50,000 Population.....	40
5.4 Option 4: Large Wards – 75,000 Population.....	44
5.5 Option 5: Natural / Physical Boundaries.....	48
6. RANKING THE OPTIONS	52
6.1 Options Evaluation Worksheet.....	53
7. NEXT STEPS	54
APPENDIX A: CURRENT WARD BOUNDARIES	55

The **Toronto Ward Boundary Review (TWBR)** is looking at the size and shape of Toronto’s wards. Learn more about the consultant team, process and timeline, visit: www.drawthelines.ca



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report lays out five options to ensure ‘*effective representation*’ within the ward structure of the City of Toronto. The purpose of presenting the options is to engage Toronto’s public, stakeholders and Members of Council in a discussion of the possibilities for a re-aligned ward system for the 2018 municipal election.

Toronto’s current ward structure, developed approximately 15 years ago, has become unbalanced. This impacts voter parity (similar but not identical population numbers among wards) not just at election time, but every time City Council votes.

In 2014 Toronto City Council started a process to rectify this situation by launching the Toronto Ward Boundary Review (TWBR). Between July 2014 and January 2015 the TWBR completed Round One of its civic engagement and public consultation process to collect opinions on Toronto's current ward alignment. The results of Round One inform the options presented in this report. This Options Report is a critical step along the road to reform of Toronto's ward system.

The Report contains 7 sections: Section 1 - Introduction; Section 2 - Context; Section 3 - Methodology for Developing the Options; Section 4 - Screening Potential Options; Section 5 - The Options; Section 6 - Ranking the Options; and Section 7 - Next Steps.

Context

Section 2, Context, introduces the key concept of ‘*effective representation*’. In order to be viable, any option must achieve effective representation and, in particular, voter parity. Section 2 also discusses why the “status quo”, or keeping Toronto's current ward boundaries, is not an option.

Effective Representation

Section 2.1 describes the components of ‘*effective representation*’ and explains how they interact. ‘*Effective representation*’ has to balance:

- Voter parity,
- Natural / physical boundaries,
- Geographic communities of interest,
- Ward history,
- Capacity to represent,
- Geographic size and shape of the ward, and
- Population growth.



Why a Review is Necessary

The city's rapid population growth has created the current ward population imbalance. Within the time frame of the TWBR, 2014 to 2031, the city will grow by some 600,000. At the current average ward population size of approximately 61,000, this is the equivalent of 10 additional wards.

This growing population will not be distributed equally across the city. Following the policies of the Official Plan, it will locate primarily in the waterfront, designated '*growth centres*' and on the '*Avenues*', both in the central city and other specific locations throughout the entire city. However, as the Official Plan notes, some 75% of Toronto's communities are meant to remain stable and not experience substantial growth.

Section 2.2 details why a new ward system is necessary. The statistical case for ward restructuring is laid out through a table that shows the population growth of current wards for the next four elections starting in 2018 and a series of maps depicting the variance of each ward from the ward population average for those years.

Methodology

Section 3, Methodology for Developing the Options, describes the approach used to develop the five options. Five key factors are introduced:

- Toronto's population growth
- Four municipal elections
- Unique options
- Balanced ward sizes
- Effective new boundaries

The design of any option needs to accommodate the expected growth of Toronto over the next 15 years and address the current imbalance in ward population size. The options are based on the 2011 Census, population projections from the City Planning Division and projections developed independently by the TWBR team.

Ward boundary reviews are complex, costly and include extensive public involvement. Municipalities cannot conduct reviews for every election. The TWBR's goal is to create a ward system that will last for the next four elections – 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030. To achieve this, the '*target year*' for effective representation is set at 2026, which is also a Census year.

There are literally hundreds of possibilities when developing options for a re-aligned ward system. The TWBR employs a methodology that achieves a limited number of unique options with different bases for public discussion and feedback.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



Ward sizes need to be *'balanced'* to achieve effective representation. The TWBR attempts to develop wards that are within plus or minus 10% of the projected ward population average for 2026. Once a variance is over 15%, voter parity is diminished and effective representation may be in jeopardy. Only in certain limited circumstance is a variance of over 15% acceptable.

Ward boundaries also need to be effective. To develop a ward boundary option the TWBR uses three variables: the average ward population size of the current wards for 2026; the plus or minus 10% range that the average ward population size allows and the specific number or range in number of wards permitted.

Voter parity variances are created for all options. When this information is mapped, it becomes clear which of the current wards need to be reduced or enlarged in size relative to the objective of a particular option and *'distribution areas'* emerge. These are groups of wards that for a specific option can be adjusted without impacting the wards around them. Once the wards within the *'distribution areas'* have been resolved in terms of voter parity, natural/physical boundaries, communities of interest, etc., an option results.

The methodology section, Section 3, ties all of the above elements together in a comprehensive approach to developing options.

Screening Potential Options

Section 4 describes all of the options that have been explored on a preliminary basis.

- Two options focus on limiting change. These are termed the *'Minimal Change'* option and the *'44 Wards'* option.
- Three options suggest a predetermined ward population size, 50,000, 60,000 and 75,000.
- Two options use the federal or provincial riding boundaries and then split them in half.
- One option uses *Natural / Physical Boundaries* as the starting point for drawing new ward boundaries.

When analyzing these potential 8 options, 5 provide for effective representation (Minimal Change; 44 Wards; 50,000 and 75,000; Natural / Physical Boundaries), 2 do not achieve effective representation (federal or provincial riding boundaries), and one duplicates another option (60,000).

The potential option based on a ward population of 60,000 (Section 4.1) has similar parameters as the *'Minimal Change'* option, which uses a ward population size of 61,000. The 60,000 ward population option would yield a very similar ward pattern as the *'Minimal Change'* option. However, the *'Minimal Change'* option has the advantage of retaining as many current ward boundaries as possible. Hence, it has been decided to pursue the *'Minimal Change'* option and not the 60,000 ward population size option.

Sections 4.2 and 4.3 consider the possibility of using federal or provincial riding boundaries to construct a new ward system for Toronto. If ridings became Toronto's wards, there would be 25 wards with an



average 2026 population of approximately 123,000. Since the idea of having 25 very large wards gained virtually no support during the TWBR's public process, it has not been pursued as an option.

Having 50 wards based on splitting federal or provincial ridings in half, however, had considerable support. These two potential options have, therefore, been examined. Any analysis of whether these options are feasible has to commence with a review of voter parity. If voter parity cannot be achieved, then there is no merit in proceeding to construct actual boundaries. Because the riding boundaries are fixed, there is no ability to adjust ward boundaries to improve voter parity.

Detailed analysis of the variances around the average ward population size of approximately 62,000 for the federal ridings reveals that this potential option does not achieve voter parity, an essential component of 'effective representation'. Since the proposed provincial ridings are to be identical to the current federal ridings, the same argument applies.

The Options

Section 5 presents five options for re-aligning Toronto's ward system. All of the options achieve effective representation. Each option contains an explanation of its objectives, a ward map, a variance table for the four municipal elections, and an analysis of the option's implications for voter parity.

The table below summarizes the key features of each option. Each option proceeds from a different set of parameters.

SUMMARY OF OPTIONS

OPTION	AVERAGE WARD POPULATION	POPULATION RANGE	# OF WARDS
(1) Minimal Change	61,000	51,850 - 70,150 (+/-15%)	47
(2) 44 Wards	70,000	63,000 - 77,000 (+/-10%)	44
(3) Small Wards	50,000	45,000 - 55,000 (+/-10%)	58
(4) Large Wards	75,000	67,500 - 82,500 (+/-10%)	38
(5) Natural/Physical Boundaries	70,000	63,000 - 77,000 (+/-10%)	41

OPTION 1: MINIMAL CHANGE

The focus of this option is 'Change, if necessary, but not necessarily change'.

Minimal change refers to both existing ward boundaries and average ward population. The current (2014) average ward population is 61,000 and there are 44 wards.

When an attempt was made to develop an option based on a plus or minus 10% variance factor, there was too much change in the existing ward fabric for the option to be considered 'minimal change'. However, at a 15% variance factor a viable option can be created. This option leaves 18 wards unchanged, reduces

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



the size of 8 wards and enlarges 5 wards. The remaining 13 wards are altered to accommodate the wards that require boundary adjustments. This option results in 47 wards of which 44 are within the 15% range in 2026.

On the ward map for this option wards are identified by the prefix "1" to indicate that they belong to **Option 1: Minimal Change.**

OPTION 2: 44 WARDS

The objective of this option is to maintain the same number of wards that exist today (44) and by implication the same size of City Council. Due to Toronto's growth the average ward population size needs to increase to 70,000, with a range of 63,000 to 77,000. In this option, in 2026, 41 of the 44 wards are within the 10% variance factor and all wards are within the 15% variance factor.

On the ward map for this option wards are identified by the prefix "2" to indicate that they belong to **Option 2: 44 Wards.**

OPTION 3: SMALL WARDS (50,000)

The goal of this option is to keep wards within an average ward population size of 45,000 to 55,000, thereby creating a larger number of small wards. During the Round One public consultation phase there was ample support for small wards to warrant the development of this option. Many people believe that smaller wards improve citizen access and the Councillors' capacity to represent their constituents.

This option results in 58 wards. Most of the increase comes from reducing the size of large wards. Only 1 ward needs to be increased in size. In 2026, 51 of the 58 wards fall within the 10% variance factor and 4 within the 10% - 15% variance factor in this option. Of the three wards above the 15% variance factor, two are above it by less than one half a percent. One ward is 17% above the average ward population in 2026. However, this ward is a very stable and homogeneous ward.

On the ward map for this option wards are identified by the prefix "3" to indicate that they belong to **Option 3: Small Wards (50,000).**

OPTION 4: LARGE WARDS (75,000)

Just as some of the people participating in the Round One public consultation process prefer small wards, others prefer a smaller number of large wards, often in order to reduce the size of City Council. However, the appetite for large wards does not extend to wards as large as federal or provincial ridings. A target average ward population size of 75,000 with a population range of 67,500 to 82,500 is employed in this option. Of the 38 wards created in this option, 35 fall within a 10% variance and all wards fall within a 15% variance factor in 2026.

On the ward map for this option wards are identified by the prefix "4" to indicate that they belong to **Option 4: Large Wards (75,000).**



OPTION 5: NATURAL / PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES

Options 1 to 4 are rooted in the existing ward structure as a basis for developing new wards. The existing ward structure, to a large extent, reflects the pre-amalgamation cities. Option 5 starts with the entire city as the template. Then, emphasizing major natural and physical boundaries (rivers, expressways, utility right-of-ways and major roads), an option is created.

The target average ward population size for this option is 70,000 with a range of 63,000 to 77,000 based on a 10% variance of the 2026 average population. While this average ward population is the same as that of **Option 2: 44 Wards**, it starts from a different perspective and, therefore, results in a different new ward arrangement. This option has 41 wards, 37 of which fall within a 10% variance factor and all fall within a 15% variance factor.

On the ward map for this option wards are identified by the prefix "5" to indicate that they belong to **Option 5: Natural/Physical Boundaries**.

Next Steps

The purpose of the Options Report is to start a discussion about a preferred new ward system for the City of Toronto among the public, stakeholders and Members of Council. A natural tendency is to only consider the impact of an option on the specific ward that a person lives in or represents. This localized concern and knowledge is very important and can provide helpful feedback on specific ward boundaries in any of the options. However, whichever option is favoured, it will have to work for the entire city.

All the 5 options provide for effective representation. Options, by their very nature, are stronger on some components of effective representation than on others and all have advantages and challenges. To assist Members of Council, the public and stakeholders in adopting a city-wide perspective, Section 6, Ranking the Options, provides a 'worksheet' to compare and contrast the options in terms of the components of effective representation (see [Section 2.1 of the Options Report](#)), rank the options in order of preference and suggest improvements to the first ranked option.


Section 7, Next Steps, lays out a road map for the process of the second round of civic engagement and public consultation for the remainder of 2015. A final report with a recommended new ward alignment is scheduled to be before the Executive Committee and City Council in May 2016.

The Options Report is available at www.drawthelines.ca



**TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT**


OPTION 2: 44 WARDS





TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT


OPTION 4: LARGE WARDS - 75,000 POPULATION





TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT

OPTION 5: NATURAL/PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES





1. INTRODUCTION

In June 2014 Toronto City Council approved a Work Plan for the Toronto Ward Boundary Review (TWBR) project as well as a substantial Civic Engagement & Public Consultation Strategy. The TWBR's approach includes wide-ranging input on the current ward alignment, the development of a series of ward boundary options and broad consultation on the options prior to a recommendation to City Council in May 2016.

To-date, the TWBR has undertaken extensive background research and conducted Round One of the civic engagement and public consultation.¹ The [Toronto Ward Boundary Review: Background Research Report](#) investigates ward structures in numerous cities in Ontario and Canada. It also considers some international examples. The report on civic engagement and public consultation: [Toronto Ward Boundary Review: Round One Report on Civic Engagement + Public Consultation](#) documents the extensive input provided by the public, stakeholders and Members of Council on Toronto's current ward alignment through interviews, public meetings, an online survey and social media.

The analyses and results from both of those reports inform the options presented in this report. This Options Report outlines five discrete options for new ward boundaries. All of the options achieve 'effective representation' for Toronto and all fundamentally change its current ward alignment. Change is never easy and is particularly disruptive to long-established municipal systems. All participants, Councillors, residents, businesses, NGOs, civic staff, etc., will have to adjust to new geographic environments. This is the reason discussion of the Options Report and feedback on the individual options from the public, stakeholders and Members of Council is so important during Round Two of the TWBR's public process.

The Options Report contains 7 sections. Following this Introduction **Section 2: Context** describes the key concept of effective representation and demonstrates why a ward boundary review is required at this time. It concludes that continuing with the current ward boundaries is not an option. **Section 3: Methodology for Developing the Options** provides a detailed discussion of the approach that was used to create the options presented in the report.

Section 4: Screening Potential Options describes all of the options that have been explored and outlines why certain options, such as using federal or provincial riding boundaries, have not been pursued. **Section 5: The Options** is the heart of the report. It presents the five options that have been developed in detail. The criteria underlying each option are described. Maps show the location of the new wards for each option. A table for each option indicates the ward population and variances from the option's target ward population size for the municipal election years of 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030. A short statistical analysis of voter parity concludes the description of each option. **Section 6: Ranking the Options** offers a

¹ The Research Report and the Round One Report on Civic Engagement + Public Consultation can be found on the TWBR website at www.drawthelines.ca/resources/reports.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



'worksheet' which allows the public and stakeholders to consider how each option achieves 'effective representation', rank the options and offer suggestions for improvement of their first ranked option.

The final **Section 7: Next Steps**, provides the road map for public discussion and feedback on the Options Report through to the TWBR's final report and recommendation to Toronto City Council in 2016.

2. CONTEXT

This section of the Options Report covers the context for developing the different options. It discusses the concept of 'effective representation' and why a review of Toronto's ward boundaries is necessary.

2.1 EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION

The term 'effective representation' is foundational in the drawing of ward boundaries for municipalities. The courts and the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) employ this term and its components when judging the merits of a ward boundary review. The OMB can reject a ward system that does not meet the test of effective representation.

'Effective representation' contains several components that need to be balanced. These are: voter parity; natural and physical boundaries; geographic communities of interest and ward history. There are additional factors that are also taken into consideration in ward boundary reviews such as: capacity to represent, size and shape of wards and future populations within wards.

Voter Parity

Voter parity speaks to the similarity between a ward's population and the average ward population of all municipal wards. To achieve parity, ward populations need to be similar but not identical. Voter parity is a criterion that has special prominence in weighing options and is assessed in terms of incremental percentage ranges around the average ward population. A range of plus or minus 10% is considered ideal. Population variances can be greater, in limited instances, in order to satisfy other criteria. However, if the range gets too large, effective representation is lost and an option becomes unviable.

Natural / Physical Boundaries

This criterion is straightforward. Natural boundaries such as rivers, ravines and green areas are often used as boundaries to separate wards. In Toronto the Humber River is an excellent example. Similarly, major infrastructure such as expressways, railways, hydro corridors and arterial roads create barriers and are used as physical ward boundaries. Highway 401 is a ward boundary throughout much of the city and major arterial streets, such as Yonge Street, serve as ward boundaries.

Geographic Communities of Interest

'Communities of interest' is a frequently used term in ward boundary reviews and is hard to define precisely. Sometimes it refers to ethno-cultural commercial areas such as Chinatown, Little Italy or Little

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



India in Toronto. The term is also used to define neighbourhoods such as The Annex, Malvern, Mount Dennis or St. Lawrence. To assist in the determination of ward boundaries communities of interest must be geographically contiguous. There is no comprehensive list or map of Toronto's communities of interest or neighbourhoods with precise boundaries. Some areas of the city have strong neighbourhood groups and residents associations with well-defined boundaries whereas other parts do not.

It is important to avoid dividing geographic communities of interest and/or neighbourhoods when creating options for new wards. However, this objective cannot always be achieved. Sometimes a community is so large that to respect voter parity it must be split among more than one ward. The Jane-Finch community and Don Mills fall into this category. Also, some communities may already be split by natural boundaries, such as Morningside in Scarborough. Given the diversity and number of Toronto's various communities, wards often contain many different communities and/or neighbourhoods.

Ward History

The history of some wards extends to well before amalgamation and those wards have developed a strong identity. Ward design should, where possible, attempt to consider the history of the ward. For example, Victoria Park Avenue has historically been the western boundary of five of the Scarborough wards. However, ward history in and of itself cannot override other major criteria such as voter parity, strong natural/physical boundaries and communities of interest. Also, an undue reliance on ward history tends to perpetuate the boundaries of the pre-amalgamation municipalities.

Capacity to Represent

Capacity to represent is often equated with Councillors' workload. It encompasses ward size, types and breadth of concerns, ongoing growth and development, complexity of issues, etc. For example, wards with high employment, major infrastructure facilities, tourism attractions, or special areas such as the Entertainment District, generate a host of issues a Councillor has to deal with in addition to the concerns of local residents.

The courts have noted that Councillors perform two functions. The first is legislative and refers to passing by-laws and considering city-wide issues. All Councillors have this role in common. The courts have referred to the second function as the '*ombudsman role*', which is interpreted as a constituency role. This speaks to a Councillor's responsibility to represent the interests of a ward's residents to the city government and its administrative structure. This latter function, the constituency role, is captured by the concept of the '*capacity to represent*'. This role can vary greatly depending on the issues prevalent in any given ward.

There is no specific information or data set to quantify this criterion. Some data on growth pressures can be gleaned from development pipeline reports and areas that play a special role in the city's economic life are known. Wards with these types of issues can remain in the lower reaches of the voter parity range. Homogeneous, stable wards can rise to the upper end of the voter parity range.



Geographic Size & Shape of the Ward

All wards cannot be the same size from a geographic perspective. Some areas of the city are more densely populated than others and some wards have more open space. Comments during Round One of the TWBR noted that many suburban wards are physically larger and take longer to get around.

Population Growth

Any changes that City Council makes to the current ward alignment will be used for the 2018 municipal election. However, the wards created should work for future elections also. The TWBR looks at the next four elections in 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030. The target election for an evaluation of effective representation has been set for 2026. This allows for growth that will inevitably occur to be factored into ward boundary calculations. Also, if the new ward structure works in 2026, it should hold until the 2030 municipal election. After then another review of Toronto's ward boundaries will likely be required.

Wards that will grow dramatically over the next decade can start out smaller, as they will achieve acceptable voter parity ranges by the municipal elections of 2022 or 2026. Similarly, more stable wards from a population growth perspective may start larger than average or at the top of the voter parity range, but come closer to average by 2022 or 2026, as general ward averages increase with overall population growth.

While all of the above factors have to be taken into consideration, they are not all equal. Some need to be weighted more heavily than others in determining options for new ward configurations. Voter parity, often referred to as '*rep-by-pop*' (representation by population), is pivotal and is a key determinant of effective representation.

The Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that voter parity is required based on the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms provision of the '*right to vote*'. Besides just voting, the right to vote asserts that one person's vote must be similar in weight to any other person's vote. Voting weights do not need to be identical but they must be 'similar', within a reasonable range. Within this range other factors such as geographic communities of interest or capacity to represent are assessed.

Ward boundary reviews need to look into the future. Toronto is growing at a considerable rate. In its pursuit of effective representation, the TWBR looks ahead to 2030 when Toronto's population will have grown by approximately 600,000.

The TWBR uses total population numbers in a ward and not electors. Councillors, once elected, represent all people in a ward and not just those eligible to vote. Also, as a ward alignment lasts for several elections, some people not eligible to vote currently will become voters in future elections.



2.2 WHY A REVIEW IS NECESSARY

In 2013 Toronto City Council recognized that the populations across its 44 wards were becoming imbalanced and in 2014 the City commissioned the TWBR. Also, Toronto faced two privately launched appeals to the OMB based on issues of voter parity².

The 2014 municipal election confirmed that the current ward alignment is jeopardizing effective representation. According to the 2011 Census, Toronto's ward populations ranged from 44,935 (Ward 29) to 88,440 (Ward 23). By the 2014 election it is estimated that Toronto's ward populations ranged from 44,280 (Ward 18) to 93,784 (Ward 23). That means that in some cases one person's vote was worth twice that of another's, not just during the elections, but every time there was a vote at City Council.

To determine how voter parity will change in the future in the current ward alignment, population projections developed by the TWBR team were employed to look at changes in ward populations from 2014 to 2030. **Table 1 "Population by Existing Wards 2014 - 2030"** depicts projected population growth based on current ward boundaries for municipal elections to 2030. These figures are used to assess changes in voter parity to 2030 should there be no change in the boundaries of the current wards.

Calculating voter parity does not use absolute figures, but proceeds by determining population ranges to achieve wards with 'similar' populations. Generally, ward boundary reviews analyze the following ranges:

- **Range 1** plus or minus 10% of the ward average;
- **Range 2** 10% to 15% above the ward average;
- **Range 3** 10% to 15% below the ward average;
- **Range 4** 15% to 20% above the ward average;
- **Range 5** 15% to 20% below the ward average;
- **Range 6** 20% to 25% above the ward average;
- **Range 7** 20% to 25% below the ward average;
- **Range 8** 25% or more above the ward average; and,
- **Range 9** 25% or more below the ward average.

Achieving a population balance of plus or minus 10% of the ward average (Range 1) is the gold standard of ward boundary reviews. Ranges 2 and 3 (10% - 15% above or below average) result in acceptable voter parity figures. Ranges 4 and 5 (15% to 20% above or below average) can only be used under special circumstances, for example a ward may be below 15% to 20% because it is expected to grow or it may be above this percentage because it is stable and will get closer to the city-wide average in time.

Wards with populations of 20% to 25% above or below average (Ranges 6 and 7) do not satisfy the voter parity criterion. Ranges 6 to 9 (20% to 25% and 25% or more above or below average) have been applied, on rare occasions, by municipalities that have to ensure the representation of rural areas within their boundaries. When the above ranges are applied to Toronto's current 44 wards, the following variance maps result.

² These appeals were withdrawn when City Council launched the TWBR.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT




TABLE 1 POPULATION BY EXISTING WARDS 2014 - 2030

WARD	2014	VARIANCE	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
1	60,577	-0.06%	60,154	-4.38%	59,918	-7.35%	60,122	-9.57%	60,412	-11.59%
2	59,263	-2.22%	59,298	-5.74%	59,205	-8.46%	59,935	-9.85%	60,886	-10.90%
3	53,165	-12.29%	54,520	-13.33%	55,155	-14.72%	55,875	-16.28%	56,229	-17.71%
4	51,762	-14.60%	53,237	-15.37%	54,403	-15.88%	54,768	-17.62%	55,253	-19.14%
5	70,448	16.23%	76,653	21.85%	81,776	26.44%	90,056	35.45%	98,527	44.19%
6	61,460	1.40%	65,500	4.12%	67,540	4.43%	69,434	4.44%	71,557	4.72%
7	54,860	-9.49%	57,080	-9.26%	57,624	-10.90%	59,105	-11.10%	60,807	-11.01%
8	48,065	-20.70%	48,362	-23.12%	49,568	-23.36%	53,030	-20.24%	56,873	-16.77%
9	47,784	-21.16%	48,278	-23.26%	48,596	-24.86%	49,048	-26.23%	49,899	-26.98%
10	63,469	4.72%	64,410	2.39%	64,986	0.48%	66,096	-0.59%	67,360	-1.42%
11	61,579	1.60%	61,420	-2.37%	61,923	-4.25%	64,304	-3.28%	66,844	-2.18%
12	53,346	-11.99%	53,654	-14.71%	54,097	-16.35%	55,261	-16.88%	56,729	-16.98%
13	53,891	-11.09%	55,548	-11.70%	56,943	-11.95%	57,505	-13.51%	58,045	-15.05%
14	52,480	-13.42%	52,814	-16.04%	53,079	-17.93%	53,747	-19.16%	54,520	-20.21%
15	61,872	2.08%	63,527	0.98%	64,327	-0.54%	67,025	0.81%	69,969	2.40%
16	56,365	-7.01%	57,292	-8.93%	58,002	-10.32%	58,560	-11.92%	59,156	-13.43%
17	50,426	-16.80%	50,302	-20.04%	50,294	-22.23%	50,719	-23.71%	51,210	-25.06%
18	45,440	-25.03%	46,450	-26.16%	47,060	-27.24%	47,482	-28.58%	47,862	-29.96%
19	57,789	-4.66%	59,124	-6.01%	60,058	-7.14%	61,179	-7.98%	62,219	-8.94%
20	85,291	40.72%	99,949	58.88%	112,475	73.91%	125,578	88.88%	132,910	94.51%
21	46,230	-23.73%	46,697	-25.77%	46,977	-27.36%	47,100	-29.16%	47,198	-30.93%
22	66,932	10.43%	72,086	14.59%	76,647	18.51%	78,291	17.76%	79,856	16.86%
23	93,687	54.57%	96,342	53.15%	97,520	50.79%	100,999	51.91%	104,934	53.57%
24	68,014	12.21%	73,948	17.55%	76,083	17.64%	77,416	16.44%	78,865	15.41%
25	59,899	-1.17%	62,046	-1.37%	63,179	-2.31%	63,583	-4.36%	63,975	-6.38%
26	63,173	4.23%	63,987	1.72%	65,004	0.51%	65,933	-0.83%	66,834	-2.19%
27	94,597	56.07%	109,447	73.98%	121,105	87.25%	129,992	95.52%	138,489	102.67%
28	72,917	20.30%	92,129	46.45%	109,024	68.57%	116,872	75.79%	124,848	82.71%
29	44,404	-26.74%	44,245	-29.67%	44,142	-31.75%	44,265	-33.42%	44,412	-35.01%
30	52,458	-13.45%	53,086	-15.61%	53,685	-16.99%	53,785	-19.10%	53,877	-21.15%
31	54,446	-10.17%	54,931	-12.68%	55,141	-14.74%	55,540	-16.46%	56,083	-17.93%
32	57,345	-5.39%	58,285	-7.35%	58,779	-9.12%	59,224	-10.92%	59,634	-12.73%
33	58,089	-4.16%	59,614	-5.23%	60,701	-6.14%	61,471	-7.54%	62,300	-8.83%
34	61,668	1.74%	63,367	0.73%	63,604	-1.65%	64,046	-3.67%	64,572	-5.50%
35	61,443	1.37%	61,940	-1.54%	62,821	-2.87%	64,495	-2.99%	66,757	-2.30%
36	51,233	-15.47%	51,902	-17.49%	53,102	-17.89%	55,546	-16.45%	58,331	-14.64%
37	66,797	10.21%	67,199	6.82%	68,105	5.31%	71,022	6.82%	74,709	9.33%
38	67,911	12.04%	68,561	8.99%	69,062	6.78%	70,617	6.21%	73,610	7.73%
39	53,015	-12.53%	52,711	-16.21%	52,472	-18.87%	52,392	-21.20%	52,323	-23.43%
40	60,000	-1.01%	61,855	-1.67%	63,362	-2.03%	64,451	-3.06%	65,598	-4.00%
41	69,302	14.34%	69,787	10.94%	70,019	8.26%	69,989	5.27%	70,250	2.81%
42	78,339	29.25%	79,120	25.77%	79,633	23.13%	79,511	19.59%	79,719	16.67%
43	54,296	-10.42%	54,969	-12.62%	55,937	-13.51%	57,086	-14.14%	58,384	-14.56%
44	61,351	1.22%	62,105	-1.28%	62,519	-3.33%	63,099	-5.09%	63,765	-6.68%




**TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT**

MAP 1 VARIANCE BY CURRENT WARD, 2014






MAP 2 VARIANCE BY CURRENT WARD 2018






MAP 3 VARIANCE BY CURRENT WARD 2022





TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT

MAP 4 VARIANCE BY CURRENT WARD 2026





**TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT**

MAP 5 VARIANCE BY CURRENT WARD 2030






Table 1 and the 5 variance maps (**Maps 1 – 5**) clearly show that the population imbalance among Toronto's wards continues to grow markedly through the next four municipal elections and that at each election fewer and fewer wards will be within 10% of the average.

By 2026, the TWBR's target date, only 17 wards will be within 10% of the average ward population size, while 12 wards will have populations in excess of 20% above or below average. The definite conclusion is that the status quo is not an option. Voter parity, a basic tenet of representative democracy, does not exist now and will only get worse in the coming years. The challenge for the TWBR is to redress this imbalance. The challenge for Toronto City Council will be to adopt a new ward alignment in 2016, so that the OMB will not be the one to *draw the lines*, if Council fails to make a decision.

3. METHODOLOGY FOR DEVELOPING THE OPTIONS

Given the current discrepancy in ward population size and the growing imbalance in the future, it is apparent that ward boundaries must change. Some of these changes will be significant in both geography and ward population size.

Designing options for future ward boundaries requires a methodology that can address all the facets of effective representation within the complex ward structure of the City of Toronto. The TWBR's methodology has developed options that reflect:

- Toronto's population growth
- Four municipal elections
- Balanced ward population sizes
- Unique options
- Effective new boundaries

The TWBR has committed to produce only options that can meet the established criteria for effective representation, and the methodology has been designed to achieve this goal.

3.1 TORONTO'S POPULATION GROWTH

Toronto is growing rapidly. In 2006, the Ontario Government adopted the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Growth Plan) under the authority of the Places to Grow Act, 2005. The Growth Plan assigned forecasts of population and employment for all regional and single-tier municipalities within the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The Growth Plan estimated that Toronto's population in 2031 would be 3.08 million. The legislation calls on all municipalities to put in place policies to accommodate this growth outlook and municipalities amended their Official Plans to come into conformity with the Growth Plan. Toronto's Official Plan, approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in 2006, incorporated this population target as guidance for planning policy.

In 2013, the Province amended the Growth Plan, updating the growth outlook to 2031 and extending the planning period with population and employment forecasts to 2041. Toronto is now expected to grow to 3.19 million by 2031. This is the target population that the City must plan to accommodate through the



current Official Plan Review. Related to this review of Official Plan policy, the City Planning Division completed population projections for small area geographies to serve as base information for infrastructure planning. These projections are based on demographic trends observed up to the 2011 Census as well as known development potential. By employing the Growth Plan amended outlook of 3.19 million as a control total for modeling, these projections are the best estimate of how population growth, or decline, might play out across the city.

The TWBR uses this 3.19 million figure as the projected 2031 population, which means that Toronto will grow by approximately 600,000 people between 2014 and 2031. The City's Official Plan offers policy guidance as to where the growth is meant to occur. The large number of new residents must be accommodated in the City's ward structure accordingly.

Knowing the overall population projections sets the context, but is not sufficient to determine detailed ward boundaries. To consider new ward boundaries, the TWBR assesses population growth for areas much smaller than existing wards by using a variety of "small area data". This small area data is used as building blocks for the development of options. It is very fine grained and allows for a detailed assessment of projected populations within proposed wards.

3.2 FOUR MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

While federal riding boundaries are revised automatically every ten years following the Census for use in the next general federal election, municipal ward boundary reviews are commissioned only when ward alignments have become unbalanced. The TWBR attempts to develop a ward system that will last for several municipal elections. Since a ward review process is complex, costly and includes extensive public involvement, it cannot be done for every election.

The design of any new ward alignment must anticipate expected population increases over time and focus on a specific future election date. To achieve this, a 'target year' for ward design needs to be established. The "target year" for the TWBR is 2026. By 2026 Toronto is expected to grow to 3,082,390 people.

The TWBR uses the 2026 municipal election 'target year' to construct the ward options and then assesses the options for the other three election years. This allows for an evaluation of any new ward structure over the entire time frame of the TWBR. A ward may be below average by the 2018 municipal election but may increase to average size by 2026, based on the growth projected within its boundaries. Also, a ward system that provides for effective representation in 2026 will still be appropriate for the 2030 municipal election. In addition, 2026 corresponds to a Census year and allows the TWBR to align projected ward populations with the city-wide projection.

Population estimates for the most recent municipal election (2014) provide a benchmark and indicate the current situation. To develop the projections for the next four election years - 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030 - the TWBR uses the City's projections for Census years as the base and then derives projections for both a total city population and smaller areas for the next four elections through a process of linear extrapolation.



3.3 UNIQUE OPTIONS

While the courts and OMB have indicated what tests a municipal ward system must meet, they do not prescribe how ward boundaries should be set. This is solely up to the municipality. There are a great many potential ward configurations for a city the size and complexity of Toronto and numerous ways to rearrange Toronto's ward boundaries to achieve effective representation.

For example, an objective could be to try to bring all wards within 10% of the current average ward population size of 61,000. Depending on which ward is used as the starting point, a different ward system will result in terms of both ward population size and ward geography. There are, of course, many more variations on ward population size than the current average. Literally hundreds of ward options could theoretically result and would have to be evaluated. To resolve this problem, the Options Report proposes options that are unique and not multiple variations on a similar theme.

3.4 BALANCED WARD POPULATION SIZES

Designing new wards is an iterative process. As a start, the projected 2026 populations for individual small areas are combined, wholly or in part, to establish wards that achieve voter parity. Then, other criteria such as communities of interest, capacity to represent and natural and physical boundaries are factored in to create a feasible option that delivers effective representation.

As noted, voter parity does not require identical ward population sizes, it does, however, require similar ward population sizes. Voter parity is analyzed by using percentage ranges around a specific ward population size. The use of ranges is important as it provides the needed flexibility to account for all the aspects of effective representation. The TWBR uses the following percentage ranges for developing and determining viable ward boundary options:

RANGE 1

Plus or minus 10% of average ward population size. This range satisfies the effective representation principle for the voter parity criterion.

RANGE 2

Between 10% and 15% above average. This larger variance can be allowed if the ward is relatively stable, or to meet aspects of effective representation other than voter parity. For example, a ward may start out above average but because of limited growth will trend towards the average over time. Also, a larger ward may be appropriate to keep a community of interest intact, especially if the community is stable.

Ward population sizes in this range may also be needed to respect major natural or physical boundaries.

RANGE 3

Between 10% and 15% below average. This is appropriate in high growth wards that may be below average in 2018 but get closer to the average by 2026. Other reasons to allow below



average wards are capacity to represent, range and complexity of issues and major natural and physical boundaries.

Ranges 1 through 3 are the primary ranges used by the TWBR for designing ward re-alignment options. All nine ranges discussed in Section 2 of this report, are used to judge the boundaries for each option.

Ranges 4 to 9 cover variances in ward populations above and below 15% of the overall ward average. Once a variance is over 15%, voter parity is diminished and effective representation may be in jeopardy.

There may be certain limited circumstances where a variance of slightly over 15% is acceptable, for example protecting communities of interest, respecting natural/physical boundaries or accommodating stable or rapidly growing wards. Variances over 15% have to be ward specific and need to be explained in detail. In any viable ward structure these exceptions should be restricted to only a few wards, if accepted at all.

3.5 EFFECTIVE NEW BOUNDARIES

To develop a ward boundary option the TWBR uses three variables: the average ward population size for 2026; the plus or minus 10% range that the average ward population size allows and the specific number or range in number of wards permitted.

If an option is based on a specific ward population for 2026, the 10% range is applied to determine acceptable ward population sizes. For example, in a 60,000 average ward population size option, the option will attempt to create wards within a range of 54,000 to 66,000 people. The 10% range is also used to determine the minimum and maximum number of wards that the option permits. Using the 60,000 average ward population size option again, the target number of wards will be anywhere between 47 and 57. This figure is derived by dividing the ward population size range into the 2026 projected city population of 3,082,390.

If an option is based on a specific number of wards, the average ward population size is determined with reference to the 2026 city population. Then the 10% range is calculated to determine the allowable size range for each ward in the option.

Next voter parity variances are calculated for all options. This indicates how much above or below the target average ward population size each of the current wards will be in 2026.

This information is then mapped based on the nine percentage ranges outlined in Section 2. These maps show which of the current wards need to be either reduced or enlarged in size.

This step provides an overall geographic representation of the amount of change required to achieve a particular option. When the voter parity ranges for the current wards are grouped, those areas of the city where change is required for each option are depicted.



The next step is to establish what are termed '*distribution areas*' covering the entire city. These are groups of wards that for the particular option can be adjusted without impacting the wards around them. Distribution areas provide the framework for creating the option's new ward structure. For example, a group of 4 large wards that can be adjusted to provide for 6 new wards without impacting wards around them can constitute a distribution area.

The use of distribution areas creates a number of unique options and limits the impact of ward boundary changes on surrounding wards. A basic objective is not to adjust a ward's boundary unless it is needed to gain voter parity. Obviously, some options have wider impacts on surrounding wards than others.

A further step is to take each distribution area and start adjusting ward boundaries inside of it. This involves considering all aspects of effective representation. The small area data helps with determining voter parity based on a plus or minus 10% variance in population size. But other factors such as the location of communities of interest, natural and physical boundaries, capacity to represent, etc. also are considered in this step.

Finally, once the new wards in each distribution area have been determined, they are mapped for the entire city as the ward system for that option. This '*option map*' is presented for each of the five options discussed in Section 5 of this report, along with its variance table.

4. SCREENING POTENTIAL OPTIONS

The TWBR's extensive research, comments from Council members, stakeholders and the public during Round One of the TWBR, and the team's own experience in ward boundary reviews have informed the development of possible options for a new ward structure in the City of Toronto.

As each of the options must achieve effective representation, they all first have to go through a preliminary screening. Several potential options have been explored.

- Two options focus on limiting change. These are termed the '*Minimal Change*' option and the '*44 Wards*' option.
- Three options suggest a predetermined ward population size, 50,000, 60,000 and 75,000.
- Two options use the federal or provincial riding boundaries and then split them in half.
- One option uses *Natural / Physical Boundaries* as the starting point for drawing new ward boundaries.

When analyzing these potential 8 options, 5 provide for effective representation (Minimal Change; 44 Wards; 50,000 and 75,000; Natural / Physical Boundaries), 2 do not achieve effective representation (federal or provincial riding boundaries), and one duplicates another option (60,000). As a result 5 options are presented in Section 5 of this report for discussion in the second round of the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process.

The remainder of this section examines the potential options that have not been pursued.



4.1 WARD POPULATION SIZE 60,000

The potential option based on a ward population of 60,000 has similar parameters as the *'Minimal Change'* option, which uses a ward population size of 61,000. The 60,000 ward population option would yield a very similar ward pattern as the *'Minimal Change'* option. However, the *'Minimal Change'* option has the advantage of retaining as many current ward boundaries as possible. Hence, it has been decided to pursue the *'Minimal Change'* option and not the 60,000 ward population size option.

4.2 FEDERAL RIDING BOUNDARIES

During the Round One civic engagement and public consultation process the idea of using the boundaries of the 25 new federal ridings as the basis for new municipal ward boundaries was discussed in some detail. Two approaches can be used to pursue this option. Either the federal ridings can become the municipal wards or the federal ridings can be divided into two municipal wards each.

If the ridings became Toronto's wards, there would be 25 wards with an average 2026 population of approximately 123,000. Since the idea of having 25 very large wards gained virtually no support during the public process, it has not been pursued as an option.

Having 50 wards based on splitting the federal ridings in half, however, had considerable support. This approach has, therefore, been examined as a potential option. Ward boundaries for an option based on federal ridings would simply divide the riding in half to achieve equal populations.

Any analysis of whether this option is feasible has to commence with a review of voter parity. If voter parity cannot be achieved, then there is no merit in proceeding to construct actual boundaries. Because the riding boundaries are fixed, there is negligible ability to adjust ward boundaries to improve voter parity.

As the analysis provided below indicates, this option does not achieve voter parity, an essential component of effective representation, nor does it address the ward population size discrepancies that Toronto now faces.

As in all options, the 2026 projected city population of 3,082,390 is used in this analysis.

With 50 wards the average ward population would be 61,659, rounded to 62,000. **Table 2 "Population and Variances by Current Federal Ridings"** presents the variances around this average.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



TABLE 2 POPULATION AND VARIANCES BY CURRENT FEDERAL RIDINGS

WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
1 BEACHES-EAST YORK	53,964	-2.52%	54,268	-4.65%	54,679	-6.54%	55,149	-8.29%
2 BEACHES-EAST YORK	53,964	-2.52%	54,268	-4.65%	54,679	-6.54%	55,149	-8.29%
3 DAVENPORT	51,894	-6.26%	52,183	-8.31%	52,613	-10.07%	53,054	-11.77%
4 DAVENPORT	51,894	-6.26%	52,183	-8.31%	52,613	-10.07%	53,054	-11.77%
5 DON VALLEY EAST	48,307	-12.74%	48,685	-14.46%	49,137	-16.02%	49,650	-17.43%
6 DON VALLEY EAST	48,307	-12.74%	48,685	-14.46%	49,137	-16.02%	49,650	-17.43%
7 DON VALLEY NORTH	56,733	2.48%	58,030	1.96%	58,860	0.60%	59,754	-0.63%
8 DON VALLEY NORTH	56,733	2.48%	58,030	1.96%	58,860	0.60%	59,754	-0.63%
9 DON VALLEY WEST	51,624	-6.75%	52,475	-7.80%	52,887	-9.61%	53,276	-11.40%
10 DON VALLEY WEST	51,624	-6.75%	52,475	-7.80%	52,887	-9.61%	53,276	-11.40%
11 EGLINTON-LAWRENCE	58,781	6.18%	59,561	4.65%	61,173	4.56%	62,923	4.64%
12 EGLINTON-LAWRENCE	58,781	6.18%	59,561	4.65%	61,173	4.56%	62,923	4.64%
13 ETOBICOKE CENTRE	58,870	6.34%	59,758	5.00%	60,251	2.98%	60,852	1.20%
14 ETOBICOKE CENTRE	58,870	6.34%	59,758	5.00%	60,251	2.98%	60,852	1.20%
15 ETOBICOKE-LAKESHORE	67,649	22.20%	71,241	25.18%	76,289	30.39%	81,512	35.56%
16 ETOBICOKE-LAKESHORE	67,649	22.20%	71,241	25.18%	76,289	30.39%	81,512	35.56%
17 ETOBICOKE NORTH	58,575	5.81%	58,417	2.64%	58,880	0.64%	59,500	-1.05%
18 ETOBICOKE NORTH	58,575	5.81%	58,417	2.64%	58,880	0.64%	59,500	-1.05%
19 PARKDALE-HIGH PARK	52,735	-4.74%	53,509	-5.98%	54,049	-7.62%	54,622	-9.16%
20 PARKDALE-HIGH PARK	52,735	-4.74%	53,509	-5.98%	54,049	-7.62%	54,622	-9.16%
21 TORONTO-ST. PAUL'S	54,993	-0.66%	57,333	0.74%	58,210	-0.51%	59,022	-1.85%
22 TORONTO-ST. PAUL'S	54,993	-0.66%	57,333	0.74%	58,210	-0.51%	59,022	-1.85%
23 SCARBOROUGH-AGINCOURT	53,184	-3.93%	53,958	-5.19%	54,481	-6.88%	55,058	-8.44%
24 SCARBOROUGH-AGINCOURT	53,184	-3.93%	53,958	-5.19%	54,481	-6.88%	55,058	-8.44%
25 SCARBOROUGH CENTRE	54,045	-2.37%	54,701	-3.89%	56,479	-3.47%	58,979	-1.92%
26 SCARBOROUGH CENTRE	54,045	-2.37%	54,701	-3.89%	56,479	-3.47%	58,979	-1.92%
27 SCARBOROUGH-GUILDWOOD	51,635	-6.73%	52,212	-8.26%	53,595	-8.40%	55,495	-7.71%
28 SCARBOROUGH-GUILDWOOD	51,635	-6.73%	52,212	-8.26%	53,595	-8.40%	55,495	-7.71%
29 SCARBOROUGH NORTH	50,187	-9.34%	50,455	-11.35%	50,356	-13.93%	50,559	-15.92%
30 SCARBOROUGH NORTH	50,187	-9.34%	50,455	-11.35%	50,356	-13.93%	50,559	-15.92%
31 SCARBOROUGH-ROUGE PARK	52,844	-4.54%	53,027	-6.83%	53,292	-8.91%	53,581	-10.89%
32 SCARBOROUGH-ROUGE PARK	52,844	-4.54%	53,027	-6.83%	53,292	-8.91%	53,581	-10.89%
33 SCARBOROUGH SOUTHWEST	53,029	-4.21%	54,011	-5.10%	55,745	-4.72%	57,891	-3.73%
34 SCARBOROUGH SOUTHWEST	53,029	-4.21%	54,011	-5.10%	55,745	-4.72%	57,891	-3.73%
35 SPADINA-FORT YORK	60,707	9.66%	69,780	22.61%	76,923	31.48%	80,213	33.40%
36 SPADINA-FORT YORK	60,707	9.66%	69,780	22.61%	76,923	31.48%	80,213	33.40%
37 TORONTO CENTRE	61,923	11.86%	70,669	24.17%	75,829	29.61%	82,209	36.72%
38 TORONTO CENTRE	61,923	11.86%	70,669	24.17%	75,829	29.61%	82,209	36.72%
39 TORONTO-DANFORTH	51,910	-6.23%	52,214	-8.26%	52,372	-10.49%	52,536	-12.63%
40 TORONTO-DANFORTH	51,910	-6.23%	52,214	-8.26%	52,372	-10.49%	52,536	-12.63%
41 UNIVERSITY-ROSEDALE	55,802	0.80%	59,064	3.78%	62,323	6.52%	65,163	8.37%
42 UNIVERSITY-ROSEDALE	55,802	0.80%	59,064	3.78%	62,323	6.52%	65,163	8.37%
43 WILLOWDALE	60,667	9.59%	61,662	8.34%	63,628	8.75%	65,833	9.48%
44 WILLOWDALE	60,667	9.59%	61,662	8.34%	63,628	8.75%	65,833	9.48%
45 YORK CENTRE	50,059	-9.57%	50,512	-11.25%	51,595	-11.81%	53,023	-11.82%
46 YORK CENTRE	50,059	-9.57%	50,512	-11.25%	51,595	-11.81%	53,023	-11.82%
47 YORK SOUTH-WESTON	57,513	3.89%	57,986	1.88%	59,756	2.13%	61,757	2.70%
48 YORK SOUTH-WESTON	57,513	3.89%	57,986	1.88%	59,756	2.13%	61,757	2.70%
49 HUMBER RIVER-BLACK CREEK	56,335	1.76%	57,115	0.35%	59,274	1.31%	61,680	2.57%
50 HUMBER RIVER-BLACK CREEK	56,335	1.76%	57,115	0.35%	59,274	1.31%	61,680	2.57%



In 2026 a Federal Riding Boundaries option results in 50 wards with:

- 34 wards within plus or minus 10% of the average ward population of 62,000
- 6 wards between 20% – 25% above average
- 8 wards between 10% – 15% below average
- 2 wards between 15% – 20% below average

From the perspective of voter parity, 34 wards (68%) lie inside the 10% variance range, 8 wards (16%) within the 10% - 15% range and 8 wards (16%) outside the 15% variance range of which 6 are outside of the 20% variance range.

This option does not resolve the issue of very large wards in the Downtown, Willowdale and southern Etobicoke and the city's numerous small wards. It merely continues most of the inequities of the current situation that led to the TWBR. An option based on using the federal riding boundaries and then dividing them in two will not achieve effective representation and has, therefore, not been pursued.

4.3 PROVINCIAL RIDING BOUNDARIES

The existing ward configuration for the City of Toronto's 44 wards is based on the current 22 provincial riding boundaries, except for some minor modifications. During the TWBR's Round One civic engagement and public consultation process there was sizeable support for continuing the practice – dividing provincial riding boundaries in half.

As noted in Section 4.2 (Federal Riding Boundaries), the federal government has redistributed ridings across Canada, and Toronto now has 25 federal ridings. The current provincial ridings mirror the previous federal ridings. There is an expectation that the provincial government will revise its ridings to follow the federal ridings. In June 2015, during the writing of this report, the Ontario Government introduced the "Electoral Boundaries Act, 2015". This Act states, in Section 2 (1) 2: "...111 southern electoral districts whose names and boundaries are identical to those of the federal electrical districts...". This means that, for Toronto, there would be 25 provincial ridings, which are identical to the federal ridings.

The provincial Electoral Boundaries Act, 2015 is at the first reading stage and not as yet law. It is possible that its approach will change during the course of its passage. However, for the purpose of this report, the analysis reflects the current situation; that the federal and provincial riding boundaries will be identical. Therefore, the analysis of the federal ridings (Section 4.2) applies equally to the proposed provincial ridings. The conclusion is that the proposed provincial ridings, split in two, would not provide for 'effective representation' and this option has, therefore, not been pursued either.



5. THE OPTIONS

Five options for a re-aligned ward system in Toronto have been developed in detail. The options are:

- Minimal Change
- 44 Wards
- Small Wards - 50,000
- Large Wards - 75,000
- Natural / Physical Boundaries

OPTION	AVERAGE WARD POPULATION	POPULATION RANGE	# OF WARDS
(1) Minimal Change	61,000	51,850 - 70,150 (+/-15%)	47
(2) 44 Wards	70,000	63,000 - 77,000 (+/-10%)	44
(3) Small Wards	50,000	45,000 - 55,000 (+/-10%)	58
(4) Large Wards	75,000	67,500 - 82,500 (+/-10%)	38
(5) Natural/Physical Boundaries	70,000	63,000 - 77,000 (+/-10%)	41

All five options are discussed below. They all achieve effective representation. Details of the options are outlined, accompanied by boundary maps and an analysis of voter parity.

To facilitate comparisons with Toronto's existing ward system, a map showing the current ward boundaries is attached in Appendix A of this report.

5.1 OPTION 1: MINIMAL CHANGE

In spite of many detailed suggestions for specific ward boundary changes and maintaining certain communities of interest, the request to limit change was raised throughout the Round One consultation process. *'Change, if necessary, but not necessarily change'* was an often-heard refrain.

The attractions of minimizing change are considerable. A key strength is that most residents and their associations do not have to adapt to boundary changes. Also, the accumulated knowledge of Councillors serving their wards is maintained.

The objective of **Option 1: Minimal Change** is to limit the amount of change in both ward boundaries and the current populations within the ward. A population target of 61,000 has been used, as this is the approximate current average size of Toronto's wards³. This means that ward population size can vary from 54,900 to 67,100, using the plus or minus 10% variance criterion. This leads to a potential range of 47 to 57 wards.

³ The 2014 ward population average for Toronto is estimated as 60,958. In 2011 the actual ward population average was 59,434.



Even under the *'Minimal Change'* option certain wards are changing and some new wards are added. These changes are required to balance ward populations among the smaller and larger wards in order to achieve effective representation and to accommodate Toronto's anticipated growth by 2026.

The development of a set of ward boundaries for **Option 1: Minimal Change** involves several steps:

- Wards within the 54,900 to 67,100 population range for 2026, a 10% variance, are mapped to determine which wards can potentially remain the same;
- The population variances of all other wards are mapped to determine which wards need their boundaries adjusted; and
- An attempt is made to create the Minimal Change option ward map for a 10% variance factor.

As it turns out, staying within a 10% variance factor leads to a great deal of change in order to accommodate the four areas of large wards (Downtown, Willowdale, North Scarborough and South Etobicoke) and three areas of small wards (York, west of Downtown and Toronto-Danforth). By the time these areas are adjusted, a domino effect occurs and many other wards need to change.

At a 10% variance in average ward population size there is too much change to have a Minimal Change option.

The idea of a Minimal Change option is still important and a worthwhile objective. Hence, a 15% variance approach has been attempted. Going to a 15% variance is appropriate within the parameters of effective representation in order to preserve existing wards and the communities of interest contained within them.

At a 15% variance and with a population range of 51,850-70,150:


- 18 of the existing wards can remain unchanged. These are existing wards 1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 25, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, and 38.
- 8 wards fall above 15% threshold and have to be reduced. These are existing wards 5, 20, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28 and 37.
- 5 wards fall below the 15% threshold and have to be enlarged. These are existing wards 9, 17, 18, 21 and 29.
- The remaining 13 existing wards require boundary adjustments to accommodate changes in the large and small wards. These are existing wards: 3, 4, 7, 8, 14, 26, 33, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 and 44.

Map 6 "Option 1: Minimal Change" depicts the option. This option results in 47 wards.



**TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT**

MAP 6 OPTION 1: MINIMAL CHANGE



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



Table 3 "*Option 1: Minimal Change - Population and Variances by Election Year*" lists the population estimates for the election years of 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030 and shows the variance for each new ward for these years based on the target ward population size of 61,000. Wards are identified with the prefix "1" to indicate that they belong to **Option 1: Minimal Change**.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



TABLE 3 OPTION 1: MINIMAL CHANGE - POPULATION & VARIANCES BY ELECTION YEAR

WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
W 101	60,154	-1.39%	59,918	-1.77%	60,122	-1.44%	60,412	-0.96%
W 102	59,298	-2.79%	59,205	-2.94%	59,935	-1.75%	60,886	-0.19%
W 103	63,291	3.76%	64,726	6.11%	67,772	11.10%	71,622	17.41%
W 104	64,109	5.10%	65,434	7.27%	65,779	7.63%	66,420	8.89%
W 105	57,038	-6.50%	61,202	0.33%	66,677	9.31%	71,996	18.03%
W 106	65,500	7.38%	67,540	10.72%	69,434	13.83%	71,557	17.31%
W 107	51,390	-15.75%	51,927	-14.87%	53,300	-12.62%	55,082	-9.70%
W 108	48,062	-21.21%	49,114	-19.49%	51,940	-14.85%	55,076	-9.71%
W 109	54,380	-10.85%	54,885	-10.02%	56,083	-8.06%	57,779	-5.28%
W 110	64,410	5.59%	64,986	6.53%	66,096	8.35%	67,360	10.43%
W 111	61,420	0.69%	61,923	1.51%	64,304	5.42%	66,844	9.58%
W 112	53,654	-12.04%	54,097	-11.32%	55,261	-9.41%	56,729	-7.00%
W 113	63,527	4.14%	64,327	5.45%	67,025	9.88%	69,969	14.70%
W 114	57,292	-6.08%	58,002	-4.91%	58,560	-4.00%	59,156	-3.02%
W 115	69,481	13.90%	70,061	14.85%	70,242	15.15%	70,602	15.74%
W 116	68,375	12.09%	68,647	12.54%	69,014	13.14%	69,623	14.14%
W 117	55,548	-8.94%	56,943	-6.65%	57,505	-5.73%	58,045	-4.84%
W 118	67,963	11.41%	68,522	12.33%	69,455	13.86%	70,461	15.51%
W 119	59,124	-3.08%	60,058	-1.54%	61,179	0.28%	62,219	2.00%
W 120	47,578	-22.00%	56,880	-6.75%	64,584	5.68%	67,100	10.00%
W 121	47,354	-22.37%	56,797	-6.89%	63,849	4.67%	69,210	13.46%
W 122	51,228	-16.02%	58,074	-4.80%	64,004	4.92%	70,052	14.84%
W 123	56,916	-6.70%	64,209	5.26%	65,423	7.25%	69,053	13.20%
W 124	47,191	-22.64%	52,473	-13.98%	57,631	-5.52%	62,297	2.13%
W 125	51,093	-16.24%	53,715	-11.94%	56,696	-7.06%	58,306	-4.42%
W 126	64,707	6.08%	69,189	13.42%	70,748	15.98%	72,439	18.75%
W 127	62,046	1.72%	63,179	3.57%	63,583	4.23%	63,975	4.88%
W 128	59,895	-1.81%	60,527	-0.78%	62,372	2.25%	64,184	5.22%
W 129	56,463	-7.44%	57,638	-5.51%	59,816	-1.94%	62,330	2.18%
W 130	53,838	-11.74%	55,343	-9.27%	56,233	-7.61%	57,191	-6.24%
W 131	59,614	-2.27%	60,701	-0.49%	61,471	0.77%	62,300	2.13%
W 132	63,367	3.88%	63,604	4.27%	64,046	4.99%	64,572	5.86%
W 133	53,675	-12.01%	54,413	-10.80%	55,138	-9.61%	55,859	-8.43%
W 134	54,741	-10.26%	54,823	-10.13%	55,248	-9.43%	55,575	-8.89%
W 135	54,931	-9.95%	55,141	-9.61%	55,540	-8.95%	56,083	-8.06%
W 136	53,086	-12.97%	53,685	-11.99%	53,785	-11.83%	53,877	-11.68%
W 137	58,285	-4.45%	58,779	-3.64%	59,224	2.91%	59,634	-2.24%
W 138	51,902	-14.91%	53,102	-12.95%	55,546	-8.94%	58,331	-4.38%
W 139	61,940	1.54%	62,821	2.98%	64,495	5.73%	66,757	9.44%
W 140	68,265	11.91%	68,963	13.05%	71,300	16.89%	74,290	21.79%
W 141	66,201	8.53%	66,997	9.83%	66,954	13.04%	72,320	18.56%
W 142	60,108	-1.46%	62,264	2.07%	63,622	4.30%	65,068	6.67%
W 143	68,045	11.55%	67,681	10.95%	67,619	10.85%	67,350	10.41%
W 144	66,858	9.60%	67,168	10.11%	67,069	9.95%	67,222	10.20%
W 145	67,514	10.68%	67,511	10.67%	67,487	10.63%	67,227	10.21%
W 146	54,969	-9.89%	55,937	-8.30%	57,086	-6.42%	58,384	-4.29%
W 147	62,105	1.81%	62,519	2.49%	63,099	3.44%	63,765	4.53%



The variance statistics for 2026 from **Table 3** indicate:

- 44 of the 47 wards in Option 1 fall within plus or minus 15% of the target average ward population size of 61,000, which is the current ward population average. Of these 44 wards 34 are within plus or minus 10% of the target average ward population.
- Two of the wards that are above 15%, 115 and 126, are between 15% and 16%.
- Only ward 140 is above 16% at 16.89%.

5.2 OPTION 2: 44 WARDS

This option retains the current number of wards at forty-four and, hence, the current size of Council at forty-five.

With respect to ward numbers this is a status quo option. However, it increases average ward population. In 2026 this option yields an average ward population size of approximately 70,000 (70,214) compared with 60,985 in 2014. The ward population range in this option, using the plus or minus 10% variance rule, is 63,000 to 77,000.

The parameters for this option, both a target population and a set number of wards, make this the most constraining of all the options. They affect both the amount of change to existing ward boundaries and the drawing of boundary lines. In this option only one ward, the current ward 6, has no boundary change. This option has the greatest impact on wards that are currently below average and are not expected to grow.

In order to develop an option based on retaining 44 wards, the following steps are followed:

- Wards within the 63,000 to 77,000 population range for 2026 are identified and small boundary changes suggested during the Round One consultation are considered to both improve boundary alignment and consider communities of interest;
- Wards smaller than the 10% range are combined, enlarged and/or removed;
- Larger wards are reduced to within the average and some fast growing wards or wards with a range of complex issues are set in the lower part of the range; and,
- The creation of new wards starts in the central city, Yonge Street corridor and Growth Centres and works outwards.


This option increases average ward population size and shifts the number of wards towards higher growth areas. This is in keeping with the policies of the City's Official Plan that direct growth to specific areas. The Official Plan also stipulates that approximately 75% of the city will remain as stable neighbourhoods with only limited growth.

Map 7 “Option 2: 44 Wards” depicts Option 2. As its title indicates, this option contains 44 wards.



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT

MAP 7 OPTION 2: 44 WARDS



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



Table 4 "Option 2: 44 Wards - Population and Variances by Election Years" shows the population estimates for the election years of 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030 and displays the variance for each new ward for these years based on the target ward population size of 70,000. Wards are identified with the prefix "2" to indicate that they belong to **Option 2: 44 Wards**.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



TABLE 4 OPTION 2 - 44 WARDS - POPULATION & VARIANCES BY ELECTION YEARS

WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
W 201	66,447	-5.08%	66,230	-5.39%	66,207	-5.42%	66,573	-4.90%
W 202	63,310	-9.56%	63,158	-9.77%	63,809	-6.64%	64,969	-7.19%
W 203	61,639	-11.94%	62,988	-10.02%	63,401	-9.43%	63,898	-8.72%
W 204	57,480	-17.89%	59,754	-14.64%	63,832	-6.81%	68,647	-1.93%
W 205	55,326	-20.96%	58,566	-16.33%	63,146	-9.79%	67,459	-3.63%
W 206	65,500	-6.43%	67,540	-3.51%	69,434	-0.61%	71,557	2.22%
W 207	66,535	-4.95%	67,093	-4.15%	68,811	-1.70%	70,798	1.14%
W 206	65,501	-6.43%	66,516	-4.98%	69,232	-1.10%	72,211	3.16%
W 209	60,952	-12.93%	61,860	-11.63%	63,830	-6.61%	66,439	-5.09%
W 210	61,418	-12.26%	61,921	-11.54%	64,302	-6.14%	66,842	-4.51%
W 211	60,281	-13.88%	61,191	-12.58%	63,658	-9.06%	66,557	-4.92%
W 212	67,345	-3.79%	67,527	-3.53%	68,486	-2.16%	69,618	-0.55%
W 213	61,741	-11.80%	62,044	-11.37%	62,469	-10.76%	62,912	-10.13%
W 214	64,645	-7.65%	66,165	-5.48%	66,848	-4.51%	67,522	-3.54%
W 215	64,080	-8.46%	64,458	-7.92%	65,199	-6.86%	66,009	-5.70%
W 216	60,195	-14.01%	61,356	-12.35%	62,756	-10.35%	64,074	-8.47%
W 217	54,819	-21.69%	63,957	-8.63%	70,151	0.22%	72,958	4.23%
W 216	48,143	-31.22%	56,808	-18.85%	65,259	-6.77%	71,015	1.45%
W 219	64,614	-7.69%	69,341	-0.94%	73,340	4.77%	76,466	9.24%
W 220	62,597	-10.58%	63,288	-9.59%	63,736	-6.95%	64,153	-8.35%
W 221	63,173	-9.75%	64,038	-8.52%	65,055	-7.06%	66,051	-5.64%
W 222	64,774	-7.47%	65,411	-6.56%	67,366	-3.76%	69,306	-0.99%
W 223	64,287	-8.16%	65,498	-6.43%	67,260	-3.91%	69,481	-0.74%
W 224	60,089	-14.16%	62,053	-11.35%	63,128	-9.82%	64,280	-8.17%
W 225	65,908	-5.85%	66,660	-4.77%	67,546	-3.51%	68,534	-2.09%
W 226	64,792	-7.44%	66,028	-5.67%	66,622	-4.83%	67,170	-4.04%
W 227	65,279	-6.74%	65,691	-6.16%	65,850	-5.93%	66,028	-5.67%
W 226	62,928	-10.10%	63,160	-9.77%	64,002	-6.57%	64,971	-7.18%
W 229	62,019	-11.40%	66,666	-4.76%	66,323	-2.40%	69,810	-0.27%
W 230	67,782	-3.17%	67,564	-3.48%	67,666	-3.33%	67,868	-3.05%
W 231	64,802	-7.43%	65,343	-6.65%	65,900	-5.86%	66,579	-4.89%
W 232	66,792	-4.58%	71,602	2.29%	76,355	9.06%	82,621	18.03%
W 233	55,008	-21.42%	68,583	-2.02%	74,796	6.85%	80,488	14.98%
W 234	58,910	-15.84%	59,741	-14.66%	60,020	-14.26%	60,255	-13.92%
W 235	66,000	-5.71%	67,171	-4.04%	68,716	-1.63%	70,586	0.84%
W 236	60,631	-13.38%	61,496	-12.15%	63,693	-9.01%	66,367	-5.19%
W 237	68,295	-2.44%	68,863	-1.62%	71,300	1.86%	74,290	6.13%
W 236	64,535	-7.81%	65,291	-6.73%	66,968	-4.30%	70,227	0.32%
W 239	60,108	-14.13%	62,264	-11.05%	63,622	-9.11%	65,068	-7.05%
W 240	68,045	-2.79%	67,681	-3.31%	67,619	-3.40%	67,350	-3.79%
W 241	66,858	-4.49%	67,168	-4.05%	67,069	-4.19%	67,222	-3.97%
W 242	67,514	-3.55%	67,511	-3.56%	67,467	-3.59%	67,227	-3.96%
W 243	65,148	-6.93%	65,773	-6.04%	67,574	-3.47%	69,801	-0.28%
W 244	61,686	-11.88%	62,634	-10.52%	63,487	-9.30%	64,331	-8.10%



The variance statistics for 2026 from **Table 4** indicate:

- 41 of the 44 wards in Option 2 fall within plus or minus 10% of the target average ward population of 70,000.
- The 3 remaining wards all fall within the plus or minus 10% to 15% range.
 - Wards 213 and 216 are between 10% and 11% below the target average of 70,000 at 62,469 and 62,756 respectively.
 - Ward 234 is 14.26% below the target population average at 60,022. It is a complex ward and contains the Port Lands. Although everyone expects significant development in this area, the timing is uncertain. It is prudent that this ward be below the average, but still within 15%.

5.3 OPTION 3: SMALL WARDS – 50,000 POPULATION

This option can be classified as the small ward option, small with regards to population size. It is an option that garnered significant support during the Round One consultation process.

Option 3: Small Wards - 50,000 Population has a ward population range of 45,000 to 55,000 people. It provides a great deal of flexibility since it makes it possible to add several wards. Potentially, this option could have between 56 and 68 wards. As developed, Option 3 results in 58 wards. It is worth recalling that the City of Toronto had 56 wards at the time of amalgamation.

With this option ward boundaries across the city change considerably. In fact, almost all existing wards experience some boundary change. The biggest changes are seen in the fast growing areas such as the Downtown, Willowdale, Scarborough and South Etobicoke, where several wards are added. In all 14 wards are added.

In order to develop an option based on an average ward population size of 50,000, the following steps are taken:

- All wards with populations above 55,000 are grouped to determine where new wards are required. As noted, this leads to 14 new wards throughout the city; and,
- The one ward over 10% below the bottom of the range (45,000) is expanded (current Ward 29).

Map 8 "Option 3: Small Wards - 50,000 Population" depicts Option 3. This option contains 58 wards.



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT

MAP 8 OPTION 3: SMALL WARDS - 50,000 POPULATION





Table 5 "Option 3: Small Wards - 50,000 Population - Population and Variances by Election Year" displays the population estimates for the election years of 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030 and shows the variance for each new ward for these years based on the target ward population size of 50,000. Wards are identified with the prefix "3" to indicate that they belong to **Option 3: Small Wards – 50,000 Population**.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



TABLE 5 OPTION 3: SMALL WARDS - 50,000 POPULATION - POPULATION & VARIANCES BY ELECTION YEAR

WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
W 301	53,107	6.21%	53,007	6.01%	53,583	7.17%	54,278	8.56%
W 302	47,477	-5.05%	47,374	-5.25%	47,863	-4.27%	48,508	-2.98%
W 303	47,555	-4.89%	47,704	-4.59%	47,886	-4.23%	48,294	-3.41%
W 304	57,392	14.78%	57,965	15.93%	58,572	17.14%	59,146	18.29%
W 305	39,662	-20.68%	41,544	-16.91%	44,180	-11.70%	46,396	-7.21%
W 306	38,323	-23.35%	40,831	-18.34%	45,132	-9.74%	50,059	0.12%
W 307	45,512	-8.98%	47,839	-4.32%	50,103	0.21%	52,340	4.68%
W 308	45,274	-9.45%	46,711	-6.58%	47,911	-4.18%	49,239	-1.52%
W 309	46,450	-7.10%	46,949	-6.10%	48,190	-3.62%	49,684	-0.63%
W 310	48,060	-3.88%	49,112	-1.78%	51,938	3.88%	55,074	10.15%
W 311	54,320	8.54%	54,812	9.62%	55,958	11.92%	57,594	15.19%
W 312	46,499	-7.00%	46,990	-6.02%	48,504	-2.99%	50,154	0.31%
W 313	52,484	4.97%	52,977	5.95%	54,553	9.11%	56,349	12.70%
W 314	44,924	-10.15%	45,172	-9.66%	46,587	-6.83%	48,256	-3.49%
W 315	45,086	-9.83%	45,020	-9.96%	46,366	-9.27%	45,786	-8.43%
W 316	55,548	11.10%	56,943	13.89%	57,505	15.01%	58,045	16.09%
W 317	52,839	5.68%	53,104	6.21%	53,774	7.55%	54,549	9.10%
W 318	46,450	-7.10%	47,060	-5.88%	47,482	-5.04%	47,862	-4.28%
W 319	39,584	-20.83%	43,629	-12.74%	46,495	-7.01%	48,648	-2.70%
W 320	39,423	-21.15%	46,403	-7.19%	53,770	7.54%	55,828	11.66%
W 321	41,037	-17.93%	43,856	-12.29%	48,062	-3.88%	51,397	2.79%
W 322	50,186	0.37%	50,733	1.47%	52,366	4.73%	53,995	7.99%
W 323	48,576	-2.85%	48,881	-2.24%	49,969	-1.66%	49,239	-1.52%
W 324	47,887	-4.23%	48,616	-2.77%	49,091	-1.82%	49,545	-0.91%
W 325	47,392	-5.22%	47,919	-4.16%	48,753	-0.49%	51,733	3.47%
W 326	46,574	-6.85%	47,978	-4.04%	49,624	-0.75%	51,478	2.96%
W 327	45,329	-9.34%	45,839	-8.32%	47,089	-5.82%	48,331	-3.34%
W 328	46,766	-6.47%	47,499	-5.00%	49,310	-1.38%	51,598	3.20%
W 329	50,553	1.11%	50,954	1.91%	51,163	2.33%	51,405	2.81%
W 330	52,644	5.29%	53,772	7.54%	54,722	9.44%	55,661	11.32%
W 331	52,408	4.82%	53,197	6.39%	53,971	7.94%	54,825	9.65%
W 332	45,764	-8.47%	46,781	-6.44%	47,180	-5.84%	47,498	-5.00%
W 333	45,288	-9.42%	46,249	-7.50%	46,317	-7.37%	46,351	-7.30%
W 334	46,300	-7.40%	46,274	-7.45%	48,757	-8.49%	47,330	-5.34%
W 335	52,048	4.10%	52,482	4.96%	53,304	6.61%	54,201	8.40%
W 336	46,632	-6.74%	50,425	0.85%	51,589	3.18%	52,752	5.60%
W 337	47,213	-5.57%	48,189	-3.62%	49,192	-1.82%	49,776	-0.45%
W 338	45,086	-9.83%	49,992	-0.02%	52,342	4.68%	54,945	9.89%
W 339	42,818	-14.36%	49,372	-1.26%	55,388	10.78%	61,109	22.22%
W 340	44,601	-10.80%	51,756	3.51%	52,777	5.55%	55,441	10.88%
W 341	36,180	-27.64%	44,980	-10.04%	49,956	-0.09%	54,454	8.91%
W 342	53,185	6.37%	53,790	7.58%	53,915	7.83%	54,026	8.05%
W 343	51,972	3.94%	52,116	4.23%	52,402	4.80%	52,673	5.35%
W 344	54,378	8.76%	54,224	8.45%	54,337	8.67%	54,542	9.08%
W 345	51,013	2.03%	51,617	3.23%	52,161	4.32%	52,764	5.53%
W 346	50,693	1.39%	51,829	3.66%	53,271	6.54%	54,905	9.81%
W 347	43,719	-12.56%	44,556	-10.89%	46,983	-6.03%	49,792	-0.42%
W 348	47,225	-5.55%	47,384	-5.23%	48,385	-3.27%	49,887	-0.23%
W 349	41,336	-17.33%	41,729	-16.54%	42,375	-15.25%	43,384	-13.23%
W 350	44,562	-10.88%	44,982	-10.04%	46,641	-8.72%	48,630	-2.74%
W 351	43,206	-13.59%	43,651	-12.70%	45,148	-9.71%	48,054	-3.89%
W 352	48,974	-2.05%	50,525	1.05%	51,573	3.15%	52,670	5.34%
W 353	52,709	5.42%	52,470	4.94%	52,390	4.78%	52,320	4.64%
W 354	50,966	1.93%	51,891	3.78%	51,875	3.95%	52,740	5.48%
W 355	54,719	9.44%	54,533	9.07%	54,346	8.69%	54,136	8.27%
W 356	55,531	11.06%	55,479	10.96%	55,388	10.78%	55,276	10.55%
W 357	46,666	-6.67%	47,679	-4.64%	48,811	-2.38%	50,012	0.02%
W 358	49,826	-0.35%	50,305	0.61%	50,929	1.86%	51,624	3.25%



The variance statistics for 2026 from **Table 5** indicate:

- 51 of the 58 wards in Option 3 fall within plus or minus 10% of the target ward population average of 50,000.
- 4 wards fall within the plus or minus 10% to 15% range. Of these 4 wards, 2 fall between 10% and 11%, and 2 fall between 11% and 12%, plus or minus, of the 50,000 target population.
- 3 wards fall between 15% and 20%, plus or minus, of the 50,000 target figure. Two of these, Wards 316 and 349, are 15.01% and 15.25%, respectively, outside the range. Ward 304 is 17.14% above the 50,000 target population. It is a very stable and homogeneous ward. Moving the boundary of Ward 305 to west of Kipling has been considered, but the population concentrations are too high. Moving the boundary would only reverse the situation making Ward 305 too large. It has been decided to retain Kipling Avenue as the boundary.

5.4 OPTION 4: LARGE WARDS – 75,000 POPULATION

This option can be classified as the large ward option, large with regards to population size. A ward population size of 75,000 is about as large as those participating in the Round One consultation process were willing to consider. The complete range at 10% for this option is 67,500 to 82,500, with the upper end of this range resulting in a ward population in excess of what was suggested during the public process.

Option 4: Large Wards – 75,000 Population has a potential ward count range of 37 to 46. The actual number of wards in this option is 38. Option 4 impacts the current smaller wards and removes several in order to gain the population required to balance the larger wards, especially in the central city and Willowdale. In Option 4 all current wards, except Ward 6 experience boundary changes.

In order to develop an option based on an average ward population size of 75,000, the following steps are taken:

- All wards with populations above 75,000 are grouped to determine where new wards are required. This leads to 6 fewer wards throughout the city; and,
- Wards under 75,000, especially those under 67,500 are enlarged.

Map 9 "Option 4: Large Wards - 75,000 Population" depicts Option 4. This option contains 38 wards.



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT

MAP 9 OPTION 4: LARGE WARDS - 75,000 POPULATION



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



Table 6 "Option 4: Large Wards - 75,000 Population - Population and Variances by Election Year" lists the population estimates for the election years of 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030 and shows the variance for each new ward for these years based on the target ward population size of 75,000. Wards are identified with the prefix "4" to indicate that they belong to Option 4.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



TABLE 6 OPTION 1: LARGE WARDS - 75,000 POPULATION - POPULATION & VARIANCES BY ELECTION YEAR

WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
W 401	77,988	3.98%	77,653	3.54%	77,793	3.72%	78,030	4.04%
W 402	77,247	3.00%	77,466	3.29%	78,463	4.62%	79,926	6.57%
W 403	79,768	6.36%	81,351	8.47%	82,359	9.81%	83,339	11.12%
W 404	68,866	-8.18%	73,994	-1.34%	81,948	9.26%	90,018	20.02%
W 405	65,500	-12.67%	67,540	-9.95%	69,434	-7.42%	71,557	-4.59%
W 406	66,535	-11.29%	67,093	-10.54%	68,811	-8.25%	70,798	-5.60%
W 407	68,081	-9.23%	69,344	-7.54%	72,545	-3.27%	76,243	1.66%
W 408	73,792	-1.61%	74,432	-0.76%	75,894	1.19%	77,761	3.68%
W 409	72,704	-3.06%	73,444	-2.07%	75,523	0.70%	79,448	5.93%
W 410	78,954	5.27%	79,833	6.44%	82,860	10.48%	86,155	14.87%
W 411	69,932	-6.76%	71,535	-4.62%	73,199	-2.40%	75,013	0.02%
W 412	79,644	6.19%	79,723	6.30%	80,245	6.99%	80,848	7.80%
W 413	79,810	6.41%	80,194	6.93%	80,946	7.93%	81,790	9.05%
W 414	78,568	4.76%	79,996	6.66%	81,481	8.64%	82,860	10.48%
W 415	59,899	-20.13%	70,124	-6.50%	79,576	6.10%	83,524	11.37%
W 416	55,672	-25.77%	69,418	-7.44%	75,716	0.95%	82,113	9.48%
W 417	62,804	-16.26%	70,081	-6.56%	76,504	2.01%	82,026	9.37%
W 418	72,667	-3.11%	79,867	6.49%	84,527	12.70%	89,208	18.94%
W 419	71,549	-4.60%	74,950	-0.07%	78,490	4.65%	80,552	7.40%
W 420	70,983	-5.36%	74,178	-1.10%	75,114	0.15%	76,069	1.43%
W 421	76,956	2.61%	79,035	5.38%	80,032	6.71%	81,040	8.05%
W 422	72,568	-3.24%	73,254	-2.33%	75,461	0.61%	77,699	3.60%
W 423	74,072	-1.24%	75,247	0.33%	77,229	2.97%	79,705	6.27%
W 424	77,044	2.73%	79,838	6.45%	81,304	8.41%	82,876	10.50%
W 425	78,979	5.31%	79,162	5.55%	79,444	5.93%	79,751	6.33%
W 426	78,449	4.60%	79,694	6.26%	80,746	7.66%	81,793	9.06%
W 427	73,857	-1.52%	74,747	-0.34%	75,501	0.67%	76,354	1.81%
W 428	81,027	8.04%	80,749	7.67%	80,867	7.82%	81,146	8.19%
W 429	77,941	3.92%	78,818	5.09%	79,226	5.63%	79,536	6.05%
W 430	75,626	0.83%	77,624	3.50%	80,550	7.40%	83,847	11.80%
W 431	71,777	-4.30%	72,708	-3.06%	74,733	-0.36%	77,411	3.21%
W 432	74,926	-0.10%	75,304	0.41%	76,538	2.05%	78,833	5.11%
W 433	68,096	-9.21%	68,970	-8.04%	71,783	-4.29%	75,714	0.95%
W 434	63,806	-14.93%	65,687	-12.42%	66,982	-10.69%	68,653	-8.46%
W 435	70,378	-6.16%	70,277	-6.30%	70,159	-6.45%	70,042	-6.61%
W 436	73,342	-2.21%	73,051	-2.60%	72,791	-2.95%	72,670	-3.11%
W 437	71,291	-4.94%	71,737	-4.35%	71,638	-4.48%	71,734	-4.36%
W 438	76,833	2.44%	77,534	3.38%	78,940	5.25%	80,507	7.34%



The variance statistics for 2026 from **Table 6** indicate:

- 35 of the 38 wards in Option 4 fall within a 10% variance of the target ward population of 75,000.
- The 3 wards outside the 10% variance range all fall within 10% to 13%, with two wards (W410 and W434) between 10% and 11%.

From a voter parity perspective, Option 4 is very good, since all new wards vary less than 13% from the target ward population size of 75,000.

5.5 OPTION 5: NATURAL / PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES

One of the criteria for effective representation is having regard for natural and physical boundaries. This includes rivers, ravines, major highways, rail corridors, hydro right-of-ways and major roads. An option based on these types of boundaries does not factor in existing wards as a starting point. However, it must be noted that many existing wards use natural and physical features as boundaries. Also, the other options in this report rely on these boundaries to construct new wards. Examples such as the Humber River and Highway 401 are quite consistently used as ward boundaries in Options 1 to 4.

Since an option based on natural and physical boundaries does not reference ward population size, a method for evaluating voter parity is needed. The approach is to divide the city into areas based on major natural and physical boundaries in the first instance and then determine if voter parity can be obtained within and across these areas.

Two maps are created as analytical tools based on major natural and physical boundaries. These maps show the distribution areas created by using natural and physical boundaries and the 2026 population for each area. The first map contains 13 distribution areas, while the second contains 6 distribution areas.

To determine if voter parity can be achieved across all areas, each area is assessed based on potential wards sizes from 45,000 to 80,000, in increments of 5,000. The first map with 13 distribution areas does not result in wards that meet a target population size across all 13 areas.

However, the second map with 6 areas leads to a ward population size of either 65,000 or 70,000 across all areas. While both these ward population sizes work in theory, a ward population of 70,000 offers the most flexibility in ward boundary determination within the major areas defined by natural and physical boundaries.


Using a target ward population size of 70,000, a 10% range of 63,000 to 77,000 results in 40 to 49 wards.

Map 10 "Option 5: Natural / Physical Boundaries" depicts Option 5. This option contains 41 wards.



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT

MAP 10 OPTION 5: NATURAL/PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES



TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



Table 7 "Option 5: Natural/Physical Boundaries - Population and Variances by Election Year" lists the population estimates for the election years of 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030 and shows the variance for each new ward for these years based on the target ward population size of 70,000. Wards are identified with the prefix "5" to indicate that they belong to **Option 5**.

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
OPTIONS REPORT



TABLE 7 OPTION 9: NATURAL/PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES - POPULATION & VARIANCES BY ELECTION YEAR

WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
W 501	65,774	-6.04%	65,982	-5.74%	66,423	-5.11%	66,996	-4.29%
W 502	68,009	-2.84%	67,978	-2.89%	69,108	-1.27%	70,495	0.71%
W 503	69,363	-0.91%	70,547	0.78%	73,344	4.78%	76,627	9.47%
W 504	73,599	5.14%	74,634	6.62%	75,056	7.22%	75,597	8.00%
W 505	65,257	-6.78%	69,874	-0.18%	75,920	8.46%	81,871	16.96%
W 506	65,500	-6.43%	67,540	-3.51%	69,434	-0.81%	71,557	2.22%
W 507	58,933	-15.81%	60,005	-14.28%	62,881	-10.17%	66,079	-5.60%
W 508	68,549	-2.07%	69,984	-0.02%	73,075	4.39%	76,577	9.40%
W 509	68,210	-2.56%	68,417	-2.26%	69,432	-0.81%	70,723	1.03%
W 510	60,899	-13.00%	61,672	-11.90%	63,649	-9.07%	66,179	-5.46%
W 511	73,035	4.34%	73,620	5.17%	76,252	8.93%	79,242	13.20%
W 512	63,589	-9.16%	64,417	-7.98%	67,253	-3.92%	70,446	0.64%
W 513	70,495	0.71%	70,904	1.29%	71,823	2.60%	72,777	3.97%
W 514	62,215	-11.12%	62,249	-11.07%	62,871	-10.18%	63,590	-9.16%
W 515	72,730	3.90%	73,559	5.08%	73,997	5.71%	74,421	6.32%
W 516	71,559	2.23%	73,154	4.51%	73,816	5.45%	74,486	6.41%
W 517	67,951	-2.93%	68,509	-2.13%	69,442	-0.80%	70,447	0.64%
W 518	74,173	5.96%	74,633	6.62%	75,395	7.71%	76,067	8.67%
W 519	59,604	-14.85%	69,275	-1.04%	74,223	6.03%	77,029	10.04%
W 520	52,173	-25.47%	63,399	-9.43%	74,683	6.69%	79,273	13.25%
W 521	61,578	-12.03%	70,872	1.25%	73,824	5.46%	80,431	14.90%
W 522	61,751	-11.78%	68,122	-2.68%	76,320	9.03%	83,730	19.61%
W 523	59,798	-14.57%	64,743	-7.51%	67,443	-3.65%	70,117	0.17%
W 524	71,602	2.29%	72,537	3.62%	73,799	5.43%	75,020	7.17%
W 525	68,793	-1.72%	73,710	5.30%	75,188	7.41%	76,590	9.41%
W 526	72,506	3.58%	73,833	5.48%	74,101	5.86%	74,253	6.08%
W 527	67,293	-3.87%	69,389	-0.87%	70,859	1.23%	72,390	3.41%
W 528	70,095	0.14%	71,205	1.72%	72,077	2.97%	73,031	4.33%
W 529	70,897	1.28%	71,769	2.53%	72,499	3.57%	73,237	4.62%
W 530	68,766	-1.76%	69,100	-1.29%	70,632	0.90%	72,417	3.45%
W 531	70,563	0.80%	71,139	1.63%	71,894	2.71%	72,807	4.01%
W 532	75,082	7.26%	75,167	7.38%	75,344	7.63%	75,544	7.92%
W 533	70,075	0.11%	70,651	0.93%	70,987	1.41%	71,301	1.86%
W 534	71,936	2.77%	73,117	4.45%	75,859	8.37%	79,089	12.98%
W 535	61,940	-11.51%	62,821	-10.26%	64,495	-7.86%	66,757	-4.63%
W 536	66,109	-5.56%	66,944	-4.37%	68,720	-1.83%	71,107	1.58%
W 537	60,806	-13.13%	61,872	-11.61%	62,277	-11.03%	63,291	-9.58%
W 538	69,540	-0.66%	69,168	-1.19%	68,979	-1.46%	68,758	-1.77%
W 539	77,557	10.80%	77,927	11.32%	77,803	11.15%	77,619	10.88%
W 540	69,480	-0.74%	70,989	1.41%	72,481	3.54%	74,033	5.76%
W 541	70,147	0.21%	70,225	0.32%	71,694	2.42%	74,587	6.55%



The variance statistics for 2026 from **Table 7** indicate:

- 37 of the 41 wards in this option fall within plus or minus 10% of the target average ward population size of 70,000.
- 2 wards fall within the 10% to 11% range of the target average ward population size. Ward 507 has a population of 62,881, or 10.17% below average and Ward 514 has a population of 62,871, or 10.18% below average.
- 2 wards are slightly over 11% of the target average ward population size. Ward 537 has a population of 62,277, or 11.03% below average and Ward 539 has a population of 77,803, or 11.15% above average.

Option 5 uses natural and physical boundaries as its determining principle. It is a viable option from a voter parity perspective. All of the 41 new wards fall within a plus or minus 12% variance factor.

6. RANKING THE OPTIONS

This Options Report puts forward five distinct ways to achieve a re-aligned ward system for the City of Toronto. All meet the test of *'effective representation'*, as laid out by the courts and the OMB. There is no *"best option"*. All options have their strengths and weaknesses and individuals will have differing opinions as to which option they prefer. During Round Two of the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process residents and stakeholders will consider the five options, rank them in order of preference and choose a preferred option from a city-wide perspective.

As outlined earlier, effective representation has several components: voter parity, natural and physical boundaries, geographic communities of interest, ward history, capacity to represent, geographic size and shape of the ward and population growth. All of these components need to be balanced in choosing a preferred option to be recommended to City Council.

To assist residents, stakeholders and Members of Council in ranking the options a *'worksheet'* has been developed. It allows consideration of each option based on the components of effective representation, a ranking of each option from 1 to 5 and suggestions for improving the first ranked option.

More information on each component of effective representation can be found in [Section 2.1](#) of this Report.



6.1 OPTIONS EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Worksheet

COMPONENTS OF EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION	OPTION 1 MINIMAL CHANGE	OPTION 2 44 WARDS	OPTION 3 50,000	OPTION 4 75,000	OPTION 5 NATURAL/PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES
	(47 WARDS)	(44 WARDS)	(58 WARDS)	(38 WARDS)	(41 WARDS)
Voter Parity					
Natural / Physical Boundaries					
Geographic Communities of Interest					
Ward History					
Capacity to Represent					
Geographic Size & Shape of the Ward					
Population Growth					
RANKING (1 to 5)					

Suggestions for improving your **FIRST RANKED OPTION**

a) Related to a specific ward:

b) To the option overall:



7. NEXT STEPS


The options presented in this report will be discussed during Round Two of the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process. Members of the public, stakeholders and Council members will have an opportunity to weigh each option, rank the five options and suggest improvements to their preferred option.

The Options Report is posted on the TWBR's website along with an online survey requesting feedback. Twelve public meetings will be held across the city (3 in each Community Council area) in September and October 2015. Members of Council will be asked to comment through individual interviews. Following this broad consultation a Round Two Report will be prepared documenting comments and opinions on the various options.

Comments from Round Two will inform the final report to Council on a recommended alignment of the City's ward boundaries for the 2018 municipal election. This final report is scheduled to go to the Executive Committee and City Council in May 2016.



APPENDIX A: CURRENT WARD BOUNDARIES





TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

Learn more about us:
www.drawthelines.ca



This is **Exhibit 5** refer to in the Affidavit of
Susan Dexter, sworn August 21, 2018


FINAL REPORT

NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

MAY 2016

DRAWTHELINES.CA




CONTENTS


1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
1.1. Recommended Ward Structure	2.
1.2. The Toronto Ward Boundary Review	4.
1.3. How to Read this Report	4.
1.4. About Ward Boundary Reviews	4.
1.5. Why A Ward Boundary Review	4.
1.6. Effective Representation	5.
1.7. The Role of the OMB	5.
1.8. The TWBR Steps	6.
1.9. Provincial & Federal Riding Boundaries	7.
1.10 Where are the Changes	7.
2. WHY A TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW	10.
2.1. Purpose of the TWBR	10.
2.2. Components of Effective Representation	11.
2.3. The Status Quo is Not an Option	15.
2.4. The Role of the OMB	18.
3. THE TWBR STEP-BY-STEP	
3.1. Overview	20.
3.2. Comparative Research	20.
3.3. Two Stage Process for Civic Engagement & Public Consultation	21.
3.4. Round One Civic Engagement & Public Consultation	24.
3.5. Creating the Options	25.
3.6. Round Two Civic Engagement & Public Consultation	28.
4. PREFERRED OPTION & REFINEMENTS	
4.1. Ranking the Options	30.
4.2. Preferred Option	40.
4.3. Refinements	44.
5. RECOMMENDATION FOR NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO	
5.1. A New Ward Structure	46.
5.2. Effective Representation	51.
5.3. Where are the Changes	53.
6. CONCLUSION & NEXT STEPS	57.
Acknowledgements	58.
APPENDIX 'A' Map of Current Wards	
APPENDIX 'B' Maps of the 5 Options	
APPENDIX 'C' Ward-Specific Refinements	
APPENDIX 'D' Out of Scope Comments	
APPENDIX 'E' Map of Recommended Wards - Large Version (11x17')	

SECTION ONE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW / NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO / FINAL REPORT





A ward boundary review seeks to achieve effective representation throughout the municipality. Factors such as the number of people in each ward, geographic communities of interest, future growth, coherent boundaries, the capacity of councillors to represent their constituents and ward history need to be balanced. Any new ward structure can be implemented in the next municipal election.

This report presents a recommendation for new wards for Toronto that achieves the principle of effective representation, can be implemented for the 2018 municipal election and will last until the 2030 municipal election.

Toronto's current ward structure, developed approximately 15 years ago, has become unbalanced. This impacts voter parity (similar but not identical population numbers among wards) not just at election time, but every time City Council votes.

All reports prior to this Final Report can be found online:
www.drawthelines.ca

RECOMMENDED WARD STRUCTURE

The map **Recommended Wards** on the following page presents the recommended ward structure. The larger version (11x17') can be found in APPENDIX E.

The recommended ward structure is based on Option 1: Minimal Change¹. This option emerged as the preferred option based on feedback received from Members of Council and the public during the project's civic engagement and public consultation process. Many of the responses also suggested refinements to the Option 1 ward boundaries. The TWBR has examined these refinements, as well as suggested refinements to other options and to existing wards, if they were relevant to Option 1.


The recommended ward structure has attempted to incorporate as many of those refinements as possible. Refinements that upset voter parity or negatively affect any other component of effective representation were not incorporated. All of the suggested refinements together with the "Action" on each refinement are included in APPENDIX C to this report.

The recommended ward structure:

- **Minimally increases the number of wards** given the need to accommodate the projected rapid growth of the city to 3.2 million people in 2030. The recommended ward structure results in 47 wards - an increase of 3 wards from the current 44 (see APPENDIX A for a map of the current City of Toronto wards).
- **Retains the current average ward size of 61,000 people.**
Achieves effective representation in all wards by 2026. The population variance is limited to plus or minus 15% of the average ward population of 61,000 for 44 of the 47 wards. Two wards are minimally above 15% (RW15 & RW41) and one ward is slightly below 15% (RW20). To review the detailed projected populations and variances of the 47 recommended wards from 2018 (the first election the new wards will be used), to 2030, please see TABLE 1: Recommended Wards - Projected Population and Variance 2018 - 2030.
- **Is designed to last for four municipal elections.** The recommended ward structure can be implemented for the 2018 election and can be used for the elections of 2022, 2026 and 2030.

¹ Maps of the five options can be found in Appendix B and the full Options Report can be found at www.drawthelines.ca

RECOMMENDED WARDS



1.1 THE TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

In 2014 Toronto City Council formally recognized that Toronto's existing ward structure was out of balance and launched the Toronto Ward Boundary Review (TWBR). Between July 2014 and February 2015, the TWBR conducted Round One of its civic engagement and public consultation process to collect opinions on Toronto's current ward alignment. The results informed the development of five options for re-aligning Toronto's wards. Round Two of the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process solicited feedback on these options between August and November 2015. This report summarizes the entire Toronto Ward Boundary Review process and outlines the methodology used for arriving at the recommended ward structure.

1.2 HOW TO READ THIS REPORT

This Report contains six sections and several appendices: Section 2 summarizes the reasons the TWBR was conducted; Section 3 details all major steps completed during the TWBR project; Section 4 describes how the preferred option was determined and how the ward boundary refinements suggested by TWBR participants were analyzed; Section 5 provides the detailed recommendation for new wards for Toronto; Section 6 outlines the conclusion and next steps; APPENDIX A contains the current ward boundary map;

APPENDIX B presents the maps of the 5 options, which were the focus of discussion during Round Two of the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process; APPENDIX C contains the numerous suggestions for ward-specific refinements; APPENDIX D lists comments gathered during Rounds One and Two of the TWBR's public process, which are outside of the project's purview; and APPENDIX E is a large version of the recommended new wards for Toronto.

1.3 ABOUT WARD BOUNDARY REVIEWS

Designing a ward structure for any municipality is not solely an academic or technical exercise. The population size of a ward affects how residents are represented at City Council not just at election time, but every time Council votes. It also influences how well Councillors can represent the number of people in a ward. Ward boundaries shape the relationship of residents and the business community with their local government and Councillors' link with their electorate. Any changes to ward boundaries can be disruptive. It is therefore important to find the right fit for the City of Toronto.

1.4 WHY A WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW?

Since Toronto's existing ward structure was created in 2000, growth in the City has been significant. Toronto's population today is approximately 2.9 million. This is some 400,000 more than when the current wards were put in place.

Between 2011 (a Census year) and 2030, Toronto’s population is projected to grow by 500,000 people to a total of 3.2 million.

In addition, there are large variations in ward population sizes. For the 2014 election the smallest ward was 45,440 (Ward 18) and the largest ward was 94,600 (Ward 27). The variance around the average ward population size ranged from minus 25.03% to plus 56.07%. Therefore, the current Council finds itself in a situation where the range in ward populations, from smallest to largest, is over 75%. This range has most likely increased since 2014.

1.5 EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION

Effective representation is an inclusive phrase used to consider how well residents are represented in our form of government, which we call “representative democracy”. At a general level it means that one person’s vote should be of similar weight to another person’s. Applied to wards, it suggests that wards should be of similar population size. In some jurisdictions this is referred to as “rep-by-pop”, or representation by population. In the TWBR it is referred to as ‘voter parity’.

In addition to ‘voter parity’, effective representation includes several other components, which have to be balanced when designing a ward structure. Geographic communities of

interest have to be respected, natural/physical boundaries should be used as ward boundaries and ward history, population growth, the capacity to represent, and the geographic shape and size of a ward have to be taken into consideration.

Toronto’s population today is approximately 2.9 million. This is some 400,000 more than when the current wards were put in place.

1.6 THE ROLE OF THE OMB

Changing an existing ward structure is a challenging and difficult task. The TWBR makes a specific recommendation for new wards for Toronto but it is up to City Council to make a final decision. Council’s decision, or lack of decision, which effectively leaves the current ward alignment in place, can be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). The recommended new ward structure meets the tests of effective representation and any amendments that City Council may wish to make have to maintain these tests to be defensible at the OMB.

1.7 THE TWBR STEPS

The TWBR process included 6 steps:



6.

1.8 PROVINCIAL & FEDERAL RIDING BOUNDARIES

During Round One of the TWBR civic engagement and public consultation process, there was little support for reducing the number of wards to 25 to mirror the new federal ridings.

However, there was some interest in aligning new ward boundaries with the boundaries of provincial or federal ridings and then dividing them in two resulting in 50 wards. The TWBR did not pursue this, since such a ward structure would not achieve voter parity, an essential component of effective representation, nor would it address the current discrepancies in ward population sizes. Option 1: Minimal Change comes closest to such a configuration, since Toronto's existing ward structure is based on provincial riding boundaries.

1.9 WHERE ARE THE CHANGES

The recommended new ward structure for Toronto increases the total number of wards to 47 from 44. This increase rebalances the existing ward population discrepancies by enlarging small wards and decreasing large wards. It also accommodates the projected population growth to 2030.

Where are the new wards? This seems like a straightforward question but the answer is more complex. Of the 44 existing wards, 38 experience some changes in their boundaries and are, therefore, "new wards". Only 6 existing wards (Wards 1,2, 6, 10, 11 and 35) retain their exact current boundaries.

To demonstrate where the "additional" wards are located, it is helpful to examine the major natural and physical boundaries of the recommended ward structure and the seven geographic areas of the city they delineate.


The major boundaries are: the Humber River, Victoria Park Avenue, the "Downtown", as defined by the Official Plan, Hwy. 401, and, in general, Eglinton Avenue. In four of the areas there are no changes in the number of wards. These are: the area west of the Humber River (6 wards); the area east of Victoria Park Avenue (10 wards); the area south of Hwy. 401, generally to Eglinton Avenue, between the Humber River and Victoria Park Avenue (6 wards); and, the area east of Downtown to Victoria Park and generally south of Eglinton Avenue (5 wards).

In two areas wards are added. The first is the area north of Hwy. 401 between the Humber River and Victoria Park Avenue. This area goes from 7 to 8 wards. The one ward is added between Bathurst Street and Victoria Park Avenue. The second area is the Downtown. Three wards are added and the Downtown goes from 3 to 6 wards.

Finally, in the area west of the Downtown, generally south of Eglinton Avenue to the Humber River, there is one less ward. This area goes from 7 to 6 wards.

WHERE ARE THE CHANGES

This map illustrates the 7 areas and the changes between the current number of wards and the recommended number of wards.



In summary the “additional” wards can be attributed to three areas of the city.


1. One additional ward north of Hwy. 401 between Bathurst St. and Victoria Park Ave.
2. Three additional wards in the Downtown area
3. One less ward in the area west of the Downtown and south of Eglinton Ave.

All other areas retain the same number of wards they currently have, although most of their ward boundaries have been adjusted. As noted, 6 of the recommended wards are the same as the current wards. This is a reflection of the “cascading effect” as ward populations are balanced, suggested refinements are incorporated and as many geographic communities of interest as possible are respected.

SECTION TWO

WHY A TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW / NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO / FINAL REPORT



Designing a ward structure for any municipality is not solely an academic or technical exercise. The population size of a ward affects how residents are represented at City Council not just at election time, but every time Council votes. The number of people in a ward also influences how well Councillors can represent their constituents. Ward boundaries shape the relationship of residents and the business community with their local government and Councillors' link with their electorate. Any changes to ward boundaries can be disruptive. It is therefore important to find the right fit for the City of Toronto.

2.1 PURPOSE OF THE TWBR

The purpose of the TWBR is articulated in the Toronto Ward Boundary Review Project Work Plan, Civic Engagement and Public Consultation Strategy approved by City Council in June 2014:

- be able to withstand a challenge most likely at the OMB, but possibly in court;
- include civic engagement and public consultation approaches that educate, inform and involve residents of Toronto, stakeholders and Council members;
- be based on a current understanding of ward boundary determination principles and practices;
- consider in detail the growth that Toronto has experienced and will experience over the coming years;
- develop a series of ward boundary options for effective representation for consideration and comment by the public, stakeholders and Council members;
- respect Toronto's equity policies;
- be conducted in an objective, neutral and independent fashion; and,
- provide City Council with a specific recommendation for a new ward structure.

To bring a recommendation to Toronto City Council on a ward boundary configuration that respects the principle of effective representation, as defined by the courts and the Ontario Municipal Board

To achieve this goal, the TWBR process must:

During the almost two years of the project, the TWBR has operated at arms-length from City of Toronto staff and Members of Council. Council members were interviewed for their opinions on the current ward alignment and on the five options proposed, but they did not comment on the final recommendation prior to its presentation to the City of Toronto Executive Committee and City Council.

Since the existing ward structure was created in 2000, growth in the city has been significant. Currently, Toronto's population is approximately 2.9 million. This is some 400,000 more than when the existing wards were put in place. Between 2011 (a Census year) and 2030, Toronto's population is projected to grow by 500,000 people to a total of some 3.2 million.

This rapid growth has focused on certain areas, primarily the Downtown and designated growth centres.

The growth has followed the policies of the Official Plan. The Official Plan directs growth to specific areas and stipulates that 75% of Toronto's neighbourhoods will remain stable.

Most new residents live, and will continue to live, in the Downtown and in the city's growth centres. The concentration of growth has altered the population size of Toronto's wards. While wards are supposed to be similar in population size, currently the largest wards are twice the size of smaller wards. This imbalance, resulting from the city's continuing growth, drives the need for a review of Toronto's ward boundaries. The TWBR faces two challenges: first to correct the current imbalance in ward populations and secondly to accommodate anticipated growth over the next decade.

The TWBR is recommending a new ward structure for Toronto that can be implemented in time for the 2018 municipal election and last until 2030.

2.2 COMPONENTS OF EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION

Effective representation is an inclusive phrase used to consider how well residents are represented in our form of government, which we call "representative democracy". At a general level it means that one person's vote should be of similar weight to another person's. Applied to wards, it suggests that wards should be of similar population size. In some jurisdictions this is referred to as "rep-by-pop", or representation by population. In the TWBR it is referred to as 'voter parity'.

In the Canadian context, the Supreme Court of Canada has employed the term "effective representation" to set the standard for creating municipal ward boundaries and provincial and federal riding boundaries. Effective representation has evolved to include several components, all of which need to be considered in designing a ward structure. These components are:

Voter Parity

Voter parity speaks to the relationship between a ward's population and the average ward population of all municipal wards. To achieve parity, ward populations need to be similar but not identical. Voter parity is a criterion that has special prominence in weighing the attainment of effective representation. It is assessed in terms of incremental percentage ranges around the average ward population. A range of plus or minus 10% is considered ideal. Population variances can be greater, in limited instances, in order to satisfy other criteria. However, if the range gets too large, effective representation is lost.

Natural/Physical Boundaries

Natural boundaries such as rivers, ravines and green areas are often used as boundaries to separate wards. In Toronto the Humber River is an excellent example. Similarly, major infrastructure such as expressways, railways, hydro corridors and arterial roads create barriers and are used as ward boundaries. Highway 401 is a ward boundary throughout much of the city and major arterial streets, such as Yonge Street and Victoria Park, also serve as ward boundaries. Natural/physical boundaries are highly recognizable and often separate communities of interest.

Geographic Communities of Interest

Communities of Interest is a frequently used term in ward boundary reviews but is difficult to define precisely. Sometimes it refers to ethno-cultural commercial areas such as Chinatown, Little Italy or Little India. The term is also used to define neighbourhoods such as The Annex, Rexdale, Malvern, Mimico, Mount Dennis or St. Lawrence. To form a basis for determining ward boundaries, communities of interest must be geographically contiguous. There is no comprehensive list or map of Toronto's communities of interest or neighbourhoods with precise boundaries. Some areas of the city have strong neighbourhood groups and residents associations with well-defined boundaries, while other areas do not.

It is important to avoid dividing geographic communities of interest and/or neighbourhoods when creating wards. However, this objective cannot always be achieved. Sometimes a community is so large that to respect voter parity it must be split among more than one ward. The Jane-Finch community and Don Mills fall into this category. Also, some communities may already be split by natural boundaries, such as Malvern in Scarborough. Given the diversity and number of Toronto's various communities, wards will often contain many different communities and/or neighbourhoods.

Ward History

The history of some wards extends to well before amalgamation and those wards have developed a strong identity. Ward design should, where possible, attempt to consider the history of the ward. For example, Victoria Park Avenue has historically been the western boundary of five of the Scarborough wards. However, ward history, in and of itself, cannot override other major criteria such as voter parity, strong natural/physical boundaries and communities of interest.

Capacity to Represent

Capacity to represent is often equated with Councillors' workload. It encompasses ward size, types and breadth of concerns, ongoing growth and development, complexity of issues, etc. For example, wards with high employment, major infrastructure facilities, tourism attractions, or special areas such as the Entertainment District, generate a host of issues a Councillor has to deal with, in addition to the concerns of local residents.

The courts have noted that Councillors perform two functions. The first is legislative and refers to passing by-laws and considering city-wide issues. All Councillors have this role in common. The courts have referred to the second function as the "ombudsman role", which is interpreted as a

constituency role. It speaks to a Councillor's responsibility to represent the interests of a ward's residents to the city government and its administrative structure.

This latter function, the constituency role, is captured by the concept of the "capacity to represent". This role can vary greatly depending on the issues prevalent in any given ward.

There is no specific information or data set to quantify this criterion. Some data on development pressures can be gleaned from development pipeline reports and areas that play a special role in the city's economic life are known. Wards with these types of issues can remain in the lower reaches of the voter parity range. Homogeneous, stable wards can rise to the upper end of the voter parity range.

Geographic Size and Shape of the Ward

All wards cannot be the same geographic size. Some areas of the city are more densely populated than others and some wards have more open space. Comments during Round One of the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process noted that many suburban wards are physically larger and take longer to get around in. However, in a built-up city like Toronto equalizing the geographic size of wards is not a relevant consideration.

Population Growth

Any changes that City Council makes to the current ward alignment will be used for the 2018 municipal election. However, the wards created should also work for future elections. The TWBR looks at the next four elections in 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030. The target election for an evaluation of effective representation has been set for 2026. This allows for Toronto's expected growth to be factored into ward boundary calculations.

If the new ward structure works in 2026, it should hold until the 2030 municipal election. After that another review of Toronto's ward boundaries will likely be required.

Wards that will grow dramatically over the next decade can start out smaller, as they will achieve acceptable voter parity ranges by the municipal elections of 2022 or 2026. Similarly, more stable wards, from a population growth perspective, may start larger than average or at the top of the voter parity range, but come closer to average by 2022 or 2026.

Balancing the Components of Effective Representation

Designing a new ward structure requires balancing all the components of effective representation. While all of the components have to be taken into consideration, they are not all equal. Some need to be weighted more heavily than

others in determining a new ward configuration. Voter parity is pivotal and is a key determinant of effective representation. Respecting communities of interest is another high priority consideration, along with well-defined, coherent ward boundaries.

The Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that voter parity is required based on the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms provision of the "right to vote". Besides just voting, the right to vote asserts that one person's vote must be similar in weight to any other person's vote. Voting weights do not need to be identical but they must be 'similar' and within a reasonable range. Within this range other factors such as geographic communities of interest or capacity to represent are considered.

Ward boundary reviews need to look into the future. Toronto is growing at a rapid rate. In its pursuit of effective representation, the TWBR looks ahead to 2030 when Toronto's population will have grown to approximately 3.2 million.

The TWBR uses total population numbers in a ward and not electors. Councillors, once elected, represent all people in a ward, not just those eligible to vote. Also, as a ward alignment lasts for several elections, some people not eligible to vote currently will become voters in future elections.

2.3 THE STATUS QUO IS NOT AN OPTION

In November 2014 the TWBR produced a report entitled **Why Is Toronto Drawing New Ward Boundaries** that explored the city's current ward structure in depth to determine what would happen to the principle of effective representation if no changes were made. The report concluded that the status quo is not an option (all TWBR reports prior to this Final Report can be found online: www.drawthelines.ca)

City staff had pointed out the large variation in ward population sizes, when the TWBR was launched. For the 2010 municipal election, based on 2011 Census data, ward populations in Toronto ranged from 44,935 (Ward 29) to 88,440 (Ward 23). This represented a variation from 24.4% below to 48.8% above the average ward population of 59,433.


By the 2014 election the smallest ward was 45,440 (Ward 18) and the largest ward was now 94,600 (Ward 27). The variation around the average ward population size ranged from minus 25.03% to plus 56.07%. Therefore, the current Council finds itself in a situation where the range in ward populations, from smallest to largest, is over 75%. This unsustainable range has most likely increased since the election of 2014.

The TWBR team set out to track the variations in ward populations, if no changes were made to the existing ward structure, for the four future elections of 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030. For analytical purposes ward populations were grouped into 9 population ranges from 25% below the average ward population size to 25% above the average. These ranges are key indicators of whether or not the voter parity component of effective representation is being achieved.


Maps showing the ward population ranges around the averages for all of the next four elections can be found in the **Options Report**. To reveal the general trend, only the maps for the elections of 2018 (Map 1) and 2026 (Map 2) have been included in this report. The 2018 election is the election that will first implement any new ward structure for Toronto and the 2026 election represents the target election year used throughout the TWBR project to determine voter parity.

The maps show voter parity ranges in 5% increments both above and below a 10% range around the average ward population. As noted previously, wards within a 10% range of the average are ideal. As the variances increase above 10%, concerns about voter parity increase and above 15% it becomes problematic, unless convincing extenuating circumstances are involved.

MAP 1 | VARIANCE BY CURRENT WARD 2018



MAP 2 | VARIANCE BY CURRENT WARD 2026



The emerging pattern is clear. With each election the number of wards outside of the 10% variation range of the average ward population size increases. By 2018, 19 wards are outside plus or minus 10%, the variance range deemed desirable for voter parity. By 2026, 27 wards are outside the 10% range, with 19 of them larger than 10% of the average.

Toronto’s population growth has been and will be concentrated in the downtown wards and the city’s designated growth centres. As noted, Toronto will grow by approximately 500,000 people between 2011 and 2030. The current ward structure can simply not accommodate this amount of growth. The ward structure was already starting to tip out of balance in the 2014 election and by 2026 over half of the wards will fall outside a reasonable range in terms of voter parity. As pointed out in the TWRB analysis of the existing ward structure, the status quo is not an option.

2.4 THE ROLE OF THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL BOARD (OMB)

The current Toronto ward structure is out of balance and the situation will worsen with every election. The TWBR recommends a new ward structure that will achieve effective representation starting with the 2018 election and continuing until the election of 2030. This recommendation addresses the two key issues facing the existing ward structure: its current population imbalance and the rapid and concentrated growth projected for Toronto.

Changing an existing ward structure is a challenging and difficult task. Ward boundaries are imbued with considerable history, and residents and Councillors have worked together in many communities for a long time. While the TWBR team makes a specific recommendation for a new ward structure for Toronto, there are a multitude of competing interests involved in making the final decision. In such a situation a stalemate can be the result. Such a stalemate, or lack of a decision, would by default leave the current ward structure in place.

TWBR CHALLENGES

- 1. Overcome the current imbalance in ward populations**
- 2. Accommodate 3.2 million people by 2030**

The decision on the new ward structure is up to Toronto City Council. However, that decision, or lack of a decision, can be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). The TWBR has crafted a recommendation that achieves effective representation and is defensible at the OMB. To remain defensible any amendments City Council may wish to make will have to maintain the tests of effective representation.

If Council does not enact a new ward structure, a group of citizens, an NGO or any other interested party can refer the matter to the OMB. Prior to the TWBR process, there were two referrals regarding the City's ward boundaries to the OMB. These were withdrawn on the understanding that the City planned to undertake a comprehensive ward boundary review. Non-action by Council could see these parties come forward again. It is preferable for City Council, an elected, representative body, to make the decision on a new ward structure than having an appointed quasi-judicial body impose a ward structure.




A ward boundary review must make sure that boundaries among wards make sense based on: the number of people in each ward, geographic communities of interest and neighbourhoods, future growth, physical and natural boundaries (e.g. ravines, roads and railway tracks), the ward's history and other relevant considerations. Changes will come into effect for the municipal election in 2018.



SECTION THREE

THE TWBR STEP-BY-STEP

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW / NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO / FINAL REPORT



3.1 OVERVIEW

- **Comparative Research**
- **Round One Civic Engagement & Public Consultation** (input on current ward structure)
- **Ward Boundary Options**
- **Round Two Civic Engagement & Public Consultation** (feedback on options)
- **Preferred Option and Refinement Analysis**
- **Recommendation for New Ward Structure**

At the other end of the council size spectrum, Montreal has 65 elected officials, but the city uses a party-based system within its municipal government.

Average ward population sizes amongst Canada’s largest cities were examined to determine how Toronto’s average ward population size of approximately 61,000 compares². Average ward populations range considerably across the country. In Montreal, wards (termed electoral districts) have an average population of 28,439. At the larger end of the scale, Calgary’s average ward population size is 78,345. Edmonton and Mississauga are in the 60,000 range. Overall Toronto’s average ward population is slightly higher than that of other large Canadian cities.

3.2 COMPARATIVE RESEARCH

The TWBR project began with research into the ward structures of other municipalities. The background report, titled **Toronto Ward Boundary Review: Background Research Report**, December 2014, includes an assessment of Toronto’s ward structure within the context of other municipalities in Ontario, Canada and a few international examples.

Direct comparisons between Toronto’s ward structure and those of other cities in Canada, or internationally cannot be made. Various provincial laws and local practices limit how comparable other jurisdictions can be. For example, Vancouver has 10 councillors but they are all elected at large.

Overall, Toronto’s average ward population is slightly higher than that of other large Canadian cities.

The research report also examined 13 Ontario cities where ward boundary reviews have occurred since 2005. This helped to confirm the context for the guiding principles used in ward boundary reviews, along with the overriding principle of effective representation established by the Supreme Court of Canada.

² All figures are from the 2011 Census.

Ward boundary reviews in Ontario have been appealed in several instances. Of the 13 municipalities assessed, 6 were appealed and the City of Ottawa was appealed twice.

A review of the OMB decisions is informative and assists in an understanding of what Toronto might encounter should the TWBR be appealed.

Comparative information on the situation in other cities helps provide some context for the TWBR. However, Toronto is the largest and fastest growing city in Canada and this raises unique challenges for the determination of ward boundaries.


3.3 TWO STAGE PROCESS FOR CIVIC ENGAGEMENT & PUBLIC CONSULTATION

The TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process has been extensive and thorough and will be able to withstand an OMB challenge, should this occur. The process was designed at the beginning of the project and approved by City Council in Spring 2014 (see **The Toronto Ward Boundary Review Project Work Plan, Civic Engagement and Public Consultation Strategy**).

The TWBR has made a distinction between "civic engagement" and "public consultation". The former focused on all web-based activities and communication with the public, Members of Council and other stakeholders via e-mail, print, social media and a user-friendly interactive project web site www.drawthelines.ca. The latter included face-to-face discussions with Members of Council and stakeholder groups, 24 public meetings and a webinar.

TWBR by the Numbers

- [2811](#) contacts on TWBR distribution list
- [1803](#) direct participants
- 474 social media contacts
- [337](#) posts on the TWBR social media twitter account @DrawtheLinesTO
- [331](#) average monthly visits to the drawthelines.ca website
- 198 posters in public library branches
- [103](#) face-to-face meetings (inc. Members of Council, School Boards other stakeholder groups)
- [55](#) advertisements (mix of online and print)
- 24 of public meetings and information sessions
- [18](#) maps posted to the drawthelines.ca website
- [12](#) e-news issued to the TWBR distribution list
- 11 media releases
- [7](#) reports available on the drawthelines.ca website
- [1](#) webinar



The TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process has been delivered in two rounds. Round One (July 2014 to February 2015) solicited opinions about Toronto's current ward structure through individual meetings with Members of Council and a number of stakeholder groups. The general public provided their input via an online survey, e-mail and 12 public meetings (3 in each Community Council area). The schedule of the public meetings was constrained by the 2014 municipal election. Community meetings could not begin until after the new City Council took office in early December.

Round Two of the process (August 2015 – November 2015) collected feedback on five options for a new ward structure from the public and Members of Council, again through individual interviews, another online survey, e-mail, a webinar and a second set of 12 public meetings.

Both sets of public meetings were held on weekday evenings and Saturday mornings to invite the broadest possible participation. Meeting locations ranged from community centres and church halls to public library branches and seniors' centres, all of them accessible to people with limited mobility. American Sign Language interpreters were present at every public meeting, and interpretation in 11 languages as well as attendant care services were available on request. Project print materials, such as the online surveys,

advertisements in community newspapers and the public library posters publicizing the 24 public meetings, all communicated the availability of translation services, if required.

The public process produced many comments that are outside of the scope of the TWBR. They are largely related to the way City Council currently governs itself. The project team had agreed at the outset to report these comments and suggestions separately. A list of the 'out-of-scope' comments and suggestions can be found in APPENDIX D to this report. More detailed summaries are included as Appendix C of the **Round One Report on Civic Engagement + Public Consultation**, March 2015 and Appendix B of the **Round Two Report on Civic Engagement + Public Consultation: Feedback on the Options for New Ward Boundaries for the City of Toronto, February 2016**.

Throughout the TWBR, the project has benefitted from the ideas and observations of an outside Advisory Panel with expertise in municipal law, business, academe, civil society research and the OMB. The Panel met three times during the course of the project.

3.4 ROUND ONE CIVIC ENGAGEMENT & PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Round One of the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process was the 'input' phase of the project. It collected opinions about the current alignment of Toronto's 44 wards from the general public, Members of Council and stakeholder groups, such as the various school boards, Civic Action (Emerging Leaders Network), Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants (OCASI), Social Planning Toronto, Toronto Association of Business Improvement Areas and United Way.

The project established a website, www.drawthelines.ca and a database of community associations and stakeholder groups, including 59 different Toronto-based ethno-cultural organizations. These groups were encouraged to share information about the TWBR with their networks. Five TWBR news releases and a number of City of Toronto releases were sent out to highlight the Round One public process.

In all 919 individuals participated as follows:

- Public Meetings – 192
- Online Survey – 608
- E-mail/Twitter/website – 9
- Members of Council (2010 – 2014) – 44
- New Members of Council – 7

- Stakeholder groups – 59
- During Round One interviews, surveys and public meetings focused on issues with current ward boundaries, communities of interest, ward size, total number of wards and congruity of City ward boundaries with those of federal/provincial ridings.

Key Findings

Ward Size

- Generally, there seemed to be commonality across all participant groups regarding ward size. Responses from all groups were comfortable with a ward size close to the current average of 61,000. Many comments suggested 'up to 60,000 people per ward' and 'current size or slightly smaller or larger'.
- A small minority favoured large wards in the 90,000 to 105,000 plus range, accompanied by additional resources to be allocated to Members of Council.

Total Number of Wards

- A large majority of Council members and responses from public meetings agreed that there should be 44 wards or more (44 – 50 wards).
- Survey responses favoured even more wards, i.e. 54 – 75 wards.

- A small minority of survey and Council members' responses suggested 22 - 25 wards to mirror provincial or federal ridings.

- Account for Toronto's population growth
- Ensure validity for four municipal elections
- Balance ward population sizes
- Offer a set of diverse and distinct options
- Achieve effective new ward boundaries

Follow Provincial or Federal Riding Boundaries

- Opinions on this issue were divided among survey and public meeting responses.
- Members of Council suggested that this should not be the major criterion for re-aligning Toronto's wards boundaries.
- Stakeholder group responses were in favour of following provincial or federal riding boundaries.

In addition to comments on specific issues such as ward size, total number of wards and whether Toronto's ward boundaries should follow those of the federal/provincial ridings, Round One participants also made suggestions on how current ward boundaries could be improved to become more 'logical' and/or better reflect existing communities of interest. These ward-specific comments from all participants can be found in Appendix D of the Round One report.

3.5 CREATING THE OPTIONS

In designing the options, a methodology was developed to:

The background research and the input from Round One of the civic engagement and public consultation process informed the development of five options for a new ward structure for Toronto. All five options respect the principles of effective representation. From this perspective, any of the options developed could be approved by Council and, in the opinion of the TWBR team, withstand an appeal at the OMB.

Two critical factors had to apply to all options. Toronto's projected growth of approximately 500,000 over the time frame of the TWBR (2011 to 2030) needs to be accommodated in the areas where the Official Plan indicates that the bulk of the growth will occur. Secondly, to balance ward population size, the large wards must get smaller and the small wards larger.

The parameters for the five options are as follows:

- Option 1 reflects the goal of making minimal changes. This refers to both average ward population size (61,000) and retaining current ward boundaries where possible.

- Option 2 focuses on keeping the current number of wards and Councillors at 44. Given the anticipated growth, the average ward population increases to 70,000.
- Options 3 and 4 are based on setting average ward population sizes and creating options that reflect these ward populations. Option 3 (Small Wards) targets an average ward population of 50,000. Option 4 (Large Wards) uses an average ward population of 75,000.
- Option 5 starts with major natural and physical boundaries, such as rivers and expressways, and designs a ward structure based on these boundaries. Unlike the other options, this option is not based on the existing ward structure.

Within these general parameters, the TWBR has used small area population data projections, natural and physical boundaries, community of interest information, and ward history to design the five options and determine exact, possible boundaries.

The TWBR has applied these small area population projections to determine the ward population size for each of the wards in the five options.

The population projections were provided to the TWBR by the City Planning Division. Those projections were based on 2011 Census data and projected out to 2041 for each Census year. From this data, the TWBR has developed its own projections for the municipal election years of 2018, 2022, 2026 and 2030. The TWBR has used the projection scenario that coincides with the growth targets for the City of Toronto in the provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

In designing the five options, population ranges around the average ward population size have been developed. The ideal range is plus or minus 10% of the desired average ward population size.³

TABLE 1 provides overview information on each option.

³ A complete discussion of the methodology for determining the five options can be found in the *Options Report*.

TABLE 1 | SUMMARY OF OPTIONS

OPTION	NAME	AVG. WARD POPULATION	WARD POPULATION RANGE	NO. OF WARDS
1	Minimal Change	61,000	51,850 - 70,150	47
2	44 Wards	70,000	63,000 -- 77,000	44
3	Small Wards	50,000	45,000 – 55,000	58
4	Large Wards	75,000	67,500 – 82,500	38
5	Natural/Physical Boundaries	70,000	63,000 – 77,000	41

APPENDIX B to this report contains a map for each of the five options showing specific boundaries for each of the possible wards.

The Options Report has provided a number of options. Each has its strengths and weaknesses. For example, the ‘Small Ward’ option is stronger with respect to “capacity to represent” than the ‘Large Ward’ option; the ‘Large Ward’ option has tighter voter parity numbers than the ‘Minimal Change’ option; and, the ‘Minimal Change’ option represents existing ward history better than the other options.

In the final analysis effective representation is about the balance amongst its various components. All five options have a different balance. However, they all achieve effective representation.

Federal and Provincial Ridings

During the consultation process the idea of using the federal/provincial riding boundaries as ward boundaries was suggested, although opinion on this issue was divided. There were two variations on this theme.

The first was to use the new 25 federal ridings as Toronto’s wards. This would result in 25 wards and 25 Councillors with an average ward size of 123,000 people. Only a very small number of Councillors and the public supported this scenario.

The second variation was to use the new federal riding boundaries but split them in half. This approach would lead to 50 wards with an average ward population of approximately 60,500 people. This population average is close to Toronto’s current average ward population size. It is worth noting that the federal riding boundaries mostly do not align with the current ward boundaries.

The TWBR team assessed these two suggestions to see if either could lead to a viable option.

Neither variation of the federal riding approach meets the tests of effective representation going forward. Specifically, the ward population size spread is too large from a voter parity perspective. For 2026, the range is 96,614 – 135,298 in the 25 ward version and 48,307 – 67,649 in the 50 ward version. There seems to be little appetite for wards as large as the 25 ward version and adjusting boundaries to make the 50 ward version respect voter parity will end up resembling Option 1 but with three additional wards.

In addition, federal riding boundaries are reviewed and adjusted every 10 years, which does not deliver a long term solution.

3.6 ROUND TWO CIVIC ENGAGEMENT & PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Round Two of the TWBR’s civic engagement and public consultation process was the ‘feedback’ phase of the project. It sought comments on the five options outlined in the Options Report released on the project website on August 11, 2015 from the same groups as those consulted during Round One. Current Members of Council (2014-2018), stakeholders and the general public were asked to rank the options, suggest possible refinements and provide whatever other comments they thought appropriate via individual interviews, by e-mail, during a webinar and by completing an online survey.

During the public meetings the five options were outlined, suggestions for refinements to the options were collected and meeting participants were encouraged to complete the survey individually in hard copy or online.

In order to promote public discussion and feedback, direct e-mails with a link to the Options Report were sent to the project’s distribution list of over 2,800 contacts, which includes community organizations, NGOs, specific ethno-cultural organizations and individuals who subscribe to the TWBR mailing list. Separate e-mails were also sent to all Members of Council, the various Boards of Education and other stakeholder groups. In addition, the TWBR as well as the City of Toronto issued news releases drawing attention to the report’s availability online.

In all 884 individuals participated in Round Two as follows:

- Public Meetings – 112
- Online Survey – 717
- General submissions – 15 (5 included a completed survey)
- Lunch-time webinar - 3
- Members of Council – 42
- Mayor’s office staff – 3
- Visits to TWBR website during feedback period – approximately 10,000

There were no individual meetings with stakeholder groups. Instead, members of these groups were encouraged to complete surveys online and/or attend one of the 12 public meetings. The TWBR was active on social media through Twitter and Facebook to spread the news of the release of the Options Report and to reach out to community members to promote local public meetings. The project was supported in this endeavour by the City of Toronto's social media accounts, but more particularly by the engagement of many Councillors who shared e-news and tweets/posts about the public meetings with their constituents.

The Round Two Report on Civic Engagement + Public Consultation: Feedback on the Options for New Ward Boundaries for the City of Toronto contains the rankings of the five options from all participants as well as overall comments received on each option. Ward-specific suggestions for refinements from all Round Two participants are consolidated by option and ward in Appendix C of the Round Two Report and additional comments on specific communities of interest and suggestions for refining existing wards can be found in Appendix D of that report.

In addition to providing feedback on specific options, Round Two participants also provided other comments about the proposed ward boundaries and the ward boundary review


process. These comments have been captured thematically in the Round Two Report.

A detailed analysis of the rankings of the five options from Round Two of the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process as well as an analysis of the proposed refinements can be found in the next section of this report and in APPENDIX C.

SECTION FOUR

PREFERRED OPTION & REFINEMENTS

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW / NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO / FINAL REPORT



Round Two of the TWBR’s civic engagement and public consultation process helped establish preferences and acceptability of the five options presented in the Options Report. It also gathered a multitude of suggestions for refining the various options, some of them contradictory. This section of the report provides a summary of the feedback received, discusses the preferred option and describes the TWBR’s approach to the proposed refinements.

indicated that they do not like some option at all, a “no-way” comment. In those cases, the option was ranked as a “No”. Members of the public did not use the “No” approach.

In addition to the ‘first choice’ analysis, the TWBR team also applied a ‘ranked score’, which is able to weigh selections beyond the first choice. A ‘ranked score’ assigns a numerical value to each choice, and the sum of those values determines the overall result.

This section of the report provides a summary of the feedback received, discusses the preferred option and describes the TWBR’s approach to the proposed refinements.

The following is the way the choices were scored to determine a ‘ranked score’ for each option:

FIRST CHOICE	5 PTS
SECOND CHOICE	4 PTS
THIRD CHOICE	3 PTS
FOURTH CHOICE	2 PTS
FIFTH CHOICE	1 PT
NOT RANKED	0 PTS
‘NO’	0 PTS

4.1 RANKING THE OPTIONS

The interviews and the Round Two public survey allowed current Members of Council and the public to rank the five options by selecting their first, second, third, fourth and fifth choices. The data and analysis from the Round Two report are provided in this section.

Not all survey participants ranked all the options. For example, some only provided their first two or three choices or, perhaps, no choices at all. In these cases the ‘blank’ options were listed as “not ranked”. Some Councillors

TABLE 2 | PUBLIC SURVEY RESPONSES BY WARD

WARD	# OF RESPONSES	WARD	# OF RESPONSES
1	0	23	33
2	3	24	10
3	5	25	47
4	9	26	17
5	11	27	70
6	9	28	39
7	2	29	21
8	1	30	29
9	1	31	21
10	6	32	83
11	13	33	10
12	1	34	4
13	11	35	8
14	22	36	19
15	9	37	3
16	6	38	1
17	21	39	4
18	15	40	7
19	23	41	3
20	44	42	4
21	23	43	9
22	19	44	13
Ward not identified in response:	8	Total Surveys:	717

The total rankings, both from the public and Members of Council, are presented separately to maintain their statistical significance and have been analyzed in four different ways.

First, the number of times an option received a “first place” vote is shown. This indicates which option has the most support. Second, a ranked score is presented. This reveals the total score received by each option. The ranked score approach and “first-place” analysis do not always yield the same results.

Since determining a preferred ward option is a matter of building consensus, options that are viewed as strongly negative can sway the ultimate outcome. Therefore, information is presented on the fifth placed option, the least preferred, and, in the case of the Councillor interviews, options that were rated as “No”.

Fourth, a comparison Chart contrasts the number of first and last, or “No”, choices. This information indicates how contentious an option may be along with its level of support.

Public Survey Results

In total, 717 people participated in the public survey. The number of surveys received by ward is presented in TABLE 2.

TABLE 3 | RANKING BY OPTION PLACEMENT – PUBLIC SURVEY

	OPTION 1 MINIMAL CHANGE	OPTION 2 44 WARDS	OPTION 3 SMALL WARDS	OPTION 4 LARGE WARDS	OPTION 5 NATURAL/PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES
First ranked	126	81	186	162	139
Second ranked	166	167	73	94	157
Third ranked	169	221	80	72	111
Fourth ranked	121	146	97	117	169
Fifth ranked	71	35	224	229	105
Not ranked	64	67	57	43	36
TOTAL	717	717	717	717	717

TABLE 3 represents the results of the public survey, the base data, and indicates how each option was ranked in the public survey. It is from this table that the relevant data for the public's preferred option has been derived.

TABLE 4 | FIRST PLACE CHOICE – PUBLIC SURVEY

	OPTION 1 MINIMAL CHANGE	OPTION 2 44 WARDS	OPTION 3 SMALL WARDS	OPTION 4 LARGE WARDS	OPTION 5 NATURAL/PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES
Times first ranked	126	81	186	162	139

Option 3 (Small Wards – 50,000) received the most first place votes with 186, followed by Option 4 (162), Option 5 (139), Option 1 (126) and finally Option 2 (81).

TABLE 5 | TOTAL RANKED SCORE – PUBLIC SURVEY

	OPTION 1 MINIMAL CHANGE	OPTION 2 44 WARDS	OPTION 3 SMALL WARDS	OPTION 4 LARGE WARDS	OPTION 5 NATURAL/PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES
Total Score	2114	2063	1880	1865	2027

The second way the data has been analyzed is by looking at how an option fared across all ranks – first to fifth. This gives credit to second to fifth place choices, as well as first. This produces a 'ranked score', which is shown in TABLE 5.

CHART 1 | TOTAL RANKED SCORE – PUBLIC SURVEY




CHART 1 shows TABLE 5 in graphic form, for ease of comparison.

Based on a 'ranked score' approach, Option 1 is preferred while Option 3, which received the most first place choices, falls to fourth place. Option 2 which received the fewest first place votes rises to second place when a ranked score is used. When consideration is given to how an option does overall a different picture emerges from solely a first place choice consideration.

Implementation of a new ward structure is not just about which option places first but just as much about which option a consensus can be built around. That is why it is important to know which option placed last and can be considered a "no way" option. Also, a comparison between first and last can assist in revealing options around which a consensus may be difficult to achieve.

TABLE 6 | FIFTH PLACE CHOICE – PUBLIC SURVEY


	OPTION 1 MINIMAL CHANGE	OPTION 2 44 WARDS	OPTION 3 SMALL WARDS	OPTION 4 LARGE WARDS	OPTION 5 NATURAL/ PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES
Times ranked fifth	71	35	224	229	105

TABLE 6 provides information on how the options distributed themselves in fifth or last place in the public survey.

Here Option 2 is ranked fifth the fewest times (35). It is “the least-worst” option; followed by Option 1 (71), Option 5 (105), Option 3 (224) and Option 4 (229).

This perspective indicates significant opposition to Options 3 and 4, an important consideration for acceptance and implementation.

CHART 2 | COMPARISON FIRST & FIFTH CHOICE – PUBLIC SURVEY



Finally, Chart 2, Comparison – First and Fifth Choice, graphically illustrates first and fifth choice options from the public survey. This chart, to some extent, reveals how strongly respondents feel about the options in both a positive and negative sense. Both Options 3 and 4 rank high on both first and fifth choices. Respondents seem to love them or hate them.

Options 1 and 2, on the other hand, have fewer first place votes but even fewer fifth place votes. Option 5 is somewhere in the middle, but with fewer fifth place votes than first place ones.

Depending on one's perspective, different, often conflicting, observations can be drawn from the public survey responses. From a "first place" perspective Option 3 (Small Wards – 50,000) is the favoured option. However, when second to fifth choices are considered in a ranked score approach, then Option 1 (Minimal Change) is the respondents' favoured option. Option 2 (44 Wards) is the least disliked, as measured by fifth place choices, while Option 4 is the most disliked.

Members of Council - Results

The results from interviews with Members of Council are analyzed in the same fashion as the results from the public survey. In all, 42 Members of Council participated. The questions posed to Councillors were similar to those in the public survey and the approach to the ranking of the options was identical.

Most Councillors tied their rankings to refinements to the ward boundaries of various options. That is, a first place choice would have to include certain refinements to be acceptable. The impact of these suggestions is described later in this report.



TABLE 7 | RANKING BY OPTION – MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

	OPTION 1 MINIMAL CHANGE	OPTION 2 44 WARDS	OPTION 3 SMALL WARDS	OPTION 4 LARGE WARDS	OPTION 5 NATURAL/ PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES
First ranked	13	9	10	3	3
Second ranked	12	7	3	4	3
Third ranked	4	4	3	0	5
Fourth ranked	1	1	1	1	0
Fifth ranked	0	0	1	0	0
Ranked 'No'	4	2	8	9	10
Not ranked	8	19	16	25	21
TOTAL	42	42	42	42	42

TABLE 7 provides the base data for analyzing how Members of Council ranked the five options.

The presentation of the data follows the same approach as that used in the analysis of the public survey. The option with the most first place choices is presented in TABLE 8, First Place Choice.

TABLE 8 | FIRST PLACE CHOICE – MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

	OPTION 1 MINIMAL CHANGE	OPTION 2 44 WARDS	OPTION 3 SMALL WARDS	OPTION 4 LARGE WARDS	OPTION 5 NATURAL/ PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES
Times ranked first	13	9	10	3	3


Option 1 is the favoured choice amongst Members of Council, followed by Options 3 and 2. Options 4 and 5 have minimal support for first place.

TABLE 9 | TOTAL RANKED SCORE – MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

	OPTION 1 MINIMAL CHANGE	OPTION 2 44 WARDS	OPTION 3 SMALL WARDS	OPTION 4 LARGE WARDS	OPTION 5 NATURAL/ PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES
Total score	127	82	77	25	42

TABLE 9 presents the ranked score for each option and CHART 3 shows this information graphically.

CHART 3 | TOTAL RANKED SCORE – MEMBERS OF COUNCIL



When the ranked score is examined there are a few changes in preference. Option 1 is still the favoured option amongst Members of Council. However, Options 2 and 3 have switched positions and Option 2 is now in second place. Options 4 and 5 remain at the rear of the group.

The next issue is how many times an option has been ranked in last place. This is shown in TABLE 10.

TABLE 10 | FIFTH PLACE CHOICE – MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

	OPTION 1 MINIMAL CHANGE	OPTION 2 44 WARDS	OPTION 3 SMALL WARDS	OPTION 4 LARGE WARDS	OPTION 5 NATURAL/ PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES
Times ranked fifth	0	0	1	0	0
Ranked 'No'	4	2	8	9	10
Not ranked	8	19	16	25	21

A fifth place ranking was rare. However, if the “No” rankings are included, then a picture of those options least favoured or discounted all together appears. Options 3, 4 and 5 are the least favoured by an almost similar number of Councillors.


Option 2 has only 2 “No’s” and Option 1 only 4. The “not ranked” responses are difficult to interpret. Options 2, 3, 4 and 5 have a high number of incidents of not being ranked. Only Option 1, not ranked 8 times, is low in this regard. A comparison of first and fifth choices of Councillors is presented in TABLE 11 and shown graphically in CHART 4.

TABLE 11 | FIRST & LAST CHOICE – MEMBERS OF COUNCIL

	OPTION 1 MINIMAL CHANGE	OPTION 2 44 WARDS	OPTION 3 SMALL WARDS	OPTION 4 LARGE WARDS	OPTION 5 NATURAL/ PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES
Times ranked first	13	9	10	3	3
Times ranked fifth or 'No'	4	2	9	9	10

The comparison of first and fifth choice that was employed in the public survey analysis cannot be directly replicated for the Councillor interviews. The reason is that very few Councillors ranked all options from first to fifth. Rather, they either left various options unranked or indicated a “No” to the option. If one takes the fifth ranked option and the “No’s” as indicating a “last place” standing, then a rudimentary comparison between first and last choice can be constructed.

CHART 4 | FIRST & LAST CHOICE – MEMBERS OF COUNCIL



What can be observed from the first and last choice data is that Options 1 and 2 are viewed more positively than negatively. Option 3 draws very mixed reactions, almost an equal amount of Councillors rank it first and last. Options 4 and 5 are viewed very negatively.

4.2 PREFERRED OPTION

To determine the preferred option the two data sets derived from the public survey and Members of Council interviews have to be examined and compared.

Initially, these data sets are dealt with separately to reflect the statistical nature of how they were generated. The information from the public was generated randomly based on who chose to respond to the public survey. The information from Members of Council is based on responses from 42 of the 45 Members of Council.

The basic data was presented in the section above. This section analyzes and compares that information to determine which of the five options is preferred. The analysis considers two dimensions of the data, positive and negative preferences. The reasons for taking into account the positive references are obvious. It is important to know which of the five Options people prefer. The need to pay attention to negative preferences is not as apparent. However, negative preferences are critical for determining where consensus may be difficult.

This analysis considers four dimensions of each data set and then compares them. The four dimensions are:

- First place choices
- Ranked scores
- Last place choices
- Comparison of first and last place choices

First Place Choices

An obvious starting point, as it indicates the option that was preferred by most respondents.

Public survey results place the options as follows:

- | | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 1. | Option 3 - Small Wards | 186 |
| 2. | Option 4 - Large Wards | 162 |
| 3. | Option 5 - Natural/Physical Boundaries | 139 |
| 4. | Option 1 - Minimal Change | 126 |
| 5. | Option 2 - 44 Wards | 81 |

Members of Council provide a much different ranking when expressing their first place choice. They place the options as follows:

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1. | Option 1 - Minimal Change | 13 |
| 2. | Option 3 - Small Wards | 10 |
| 3. | Option 2 - 44 Wards | 9 |
| 4. | Option 5 - Natural/Physical Boundaries | 3 |
| 5. | Option 4 - Large Wards | 3 |

There is a considerable difference between how the public judge the options and how Members of Council view the options. Generally, the public is more open to large changes in the ward structure and places the three options that reflect the most change at the top of their list.

On the other hand, Members of Council gravitate towards maintaining the existing situation through either minimal change or retaining 44 wards. The area of most convergence is around Option 3 (Small Wards), which tops the public list and comes second with Members of Council.

Ranked Scores

The public and Members of Council were asked to rank the options in order of first to fifth choice. By assigning a numerical value to each of these choices, a ‘ranked score’ was produced that allows choices other than the first to be considered and evaluated. The public surveys result in the following total ranked scores for the options:

1.	Option 1 - Minimal Change	2114
2.	Option 2 - 44 Wards	2063
3.	Option 5 - Natural/Physical Boundaries	2027
4.	Option 3 - Small Wards	1880
5.	Option 4 - Large Wards	1865

Interviews with Members of Council result in the following total ranked scores for the options:

1.	Option 1 - Minimal Change	127
2.	Option 2 - 44 Wards	82
3.	Option 3 - Small Wards	77
4.	Option 5 - Natural/Physical Boundaries	42
5.	Option 4 (Large Wards)	25

Based on the ranked score there is considerable concurrence between the public and Members of Council. Both rank Option 1 and Option 2 as the top two options. Both rank Option 4 in last place. There is a slight difference in how Options 3 and 5 are ranked, trading 3rd and 4th place between the two data sets.

Last Place Choices

The public ranking for last place is:

1.	Option 4 - Large Wards	229
2.	Option 3 - Small Wards	224
3.	Option 5 - Natural/Physical Boundaries	105
4.	Option 1 - Minimal Change)	71
5.	Option 2 - 44 Wards	35

The last place ranking for Members of Council is:


- | | |
|---|----|
| 1. Option 4 - Large Wards | 34 |
| 2. Option 5 - Natural/Physical Boundaries | 31 |
| 3. Option 3 - Small Wards | 24 |
| 4. Option 2 - 44 Wards | 21 |
| 5. Option 1- Minimal Change | 12 |

This data set indicates which options are the least preferred. As with the ranked scores, there is considerable convergence between the views of the public and Members of Council. Options 3, 4, and 5 are the least favoured options by both groups. Options 1 and 2 have the fewest last place choices in both groups.

Comparison of First and Last Place Choices


This comparative data set is best shown as a chart, both for the public survey results and for the results from interviews with Members of Council

CHART 5 | COMPARISON FIRST & LAST PLACE CHOICES – PUBLIC SURVEY



A key observation from comparing these two Charts revolves around Option 3 (Small Wards). In both the responses from the public survey and Members of Council interviews, there is a high degree of first and last choices for this option. In some respects, Option 3 is the “love it or hate it” option. It would be the option that would be the most difficult to form a consensus around, because of the strong positive and negative reactions to it.

CHART 6 | COMPARISON FIRST & LAST PLACE CHOICES – MEMBERS OF COUNCIL



Conclusions – Preferred Option

The results of the public survey and Members of Council interviews give clear preference to Option 1 in three of the four ways the data has been examined. The only divergence from this perspective is in the first place choices, with the public preferring Option 3 (Small Wards) and Members of Council preferring Option 1 (Minimal Change).

However, when ranked scores are applied, Option 1 is the favoured option by both groups. Also, as the comparison of first and last place choices indicates, Option 3 would be the most difficult option to form a consensus around.

Based on an assessment of all these factors, Option 1 (Minimal Change) is the preferred option and the option that provides the starting point for the recommended new ward structure for the City of Toronto.

Based on an assessment of all these factors, Option 1 (Minimal Change) is the preferred option and the option that provides the starting point for the recommended new ward structure for the City of Toronto.

4.3 REFINEMENTS

The Minimal Change option, Option 1, is the preferred option and forms the basis for the new ward structure for Toronto recommended in this report. However, it is only the basis and not the final recommended ward structure. During the Round Two civic engagement and public consultation process both the public and Members of Council were asked for “refinements” to the options. The purpose of these refinements was to improve the options with regard to communities of interest, ward history and more ‘coherent’ ward boundaries.

The refinements suggested by Members of Council and the general public through the online survey, submissions and at public meetings have been integrated by option, ward and community of interest (see Appendices C & D of the Round Two report).

Some of the refinements have been put forward more than once, which indicates a particular interest in an issue, and, as can be expected, some contradict each other.

Since Option 1 was the preferred option, all the refinements suggested for that option have been explored. Refinements suggested for other options have also been examined, if they are relevant to Option 1.

In addition, numerous suggested refinements relate to the boundaries of existing wards and communities of interest. Again, those refinements relevant to Option 1 have been analyzed. It has not been possible to accommodate 'refinements', which have recommended no change to the existing ward boundaries in areas where the 2026 ward populations will be well below the average ward population of 61,000. As well, it has not been possible to keep most Business Improvement Areas in one ward, since BIAs almost always include both sides of arterial roads, which are recognizable ward boundaries.

By definition, the suggested refinements alter the Minimal Change option. Incorporating certain suggested refinements changes more of the current ward boundaries than occurs in Option 1, as boundary changes in one area cascade into adjacent wards.


To determine whether suggested refinements are feasible, Option 1 wards were grouped based on natural/physical boundaries, e.g. west of the Humber River, north and south of the 401, downtown and east of Victoria Park. In particular, the boundaries of the downtown wards have been adjusted to coincide with the Official Plan boundaries for the Downtown. Both members of the general public and Members of Council strongly suggested that "downtown wards should be inside the Downtown".

Within these groupings suggested refinements to Option 1 wards have been assessed to determine whether they maintain effective representation, that is improve or upset voter parity, achieve more coherent ward boundaries and/or keep communities of interest together. There are over 125 'relevant' refinements. These refinements as well as the 'action' by the TWBR team are included as APPENDIX C to this report.

SECTION FIVE

RECOMMENDATION FOR NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW / NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO / FINAL REPORT



5.1 A NEW WARD STRUCTURE

The recommended new ward structure is centered on three components. The first bases the new wards on Option 1, the preferred ward option from the Round Two Civic Engagement and Public Consultation process. The second incorporates the suggested refinements to Option 1 that are feasible and relevant to that option. And finally, the recommended ward structure meets the tests of effective representation.

The following map shows the recommended new ward structure for Toronto. The wards in the recommended new ward structure are labeled RW for "Recommended Ward". The ward numbering system follows the current numbering system that starts in the northwest corner of the city.

Although the base for the recommended ward structure is Option 1, the relevant refinements are quite numerous with the result that the boundaries of 6 of the recommended wards are the same as those of the current wards. (In Option 1, 18 wards have the same boundaries as the current wards). The recommended new ward structure results in 47 wards, the same as in Option 1.

Option 1 meets the criteria for effective representation. Therefore, the changes brought about by the suggested refinements have been analyzed in terms of how they affect effective representation. The recommended ward structure maintains the following principles underlying Option 1:

- Average ward population - 61,000
- Ward population range – 51,850 – 70,150 (plus or minus 15% of the average)
- 47 wards
- Target year - 2026

Most of the suggested refinements focus on two issues, keeping communities of interests or neighbourhoods together in the same ward and/or suggesting more appropriate ward boundaries.

The following Table demonstrates how the recommended ward structure achieves voter parity, an essential component of effective representation. The Table “Recommended Wards – Projected Population and Variance, 2018 - 2030” presents this information for the four election years from 2018 to 2030. The variance figures are based on the target ward population size of 61,000. The year 2026 is highlighted, as that is the year that is used to determine voter parity. The Table covers the period 2018, the year of implementation, to 2030, the end of the time frame of the TWBR. After 2030 it may be time for another review of Toronto’s ward boundaries.

RECOMMENDED WARDS - PROJECTED POPULATION AND VARIANCE 2018 – 2030

RECOMMENDED WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
RW 1	60,154	-1.39%	59,918	-1.77%	60,122	-1.44%	60,412	-0.96%
RW 2	59,298	-2.79%	59,205	-2.94%	59,935	-1.75%	60,886	-0.19%
RW 3	62,791	2.94%	63,747	4.50%	65,044	6.63%	66,551	9.10%
RW 4	63,419	3.97%	64,810	6.25%	65,507	7.39%	66,299	8.69%
RW 5	58,254	-4.50%	62,838	3.01%	70,010	14.77%	77,220	26.59%
RW 6	65,500	7.38%	67,540	10.72%	69,434	13.83%	71,557	17.31%
RW 7	55,133	-9.62%	55,670	-8.74%	57,043	-6.49%	58,825	-3.57%
RW 8	48,062	-21.21%	49,114	-19.49%	54,748	-10.25%	57,884	-5.11%
RW 9	54,677	-10.37%	55,182	-9.54%	56,380	-7.57%	58,076	-4.79%
RW 10	64,410	5.59%	64,986	6.53%	66,096	8.35%	67,360	10.43%
RW 11	61,420	0.69%	61,923	1.51%	64,304	5.42%	66,844	9.58%
RW 12	52,645	-13.70%	53,073	-13.00%	54,213	-11.13%	55,653	-8.77%
RW 13	58,726	-3.73%	59,584	-2.32%	62,255	2.06%	65,165	6.83%
RW 14	58,823	-3.57%	59,524	-2.42%	60,077	-1.51%	60,667	-0.55%
RW 15	69,412	13.79%	69,971	14.71%	70,313	15.27%	70,641	15.81%
RW 16	65,645	7.61%	65,779	7.84%	66,141	8.43%	66,530	9.07%
RW 17	64,645	5.98%	66,165	8.47%	66,846	9.58%	67,522	10.69%
RW 18	65,946	8.11%	66,428	8.90%	67,253	10.25%	68,135	11.70%
RW 19	64,392	5.56%	65,401	7.22%	66,683	9.32%	67,892	11.30%
RW 20	38,154	-37.45%	45,542	-25.34%	51,350	-15.82%	53,131	-12.90%
RW 21	47,180	-22.66%	58,859	-3.51%	63,625	4.30%	68,940	13.02%
RW 22	47,425	-22.25%	54,356	-10.89%	60,987	-0.02%	65,905	8.04%
RW 23	55,416	-9.15%	60,270	-1.20%	61,181	0.30%	64,922	6.43%
RW 24	47,020	-22.92%	50,248	-17.63%	55,692	-8.70%	60,357	-1.05%
RW 25	47,686	-21.83%	54,404	-10.81%	60,450	-0.90%	63,582	4.23%
RW 26	53,241	-12.72%	57,018	-6.53%	58,560	-4.00%	59,983	-1.67%

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO – FINAL REPORT MAY 2016

RECOMMENDED WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
RW 27	64,743	6.14%	66,332	8.74%	66,822	9.54%	67,279	10.29%
RW 28	57,443	-5.83%	58,037	-4.86%	59,815	-1.94%	61,549	0.90%
RW 29	59,020	-3.25%	60,233	-1.26%	62,378	2.26%	65,069	6.67%
RW 30	53,371	-12.51%	54,726	-10.28%	55,527	-8.97%	56,387	-7.56%
RW 31	60,082	-1.51%	61,318	0.52%	62,177	1.93%	63,103	3.45%
RW 32	68,522	12.33%	69,136	13.34%	69,527	13.98%	69,966	14.70%
RW 33	55,167	-9.56%	56,019	-8.17%	56,841	-6.82%	57,638	-5.51%
RW 34	55,616	-8.83%	55,463	-9.08%	55,576	-8.89%	55,706	-8.68%
RW 35	66,789	9.49%	67,026	9.88%	67,720	11.02%	68,605	12.47%
RW 36	57,817	-5.22%	58,490	-4.11%	58,637	-3.87%	58,764	-3.67%
RW 37	53,553	-12.21%	53,974	-11.52%	54,372	-10.87%	54,748	-10.25%
RW 38	63,014	3.30%	64,242	5.32%	67,016	9.86%	70,194	15.07%
RW 39	61,940	1.54%	62,821	2.98%	64,495	5.73%	66,757	9.44%
RW 40	65,979	8.16%	66,413	8.87%	68,542	12.36%	71,172	16.68%
RW 41	67,393	10.48%	68,402	12.14%	70,307	15.26%	73,894	21.14%
RW 42	63,507	4.11%	65,643	7.61%	66,889	9.65%	68,503	12.30%
RW 43	68,045	11.55%	67,681	10.95%	67,619	10.85%	67,350	10.41%
RW 44	66,035	8.25%	66,253	8.61%	66,060	8.30%	66,237	8.59%
RW 45	64,969	6.51%	64,979	6.52%	64,864	6.33%	64,714	6.09%
RW 46	58,644	-3.86%	59,616	-2.27%	60,815	-0.30%	62,215	1.99%
RW 47	50,847	-16.64%	51,327	-15.86%	51,952	-14.83%	52,646	-13.69%

5.2 EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION

Voter Parity

The range established for voter parity in Option 1 was 15% above or below the target average ward population of 61,000. As noted, this allows for ward population sizes to range from 51,850 to 70,150, which becomes the acceptable ‘voter parity’ range.

Forty-four of the 47 wards in the recommended new ward structure fall within this range. Two wards have a variance above 15% and one ward has a variance of below 15%. Looking at ‘voter parity’ in more detail the following pattern emerges.

VARIANCES	NUMBER OF WARDS	RECOMMENDED WARDS INCLUDED
+/- 15% of average	44	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46 and 47
Below 15% of average	1	20
Over 15% of average	2	15 & 41

Recommended Ward 20 is 15.82% below the targeted ward population of 61,000. This is one of the fastest growing recommended wards. In total, 6 wards grow by more than 10,000 during the period 2018 to 2030. These are wards: RW5 (18,968), RW20 (14,977), RW21 (21,760), RW22 (18,480), RW24 (13,336) and RW25 (15,896) RW20 has the fastest growth rate and by 2030 is within the 15% variance range. Except for RW5 all these high growth wards are in the Downtown where the Official Plan’s policies allocate much of Toronto’s growth.

The range established for ‘voter parity’ in Option 1 was 15% above or below the target average ward population of 61,000.

Recommended Wards 15 and 41 are slightly above the 15% threshold at 15.27% and 15.26% respectively. RW15 is a relatively stable ward and is expected to grow by slightly over 1,000 people between 2018 and 2030. RW41 is just over 15% in 2026 (15.26%), but is a growing ward and will be over 21% above average in 2030. It is one of the wards, along with Recommended Wards 5, 6 and 40 that may lead to a ward boundary review following the 2030 election.

Attempts were made to reduce RW41’s population, but RW40’s population is also high and RW41’s boundaries on its other three sides are quite distinctive. Reducing RW41’s population would have required moving ward boundaries onto residential side streets.

Ward History

Option 1’s goal is Minimal Change, which respects, to some extent, ward history. There are two components to Minimal Change. The first is retaining the current average ward population size of 61,000. The other is minimizing the change in ward boundaries.

The recommended ward boundaries maintain the 61,000 average ward population as the base for calculating voter parity. Option 1 retains the existing boundaries of 18 wards. The recommended ward structure retains only 6. These are:

- Existing Ward 1 = RW 1
- Existing Ward 2 = RW 2
- Existing Ward 6 = RW 6
- Existing Ward 10 = RW 10
- Existing Ward 11 = RW 11
- Existing Ward 35 = RW 39

The change of so many of the current ward boundaries from Option 1 is due to refinements suggested by the public and

Members of Council during the Round Two consultation process. Many of the suggested refinements aim to improve existing ward boundaries, often to include various communities of interest.

Population Growth

Toronto is growing at a rapid rate. The TWBR anticipates an additional 500,000 people over the project’s time frame of 2011 - 2030.

This projected growth has been incorporated into the recommended ward configuration. As noted previously, the year 2026 has been used as the target year. This allows City Council to consider a recommended ward structure that will last for 4 elections, up to 2030. The projected growth of the recommended wards is shown in the Table Recommended Wards - Projected Population and Variance 2018 – 2030, above.

Geographic Communities of Interest

A great effort has been made to keep geographic communities of interest together. It has not always been possible. Some communities of interest are too large to fit into a single ward and in some cases keeping communities of interest in one area splits communities in other areas or disrupts voter parity significantly.

One example that has been tested repeatedly is the Regent Park community. The recommended ward structure uses Dundas Street as a boundary between RW21 and RW23. This separates Regent Park North and Regent Park South. A boundary configuration that keeps them together has a significant impact on voter parity. Keeping all of Regent Park in RW23 produces a variance in that ward of +20.41% and a variance in RW21 of -15.81%. Boundary adjustments in other parts of RW23 have been considered but result in dividing other communities. This part of Toronto is very dense and boundary changes of even a few blocks can have a significant impact on voter parity.

Natural/Physical Boundaries

The recommended ward structure attempts to use recognizable major natural and physical boundaries. Often this supports ward history. Some of the major boundaries used in the recommended ward structure are:

- The “Downtown” as defined by the Official Plan
- Highway 401, a major physical boundary
- The Humber River, a major natural boundary and the current ward boundary for the “Etobicoke” wards
- Eglinton Avenue across much of mid-town
- Victoria Park Avenue, a major artery and the current ward boundary for the “Scarborough” wards


5.3 WHERE ARE THE CHANGES

As outlined above, the recommended ward structure for Toronto increases the total number of wards to 47 from 44. This increase re-balances the existing ward population discrepancies by enlarging the populations of small wards and decreasing the populations of large wards. It also accommodates the projected population growth to 2030. This is accomplished by adding three wards, while maintaining the current average ward population size of approximately 61,000.

Where are the new wards? This seems like a straightforward question but the answer is more complex. Of the 44 existing wards, 38 experience some changes in their boundaries. Only 6 existing wards retain their exact current boundaries. These are the current wards 1, 2, 6, 10, 11 and 35. Therefore, the recommended ward structure for Toronto creates, in fact, 38 “new” wards.

To demonstrate where the additional wards are located, it is helpful to examine seven major geographic areas of the city and compare the number of current wards with the number of recommended wards. The map on the following page illustrates this comparison. Comments describe the changes in more detail.

WHERE ARE THE CHANGES



DESCRIPTION	CURRENT WARDS	RECOMMENDED WARDS	COMMENTS
Area 1: West of the Humber River	1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6	RW1, RW2, RW3, RW4, RW5 & RW6	This area has the same number of wards at 6. Current Wards 1, 2, & 6 do not change. Wards 3, 4 & 5 are changed to accommodate current and projected growth in Ward 5.
Area 2: East of Victoria Park Ave.	35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 & 44	RW38, RW39, RW40, RW41, RW42, RW43, RW44, RW45, RW46 & RW47	This area has the same number of wards at 10. Current Ward 35 remains the same and becomes RW 39. All other wards are adjusted to balance populations, use Hwy. 401 as a natural boundary and reflect suggested refinements.
Area 3: North of Hwy. 401 from the Humber River east to Victoria Park Ave.	7, 8, 9, 10, 23, 24 & 33	RW7, RW8, RW9, RW10, RW28, RW29, RW30 & RW31	This area has one additional ward at 8. Current Ward 10 remains the same. Current Wards 7, 8 & 9 are adjusted to balance populations and reflect suggested refinements. One ward is added between Bathurst St. and the Don Valley Parkway to accommodate both current and projected growth.
Area 4: Downtown, as defined in the Official Plan, generally, Bathurst St. to the Don Valley Parkway, south to Lake Ontario and north to Rosedale Valley Road and the railroad tracks	All of 28, most of 20 & 27.	RW20, RW21, RW22, RW23, RW24 & RW25	The Downtown has three additional wards at 6. The 3 wards are added to accommodate both current and projected growth.

DESCRIPTION	CURRENT WARDS	RECOMMENDED WARDS	COMMENTS
Area 5: South of Hwy. 401, generally to Eglinton Ave. and from Victoria Park Ave. west to the Humber River	11, most of 12, 15, 16, most of 25 & 34	RW11, RW12, RW13, RW14, RW27 & RW32	This area has the same number of wards at 6. Current Ward 11 stays the same. Other wards are adjusted to balance populations, generally use Eglinton Ave. as a boundary and incorporate suggested refinements.
Area 6: East of Downtown to Victoria Park Ave. and generally south of Eglinton Ave.	29, 30, 31, 32, most of 26	RW33, RW34, RW35, RW36 & RW37	This area has the same number of wards at 5. All current ward boundaries experience some change to balance populations and incorporate suggested refinements.
Area 7: West of Downtown to the Humber River and generally south of Eglinton Ave.	13, 14, 18, parts of 17, 19, 21 & 22	RW15, RW16, RW17, RW18, RW19 & RW26	This area has one less ward at 6. All current ward boundaries are adjusted to reflect the use of Eglinton Ave. as a general boundary, balance populations given the three current small wards (Wards 13, 14 & 21) and incorporate suggested refinements.

In summary the "additional" wards can be attributed to three areas of the city.


1. One addition ward north of Hwy. 401 between Bathurst St. and Victoria Park Ave.
2. Three additional wards in the Downtown area.
3. One less ward in the area west of the Downtown and south of Eglinton Ave.

All other areas retain the same number of wards they currently have, although most of their ward boundaries have been adjusted in some way to balance ward populations, reflect a set of coherent boundaries and incorporate suggested refinements. As noted, only 6 of the recommended wards are the same as the current wards. This is a reflection of the "cascading effect" as ward populations are balanced and as many geographic communities of interest as possible are respected.

SECTION SIX

CONCLUSION & NEXT STEPS

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW / NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO / FINAL REPORT



The recommended new wards for the City of Toronto are shown on the map entitled **Recommended Wards** contained within the report and attached in a larger format as APPENDIX E to this report. Creating a new ward structure that achieves effective representation for a city as complex as the City of Toronto, and with Toronto's growth rate, requires an appropriate balance among the components of effective representation and the input received during the TWBR's two rounds of civic engagement and public consultation. Different points-of-view often exert a pull in conflicting directions. The TWBR has accomplished an appropriate balance by recommending a ward structure that achieves effective representation while incorporating many of the suggestions from the public, stakeholders and Members of Council.



To implement the new ward structure in time for the 2018 municipal election, the following timeline is anticipated:

- Discussion of TWBR Final Report by the City of Toronto Executive Committee (May 2016)
- Discussion of the TWBR Final Report by Toronto City Council (Summer/Fall 2016)
- City Council decision on New Wards for Toronto (by the end of 2016)
- Potential OMB Hearing (January – June 2017)
- Implementation of a new ward structure for Toronto (by the end of 2017)

Adherence to this timeline is critical. Based on experience from other ward boundary reviews, and the fact that Toronto's ward system has been appealed in the past, an OMB hearing on a new ward structure is probable. There needs to be sufficient time in 2017 to resolve such a hearing, should it occur.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS


The Toronto Ward Boundary Review (TWBR) began in June 2014 and will end with the presentation of this report to the City of Toronto Executive Committee in May 2016 and City Council thereafter. Funding for this project was provided by the City of Toronto. The TWBR team appreciates the many individuals and organizations who participated in and provided input to this project. This includes: Members of Council, School Board representatives, neighbourhood associations, other stakeholder groups and members of the public. All of your contributions have helped make our final recommendation for new wards for Toronto possible. Thank you.

We would also like to give recognition to the **TWBR Advisory Panel** for contributing their time and collective expertise: Fred Dean, Municipal Lawyer; Beverley Don, Vice President and Director, Toronto Association of Business Improvement Areas (TABIA) and Proprietor, Ardith One Canadian Pottery and Crafts; Don Granger, former member and vice chair of the Ontario Municipal Board (1997-2012), Regional Councillor, Hamilton-Wentworth (1988-1994), Mayor, Flamborough, Ontario (1991-1994); Dr. Patricia O’Campo, Director, Centre for Research on Inner City Health and Professor, Dalla Lana School of Public Health Sciences, University of Toronto; and Dr. Myer Siemiatycki, Professor, Department of Politics and Public Administration, Ryerson University.

The **TWBR Team** is a partnership among: Beate Bowron Etcetera: Beate Bowron FCIP, RPP; Canadian Urban Institute: Ariana Cancelli, Lisa Cavicchia, Shannon Clark, Jonathan Critchley, Jeff Evenson, Glenn Miller, Robyn Visheau; The Davidson Group: Gary Davidson FCIP, RPP; and Thomas Ostler MCIP, RPP.




DRAWTHELINES.CA




APPENDIX 'A'

MAP OF CURRENT WARDS

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW / NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO / FINAL REPORT




Appendix A – Map of Current Wards



APPENDIX 'B'

MAPS OF THE 5 OPTIONS


TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW / NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO / FINAL REPORT



Appendix B – Maps of the 5 Options


OPTION 1: MINIMAL CHANGE TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

drawthelines.ca



OPTION 2: 44 WARDS TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

drawthelines.ca



NUMBER OF WARDS
44


AVG WARD SIZE
70,000

POPULATION RANGE
63,000 - 77,000 (+/-10%)

The objective of the 44 WARDS option is to maintain the same number of wards that exist today (44) and by implication, the same size of City Council. Due to Toronto's growth, the average ward population size needs to increase to 70,000, with a range of 63,000 to 77,000. In this option, 41 of the 44 wards are within the ±20% variance factor and all wards are within the 15% variance factor.

OPTION 3: SMALL WARDS TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW


drawthelines.ca



The goal of the **SMALL WARDS** option is to keep wards within an average ward population size of 45,000 to 55,000, thereby creating a larger number of small wards. During the Round One public consultation phase, there was ample support for small wards to warrant the development of this option. Many people believe that smaller wards improve citizen access and the Councilors' capacity to represent constituents. This option results in 58 wards. Most of the increase comes from reducing the size of large wards. Only 1 ward needs to be increased in size. In 2026, 51 of the 58 wards fall within the 10% variance factor and 4 within the 10% - 15% variance factor in this option. Of the three wards above the 15% variance factor, two are above it by less than one half a percent. One ward is 17% above the average ward population in 2026. However, this ward is a very stable and homogeneous ward.

OPTION 4: LARGE WARDS TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW


drawthelines.ca



Just as some of the people participating in the Round One public consultation process prefer small wards, others prefer a smaller number of large wards, often in order to reduce the size of City Council. However, the appetite for **LARGE WARDS** does not extend to wards as large as federal or provincial ridings. A target average ward population size of 75,000 with a population range of 67,500 to 82,500 is employed in this option. Of the 38 wards created in this option, 35 fall within a 10% variance and all wards fall within a 15% variance factor in 2026.

OPTION 5: NATURAL / PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

drawthelines.ca




Options 1 to 4 are rooted in the existing ward structure as a basis for developing new wards. The existing ward structure to a large extent reflects the pre-amalgamation cities. The **NATURAL/PHYSICAL BOUNDARIES** option starts with the entire city as the template. Then, emphasizing major natural and physical boundaries (rivers, expressways, utility right-of-ways and major roads), an option is created. The target average ward population size for this option is 70,000 with a range of 63,000 to 77,000 based on a 10% variance of the 2026 average population. While this average ward population is the same as that of Option 2, 44 wards, it starts from a different perspective and, therefore, results in a different ward arrangement. This option has 41 wards, 37 of which fall within a 10% variance factor and all fall within a 15% variance factor.

- NUMBER OF WARDS**
41
- AVG WARD SIZE**
70,000
- POPULATION RANGE**
63,000 - 77,000 (+/-10%)

APPENDIX 'C'

WARD-SPECIFIC REFINEMENTS

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW / NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO / FINAL REPORT



Appendix C –Ward-Specific Refinements

Note: ‘W’ followed by a number refers to the relevant Ward in Option 1 – Minimal Change. ‘RW’ followed by a number refers to the relevant Recommended Ward (See APPENDIX E).

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W101	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add Humberwood area to Rexdale (don't use river). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, upsets voter parity in RW2.
W102	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No suggested refinements. 	
W103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kipling should be eastern boundary (not Martin Grove). Add area between Kipling and Martin Grove. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated, partially at south end.
W103/W105	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move area north of Dundas along Bloor to 427 into W105. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated.
W104	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use Mimico Creek as western boundary; add area west of Martin Grove. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, upsets voter parity in RW3.
W104/105	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> W105 should be amalgamated with the south end of W104 due to all the development issues occurring within the Dundas/Royal York area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, should keep Etobicoke Centre development together.
W105	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To keep growth area around Dundas together, move area north of Bloor to Mimico Creek east of Kipling into W105. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated.
W106	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move area south of Bloor north of Dundas between #427 and Kipling to W105. The current Ward 6 should be divided north to south, not east to west as proposed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Not incorporated, upsets voter parity. Resulting wards too small.
W107/W108	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Firgrove industrial area is split at Eddystone; use Finch instead [shift area north of Eddystone Jane/Finch/400] to W107 from W108]. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, upsets voter parity between RW7 and RW8.

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W107/W109	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area just north of the 401 east of Jane is the same as west of Jane; add area to W107. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, upsets voter parity between RW7 and RW8. Not a coherent boundary.
W108/W109	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Divides Dufferin/Finch BIA in half (now Duke Heights BIA). Make Grandravine Drive the southern boundary between W108 and W109 and extend east to Dufferin. Sentinel is not a good boundary, use Keele Street south to Grandravine. Don't use Grandravine, instead go up Jane to Finch and then east to include complete Jane-Finch community. Instead of a horizontal boundary between W108 and W109 along Sheppard/ Grandravine/Waterloo, use the rail line that is between Keele St. and Allen Road. The communities to the east vs. west of this boundary are different. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. BIA all in RW9. Not incorporated. Affects voter parity in RW9. Not incorporated. University Heights community is too big. Not incorporated, upsets voter parity. Not incorporated, makes RW9 too small.
W109	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can RR track be the eastern boundary of W109 instead of Allen? Keep Yorkwoods community together. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, upsets voter parity. Makes RW9 too small. Incorporated. In RW8.

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use De Boer's as boundary in north-east corner of re-arranged W109. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, not a coherent boundary.
W111	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No suggested refinements. Add area east of Jane to Black Creek. The old Junction main street along Dundas West should be kept intact, so keep the tip up to Dupont in Ward 111. Keep the West Toronto Junction whole, it is currently split between Wards 13 and 14. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, upsets voter parity between RW11 and RW12. Incorporated, now in RW17. Incorporated, now in RW17.
W112/W113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use Rogers Road as southern boundary of W112 and W113, Eglinton is a community between Rogers and the Beltline. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated for RW12. Not incorporated for RW13, upsets voter parity between RW13 and RW16.
W113	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add the area north of Eglinton (currently in W115) to W113. New ward alignment for W113 should be 401/Allen Road/Ravine/Rogers Road; area east of the Allen should go to W114. Winona as boundary for W113 splits a community; use Rogers Road and ravine instead. Oakwood should be eastern boundary of W113 instead of Winona; community east of Oakwood is different. (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Not incorporated, upsets voter parity between RW13 and RW14. Not incorporated, upsets voter parity between RW13 and RW15. Incorporated.

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W113/W114/ W115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boundary between W113, W115 and W114 should be the Allen Road; there are two distinct neighbourhoods on either side; Census takers do not cross the Allen (Lawrence Height community does, but better represented by two Councilors). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, upsets voter parity between RW13 and RW14. Allen Road all in RW13.
W113/115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep boundary of W113/115 east at Winona to keep Oakwood Village community and Friends of Roseneath in the same ward. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, Winona is a small residential street, not a coherent boundary.
W113/W115/ W116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change the boundary between W113, W115 and W116 to Eglinton. Keep W113's and W115's traditional boundary - both cross Eglinton. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Not incorporated, Eglinton is a coherent boundary.
W114/W115/ W126	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Beltline is not a very good divider for W114, W115 and W126; instead go to Bathurst and down to Eglinton, s/w corner does not have that many people. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated (Oriole Parkway/Avenue Road).
W115/W116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep the Davenport neighbourhood (north of the Dupont rail corridor) as a single ward – it's a distinct community of interest. Make Eglinton the northern boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Incorporated.
W116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use Rogers Road at north end instead of Lavender. Use western RR track (UPE tracks) as western boundary instead of Parkside; community west of the tracks relates more to High Park; also there is only one connection across those tracks - Wallace Avenue bridge. Run eastern boundary south on Dufferin, if populations numbers work. Junction Triangle community split between W116 and W118. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Incorporated. Not incorporated, upsets voter parity for RW16. Not incorporated, Bloor Street is a more coherent boundary between RW16 and RW18.
W116/W118		

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W117/W118	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Area west of the UPE RR tracks north of Bloor should be in either W117 or W118; does not have anything in common with Junction Triangle; no east –west connections except Wallace footbridge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. In RW17.
W119	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change the north boundary of W119 to Bloor Street West. Liberty Village should fall in one ward. (2) [Dufferin/King/Strachan/RR tracks]. Liberty Village and Exhibition Place should be contained within one ward. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, upsets voter parity in RW19. Incorporated. All in RW19. Incorporated. In RW19.
W119/120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harbourfront east of Bathurst and west of Bathurst are two completely different neighbourhoods and should not be combined into a single ward. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boundary between RW19 and RW20 is Bathurst except for Bathurst Quay.
W119/W125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could W119 boundary with W125 run north on Bathurst? (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated.
W120	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep CityPlace, Fort York and South Core together with the condos south of King. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boundary between RW19 and RW20 is Bathurst except for Bathurst Quay.
W120/W121	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep all the following boundaries: King Street west to the Islands north- south and Yonge Street to Bathurst east-west. There are many commonalities within that neighborhood. If need be, split the ward from Front Street going south. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, recommended wards now run north-south.
W121	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make Yonge Street the western boundary of W121. The community west of Yonge belongs more appropriately with W120. The boundary for St. Lawrence should be Yonge to Parliament, Queen and Railway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. All in RW 21.
W121/W122/ W123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Queen Street is an undesirable dividing line; it separates a connected and resilient business community. Shuter Street might make a better boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both sides of Queen in RW22 and RW21. Queen

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W122/W123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 Moss Park Apartment towers get orphaned in W122, should be in W123 together with Regent Park. 	Street divides RW20 and RW24.
W122/W124	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Split W122 and W124 north-south, rather than east-west (split along University or Bay). Queens Park should be a dividing line as it is both a physical and social regime boundary. Harbord Village and Kensington have distinct issues and should not be contained within the same ward. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moss Park now together with Regent Park South in RW21. Incorporated. Incorporated. Both in RW24, together with many other communities.
W123	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Castle Frank Crescent very cut off by DVP; feel like they are part of South Rosedale; don't connect with Parliament. Church-Wellesley village's northern boundary is Charles Street, not Wellesley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Now in RW34. Incorporated. All in RW25 now.
W123/W124	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jarvis St. (between W123 and W124) splits a community of LGBT residents from the Church-Wellesley Village. Sherbourne or Yonge St. would be a better boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Church is now the boundary between RW25 and RW23.
W123/125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The boundary between W123 and W125 should be Rosedale Valley Road/the ravine instead of Bloor St. You could take Rosedale Valley Road east of Sherbourne. Rosedale and Summerhill similar communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated.
W124	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should include area up Yonge Street to the tracks (ABC Residents Association; Yorkville). Don't split the U of T campus - there are 2 colleges (St. Michael's and Victoria College) east of Queens Park, which are cohesive communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Incorporated. Boundary between RW24 and RW25 is Queens Park.
W124/W125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The boundaries of the downtown wards are not good - there is an issue with W124 and W125 at Bloor Street. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Downtown wards re-aligned.

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yorkville BIA should not be split at Bloor Street, its southern boundary is Charles. • Keep Bloor East intact - Move 278, 300, 360 & 388 Bloor Street East away from University-Rosedale into Toronto-Centre. • W125 has a long east-west shape – it doesn't accomplish minimum change. (3) • The Castle Frank enclave south of Bloor should be in W125. • Any new boundary for the current Ward 27 should include Wellesley from Yonge to Sherbourne, even Parliament as well as north-south streets Church and Jarvis down to at least Dundas. • W125 should include Governor's Bridge, which is part of North Rosedale's community of interest. (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated. Now in RW25. • Incorporated. In RW25. • Downtown wards now run north-south. • Now in RW34. • Downtown wards now run north-south. • Incorporated. Now in RW34.
W126	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend W126 south so that Redway Road and the big Loblaws is the southern border. • Put the whole of Yonge-Eglinton into W126. • Boundary goes through Upper Canada College; use Oriole Parkway all the way up, then along Oxtou to the Beltline; Beltline makes sense; should stop at Oriole Parkway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated. • Not incorporated, boundaries not coherent. • Incorporated. Boundary follows Avenue Road in order not to upset voter parity in RW26.
W126/127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadway boundary now cuts through houses. • Broadway boundary should be at Eglinton. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated. Eglinton is now the boundary between RW27 and RW26. • Not incorporated. Not a coherent boundary.
W128	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North and south of Erskine Avenue are two different types of neighbourhoods – would be a good boundary line. • Should go east to Willowdale; Willowdale is a very good boundary; very different community east and west of Willowdale; Doris is not good; Parkview Gardens and Lee's Life and Art Park cannot be separated from Yonge; when walking, you do not cross Willowdale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated.

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W128/W129	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested boundaries: Bathurst/West Don River/401/Yonge to Sheppard/north on Willowdale/Finch. • The boundary should be a straight line, instead of a jagged line. (4) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Using Willowdale or Kenneth would keep the condo neighbourhood together. ◦ Consider using Yonge Street. ◦ The hydro corridor is a great natural/physical boundary. ◦ The jagged line separates the condos from single family homes. • Change the boundary between W128 and W129 to Doris or Willowdale. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated. • Incorporated. Willowdale is the boundary between RW28 and RW29 to Sheppard. • Incorporated. Willowdale is the boundary between RW28 and RW29 to Sheppard.
W129	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could gain the n/e corner of Yonge and 401 (Avondale community); this is the best way to split W128 and W129. • Suggested boundaries: Finch/Victoria Park/Steeles/ boundary of current Ward 10. [includes northern part of W130]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated. • Not incorporated, upsets voter parity. Large geographic area.
W130	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested boundaries: 401/Yonge to Sheppard/north on Willowdale/Finch/East Don River. [includes part of W131]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated, upsets voter parity.
W131	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use RR track as western boundary of W131. • Suggested boundaries: 401/East Don River/Finch/Victoria Park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated. • Almost the same as RW31.
W132	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move Wynford Park area into W132 (Don Mills Residents Association includes it). • Make the continuation of Eglinton west of Victoria Park the southern boundary of W132, i.e. move area south of it into W135. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated. • Incorporated.
W132/W133/ W135	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use DVP as a boundary among W132, W133 and part of W135. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated.

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W133/134	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Leaside neighbourhood is divided by Eglinton, which is not a natural boundary. Leaside should remain intact. (11) Leaside is bounded on 3 sides by the Don River and on the 4th by Bayview Avenue. Decrease W134 by making RR track the northern boundary; move area north of RR tracks into W133 -this keeps north and south Leaside together. Change the W133 and W134 boundary to original boundary or to another option that doesn't affect the Laird community. Keep Bennington Heights and Leaside neighbourhoods together – they are similar. Leaside and Thorncliffe Park need to stay together. Leaside, Flemington Park, Thorncliffe Park neighbourhoods should be kept together. Consider splitting Leaside and Thorncliffe Park communities – they have very different interests, which splits a Councillor's focus. Join Flemington Park and Thorncliffe; these two areas have many issues that would benefit from a smaller ward and personalized treatment. The Don Valley would be a more reasonable northern boundary of W134. Increase W134 by extending eastern boundary to Woodbine. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of Leaside is included in RW33. Incorporated. Incorporated. Both in RW33. Incorporated. All in RW33. Not incorporated, both in RW33. Incorporated. Both in RW33, but together with Leaside. Not incorporated, upsets voter parity. Not incorporated, upsets voter parity between RW34 and RW35.
W134		

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W134/W135	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking lot in Taylor Creek Park is cut in half, should be in W135, not in W134; boundary also cuts the park in two. Include Barbara Crescent (from W134) in W135. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Incorporated.
W134/W136	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't combine north of Danforth with areas south of Danforth - at least east of Pape. We're just south of Danforth east of Coxwell and much, much more oriented to Gerrard, Queen and the lake than northward to the Don Valley and Eglinton. The current Danforth boundary cuts the Danforth community in half (4) - The Danforth is the community hub for Greektown, for the Mosaic, and others. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Danforth is boundary between RW34 and RW36. Not incorporated. Danforth is a coherent boundary.
W135	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use DVP as boundary rather than the river; W135 should have south side of the Don Valley (from W133). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated.
W134/W135/ W136/W137	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The railroad track is a good physical barrier and would put Danforth in 2 wards not 4 wards. Include north and south side of Danforth Ave in one ward to encourage rational development. Do not split Danforth Avenue between Greenwood and Main (more or less). This area has a similar architectural feel as well as a need/desire by the BIA and neighbourhood associations to study, renovate and re-invigorate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, upsets voter parity. Not incorporated. Danforth is a coherent boundary. Not incorporated, upsets voter parity.
W136/W137	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leslieville should not be split - Coxwell should be the boundary. Move the western boundary of W137 to Coxwell, so that Leslieville and the Beaches are not in the same ward. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mostly incorporated. Leslieville in RW36, except a portion of the south side of Queen Street.
W137	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't include Beach community as part of Danforth; they have different needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, upsets voter parity between RW35 and RW37.

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not include anything north of Kingston Road in the Beach area. Kingston Road is a clear physical boundary. • The Beach ward should end at Kingston Road and Queen Street to the west, and at Fallingbrook to the east. • The eastern boundary of W137 should be moved from Victoria Park over to Hunt Club Drive – more natural boundary (6) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Victoria Park Avenue is not a natural boundary, especially the southern portion by the lake. The eastern boundary should be the Toronto Hunt Club Drive, thereby incorporating Fallingbrook as a part of the beaches. ○ Vic Park over to Fallingbrook should be included in the Beaches Ward. ○ I live on Courcellette, which is technically in Ward 36, but due to the natural splitting that occurs because of the Hunt Club Ravine we are much more a part of Ward 32. Don't use Victoria Park as a dividing line. (2) • The community west of Victoria Park to Fallingbrook Road to Danforth in the north should be part of Toronto and not Scarborough. Blantyre, Courcellette and Fallingbrook are Beach communities not Scarborough communities. • Eastern boundary of W137 should remain Victoria Park between Bracken and Queen. • Maintain the "Beach" business district within the same ward all the way to RC Harris plant. • Draw the boundaries at Gerrard Street to the Lakeshore from Coxwell to Victoria Park rather than all the way to the Danforth. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated, upsets voter parity between RW35 and RW37. • Not incorporated. Victoria Park remains the boundary between RW37 and RW38 to respect "minimal change" principle. • Not incorporated. Victoria Park remains the eastern boundary of RW37. • Incorporated. • Incorporated. • Not incorporated, upsets voter parity.

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W138	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> South-east end of the city (Riverside, Leslieville, the Beaches, and the Upper Beach) should be grouped together. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partially incorporated.
W139	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No suggested refinements 	
W140/W141	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is there room for W139 to grow? Brimley Road is the natural boundary (Midland Ratepayers Association is between Midland and Brimley; focus west); Brimley is also a school catchment area boundary; "but world would not end if we use Midland". Move eastern boundary to where Ward 38's is now (to Scarborough Golf Club Road); i.e. keep Ward 38 as is; but this tweak is not as important as Brimley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Not incorporated, upsets voter parity in RW40. Not incorporated, upsets voter parity in RW46.
W141	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No suggested refinements. 	
W142/W143	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cut W142 and 143 along the creek - come down Birchmount and the creek [like current Ward 39]. Even out current populations between W143 and W142 [make W143 bigger]. Huntingwood splits two communities; Corinthian community (Victoria Park to Pharmacy north and south of Huntingwood); Bridlewood community (north and south of Huntingwood); should use Finch as a divider. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, would make RW42 too small. Incorporated. 2026 populations almost equal. Not incorporated, upsets voter parity between RW42 and RW43.
W142/W144	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C.D Farquharson Community Association is split between W142 and W144. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Now in RW42.
W143	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add area Warden/Sheppard/Victoria Park south of Huntingwood (could add whole area or use Pharmacy). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, upsets voter parity between RW42 and RW43.
W144	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The eastern boundary of W144 should be the creek that runs through Neilson and McLevin. The creek does meet with Markham Road and the eastern boundary can continue northward via Markham Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated, upsets voter parity between RW44 and RW45.


TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO – FINAL REPORT MAY 2016

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W144/W145	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Malvern is split between W144 and W145 [definition either Malvern Town Centre or larger area which has 50,000 people]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated. Upsets voter parity between RW45 and RW44.
W145	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The western boundary of W145 should be moved to Markham Road. You could use Sheppard as the southern boundary or move the south-eastern boundary (i.e. where the 401 is). (Markham to Sheppard). People who identify the least with Malvern live south of Sheppard – i.e. those who live in Burroughs Hall. (Note: All the options split Malvern in some way). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated. Upsets voter parity between RW45 and RW44. Incorporated. Burroughs Hall shifted from RW45 to RW44.
W146	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kingston Road splits the Kingston Galloway community. Instead use Morningside and Eglinton as boundaries so W146 would be square to Morningside. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Now in RW46.
W147	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> W147 should look more like W244. Keep West Hill/Manse Valley/Coronation in one ward. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated. Almost the same. Incorporated. All in RW47.

APPENDIX 'D'

OUT OF SCOPE COMMENTS

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW / NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO / FINAL REPORT



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

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

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


APPENDIX 'E'


MAP OF RECOMMENDED WARDS LARGE VERSION 11X17'

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW / NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO / FINAL REPORT



Appendix E – Recommended Wards





DRAWTHELINES.CA



This is **Exhibit 6** refer to in the Affidavit of
Susan Dexter, sworn August 21, 2018

HARBORD VILLAGE RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION

Box 68522, 360A Bloor St. W.
Toronto, ON M5S 1X1



To Executive Committee:
Ward Boundary Review Recommendations.
EXE 15.2

97 Willcocks St.
Toronto, M5S1C9.
May 24, 2016.

I am here to talk a little bit about the Downtown and to recommend council adopt the proposed ward boundaries minimal change option RW 24 -- from the tracks north of Davenport, to Queen, and from Bathurst to University/Avenue Road.

I am Sue Dexter. I am on the board of the Harbord Village Residents' Association. Our boundaries are Bloor-College, Spadina to Bathurst. We are in the northwest corner of the City's Downtown zoning area.

Does the present system work democratically?

2011 population Ward 20: 76,600
compared to St. Paul's 48,640
Davenport 44,970,
Ward 19 57,240.

These 2011 numbers do not take into account what has been built since, nor what has been approved, let alone what is in the pipeline. Today's imbalances will get worse. Look at the cranes.

Population and development pressures also create invisible hardships on councillors in the densest wards. The Ward 20 Councillor has a barely sustainable workload. This, too, curtails the access of voters to fairly balanced representation at Council.

So our question is how to make our votes count as much those of residents living outside the downtown. Otherwise, we are discriminated against—or they are advantaged.

Clearly, we have too many people and too little power. What to do?

Adding office staff could solve potholes, general office administration, garbage, streets. It would not address the strength of our voice in council decisions, which at the moment is about two-thirds that of our neighbours... a democratic deficit created in part by public planning policy and OMB decisions which funneled so much development to King-University-Spadina.

Rather, we believe our representation should be increased. Boundaries must change, and they should respect the local political realities. We support the consultant's

recommendation to add a councillor, splitting ward 20 into two distinct parts, one north, one south.

The logic is this: there are two distinct worlds in the west Downtown. The high-rise world south of Queen, the house-form world north of Queen. Different built-form, different problems.

To the north, we are stable neighbourhoods. For the most part, Victorian two and two and-a-half storey houses or walkup apartments. Walkable, often treed, shared porches. Tight. Mid and low-rise, predominantly. We are communities.

And there is one element that binds us and separates us from our southern neighbours.

There is a single dominant developer in RW24: the University of Toronto.

Its decisions determine much of the character of adjacent neighbourhoods from rooming houses, to rents, to congestion at nodes, to the kinds of businesses that have grown up along Bloor St., to developments on College, Bloor and Spadina, to the inexhaustible stimulation of the students who live amongst us.

To redress the balance between town and gown, the City formed the University of Toronto Area Liaison Committee, which brings the Councillor, the City, the flanking communities and the University together at a common table. This has resulted in more respect from the University, and strong working partnerships among the community members of the committee.

The challenge of the University's expansion in the last twenty years, as well as more recent private developments and applications, has resulted in the strengthening of the neighbourhood collaboration. I need only list the numbers of joint studies we are working on: University of Toronto Secondary Plan, Huron-Sussex, Bloor Block, College, Westbank/Honest Ed's, Spadina to come. The Annex shares its development portal with us. We are regular attendees at its planning committee meeting. We are working with heritage folks in Kensington on their IICD. Our community association donates scholarship money to Scadding Court.

The bonds are deep. But they do not extend south of Queen or east of University/Avenue Road. And most important, they include neighbourhoods on both sides of Bloor Street. In the federal boundaries option, to draw a line separating south of Bloor from the north and add Rosedale would absolutely violate the way we experience and work for a great City. Likewise, in the 44-ward option, to add Rosedale to the downtown mixes two different cultures, planning regimes and sensibilities. It has not worked federally in our experience.

In sum, we support RW24, the 47 ward option. It reflects our experience in the City, our local political institutions and rights a democratic wrong.

With thanks
Sue Dexter


Board HVRA
asusandexter@gmail.com

This is **Exhibit 7** refer to in the Affidavit of
Susan Dexter, sworn August 21, 2018

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

AUGUST 2016



CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 TWBR CONTEXT	2
1.3 HOW MUCH CAN WARD POPULATIONS DIFFER	3
2. REVIEW OF OPTION 1 (47 WARDS)	4
3. REFINEMENTS FOR OPTION 2 (44 WARDS)	7
4. CONSISTENCY WITH FEDERAL RIDING BOUNDARIES	10
4.1 10% VARIANCE SCENARIO	12
4.2 15% VARIANCE SCENARIO	12

APPENDIX A Suggestions for Ward-Specific Refinements to Option 2 – 44 Wards

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

In 2014 Toronto City Council launched the Toronto Ward Boundary Review (TWBR). From July 2014 to February 2015, the TWBR conducted a civic engagement and public consultation process to collect opinions on Toronto's current ward alignment. The results informed the development of five options for re-aligning Toronto's wards. A second round of the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process solicited feedback on these options between August and November 2015. The TWBR Final Report (May 2016), summarized the TWBR process and recommended a new ward structure. All of the TWBR reports are available on the project website at <http://www.drawthelines.ca/reports>.

At its meeting on May 24, 2016, the City of Toronto Executive Committee asked the TWBR Team to provide additional information on a number of issues. The TWBR Team developed this Additional Information Report in response.

During August and September 2016 the TWBR is seeking comments from the public, stakeholders and Members of City Council at four public meetings, through an online survey and in individual interviews on two items:

- A revised Option 2 (44 wards) that incorporates the refinements suggested during the TWBR public consultation process in August - November 2015;
- A ward option that is consistent with the boundaries of the 25 federal and provincial ridings.

Members of Council will also have the opportunity to comment on the TWBR Recommended Wards.

The four public meetings are scheduled for September 14 (Metro Hall), September 15 (Scarborough Civic Centre), September 19 (North York Civic Centre) and September 21 (Etobicoke Civic Centre).

Based on the comments received during the public consultation, a TWBR Supplementary Report will be prepared and submitted to the Executive Committee meeting of October 26, 2016.

1.2 TWBR CONTEXT

- Toronto's expected growth from 2011 to 2030 is 500,000
- 2014 average ward population: 61,000
- 2014 smallest ward: 45,400; 2014 largest ward: 109,450
- TWBR will need to balance the components of *effective representation*:
 - Achieving voter parity (similar, not identical, numbers of people in each ward)
 - Keeping together geographic communities of interest
 - Following natural and physical boundaries
 - Respecting ward history
 - Considering 'capacity to represent' (variety/complexity of issues in a ward)
- New ward structure to last for the next 4 elections: 2018, 2022, 2026 & 2030
- Target year to determine voter parity: 2026

Any ward boundary review has to balance the various components of *effective representation*. While voter parity (similar, but not identical numbers of people in each ward) is of prime importance to an individual's 'right-to-vote', not dividing neighbourhoods (if at all possible) and following clearly recognizable boundaries are also major factors.

Toronto's wards were last redrawn in 2000. Because of the large difference between the City's smallest and largest wards, the populations of the large wards have to get smaller and those of the small wards have to get larger to achieve *effective representation*.

The vast majority of Toronto's growth will occur in the Downtown and the other growth centres designated in the Official Plan. At the same time, most of Toronto's communities will not see substantial growth and will remain stable, again as determined by the Official Plan. To accommodate Toronto's growth and allow any new ward structure to last for four (4) municipal elections, the TWBR uses 2026 as the target year for balancing projected ward populations. Using 2026 allows a new ward structure to be in place for the municipal elections of 2018 and last for the 2022, 2026 and 2030 municipal elections.

1.3 HOW MUCH CAN WARD POPULATIONS DIFFER

To achieve the most important component of *effective representation*, voter parity, 10% above or below the average ward population has been the gold standard of ward boundary reviews. This means that there can be a 20% difference (or variance) between ward populations. For example, since the 2014 average ward population for Toronto was 61,000, wards could be between 54,900 and 67,100 people in 2014.

A difference of 10% to 15% above or below the average ward population can also be used to minimize change to certain ward boundaries, keep neighbourhoods together or follow a clearly recognizable ward boundary. Differences above plus or minus 15% become problematic and can be used only in special circumstances. For example, a ward may be below 15%, because it is expected to grow or it may be above this percentage, because it is stable and will get closer to the city-wide average over time.

To illustrate:

Current 2014 average ward population	Minimum population with -10% variance	Maximum population with +10% variance
61,000	54,900	67,100

Current 2014 average ward population	Minimum population with -15% variance	Maximum population with +15% variance
61,000	51,850	70,150

A variance of plus or minus 20% or more has been applied, on rare occasions, by municipalities that have to ensure the representation of rural areas within their boundaries, such as the City of Ottawa. Such a large difference is not appropriate for a built-up city like Toronto. The plus or minus 10% - 15% difference in ward populations has been held up by the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) for urban areas.

In the options presented in the TWBR Options Report (October 2015), Option 1 (47 Wards) used a variance of +/- 15% in order to maintain as many existing ward boundaries as possible. The other 4 options applied a +/- 10% variance.

2. REVIEW OF OPTION 1 (47 WARDS)

The Executive Committee direction was to review Option 1 (47 wards) by focusing only on wards with the highest population discrepancies (i.e. Wards 20, 22, 23, 27 and 28) and leaving the other wards intact; to examine the possibility of having only 46 wards; and to ensure that the resulting Option achieves *effective representation*.

Option 1 was based on two main factors: 1) maintain the current average ward population of 61,000 and 2) retain the current ward boundaries of as many wards as possible. To achieve this, Option 1 used a range around the average ward population of +/- 15%, or ward populations between 51,850 and 70,150.

Table 1 shows the populations of the large wards that were used as examples in the Executive Committee direction for 2026 target year.

Table 1: 2026 Population Projections (Selected Wards)

WARD	PROJECTED 2026 POPULATION
20	125,578
22	78,291
23	100,999
27	129,992
28	116,872


However, there are also three other large wards – Ward 5 (90,056), Ward 24 (77,416) and Ward 42 (79,511). Of the 8 large wards in the city, 4 will be over 100,000 by 2026. Three of those wards are in the downtown area (Wards 20, 27 and 28) and one is in Willowdale (Ward 23). To correct the population discrepancies among these 4 wards would require 4 additional wards, three in the Downtown and one in Willowdale. A focus only on the four largest wards, while leaving all other wards intact, requires 48 wards.

An approach with 46 wards could only add one ward in the downtown area and one ward in Willowdale. The resulting Downtown wards will remain very large - approximately 93,000 each.

To achieve *effective representation*, especially with respect to voter parity, both large and small wards must be considered. That means all wards above and below 15% of the average ward population of 61,000 have to be examined.

Map 1 shows the wards within +/- 15% of the average ward population in 2026. In 2026 Toronto will have 8 wards that are above 15% of the average ward population of 61,000. It will also have 14 wards that are more than 15% below average. In total, 22 wards, or half of Toronto's wards, will be outside the voter parity range required for *effective representation*.

MAP 1: EXISTING WARD VARIANCES - 2026



To achieve *effective representation*, large wards need to be made smaller and small wards larger. The objective of minimizing changes to ward boundaries was pursued in Option 1 (The Minimal Change Option) in the TWBR Options Report. In this option 18 wards had no boundary changes. The original Option 1 (47 Wards) achieves *effective representation* while minimizing changes in ward boundaries. However, it does not incorporate the suggestions for boundary changes made by Members of Council and the general public during the public discussion of the Options Report.

As this analysis indicates, focusing on only the large wards does not lead to a ward configuration that achieves voter parity, the prime component of *effective representation*. It does not address the numerous wards that are currently too small. In summary, an approach that focuses only on the large wards cannot pass the test of *effective representation*.

3. REFINEMENTS FOR OPTION 2 (44 WARDS)

In line with the direction from the Executive Committee, the Consultant Team has reviewed all of the refinements to Option 2 (44 Wards) suggested during the TWBR’s civic engagement and public consultation process. Each suggested refinement has been considered individually and its impact on the three major components of *effective representation* has been evaluated: voter parity, communities of interest; and coherent ward boundaries.

Depending on the outcome of this evaluation, a refinement has been either incorporated or not incorporated into a revised version of Option 2 (44 Wards). **APPENDIX A** lists all of the suggested refinements together with an “Action/Comment” on each suggestion. It should be noted that many of the suggested refinements, which could not be accommodated, either reduce or enlarge the 44 Wards in Option 2 to such an extent that voter parity cannot be maintained.

The Revised Option 2, just like the initial Option 2 is based on an average 2026 population size of 70,000. It divides a number of communities of interest such as the Dundas growth area in Etobicoke, Leaside and the “The Beach” crosses Victoria Park Avenue. In each instance several potential ward boundary permutations have been explored, but it has not been possible to keep these communities together in one ward because of issues with voter parity.

Table 2 shows the 2026 projected populations for the revised Option 2 (44 Wards). 40 Wards fall within the +/- 10% range of the average ward population of 70,000. Four (4) Wards in the revised Option 2 are in the +/- 12% range, which are highlighted below.


Table 2: Revised Option 2 - 44 Wards (2026 Populations and Variances)

WARD	2026	VARIANCE
W 201	66,207	-5.42%
W 202	63,809	-8.84%
W 203	63,401	-9.43%
W 204	63,832	-8.81%
W 205	63,146	-9.79%
W 206	69,434	-0.81%
W 207	68,811	-1.70%
W 208	69,232	-1.10%
W 209	63,830	-8.81%
W 210	64,302	-8.14%
W 211	63,658	-9.06%
W 212	68,486	-2.16%
W 213	62,469	-10.76%
W 214	66,846	-4.51%
W 215	65,199	-6.86%
W 216	62,756	-10.35%
W 217	63,339	-9.52%
W 218	77,350	10.50%
W 219	74,021	5.59%
W 220	70,233	0.33%
W 221	65,055	-7.06%
W 222	64,828	-7.39%

WARD	2026	VARIANCE
W 223	67,260	-3.91%
W 224	65,690	-6.16%
W 225	67,546	-3.51%
W 226	66,622	-4.83%
W 227	65,850	-5.93%
W 228	64,002	-8.57%
W 229	61,836	-11.66%
W 230	67,666	-3.33%
W 231	65,900	-5.86%
W 232	72,382	3.24%
W 233	73,031	4.33%
W 234	65,176	-6.89%
W 235	63,786	-8.88%
W 236	63,693	-9.01%
W 237	71,300	1.86%
W 238	66,988	-4.30%
W 239	66,889	-4.44%
W 240	67,619	-3.40%
W 241	63,325	-9.54%
W 242	67,487	-3.59%
W 243	67,574	-3.47%
W 244	63,487	-9.30%

Map 2 on the following page shows the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards).

MAP 2: REVISED OPTION 2 – 44 WARDS (with Refinements)



In summary, as Table 2 shows, the revised Option 2 achieves voter parity across the 44 wards. However, there are some significant challenges. Although the number of wards (44), is the same as what there is currently, the configuration is significantly different. Some existing geographic communities of interest are divided and most of the current ward boundaries have changed.

4. CONSISTENCY WITH FEDERAL RIDING BOUNDARIES

The third component of the Executive Committee's direction is to determine whether Toronto's ward boundaries can be consistent with the 25 federal and provincial riding boundaries.

Currently, 25 federal ridings are completely within the boundaries of the City of Toronto. There are now 22 provincial ridings. However, all indications are that the Province will adopt the federal riding boundaries for the City of Toronto prior to the next provincial election. This analysis is based on the current 25 federal ridings.

The TWBR uses the year 2026 to ensure that any new ward structure will last for several elections and constant ward boundary reviews are not required. This is different from how provincial and federal riding boundaries are determined. Federal and provincial ridings are adjusted every 10 years based on the most recent Census. The current federal ridings are based on the 2011 Census and they will be adjusted again following the 2021 Census. In this respect the TWBR looks to the future, while the federal and provincial riding boundary commissions look to the past.

Using federal / provincial riding boundaries as potential ward boundaries is grounded in the assumption that it is administratively easier for staff and more transparent for residents to have these boundaries coincide. Some people feel that having the same boundaries for all three levels of government makes it easier for constituents to know who to contact to resolve their concerns.

During the TWBR's first round of public consultation, the idea of using federal /provincial riding boundaries as ward boundaries was suggested on numerous occasions. However, it was mostly within the context of then splitting the ridings in half, similar to how Toronto's wards are currently structured. This approach would have resulted in 50 wards.

Table 3 lists the existing federal ridings, presents the estimated 2026 populations and shows the variance from the average riding population of approximately 117,000.

Table 3: Projected Populations – Federal Ridings

FEDERAL RIDING NAME	2026 PROJECTED POPULATION	VARIANCE FROM AVERAGE RIDING POPULATION
Beaches-East York	109,357	-6.54%
Davenport	105,226	-10.07%
Don Valley East	98,273	-16.02%
Don Valley North	117,721	+0.60%
Don Valley West	105,774	-9.61%
Eglinton-Lawrence	122,347	+4.56%
Etobicoke Centre	120,501	+2.98%
Etobicoke-Lakeshore	152,578	+30.39%
Etobicoke North	117,760	+0.64%
Parkdale-High Park	108,098	-7.62%
Toronto-St. Paul's	116,420	-0.51%
Scarborough-Agincourt	108,962	-6.88%
Scarborough Centre	112,958	-3.47%
Scarborough-Guildwood	107,190	-8.40%
Scarborough North	100,712	-13.93%
Scarborough-Rouge Park	106,585	-8.91%
Scarborough Southwest	111,491	-4.72%
Spadina-Fort York	153,846	+31.48%
Toronto Centre	151,658	+29.61%
Toronto-Danforth	104,744	-10.49%
University-Rosedale	124,646	+6.52%
Willowdale	127,257	+8.75%
York Centre	103,191	-11.81%
York South-Weston	119,512	+2.13%
Humber River-Black Creek	118,548	+1.31%
TOTAL	2,925,352	

4.1 10% VARIANCE SCENARIO

If the 25 federal ridings were to become 25 wards and a +/-10% variance was used, ward populations could vary from 105,300 to 128,700. This is a population range of 23,400 residents between the smallest and the largest potential ward. Even though this is a significant number of people, a +/- 10% variance is considered appropriate for municipal wards.

At a +/- 10% variance, 8 ridings fall outside this variance - 5 that are below and 3 that are above. This represents almost a third of the potential wards. Attempting boundary adjustments to correct for these variances would alter too many riding boundaries and negate the value of using the federal riding boundaries as ward boundaries. The +/- 10% variance scenario has, therefore, been rejected.

4.2 15% VARIANCE SCENARIO

This scenario increases the variance range for voter parity to +/- 15%. In this scenario, average ward populations could vary from 99,450 to 134,550. This is a potential ward population variance of 35,100 people, which is considerable.

At +/- 15% four potential wards would be outside the variance range, Don Valley East at -16.02%, Etobicoke-Lakeshore at 30.39%, Spadina-Fort York at 31.48% and Toronto Centre at 29.61%. Don Valley East at 16.02% below the average could be a viable ward. However, the other three larger wards would need to be adjusted to achieve voter parity.

The two downtown wards are projected to have 305,504 residents by 2026. If three wards were created within the boundaries of the two existing ridings, they would average approximately 102,000 people each. This is within the +/- 15% range and would not impact any of the other federal riding boundaries.

Etobicoke-Lakeshore presents a different challenge. In 2026, it is projected to have a population of 152,578. One approach would be to combine Etobicoke-Lakeshore with Etobicoke-Centre and adjust their boundaries by adding to Etobicoke-Centre. This would result in two wards of approximately 136,500. This is slightly above +/- 15%. In order to bring the voter parity numbers within +/- 15%, Etobicoke-North would have to be included. This would bring the average ward population size to 130,280. However, it would require an adjustment to all three Etobicoke ridings. Such significant adjustments to the federal riding boundaries is not in keeping with the Executive Committee's direction.


The most realistic alternative is to create an extra ward in the Downtown and adjust the boundaries between Etobicoke-Lakeshore and Etobicoke-Centre by adding some population to the latter. This scenario results in 26 wards.

Map 3 shows 26 wards consistent with federal riding boundaries with some minor adjustments to achieve effective representation:

- The two current federal ridings of Toronto Centre and Spadina-Fort York have been reconfigured into three wards: Toronto Centre North, Toronto Centre South and Spadina-Fort York.
- The boundary between Etobicoke-Lakeshore and Etobicoke-Centre has been adjusted.

The adjusted wards are highlighted in Map 3 and bolded in Table 4.

MAP 3: WARDS CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL RIDING BOUNDARIES



The ward configuration shown in Map 3 has 26 wards consistent with federal riding boundaries. However, by adding a 26th ward, the average ward population changes from 117,000 to 112,500. Table 4 recalculates voter parity variances for 26 wards consistent with federal riding boundaries.

Table 4: Projected 2026 Population and Variances for Wards Consistent with Federal Riding Boundaries

FEDERAL RIDING	2026	VARIANCE
Beaches - East York	109,358	-3%
Davenport	105,226	-6%
Don Valley East	98,274	-13%
Don Valley North	117,720	+5%
Don Valley West	105,774	-6%
Eglinton - Lawrence	122,346	+9%
Etobicoke Centre	137,248	+22%
Etobicoke - Lakeshore	135,832	+21%
Etobicoke North	117,760	+5%
Parkdale - High Park	108,098	-4%
St. Paul's	116,420	+3%
Scarborough - Agincourt	108,962	-3%
Scarborough Centre	112,958	0%
Scarborough - Guildwood	107,190	-5%
Scarborough North	100,712	-10%
Scarborough - Rouge River	106,584	-5%
Scarborough Southwest	111,490	-1%
Spadina - Fort York	101,898	-9%
Toronto Centre North	98,201	-13%
Toronto Centre South	105,405	-7%
Toronto - Danforth	104,744	+11%
University - Rosedale	124,646	+13%
Willowdale	127,256	-8%
York Centre	103,190	+6%
York South - Weston	119,512	+5%
Humber River - Black Creek	118,548	+5%

The voter parity figures for 26 wards again put the challenge on the Etobicoke wards. The re-aligned wards of Etobicoke-Lakeshore and Etobicoke Centre are both 20% above the average ward population. An attempt to correct this imbalance requires not only adjusting the boundaries of Etobicoke North, but also crossing the Humber River and adjusting the boundaries of York South-Weston and Parkdale-High Park. The domino effect of changing ward boundaries is evident. This amount of adjustment negates the use of federal riding boundaries as ward boundaries. Also, it would mean crossing a major natural and historic ward boundary – the Humber River.

In summary, using federal riding boundaries as a basis for ward boundaries as shown on Map 3 and Table 4 raises significant concerns for voter parity, the prime component of *effective representation*, in Etobicoke. To resolve this would require altering the boundaries of several federal ridings and crossing a major natural and historic current ward boundary. Such significant change contradicts the purpose of making federal riding boundaries and ward boundaries consistent. It should also be noted that the current federal riding boundaries will be adjusted following the 2021 Census.

APPENDIX 'A'

SUGGESTIONS FOR WARD-SPECIFIC REFINEMENTS TO OPTION 2 - 44 WARDS

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REPORT



APPENDIX A

SUGGESTIONS FOR WARD-SPECIFIC REFINEMENTS TO OPTION 2 – 44 WARDS

Note: Appendix A is a summary of suggestions received from Members of Council, through the online survey and at public meetings during the public consultation on the TWBR Options Report, August – November 2015. ‘W’ followed by a number refers to the relevant Ward in Option 2 – 44 Wards.

Each suggested refinement has been assessed in terms of how it impacts the three most important components of *effective representation*: voter parity; communities of interest; and clear ward boundaries. The Action/Comment column shows whether it was possible to incorporate a particular suggestion or not.

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W201	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add Humberwood area to Rexdale (don't use river). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity between W201 and W202.
W202	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add area east of Islington to Humber River [from W201]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity between W201 and W202.
W203	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make Dixon Road the northern boundary; Dixon Road is very much a dividing line; the Westway is not a good boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity between W202 and W203.
W204/W205	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dundas growth area is cut in half (between W205 and W204). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity between W204 and W205.
W207/W208	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't use Jane as boundary between W207 and W208, instead move Jane-Finch to W208 south to Finch or south to Eddystone (Jane-Finch community is the way it is supposed to be in Option 5). Jane Street as a boundary is no problem; Jane-Finch consists of so many communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity. Jane Street is boundary between W207 and W208.



W208/W209	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instead of a horizontal boundary between W208 and W209 along Sheppard/ Grandravine/Waterloo, use the rail line that is between Keele St. and Allen Road. The communities to the east vs. west of this boundary are different. • Use Sheppard as the dividing line between W208 and W209 (2). • Move [industrial] area on east side north of Waterloo from W208 into W209. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; W208 and W209 run east-west. • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity. • Not incorporated; area is mostly residential; negative effect on voter parity.
W209	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Splits the Jewish community at Bathurst; Allen or Keele should be the boundary between W222 and W209. • A perfect W209 would be 401/Jane/Steeles/ RR tracks. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity. • Not incorporated; would make W208 too small and W209 too large.
W210	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add area east of Jane to Black Creek. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity between W210 and W211.
W212/W213/ W220	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The southern boundary of W212 should run across St Clair to keep the community intact. • Oakwood should be eastern boundary of W212 instead of Winona; community east of Oakwood is different. • Add area north of St. Clair from W213, so that boundary runs along St. Clair to RR tracks (relates to Police Divisions 11 and 12). • Winona boundary should move to Oakwood (2). • Make eastern boundary Ossington or Dovercourt instead of Christie. • Add area north of St. Clair from Oakwood to the western RR tracks (similar populations re income). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity among W212, W213 and W220.
W213/W216	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seaton Village is split from Christie Pits. • Move area Bloor/Dovercourt/e-w RR tracks/Christie from W213 into W216, if possible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity between W216 and W213.

W216/217	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep CityPlace, Fort York and South Core together with the condos south of King. Liberty Village should fall in one ward. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partially incorporated; City Place and South Core in W217. Liberty Village in W216.
W217	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only one Councillor for the Central Waterfront, better to have 2 as in Option 1. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Central Waterfront in W217, W233 and W234.
W217/W233	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St. Lawrence neighbourhood is split by Jarvis (3). Splitting the St. Lawrence community at Jarvis or Front does not fit the long established boundaries of the Neighbourhood Association or BIA. (Note: same issue with option 5). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated; St. Lawrence now in W233 (W217 and W218 affected).
W218/W219	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Split W219 and W218 north-south. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; wards run east-west.
W219/W232	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The boundary between W219 and W232 should be Rosedale Valley Road/the ravine instead of Bloor St. You could take Rosedale Valley Road east of Sherbourne. Rosedale and Summerhill similar communities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated.
W220/W229	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Make Avenue Road boundary between W220 and W229. The eastern boundary of W220 should remain the Avoca Ravine and not be moved to Yonge St. The condo and apartment buildings between the Avoca Ravine and Yonge St, which are now in Ward 22 and in the Deer Park Residents Association area, would move to Moore Park, if Option 2 is adopted as proposed. This does not make sense. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity (makes W220 too small). Incorporated; shifts W229 somewhat out of voter parity range.
W221	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The old Wards 15 and 16 split the Jewish community to the east and west of Bathurst Street. The new W221 as part of Option 2, corrects this problem. W221 is very different west of Bathurst; different demographics, immigrant populations; high rises. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change required.
W222	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area east of Yonge to Willowdale should be included in W222 so that the areas close to the North York Centre are in the hands of one Councillor. This is an important buffer between the dense North York downtown and the single family residential area. (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> W221 includes many different communities. Incorporated.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move the n/e corner of Yonge and 401 into W224, if needed (Avondale community, built-out, self-contained). • The residential pocket in the southwest corner of W222 seems isolated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated. • No change required. • No change required.
W222/W223/ W224	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • W222, W223 and W224 are better in Option 2 than in Option 1, because the area north of Finch is distinct from the areas south of Finch. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partially incorporated in refinement to W222.
W222/W224	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use hydro corridor and/or Willowdale Ave as natural boundaries to eliminate the messy boundary near Yonge + 401. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity between W226 and W229.
W226/W229	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broadway boundary should be at Eglinton. • Broadway boundary cuts through houses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; makes W228 too small.
W227/W228	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should add Wynford/Concorde community to W227. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; would isolate small residential community.
W228/W229	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make Laird Drive the boundary between W228 and W229. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity between W226 and W229.
W229/W230	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaside is split between W229 and W226. • Cuts up Leaside. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; W230 and W231 include many different communities.
W230/W231	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North and south of the Danforth are very different communities in terms of income/voting/built form. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; would divide Flemington Park community.
W231	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use DVP as boundary rather than the river; W231 should have south side of the Don Valley [from W228]. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partially incorporated; most of Victoria Park is a historic boundary. • Partially incorporated (up to Jarvis). • No change required.
W231/235	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Get rid of the Victoria Park border for Scarborough. (2) 	
W232/W233	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rethink W232 and W233; use Gerrard as boundary? • Dundas boundary divides Cabbagetown from Regent Park, but may be ok. 	

W233	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • St. Lawrence community ends at Yonge, so area between Yonge and Jarvis should go from W217 to W233. • The boundary for St. Lawrence should be Yonge to Parliament. • W233 should gain a piece west of Jarvis. • Do not use King as a boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of St. Lawrence now in W233. • Partially incorporated.
W234/W235	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Beach is divided between W234 and W235. (8) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ People up to Victoria Park consider themselves "Beachers" ◦ It is a distinct community. • Do not use Lee as a dividing line. (2) • This configuration would hurt the branding of some local groups. (2) • Split the Beaches and Upper Beach from the rest of the East End at the tracks. • The area just east of Victoria Park and south of Gerrard fits better with the Beach area just west of Victoria Park. • Birchcliffe should be part of the Beaches. • The Beaches ward should extend along Queen St. from Coxwell Ave to Victoria Park. The City recently passed an OPA for "the Beach" defined as Coxwell to Victoria Park. (2) • Boundary between W234 and W235 should be Woodbine (2); maybe Main, but it becomes a smaller street at the north end. • Bring boundary between W234 and W235 down Victoria Park (3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Victoria Park is a boundary with a long history. ◦ W234 and W235 are VERY different re income, education, etc. • Use Victoria Park and Fallingbrook as north-south boundary and Kingston Road as the northern boundary. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partially incorporated (south of Queen to Victoria Park). • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity between W234 and W235. • No change required. • Not incorporated; makes W235 too small. • In W235. • In W235. • Partially incorporated; south of Queen now in W234. • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity. • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity. • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity.

W234/W235/ W236	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too big a change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change required.
W236/243	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not divide east Guildwood. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated; in W243.
W238	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brimley Road is the natural boundary (Midland Ratepayers Association is between Midland and Brimley; focus west; Brimley is also a school catchment area boundary; "but world would not end if we use Midland". • Keep Brimley for now and recommend review after 8 years (see how far development has progressed due to Scarborough subway and Scarborough Town Centre growth). • Move eastern boundary to where Ward 38's is now (to Scarborough Golf Club Road); i.e. keep Ward 38 as is; but this tweak is not as important as Brimley. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change required. • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity between W238 and W243.
W239/W240	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cut W239 and W240 along the creek - come down Birchmount and the creek [like current Ward 39 and Option 3]. • Huntingwood splits two communities; Corinthian community (Victoria Park to Pharmacy north and south of Huntingwood); Bridlewood community (north and south of Huntingwood); should use Finch as a divider. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; would make W239 too small. • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity between W239 and W240.
W239/W241	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community of interest north of 401, south of Sheppard on either side of Brimley – C. D. Farquharson Community Association, very established (split between W239 and W241). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporated; now all in W239.
W240	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move boundary of W240 west to DVP, from W225. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; would make W225 too small.
W241/W242	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malvern is split between Wards 241 and 242 [definition either Malvern Town Centre or larger area which has 50,000 people]. • Option 2 splits the Malvern community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; Malvern is a large community; negative effect on voter parity between W241 and W242.
W244	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep West Hill/Manse Valley/Coronation in one ward. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; negative effect on voter parity between W243 and W244.



This is **Exhibit 8** refer to in the Affidavit of
Susan Dexter, sworn August 21, 2018

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW
NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO

OCTOBER 2016



CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	11
1.1 Background	11
1.2 TWBR Context	12
1.3 How Much Can Ward Populations Differ	13
1.4 Public Consultation Process August – September 2016	13
1.5 Communications	15
1.6 Supplementary Report Information	16
2. REVIEW OF OPTION 1 (47 WARDS)	17
3. REFINEMENTS TO OPTION 2 (44 WARDS)	20
3.1 Background	20
3.2 What We Heard	23
3.3 Summary	25
4. CONSISTENCY WITH FEDERAL RIDING BOUNDARIES	31
4.1 Background	31
4.2 What We Heard	36
4.3 Summary	38
5. REVISIONS TO THE RECOMMENDED WARDS (47 WARDS)	39
5.1 Background	39
5.2 What we heard	43
5.3 Summary	43
6. GENERAL SUMMARY	50

APPENDIX A: Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) – Additional Suggestions For Refinements

APPENDIX B: Recommended Wards – Suggestions For Refinements

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CONTEXT

In 2014 Toronto City Council launched the Toronto Ward Boundary Review (TWBR). Toronto's current ward structure, implemented approximately 15 years ago, has become unbalanced. This is problematic, not just at election time, but every time City Council votes.

The purpose of the TWBR is to put forward a new ward structure for Toronto that achieves the principle of *effective representation*, and can last for the next four municipal elections.

Beginning in mid-2014, the TWBR Team, made up of an independent team of consultants, conducted a civic engagement and public consultation process to collect input on Toronto's current ward alignment. The results informed the development of five options for re-aligning Toronto's wards. A second round of the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process solicited feedback on these options between August and November 2015. The **TWBR Final Report** (May 2016) summarized the TWBR process and recommended a new ward structure -- referred to as the TWBR Recommended Wards (47 Wards).

At its meeting on May 24, 2016, the City of Toronto Executive Committee asked the City Manager to request the TWBR Team to provide additional information on a number of issues. The TWBR Team developed the **Additional Information Report** (August 2016) in response, as the basis for conducting a public consultation process in August-September 2016.

This **Supplementary Report** contains relevant sections of the **TWBR Additional Information Report**, a description and analysis of the comments and suggestions received during the recent consultation process on the various ward boundary options and the TWBR Team's revisions of the maps of some options, where applicable. All of the TWBR reports are available on the project website at drawthelines.ca.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

During August and September 2016 the TWBR gathered comments from the public and stakeholders at four public meetings and through an online survey. Members of City Council were interviewed individually. The following items were discussed:

- A Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) that incorporates the refinements suggested during the TWBR public consultation process between August and November 2015;

- A ward option that is consistent with the boundaries of the 25 federal and provincial ridings.
- Members of Council and public meeting participants also commented on the TWBR Recommended Wards (47 Wards)¹.

In total 613 individuals and groups participated.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT AT-A-GLANCE

This Report is organized around the four additional information items the TWBR Team was asked to explore:

1. Review the original Option 1 (47 Wards) to determine if the imbalance in ward populations can be addressed by re-aligning only the wards with large populations, while still maintaining *effective representation*.
2. Review the refinements to Option 2 (44 Wards) that were received during the public involvement process leading to the **TWBR Final Report**.
3. Determine whether and how Toronto’s ward boundaries could be consistent with the 25 federal and provincial riding boundaries.
4. Allow for further boundary refinements of the Recommended Wards (47 Wards).

The Executive Committee also expressed its “preference for maintaining the Community Council boundaries given their historical significance reflecting communities of interest”. While the number and shape of community councils are outside the scope of the TWBR, it is worth noting that the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) with additional refinements, the 26 Wards Consistent with Federal Riding Boundaries and the Revised Recommended Wards (47 Wards) all maintain the Humber River and Victoria Park as historic ward boundaries.

The Report contains 6 Sections and 2 Appendices. What follows is a very brief description of each Section of the Report.

INTRODUCTION (SECTION 1)

The introduction briefly describes the TWBR background and context. It outlines the components of *effective representation*, which need to be balanced:

- Achieving voter parity (similar, not identical, numbers of people and taking into account population growth)
- Keeping together geographic communities of interest

¹ The recommended ward structure was not included as an option in the online survey. The Recommended Wards (47 Wards) already reflected input from the 2015 public consultation process.

- Following natural and physical boundaries
- Respecting ward history
- Considering ‘capacity to represent’ (variety/complexity of issues in a ward)

Any ward boundary review has to balance the various components of *effective representation*. Voter parity (similar, not identical, numbers of people and taking into account population growth) is of prime importance to an individual’s ‘right-to-vote’.

The Introduction also explains how much ward populations can differ. It then outlines the August – September 2016 public consultation process and the communications efforts to publicize the process.

REVIEW OF OPTION 1 (47 WARDS) (SECTION 2)

The Executive Committee’s direction was to review Option 1 (47 Wards) by focusing only on wards with the highest population discrepancies (the examples given were: Wards 20, 22, 23, 27 and 28) and leaving the other wards intact; to examine the possibility of having only 46 wards; and to ensure that the resulting option achieves *effective representation*.

This Section of the Report demonstrates that focusing only on Toronto’s existing large wards does not produce an option that can achieve *effective representation* nor reduce the number of wards below 47. It takes 4 new wards (3 in the Downtown and 1 in Willowdale) to reduce the size of the 4 very large wards. This would result in 48 wards. Also, there are 4 other large wards that need to be reduced in size and 14 small wards that need to be enlarged to achieve *effective representation*. *Effective representation* cannot be achieved by just focusing on the large wards.

REFINEMENTS TO OPTION 2 (44 WARDS) (SECTION 3)

The TWBR Team reviewed all of the refinements to Option 2 (44 Wards) suggested during the TWBR’s civic engagement and public consultation process in 2015. Each suggested refinement was considered individually and its impact on the three major components of *effective representation* (voter parity; communities of interest; and coherent ward boundaries) was evaluated.

Map 2 in the body of this Report depicts Option 2 (44 Wards) with the refinements suggested during the TWBR’s civic engagement and public consultation process in 2015. It was the basis for the discussion of this option during the public consultation process in August – September 2016.

Some participants like this option and some have concerns. The most frequently mentioned reason for supporting this revised option is that it “retains the current size of City Council” and keeps certain communities intact (for example: Regent Park; Church-Wellesley Village; West Toronto Junction). Those with concerns mention the “large amount of change to existing ward boundaries”; “reduced ‘capacity to represent’”; and the division of certain communities (for example: Lawrence Heights; Flemingdon Park; Leaside; The Beach).

The public process generated some 164 comments, including 83 suggestions for refinements to this option. The TWBR Team has evaluated all suggestions for their impact on *effective representation* and, wherever possible, has tried to unite communities of interest. Based on that analysis **Map 3**, Additional Revisions – Option 2 – 44 Wards, has been developed. This configuration of wards achieves *effective representation*. **Map 3** is included at the end of the Executive Summary and in the body of the Report.

CONSISTENCY WITH FEDERAL RIDING BOUNDARIES (SECTION 4)

The third component of the Executive Committee’s direction was to determine whether Toronto’s ward boundaries can be consistent with the existing federal and provincial riding boundaries. Using federal / provincial riding boundaries as potential ward boundaries is grounded in the assumption that it is administratively easier for staff and more transparent for residents to have these boundaries coincide.

Currently, 25 federal ridings are completely within the boundaries of the City of Toronto. There are now 22 provincial ridings. However, all indications are that the Province will adopt the federal riding boundaries for the City of Toronto prior to the next provincial election. This analysis is based on the current 25 federal ridings.

The TWBR Team encountered challenges in trying to achieve voter parity, a prime component of *effective representation*, among the potential 25 wards. The least disruptive alternative is to create an extra ward in the Downtown resulting in a total of 26 potential wards. This arrangement still raises some concerns with voter parity between two potential wards in Etobicoke. Etobicoke Centre and Etobicoke-Lakeshore have a 2026 population variance of +22% and +21% respectively. However, attempting to resolve this situation would require altering the boundaries of several federal ridings and crossing the Humber River, a major natural and historic current ward boundary. This contradicts the purpose of making federal riding boundaries and ward boundaries consistent.

Map 4 depicts a possible ward structure for Toronto composed of 26 wards. A copy of **Map 4** is included at the end of the Executive Summary, as well as in the body of the Report.

There was little support for this option at the public meetings and from Members of Council. The online survey yielded considerable support but not from a majority of the respondents. For those who like this option three reasons stand out. The first is the reduction in Councillors, the second relates to the ease of residents knowing which representatives serve them and the third is that larger wards are able to keep more communities together. For those that have concerns, the main issue is that the “level of local representation will diminish with wards this size”. Also noted are the dissimilarities between the roles of local Councillors and those of Federal and Provincial Members of Parliament. Finally, some express that “large wards force too many divergent communities together”.

The essence of this option is to use the existing federal riding boundaries as ward boundaries. Therefore, suggestions for boundary changes defeat the purpose of the option and have not been solicited.

REVISIONS TO THE RECOMMENDED WARDS (47 WARDS) (SECTION 5)

The TWBR Team submitted a recommended ward structure of 47 wards to the Executive Committee in May 2016. During the August-September 2016 public consultation process, Members of Council and public meeting participants suggested a number of boundary refinements. The recommended ward structure was not included as an option for input in the online survey. The Recommended Wards (47 Wards) already reflected input from the 2015 public consultation process.

Map 5 in the body of this Report shows the original Recommended Wards (47 Wards). It was the basis for the discussion of this option during the public consultation process in August - September 2016.

Some participants like this option and some have concerns. The most frequently stated reasons for supporting this option are that “it minimizes change to the current ward boundaries”; “is the best option of the three: Revised Option 2 (44 Wards); Wards Consistent with Federal Riding Boundaries (26); and Recommended Wards (47)”; “preserves the ‘capacity to represent’”; and “keeps communities of interest together (for example: Leaside; The Beach)”.

Those not supporting this option note that “the size of Council would increase to 47” and that certain communities of interest are split (for example: Regent Park; Church-Wellesley Village).

In all, the public process generated some 70 comments, including 37 suggestions for refinements. The TWBR Team has evaluated all suggestions for their impact on *effective representation* and has tried, wherever possible, to unite communities of interest.

Based on that analysis, **Map 6** Recommended Wards with Refinements (47 Wards), has been developed. This configuration of wards reunites certain communities: the community on either side of Sentinel Road; Regent Park; and Church-Wellesley Village. It achieves

effective representation. The Recommended Wards with Refinements (47 Wards) is an improvement on the TWBR Recommended Wards (47 Wards). In addition to achieving voter parity, it manages to keep many communities of interest together. **Map 6** can be found at the end of the Executive Summary and in the body of the Report.

GENERAL SUMMARY (SECTION 6)

The general summary provides a snapshot of the information that was gathered and the analysis the TWBR Team completed for the 4 issues from the Executive Committee direction:


ISSUES	EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION	OBSERVATIONS
Focus on Large Wards to Minimize Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot achieve <i>effective representation</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not deal with 14 existing small wards
Revised Option 2 - 44 Wards (With Refinements)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieves <i>effective representation</i> Divides a number of communities of interest (e.g., Lawrence Heights; Flemingdon Park; Leaside; The Beach) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintains the current size of City Council Average ward population: 70,000 3 wards added (Downtown and Willowdale); 2 wards removed (10 and 32); 3 existing wards combined into 2 (14, 17 and 18)
Consistency with Federal Riding Boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not achieve voter parity 'Capacity to represent' reduced significantly Keeps a number of communities of interest together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces the current size of City Council Average ward population: 112,500 18 wards removed
Further Refinements to the Recommended Wards (47 Wards)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Achieves <i>effective representation</i> Keeps many communities of interest together (e.g., Regent Park, Church-Wellesley Village) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases the current size of City Council Average ward population: 61,000 4 wards added (3 Downtown, 1 Willowdale); 3 existing wards combined into 2 (14, 17 and 18)

The Recommended Wards with Refinements (47 Wards) is an improvement to the TWBR Recommended Wards (47 Wards). In addition to achieving voter parity, it manages to keep many communities of interest together and has coherent ward boundaries. The Recommended Wards with Refinements (47 Wards) is the TWBR Team's recommendation.

APPENDICES


Appendix A lists the comments and suggested refinements for Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) and their disposition and **Appendix B** does the same for the Recommended Wards (47 Wards).

MAP 3: ADDITIONAL REVISIONS - OPTION 2 (44 WARDS) TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW




MAP 4: WARDS CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL RIDING BOUNDARIES TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

drawthelines.ca



MAP 6: RECOMMENDED WARDS WITH REFINEMENTS (47 WARDS) TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW



1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

In 2014, Toronto City Council launched the Toronto Ward Boundary Review (TWBR). Toronto's current ward structure, implemented approximately 15 years ago, has become unbalanced. This is problematic, not just at election time, but every time City Council votes.

The purpose of the TWBR is to put forward a new ward structure for Toronto that achieves the principle of *effective representation*, and can last for the next four municipal elections.

Beginning in mid-2014, the TWBR Team, made up of an independent team of consultants, conducted a civic engagement and public consultation process to collect input on Toronto's current ward alignment. The results informed the development of five options for realigning Toronto's wards. A second round of the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process solicited feedback on these options between August and November 2015. The **TWBR Final Report** (May 2016) summarized the TWBR process and recommended a new ward structure -- referred to as the TWBR Recommended Wards (47 Wards).

At its meeting on May 24, 2016, the City of Toronto Executive Committee asked the City Manager to request the TWBR Team to provide additional information on a number of issues. The TWBR Team developed the **Additional Information Report** (August 2016) in response, as the basis for conducting a public consultation process in August-September 2016. All of the TWBR reports are available on the project website at drawthelines.ca.

During August and September 2016 the TWBR gathered comments from the public and stakeholders at four public meetings and through an online survey. Members of City Council were interviewed individually. The following items were discussed:

- A Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) that incorporates the refinements suggested during the TWBR public consultation process between August and November 2015;
- A ward option that is consistent with the boundaries of the 25 federal and provincial ridings.
- Members of Council and public meeting participants also commented on the TWBR Recommended Wards (47 Wards)².

² *The recommended ward structure was not included as an option in the online survey. The Recommended Wards (47 Wards) already reflected input from the 2015 public consultation process.*

In total 613 individuals and groups participated.

1.2 TWBR CONTEXT

- Toronto’s expected population growth from 2011 to 2030 is approximately 500,000
- 2014 average ward population: 61,000
- 2014 smallest ward: 44,400; 2014 largest ward: 94,600
- If there is no change to the current ward structure, in 2026 the smallest ward will be 44,300 and the largest ward 130,000, an almost 66% difference
- TWBR needs to balance the components of *effective representation*:
 - Achieving voter parity (similar, not identical, numbers of people and taking into account population growth)
 - Keeping together geographic communities of interest
 - Following natural and physical boundaries
 - Respecting ward history
 - Considering ‘capacity to represent’ (variety/complexity of issues in a ward)
- New ward structure to last for the next 4 elections: 2018, 2022, 2026 & 2030
- Target year to determine voter parity: 2026

Any ward boundary review has to balance the various components of *effective representation*. Voter parity (similar, not identical, numbers of people and taking into account population growth) is of prime importance to an individual’s ‘right-to-vote’.

Toronto’s wards were last redrawn in 2000. Because of the large difference between the City’s smallest and largest wards, the populations of the large wards have to get smaller and those of the small wards have to get larger to achieve *effective representation*.

The vast majority of Toronto’s growth will occur in the Downtown and the other growth centres designated in the Official Plan³. At the same time, most of Toronto’s communities will not see substantial growth and will remain stable, again as determined by the Official Plan. To accommodate Toronto’s growth and allow any new ward structure to last for multiple elections, the TWBR uses 2026 as the target year for balancing projected ward populations. Using 2026 allows a new ward structure to be in place for the municipal election of 2018 and last for the 2022, 2026 and 2030 municipal elections.

³ *The Official Plan sets out the vision for where and how Toronto will grow to the year 2031* (toronto.ca)

1.3 HOW MUCH CAN WARD POPULATIONS DIFFER

To achieve the voter parity component of *effective representation*, 10% above or below the average ward population has been the gold standard of ward boundary reviews. This means that there can be a 20% difference (or variance) between the highest and lowest ward populations. For example, since the 2014 average ward population for Toronto was 61,000, wards could be between 54,900 and 67,100 people in 2014.

A difference of 10% - 15% above or below the average ward population can also be used to minimize change to ward boundaries, keep neighbourhoods together or follow a clearly recognizable ward boundary. Differences above plus or minus 15% become problematic and can be used only in special circumstances. For example, a ward may be below 15%, because it is expected to grow or it may be above this percentage, because it is stable and will get closer to the city-wide average over time.

A variance of plus or minus 20% or more has been applied, on rare occasions, by municipalities that have to ensure the representation of rural areas within their boundaries, such as the City of Ottawa. Such a large difference is not appropriate for a built-up city like Toronto. The plus or minus 10% - 15% difference in ward populations has been upheld by the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) for urban areas.

In the options presented in the **TWBR Options Report** (October 2015) Option 1 (47 Wards) used a variance of +/- 15% in order to maintain as many existing ward boundaries as possible. The other 4 options applied a +/- 10% variance factor.

1.4 PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS AUGUST – SEPTEMBER 2016

The TWBR Team carried out a public consultation process on the **Additional Information Report** (August 2016) in August and September 2016. A total of 613 individuals and groups participated as follows:

- **Public meetings:** Public meetings were held on September 14, 15, 19 and 21 (one in each Community Council area). Each meeting included a presentation and a facilitated discussion. Large maps were also on display. In total, 90 people attended the four meetings. At each meeting, participants were asked what they liked about the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) and if they had any concerns or suggested refinements. Comments were also collected about the Wards Consistent with Federal Riding Boundaries (26). In addition, feedback on the Recommended Wards (47 Wards) was provided and recorded during the meetings.
- **Public survey/submissions:** An online survey was developed and posted on the TWBR website. Survey forms were also available at the four public meetings. The online survey was open from August 10 to September 23. A number of submissions were also sent to the TWBR during this time period. In total 485 responses were received. The recommended ward structure

was not included as an option in the online survey. The Recommended Wards (47 Wards) already reflected input from the 2015 public consultation process.

- **Interviews with Members of Council:** Individual interviews with Members of Council were held in August and September 2016. Councillors commented on the two additional options and suggested refinements to the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) and the Recommended Wards (47 Wards); 38 of the current 43 Councillors participated.

Table 1 indicates the responses by ward to the online survey and through submissions.

Table 1 – Survey/Submission Responses by Ward

CURRENT WARD	# OF SURVEYS	CURRENT WARD	# OF SURVEYS
1	2	23	8
2	5	24	2
3	4	25	4
4	3	26	9
5	8	27	38
6	23	28	20
8	5	29	5
9	2	30	5
10	2	31	7
11	5	32	78
13	8	33	8
14	14	34	2
15	6	35	14
16	12	36	9
17	9	40	1
18	12	41	2
19	12	42	1
20	29	43	4
21	7	44	5
22	20	Did Not Specify	75

1.5 COMMUNICATIONS

In order to promote public discussion on and feedback about the **Additional Information Report**, direct e-mails with background information, public meeting dates and the online survey were sent to the TWBR's distribution list of over 2,800 contacts. The contact list includes community organizations, NGOs, specific ethno-cultural organizations, School Board trustees and individuals who subscribed to the TWBR mailing list.

Separate e-mails were also sent to all Members of Council with a request to distribute the information to residents in their ward. Many Councillors shared e-news and tweets/posts about the public meetings and survey with their constituents. City staff also supported the outreach efforts through the City of Toronto's @GetInvolvedTO social media account.

The TWBR as well as the City of Toronto issued news releases drawing attention to the report's availability online. Ads were also placed in the following local and regional newspapers, including:

- Metro (Toronto)
- Metroland (9 local papers: North York, Scarborough, Etobicoke, City Centre, East York, Beach, York, Parkdale, Bloor West Village)
- Sing Tao (Traditional Chinese)
- Canadian Chinese Express (Mandarin)
- Senthamarai (Tamil)
- El Popular (Spanish)
- Philippine Reporter
- Corriere Canadese (Italian)
- Sol Portuguese
- Iran Javan (Farsi)
- Russian Canadian Info
- Urdu Post (Urdu)
- Korea Times Daily
- CBC.ca (online)
- Now Toronto (online)
- Toronto Star (Online)

There were over 5,900 visits to the TWBR website during the feedback period.

1.6 SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT AT-A-GLANCE

The following Sections of this **Supplementary Report** are organized around the four additional information items the TWBR Team was asked to explore:

1. Review the original Option 1 (47 Wards) to determine if the imbalance in ward populations can be addressed by re-aligning only the wards with large populations, while still maintaining *effective representation*.
2. Review the refinements to Option 2 (44 Wards) that were received during the public involvement process leading to the **TWBR Final Report**.
3. Determine whether and how Toronto’s ward boundaries could be consistent with the 25 federal and provincial riding boundaries.
4. Allow for further boundary refinements of the Recommended Wards (47 Wards).

The report reviews each of these four items under three general headings – Background, What We Heard and Summary. The “Background” sub-section outlines the context, including relevant material from the **Additional Information Report**. The results of the online survey, public meetings and interviews with Members of Council are reported separately in the “What We Heard” sub-section. The “Summary” sub-section provides a concluding overview of all comments and includes revised maps, where appropriate.

This **Supplementary Report** also contains two Appendices that catalogue comments and further suggested boundary refinements to Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) and Recommended Wards (47 Wards) and indicate if the suggestions were able to be incorporated into the revised maps. If a suggested refinement could not be incorporated, a reason is provided.

The Executive Committee also expressed its “preference for maintaining the Community Council boundaries given their historical significance reflecting communities of interest”. While the number and shape of community councils are outside the scope of the TWBR, it is worth noting that the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) with additional refinements, the 26 Wards Consistent with Federal Riding Boundaries and the Revised Recommended Wards (47 Wards) all maintain the Humber River and Victoria Park as historic ward boundaries.

2. REVIEW OF OPTION 1 (47 WARDS)

The Executive Committee's direction was to review Option 1 (47 wards) by focusing only on wards with the highest population discrepancies (the examples given were: Wards 20, 22, 23, 27 and 28) and leaving the other wards intact; to examine the possibility of having only 46 wards; and to ensure that the resulting option achieves *effective representation*.

Option 1 was based on two key factors: 1) maintain the current average ward population of 61,000 and 2) retain the current ward boundaries of as many wards as possible. To achieve this, Option 1 used a range around the average ward population of +/- 15%, or ward populations between 51,850 and 70,150.

Table 2 shows the populations of the large wards that were used as examples in the Executive Committee direction for the target year 2026.

Table 2: 2026 Population Projections (Selected Wards)

WARD	PROJECTED 2026 POPULATION
20	125,578
22	78,291
23	100,999
27	129,992
28	116,872


However, there are also three other large wards – Ward 5 (90,056), Ward 24 (77,416) and Ward 42 (79,511). Of the 8 large wards in the city, 4 will be over 100,000 by 2026. Three of those wards are in the downtown area (Wards 20, 27 and 28) and one is in Willowdale (Ward 23). To correct the population discrepancies among these 4 wards would require 4 additional wards, three in the Downtown and one in Willowdale. A focus only on the four largest wards, while leaving all other wards intact, requires 48 wards.

A ward structure with 46 wards could only add one ward in the downtown area and one ward in Willowdale. The resulting downtown wards would still remain very large - approximately 93,000 each. To achieve *effective representation*, especially with respect to voter parity, both large and small wards must be considered. That means all wards above and below 15% of the average ward population of 61,000 have to be examined. Map 1 shows existing wards within +/- 15% of the average ward population, as well as those wards above 15% and those below 15%.

Map 1: Existing Ward Variances - 2026

EXISTING WARDS (2026 PROJECTED POPULATION VARIANCES) TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

drawthelines.ca



In 2026 Toronto will have 8 wards that are above 15% of the average ward population of 61,000. It will also have 14 wards that are more than 15% below average. In total, 22 wards, or half of Toronto’s wards, will be outside the voter parity range required for *effective representation*.

To achieve *effective representation* around the current average ward population of approximately 61,000 requires making the large wards smaller and making the small wards larger. The objective of minimizing changes to ward boundaries was pursued in Option 1 (the Minimal Change Option) in the **TWBR Options Report**. In this option 18 wards had no boundary changes. The vast majority of the changes occurred in the 22 large and small wards. The remaining 4 wards had to change, due to the cascading effect of the changes in adjacent wards. This Option 1 (47 Wards) achieved *effective representation*. However, it did not incorporate the suggestions for boundary changes made by Members of Council and the general public during the public discussion of the **TWBR Options Report**.

As this analysis indicates, focusing only on the large wards does not lead to a ward configuration that achieves voter parity, a prime component of *effective representation* and a condition of the Executive Committee’s direction. It would lead to 48 wards to adjust the large wards and it does not address the numerous wards that are currently too small. In summary, an approach that focuses only on the large wards cannot pass the test of *effective representation* and has not been pursued.

3. REFINEMENTS TO OPTION 2 (44 WARDS)

3.1 BACKGROUND

The TWBR Team reviewed all of the refinements to Option 2 (44 Wards) suggested during the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process in 2015. Each suggested refinement was considered individually and its impact on the three major components of *effective representation* (voter parity; communities of interest; and coherent ward boundaries) was evaluated.

Depending on the outcome of this evaluation, a refinement was incorporated or not incorporated into a revised version of Option 2 (44 Wards). It should be noted that many of the suggested refinements, which could not be accommodated, either reduce or enlarge the 44 wards in Option 2 to such an extent that voter parity cannot be maintained. The Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) map was discussed during the public consultation process in August - September 2016.

The Revised Option 2, just like the initial Option 2, is based on an average 2026 population size of 70,000. It divides a number of communities of interest such as the Dundas growth area in Etobicoke, Leaside and The Beach. In each instance several potential ward boundary permutations were explored, but it was not possible to keep these communities together in one ward because of issues with voter parity. All proposed revisions and the actions taken were documented in **Appendix A** to the **Additional Information Report**.

A +/- 10% variance is used in this option to evaluate voter parity. In order to maintain 44 wards and accommodate Toronto's projected growth, the current average ward population of 61,000 has to increase to 70,000. A variance of +/-10% leads to a major re-alignment of the current ward boundaries. At an average ward population of 70,000 a +/-10% population range between the largest and smallest ward is 14,000, which is appropriate.

Map 2 shows the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) incorporating the refinements suggested in the TWBR's civic engagement and public consultation process in 2015. Table 3 shows the accompanying 2026 projected population variances for the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards). Forty wards fall within the +/- 10% range of the average ward population of 70,000. Four wards are outside the +/- 10% range. However, these 4 Wards are between +/- 10% and +/- 12%.

MAP 2: REVISED OPTION 2 - 44 WARDS TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

drawthelines.ca




Table 3: Revised Option 2 - 44 Wards

WARD	2026	VARIANCE	WARD	2026	VARIANCE
W 201	66,207	-5.42%	W 223	67,260	-3.91%
W 202	63,809	-8.84%	W 224	65,690	-6.16%
W 203	63,401	-9.43%	W 225	67,546	-3.51%
W 204	63,832	-8.81%	W 226	66,622	-4.83%
W 205	63,146	-9.79%	W 227	65,850	-5.93%
W 206	69,434	-0.81%	W 228	64,002	-8.57%
W 207	68,811	-1.70%	W 229	61,836	-11.66%
W 208	69,232	-1.10%	W 230	67,666	-3.33%
W 209	63,830	-8.81%	W 231	65,900	-5.86%
W 210	64,302	-8.14%	W 232	72,382	3.40%
W 211	63,658	-9.06%	W 233	73,031	4.33%
W 212	68,486	-2.16%	W 234	65,176	-6.89%
W 213	62,469	-10.76%	W 235	63,786	-8.88%
W 214	66,846	-4.51%	W 236	63,693	-9.01%
W 215	65,199	-6.86%	W 237	71,300	1.86%
W 216	62,756	-10.35%	W 238	66,988	-4.30%
W 217	63,339	-9.52%	W 239	66,889	-4.44%
W 218	77,350	10.50%	W 240	67,619	-3.40%
W 219	74,021	5.59%	W 241	63,325	-9.54%
W 220	70,233	0.33%	W 242	67,487	-3.59%
W 221	65,055	-7.06%	W 243	67,574	-3.47%
W 222	64,828	-7.59%	W 244	63,487	-9.30%

As Table 3 shows, the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) achieves excellent voter parity among the 44 wards. However, it has some significant challenges regarding existing geographic communities of interest.

3.2 WHAT WE HEARD

During August and September 2016 **Map 2**, Revised Option 2 - 44 Wards, was discussed at four public meetings, presented in the online survey and examined by Members of Council in individual interviews. Comments were of two types, general ‘likes’ and ‘concerns’ and ward-specific suggestions for further boundary refinements. The comments are discussed separately below by the origin of the feedback – public meetings, online survey/submissions, and interviews with Members of Council. Ward-specific suggestions for boundary revisions have been integrated and both the suggestions and their disposition are contained in **Appendix A** of this Report.

Public Meetings

Overall, 20 people expressed concerns about this option and 7 liked the option. The most common concern is that the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) would make the average ward population larger and therefore diminish local representation and the public’s ability to access their Councillor. Similarly, a few people also expressed that this option does not “achieve the ‘capacity to represent’ principle,” because “Councillors will not be able to handle larger wards” and “governance will be difficult”.

At a general level, concerns were expressed stating that the option: “does not improve local representation”; “creates massive change”; “artificially keeps 44 wards, which doesn’t make sense”; “creates too many downtown wards”; “is not good for the downtown neighbourhoods”; and “divides up major downtown intersections”.

Those that like the option referred primarily to the size of City Council. Participants stated that “a 44 ward option would be easier to get Council support” and “doesn’t increase the size of City Council”. Some like the option because it doesn’t split certain communities. In particular, the Church-Wellesley Village and Regent Park have been noted.

Online Survey/Submissions

There were a total of 376 responses directly related to the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards). Sorting responses into ‘likes’ and ‘concerns’ result in 118 respondents liking Revised Option 2 and 244 respondents having concerns about it. Comments can be divided into several themes.

Table 4: Summary of Key Themes – Revised Option 2 - 44 Wards

Likes (122)	Concerns (254)
Smaller wards provide more representation for local population (39) ⁴	Wards split existing neighbourhoods and communities (61)
General support for this option (35)	Too many Councillors for effective and efficient government (39)
Boundaries are in good locations (e.g. reflect communities of interest and natural boundaries) (23)	Not enough Councillors for effective local governance (33)
Maintains current number of wards, but better distributes population (22)	General concerns with this option (29)
No increase in cost for additional Councillors (3)	Prefer fewer wards consistent with Federal Ridings (23)
	Downtown core is underrepresented (16)
	Prefer the 47 ward option (13)
	Wards do not reflect different neighbourhood characteristics (10)
	Increased costs with too many wards/Councillors (10)
	Boundary lines are not appropriate (10)
	Boundaries are manipulated by political interest (6)
	Better to maintain the status quo (4)

Members of Council

In general, comments by Members of Council are similar to those of the public expressed at the public meetings and through the online survey and submissions. The ‘like’ category includes the fact that the size of Council remains the same and that the extra workload generated by the larger wards is manageable. Some of the ‘likes’ are dependent on certain boundary adjustments. Concerns expressed also mirror those articulated by the public and revolve around the high degree of change, the disappearance of Wards 10 and 32, the mixing of divergent communities and the impact the increase in ward population will have on Councillors’ ‘capacity to represent’.

⁴ Some of the responses regarding smaller wards may have arisen as respondents compared this option to the 26 ward option that follows federal riding boundaries.

Suggestions for Refinements

Through all three forms of input – public meetings, online survey/submissions and interviews with Members of Council – numerous suggestions for refinements were put forward. These are listed in **Appendix A**, Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) – Additional Suggestions for Refinements along with their disposition.

3.3 SUMMARY

Map 3, Additional Revisions – Option 2 (44 Wards) presents a revised version of **Map 2** that includes further suggested refinements which are compatible with *effective representation*. **Map 3** highlights in red the wards with unchanged boundaries. **Table 5** indicates the variance calculations for the ward alignment shown on **Map 3**.

MAP 3: ADDITIONAL REVISIONS - OPTION 2 (44 WARDS) TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW




Table 5: Additional Revisions – Option 2 (44 Wards)

WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
W 201	66,297	-5.29%	66,024	-5.68%	66,257	-5.35%	66,472	-5.04%
W 202	63,210	-9.70%	63,108	-9.85%	63,859	-8.77%	64,869	-7.33%
W 203	56,657	-19.06%	59,209	-15.42%	62,651	-10.50%	65,836	-5.95%
W 204	61,673	-11.90%	62,294	-11.01%	62,891	-10.16%	63,594	-9.15%
W 205	55,962	-20.05%	59,756	-14.63%	64,883	-7.31%	70,468	0.67%
W 206	65,513	-6.41%	67,555	-3.49%	69,449	-0.79%	71,572	2.25%
W 207	66,535	-4.95%	67,093	-4.15%	68,811	-1.70%	70,798	1.14%
W 208	65,500	-6.43%	66,516	-4.98%	69,232	-1.10%	72,210	3.16%
W 209	60,952	-12.93%	61,860	-11.63%	63,830	-8.81%	66,439	-5.09%
W 210	61,418	-12.26%	61,921	-11.54%	64,302	-8.14%	66,842	-4.51%
W 211	61,568	-12.05%	62,493	-10.72%	63,658	-9.06%	68,029	-2.82%
W 212	66,058	-5.63%	66,225	-5.39%	68,486	-2.16%	68,146	-2.65%
W 213	61,741	-11.80%	62,044	-11.37%	62,469	-10.76%	62,912	-10.13%
W 214	64,645	-7.65%	66,165	-5.48%	66,846	-4.51%	67,522	-3.54%
W 215	64,080	-8.46%	64,458	-7.92%	65,199	-6.86%	66,009	-5.70%
W 216	60,195	-14.01%	61,356	-12.35%	62,756	-10.35%	64,074	-8.47%
W 217	48,537	-30.66%	57,227	-18.25%	63,339	-9.52%	65,465	-6.48%
W 218	56,635	-19.09%	67,368	-3.76%	77,350	10.50%	84,188	20.27%
W 219	65,189	-6.87%	69,913	-0.12%	74,021	5.74%	77,033	10.05%
W 220	68,214	-2.55%	69,338	-0.95%	70,223	0.32%	70,927	1.32%
W 221	63,173	-9.75%	64,038	-8.52%	65,055	-7.06%	66,051	-5.64%
W 222	62,339	-10.94%	62,938	-10.09%	64,828	-7.39%	66,688	-4.73%
W 223	64,287	-8.16%	65,498	-6.43%	67,260	-3.91%	69,481	-0.74%
W 224	62,546	-10.65%	64,548	-7.79%	65,690	-6.16%	66,920	-4.40%
W 225	65,908	-5.85%	66,660	-4.77%	67,546	-3.51%	68,534	-2.09%
W 226	64,795	-7.44%	66,031	-5.67%	66,622	-4.83%	67,173	-4.04%
W 227	65,287	-6.73%	65,700	-6.14%	65,850	-5.93%	66,038	-5.66%
W 228	62,928	-10.10%	63,160	-9.77%	64,002	-8.57%	64,971	-7.18%
W 229	56,401	-19.43%	60,616	-13.41%	61,836	-11.66%	63,036	-9.95%
W 230	67,782	-3.17%	67,564	-3.48%	67,666	-3.33%	67,868	-3.05%
W 231	64,802	-7.43%	65,343	-6.65%	65,900	-5.86%	66,579	-4.89%
W 232	62,942	-10.08%	67,557	-3.49%	72,382	3.40%	78,114	11.59%

WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
W 233	56,074	-19.89%	68,227	-2.53%	73,031	4.33%	78,749	12.50%
W 234	63,988	-8.59%	64,802	-7.43%	65,176	-6.89%	65,287	-6.73%
W 235	62,434	-10.81%	63,312	-9.55%	64,984	-7.17%	67,253	-3.92%
W 236	59,124	-15.54%	60,297	-13.86%	62,273	-11.04%	64,672	-7.61%
W 237	68,295	-2.44%	68,863	-1.62%	71,300	1.86%	74,290	6.13%
W 238	64,535	-7.81%	65,291	-6.73%	66,988	-4.30%	70,227	0.32%
W 239	63,507	-9.28%	65,643	-6.22%	66,889	-4.44%	68,503	-2.14%
W 240	68,626	-1.96%	68,260	-2.49%	67,689	-3.30%	67,924	-2.97%
W 241	63,279	-9.60%	63,510	-9.27%	63,325	-9.54%	63,512	-9.27%
W 242	67,467	-3.62%	67,465	-3.62%	67,487	-3.59%	67,182	-4.03%
W 243	65,148	-6.93%	65,773	-6.04%	67,574	-3.47%	69,801	-0.28%
W 244	61,686	-11.88%	62,634	-10.52%	63,487	-9.30%	64,331	-8.10%

One of the concerns raised during the public consultation process is the large degree of change from the existing ward structure. This option changes ward boundaries for virtually all wards – only the boundaries of Wards 206, 210 and 235 remain the same. This is primarily the result of increasing the average ward population from 61,000 to 70,000, a change required to accommodate Toronto’s projected population growth while retaining the same number of wards.

Table 5, Additional Revisions – Option 2 - 44 Wards, shows the projected ward populations and variances from the average ward population of 70,000. As mentioned previously, the target year for considering variances is 2026 and the variance goal for voter parity is +/- 10%. With these revisions the variances in voter parity are largely within +/- 10%.

There are 4 wards (W203, W204, W213 and W216) which are just slightly below the 10% threshold. Also W218 is slightly above the 10% threshold. For all these wards the variance is less than +/- 11%. Two wards, W229 at -11.66% and W236 at -11.04% have a variance between +/- 11% and 12%. Both are growing in population and will be within the +/- 10% threshold by 2030. This further revised Option 2 presents a good voter parity profile.

The main differences between the further revised Option 2 and the current ward structure are:

- The average ward population increases from 61,000 to 70,000. It is this increase that results in the changes in most ward boundaries, especially for the smaller wards
- 2 wards are added in the downtown area
- 1 ward is added in Willowdale

- Existing Wards 10 and 32 are removed
- Existing Wards 14, 17 and 18 are combined into 2 wards

However, this option maintains the current number of wards at 44 and hence does not change the size of City Council.

There were 164 comments and ward-specific suggestions for refinements to the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) as a result of the consultations with the public, Members of Council and the online survey/submissions. Many of the suggested refinements could not be incorporated, because 14 of the existing wards are so small and have to be enlarged. It was only possible to incorporate 6 of the suggestions. Of the 77 suggestions that could not be incorporated most want to shift the boundaries back to the existing ward system. There were also 33 ‘likes’ of and 31 ‘concerns’ with specific wards.

Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) with additional refinements results in the following:

- Downtown wards are not within the boundary of the Downtown, as defined in the Official Plan
- A ward boundary crosses Victoria Park
- The following communities of interest are kept together (among others)
 - Church-Wellesley Village
 - Regent Park
 - St. Lawrence
 - West Toronto Junction
- The following communities of interest are divided
 - Bridlewood/Corinthian communities
 - Don Mills Residents Association
 - Entertainment District Residents Association
 - Flemingdon Park
 - Jane-Finch
 - Lawrence Heights
 - Leaside
 - Malvern
 - Mount Dennis Community Association
 - Northwood community
 - The Beach

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW – NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO | SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
OCTOBER 2016

Some of the ‘divided’ communities, such as Jane-Finch, Don Mills or Malvern, are too large to be included in one ward. In the other instances several potential ward boundary permutations have been explored, but it has not been possible to keep these communities together in one ward because of issues with voter parity among adjacent wards.

4. CONSISTENCY WITH FEDERAL RIDING BOUNDARIES

4.1 BACKGROUND

The third component of the Executive Committee's direction was to determine whether Toronto's ward boundaries can be consistent with the 25 federal and provincial riding boundaries.

Currently, 25 federal ridings are completely within the boundaries of the City of Toronto. There are now 22 provincial ridings. However, all indications are that the Province will adopt the federal riding boundaries for the City of Toronto prior to the next provincial election. This analysis is based on the current 25 federal ridings.

The TWBR uses the year 2026 to ensure that any new ward structure will last for several elections and constant ward boundary reviews are not required. This is different from how provincial and federal riding boundaries are determined. Federal and provincial ridings are adjusted every 10 years based on the most recent Census. The current federal ridings are based on the 2011 Census and they will be adjusted again following the 2021 Census. In this respect the TWBR looks to incorporate future growth, while the federal and provincial riding boundary commissions adjust riding boundaries based on past growth.

Using federal / provincial riding boundaries as potential ward boundaries is grounded in the assumption that it is administratively easier for staff and more transparent for residents to have these boundaries coincide. Some people feel that having the same boundaries for all three levels of government makes it easier for constituents to know who to contact to resolve their concerns.

During the TWBR's first round of public consultation the idea of using federal /provincial riding boundaries as ward boundaries was suggested on numerous occasions. However, it was mostly within the context of then splitting the ridings in half, similar to how Toronto's wards are currently structured. This approach would have resulted in 50 wards.

Table 6 lists the existing federal ridings, presents their estimated 2026 populations and shows the variance from the average riding population of approximately 117,000.

Table 6: Projected Populations – Federal Ridings

FEDERAL RIDING NAME	2026 PROJECTED POPULATION	VARIANCE FROM AVERAGE RIDING POPULATION
Beaches-East York	109,357	-6.54%
Davenport	105,226	-10.07%
Don Valley East	98,273	-16.02%
Don Valley North	117,721	+0.60%
Don Valley West	105,774	-9.61%
Eglinton-Lawrence	122,347	+4.56%
Etobicoke Centre	120,501	+2.98%
Etobicoke-Lakeshore	152,578	+30.39%
Etobicoke North	117,760	+0.64%
Parkdale-High Park	108,098	-7.62%
Toronto-St. Paul's	116,420	-0.51%
Scarborough-Agincourt	108,962	-6.88%
Scarborough Centre	112,958	-3.47%
Scarborough-Guildwood	107,190	-8.40%
Scarborough North	100,712	-13.93%
Scarborough-Rouge Park	106,585	-8.91%
Scarborough Southwest	111,491	-4.72%
Spadina-Fort York	153,846	+31.48%
Toronto Centre	151,658	+29.61%
Toronto-Danforth	104,744	-10.49%
University-Rosedale	124,646	+6.52%
Willowdale	127,257	+8.75%
York Centre	103,191	-11.81%
York South-Weston	119,512	+2.13%
Humber River-Black Creek	118,548	+1.31%

10% Variance Scenario

If the 25 federal ridings were to become 25 wards and a +/-10% variance was used, ward populations could vary from 105,300 to 128,700. This is a population range of 23,400 residents between the smallest and the largest potential ward. Even though this is a significant number of people, a +/- 10% variance is considered appropriate for municipal wards.

However, at a +/- 10% variance 8 ridings fall outside this variance, 5 that are below and 3 that are above. This represents almost a third of the potential wards. Attempting boundary adjustments to correct for these variances would alter too many riding boundaries and negate the value of using the federal riding boundaries as ward boundaries. The +/- 10% variance scenario has, therefore, been rejected.

15% Variance Scenario

This scenario increases the variance range for voter parity to +/- 15%. In this scenario, average ward populations could vary from 99,450 to 134,550. This is a potential ward population variance of 35,100 people, which is considerable.

At +/- 15% four potential wards would be outside the variance range, Don Valley East at -16.02%, Etobicoke-Lakeshore at +30.39%, Spadina-Fort York at +31.48% and Toronto Centre at +29.61%. Don Valley East at 16.02% below the average could be a viable ward. However, the other three larger wards would need to be adjusted to achieve any semblance of voter parity.

The two downtown potential wards are projected to have 305,504 residents by 2026. If three wards were created within the boundaries of the two existing ridings, they would average approximately 102,000 people each. This is within the +/- 15% range and would not impact any of the other federal riding boundaries.


Etobicoke-Lakeshore presents a different challenge. In 2026, it is projected to have a population of 152,578. One approach would be to combine Etobicoke-Lakeshore with Etobicoke Centre and adjust their boundaries by adding area to Etobicoke Centre. This would result in two wards which are still above the 15% variance. In order to bring the voter parity numbers within +/- 15%, Etobicoke North would have to be included, as would ridings east of the Humber River. Such significant adjustments to the federal riding boundaries are not in keeping with the Executive Committee's direction.

The least disruptive alternative would be to create an extra ward in the Downtown and adjust the boundaries between Etobicoke-Lakeshore and Etobicoke Centre by adding some population to the latter. This scenario results in 26 wards.

Map 4 shows 26 wards consistent with federal riding boundaries. One ward has been added Downtown and the boundary between Etobicoke-Lakeshore and Etobicoke Centre has been adjusted.

MAP 4: WARDS CONSISTENT WITH FEDERAL RIDING BOUNDARIES TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

drawthelines.ca



The ward configuration shown on **Map 4** has 26 wards consistent with federal riding boundaries. By adding a 26th ward, the average ward population changes from 117,000 to 112,500. **Table 7** recalculates voter parity variances for 26 wards consistent with federal riding boundaries.

Table 7: Wards Consistent with Federal Riding Boundaries

FEDERAL RIDING	2026	VARIANCE
Beaches - East York	109,358	-3%
Davenport	105,226	-6%
Don Valley East	98,274	-13%
Don Valley North	117,720	+5%
Don Valley West	105,774	-6%
Eglinton - Lawrence	122,346	+9%
Etobicoke Centre	137,248	+22%
Etobicoke - Lakeshore	135,832	+21%
Etobicoke North	117,760	+5%
Parkdale - High Park	108,098	-4%
St. Paul's	116,420	+3%
Scarborough - Agincourt	108,962	-3%
Scarborough Centre	112,958	0%
Scarborough - Guildwood	107,190	-5%
Scarborough North	100,712	-10%
Scarborough - Rouge River	106,584	-5%
Scarborough Southwest	111,490	-1%
Spadina - Fort York	101,898	-9%
Toronto Centre North	98,201	-13%
Toronto Centre South	105,405	-6%
Toronto - Danforth	104,744	-7%
University - Rosedale	124,646	+11%
Willowdale	127,256	+13%
York Centre	103,190	-8%
York South - Weston	119,512	+6%
Humber River - Black Creek	118,548	+5%

As Table 7 shows, the re-aligned wards of Etobicoke-Lakeshore and Etobicoke Centre are both 20% above the average ward population. An attempt to correct this imbalance requires not only adjusting the boundaries of Etobicoke North, but also crossing the Humber River and adjusting the boundaries of York South-Weston and Parkdale-High Park. This amount of adjustment negates the use of federal riding boundaries as ward boundaries. Also, it would mean crossing a major natural and historic ward boundary – the Humber River.

Using federal riding boundaries as a basis for ward boundaries as shown on **Map 4** and Table 7 raises significant concerns for voter parity, a prime component of *effective representation*, in Etobicoke. However, to resolve this would require altering the boundaries of several federal ridings and crossing a major natural and historic current ward boundary. Such significant change contradicts the purpose of making federal riding boundaries and ward boundaries consistent.

4.2 WHAT WE HEARD

The concept of using the current federal riding boundaries as the boundaries for a new ward structure was discussed at public meetings, presented in the online survey and discussed with Members of Council. Because the intention of the option was to use the existing boundaries of federal ridings, no boundary adjustments or refinements could be considered. Hence, the comments received focus on the idea and practicality of using federal riding boundaries for a new ward structure for Toronto.

Public Meetings

More people expressed concerns (24) about this option than liked it (11). The common theme for those who like this option is that it “reduces the number of Councillors”, which they believe would “make City Council more efficient” and “26 Councillors will be able to deal more effectively with strategic and city-wide issues”. A general assumption is that Councillors would require more staff support. There was also some confusion about this option. Some people, using the current ward system as a reference, thought that if the wards were consistent with federal riding boundaries, the ridings would then be divided in half and there would be 52 Councillors. At the public meetings the TWBR Team was able to explain that this was not the case.

The common theme for those that have concerns about this option is that the wards will be “too large” and that a Councillor, even with additional staff, cannot “properly represent their/his constituents”. Other factors raised are: the difference between the roles of Councillors and Members of Parliament and “wards with an average size of 112,500 lump too many divergent communities of interest together”.

Online Survey/Submissions

There were a total of 416 responses related to this option. Sorting responses into ‘likes’ and ‘concerns’ results in 197 people liking the option, while 219 have concerns about it. Comments can be divided into several themes.

Table 8 – Summary of Key Themes – Federal Riding Boundaries

Likes (197)	Concerns (219)
General support for this option (68)	Diminishes local democracy/representation (85)
More efficient/effective Council with fewer politicians (38)	General concerns with this option (75)
Larger wards maintain cohesive communities (29)	Different purposes served by municipal and federal governments (28)
Ward identification is simpler for residents (23)	Larger wards create population discrepancies (16)
Increases collaboration between levels of government (14)	Difficult to manage municipal issues with larger wards (15)
Fewer wards are more cost effective (14)	
Aligns representation between governments (7)	
Achieves an amalgamated City of Toronto (4)	

For those who like this option, three reasons stand out. The first is the reduction in Councillors, the second relates to the ease of residents knowing which representatives serve them and the third is that larger wards are able to keep more communities together. For those that have concerns, the main issue is that is the “level of local representation will diminish with wards this size”. Also noted are the dissimilarities between the roles of local Councillors and those of Federal and Provincial Members of Parliament. Finally, some expressed that “large wards force too many divergent communities together”.

Views in favour and against this option from the online survey seem to revolve around the desire for fewer Councillors on the one hand and the capacity of Councillors to represent the interests of his or her constituents on the other.

Members of Council

Members of Council have very strong opinions on this option. Among the 38 Councillors interviewed only 2 like this option. Twenty-nine (29) Councillors responded with a definite ‘No’ regarding it as completely unworkable. The main concern voiced by Councillors is the “inability to represent a ward as large as 112,500 people”. Wards this large are felt to be “undemocratic”. The general opinion is that “26 wards will not save money, since additional staff will be required”.

The “capacity to represent local constituents well” is the major concern. Also noted is the difference between the roles and responsibilities of a municipal Councillor and a Member of Parliament.

Suggestions for Refinements

The essence of this option is to use the existing federal riding boundaries as ward boundaries. Therefore, suggestions for boundary changes defeat the purpose of the option and have not been solicited.

4.3 SUMMARY

There was little support for this option at the public meetings and from Members of Council. The online survey yielded considerable support but not from a majority of the respondents.

5. REVISIONS TO THE RECOMMENDED WARDS (47 WARDS)

5.1 BACKGROUND

The TWBR Team submitted its **Final Report** with a recommended ward structure of 47 wards to the Executive Committee in May 2016. See www.drawthelines.ca/the-final-report.

The public consultation process on the **TWBR Additional Information Report** provided an opportunity for Members of Council to comment on the Recommended Wards (47 Wards). Suggestions for boundary refinements were also gathered at the public meetings. The recommended ward structure was not included as an option in the online survey. The Recommended Wards (47 Wards) already reflected input from the 2015 public consultation process.

The recommended ward structure aims for a +/- 15% variance factor to evaluate voter parity. This is a higher variance factor than in the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards), which uses a +/- 10% variance factor. The former was deemed appropriate in order to minimize change and, as much as possible, respect ward history. It should be noted that the boundaries of the downtown wards have been adjusted to coincide with the Official Plan boundaries for the Downtown.


Map 5 shows the Recommended Wards (47 Wards) and Table 9 depicts the variance of each ward from the average ward population of 61,000. As with all other variance figures, 2026 is the target year used for comparison purposes. Recommended Ward 20 (a downtown ward) is 15.82% below the targeted ward population of 61,000. RW20 has the fastest growth rate and by 2030 will be within the +/-15% range (-12.90). Recommended Wards 15 and 41 are slightly above the 15% threshold at 15.27% and 15.26% respectively. RW15 is a relatively stable ward and is expected to grow by slightly over 1,000 people between 2018 and 2030. RW41 is just over 15% in 2026 (15.26%).

Wards that will grow dramatically over the next decade can start out smaller, as they will achieve acceptable voter parity ranges by the municipal election of 2026. Similarly, more stable wards, from a population growth perspective, may start larger than average or at the top of the voter parity range, but come closer to average by 2026.

Map 5: Recommended Wards (47)

RECOMMENDED WARDS TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW

drawthelines.ca



LEARN MORE ABOUT **DRAW THE LINES** www.drawthelines.ca

Table 9: Recommended Wards – 2018 – 2030

RECOMMENDED WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
RW 1	60,154	-1.39%	59,918	-1.77%	60,122	-1.44%	60,412	-0.96%
RW 2	59,298	-2.79%	59,205	-2.94%	59,935	-1.75%	60,886	-0.19%
RW 3	62,791	2.94%	63,747	4.50%	65,044	6.63%	66,551	9.10%
RW 4	63,419	3.97%	64,810	6.25%	65,507	7.39%	66,299	8.69%
RW 5	58,254	-4.50%	62,838	3.01%	70,010	14.77%	77,220	26.59%
RW 6	65,500	7.38%	67,540	10.72%	69,434	13.83%	71,557	17.31%
RW 7	55,133	-9.62%	55,670	-8.74%	57,043	-6.49%	58,825	-3.57%
RW 8	48,062	-21.21%	49,114	-19.49%	54,748	-10.25%	57,884	-5.11%
RW 9	54,677	-10.37%	55,182	-9.54%	56,380	-7.57%	58,076	-4.79%
RW 10	64,410	5.59%	64,986	6.53%	66,096	8.35%	67,360	10.43%
RW 11	61,420	0.69%	61,923	1.51%	64,304	5.42%	66,844	9.58%
RW 12	52,645	-13.70%	53,073	-13.00%	54,213	-11.13%	55,653	-8.77%
RW 13	58,726	-3.73%	59,584	-2.32%	62,255	2.06%	65,165	6.83%
RW 14	58,823	-3.57%	59,524	-2.42%	60,077	-1.51%	60,667	-0.55%
RW 15	69,412	13.79%	69,971	14.71%	70,313	15.27%	70,641	15.81%
RW 16	65,645	7.61%	65,779	7.84%	66,141	8.43%	66,530	9.07%
RW 17	64,645	5.98%	66,165	8.47%	66,846	9.58%	67,522	10.69%
RW 18	65,946	8.11%	66,428	8.90%	67,253	10.25%	68,135	11.70%
RW 19	64,392	5.56%	65,401	7.22%	66,683	9.32%	67,892	11.30%
RW 20	38,154	-37.45%	45,542	-25.34%	51,350	-15.82%	53,131	-12.90%
RW 21	47,180	-22.66%	58,859	-3.51%	63,625	4.30%	68,940	13.02%
RW 22	47,425	-22.25%	54,356	-10.89%	60,987	-0.02%	65,905	8.04%
RW 23	55,416	-9.15%	60,270	-1.20%	61,181	0.30%	64,922	6.43%
RW 24	47,020	-22.92%	50,248	-17.63%	55,692	-8.70%	60,357	-1.05%
RW 25	47,686	-21.83%	54,404	-10.81%	60,450	-0.90%	63,582	4.23%
RW 26	53,241	-12.72%	57,018	-6.53%	58,560	-4.00%	59,983	-1.67%

TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW – NEW WARDS FOR TORONTO | SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT
OCTOBER 2016

RECOMMENDED WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
RW 27	64,743	6.14%	66,332	8.74%	66,822	9.54%	67,279	10.29%
RW 28	57,443	-5.83%	58,037	-4.86%	59,815	-1.94%	61,549	0.90%
RW 29	59,020	-3.25%	60,233	-1.26%	62,378	2.26%	65,069	6.67%
RW 30	53,371	-12.51%	54,726	-10.28%	55,527	-8.97%	56,387	-7.56%
RW 31	60,082	-1.51%	61,318	0.52%	62,177	1.93%	63,103	3.45%
RW 32	68,522	12.33%	69,136	13.34%	69,527	13.98%	69,966	14.70%
RW 33	55,167	-9.56%	56,019	-8.17%	56,841	-6.82%	57,638	-5.51%
RW 34	55,616	-8.83%	55,463	-9.08%	55,576	-8.89%	55,706	-8.68%
RW 35	66,789	9.49%	67,026	9.88%	67,720	11.02%	68,605	12.47%
RW 36	57,817	-5.22%	58,490	-4.11%	58,637	-3.87%	58,764	-3.67%
RW 37	53,553	-12.21%	53,974	-11.52%	54,372	-10.87%	54,748	-10.25%
RW 38	63,014	3.30%	64,242	5.32%	67,016	9.86%	70,194	15.07%
RW 39	61,940	1.54%	62,821	2.98%	64,495	5.73%	66,757	9.44%
RW 40	65,979	8.16%	66,413	8.87%	68,542	12.36%	71,172	16.68%
RW 41	67,393	10.48%	68,402	12.14%	70,307	15.26%	73,894	21.14%
RW 42	63,507	4.11%	65,643	7.61%	66,889	9.65%	68,503	12.30%
RW 43	68,045	11.55%	67,681	10.95%	67,619	10.85%	67,350	10.41%
RW 44	66,035	8.25%	66,253	8.61%	66,060	8.30%	66,237	8.59%
RW 45	64,969	6.51%	64,979	6.52%	64,864	6.33%	64,714	6.09%
RW 46	58,644	-3.86%	59,616	-2.27%	60,815	-0.30%	62,215	1.99%
RW 47	50,847	-16.64%	51,327	-15.86%	51,952	-14.83%	52,646	-13.69%

5.2 WHAT WE HEARD

Map 5 was discussed at four public meetings and with Members of Council through individual interviews. Comments were of two types, general and ward-specific suggestions for further boundary refinements.

Public Meetings

More people attending the public meetings liked this option than had concerns with it. Of those who expressed a direct preference 17 support this option and 2 dislike it. The concerns centre on the increase in the size of City Council.

The main reasons given for supporting the option are that “it achieves better local representation and hence is better for democracy”. However, it was noted that some of the ward boundaries “still need improvement” and there were numerous suggestions for refinements.

Members of Council

Again, as with the comments on the Revised Option 2 (44 Wards), comments by Members of Council echo the comments of the public expressed at the public meetings. The ‘like’ category includes the fact that the average ward population remains the same, thus “limiting the need for boundary changes” and that the 47 ward option allows for “better capacity to represent”, “keeps existing communities together” and is the “result of an independent process”. Some Councillors believe that adding three Councillors “is appropriate given the growth that has occurred in Toronto since the current ward boundaries were established in 2000”. A number of Councillors like the Recommended Wards (47 Wards), subject to a few boundary adjustments.

Concerns expressed by Councillors include increasing the size of City Council and the splitting of some communities, such as Regent Park, the Church-Wellesley Village and the community on either side of Sentinel Road. It was also suggested that this option “merely transfers the smaller wards to the Downtown”.

Suggestions for Refinements

During the public meetings and interviews with Members of Council, numerous suggestions for refinements were put forward. These are listed in **Appendix B**, Recommended Wards (47 Wards) – Additional Suggestions for Refinements along with their disposition.

5.3 SUMMARY

Map 6, Recommended Wards – with Refinements (47 Wards), presents a revised version of **Map 5** and includes suggested refinements which are compatible with *effective representation*. **Map 6** highlights in red the wards with unchanged boundaries. Table 10 shows the population projections and variance calculations for the revised ward alignment shown in **Map 6**.

The Recommended Wards with Refinements (47 Wards) is an improvement to the TWBR Recommended Wards (47 Wards). In addition to achieving voter parity, it manages to keep many communities of interest together and has coherent ward boundaries. The Recommended Wards with Refinements (47 Wards) is the TWBR Team’s recommendation.

MAP 6: RECOMMENDED WARDS WITH REFINEMENTS (47 WARDS) TORONTO WARD BOUNDARY REVIEW




Table 10: Recommended Wards with Refinements 2018 – 2030

WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
RW 1	60,154	-1.39%	59,918	-1.77%	60,122	-1.44%	60,412	-0.96%
RW 2	59,298	-2.79%	59,205	-2.94%	59,935	-1.75%	60,886	-0.19%
RW 3	63,315	3.30%	64,473	5.69%	65,822	7.90%	67,341	10.40%
RW 4	62,895	3.11%	64,084	5.06%	64,729	6.11%	65,509	7.39%
RW 5	58,254	-4.50%	62,838	3.01%	70,010	14.77%	77,220	26.59%
RW 6	65,500	7.38%	67,540	10.72%	69,434	13.83%	71,557	17.31%
RW 7	55,133	-9.62%	55,670	-8.74%	57,043	-6.49%	58,825	-3.57%
RW 8	53,962	-11.54%	56,018	-8.17%	57,857	-5.15%	60,994	-0.01%
RW 9	48,470	-20.54%	48,571	-20.38%	51,451	-15.65%	51,950	-14.84%
RW 10	64,410	5.59%	64,986	6.53%	66,096	8.35%	67,360	10.43%
RW 11	61,420	0.59%	61,923	1.51%	64,304	5.42%	66,844	9.58%
RW 12	52,645	-13.70%	53,073	-13.00%	54,213	-11.13%	55,653	-8.77%
RW 13	58,726	-3.73%	59,584	-2.32%	62,255	2.06%	65,165	6.83%
RW 14	58,823	-3.57%	59,524	-2.42%	60,077	-1.51%	60,667	-0.55%
RW 15	62,786	2.93%	63,236	3.67%	63,558	4.19%	63,867	4.70%
RW 16	65,645	7.51%	65,779	7.84%	66,141	8.43%	66,530	9.07%
RW 17	64,645	5.98%	66,165	8.47%	66,846	9.58%	67,522	10.69%
RW 18	65,946	8.11%	66,428	8.90%	67,253	10.25%	68,135	11.70%
RW 19	64,392	5.56%	65,401	7.22%	66,683	9.32%	67,892	11.30%
RW 20	38,154	-37.45%	45,542	-25.34%	51,350	-15.82%	53,131	-12.90%
RW 21	40,098	-34.26%	50,011	-18.01%	53,417	-12.43%	59,115	-3.09%
RW 22	47,425	-22.25%	54,356	-10.89%	60,987	-0.02%	65,905	8.04%
RW 23	55,299	-9.35%	61,272	0.45%	62,367	2.24%	65,441	7.28%
RW 24	47,020	-22.92%	50,248	-17.63%	55,692	-8.70%	60,357	-1.05%
RW 25	52,786	-13.47%	59,049	-3.20%	65,576	7.50%	69,888	14.57%
RW 26	59,868	-1.86%	63,752	4.51%	65,315	7.07%	66,758	9.44%
RW 27	64,743	6.14%	66,332	8.74%	66,822	9.54%	67,279	10.29%
RW 28	57,443	-5.83%	58,037	-4.86%	59,815	-1.94%	61,549	0.90%
RW 29	59,020	-3.25%	60,233	-1.26%	62,378	2.26%	65,069	6.67%
RW 30	53,638	-12.07%	55,343	-9.27%	56,233	-7.81%	57,191	-6.24%
RW 31	59,414	-2.60%	60,701	-0.49%	61,471	0.77%	62,300	2.13%
RW 32	68,522	12.33%	69,136	13.34%	69,527	13.98%	69,966	14.70%
RW 33	55,167	-9.56%	56,019	-8.17%	56,841	-6.82%	57,638	-5.51%
RW 34	56,954	-6.63%	56,787	-6.91%	56,892	-6.73%	57,324	-6.03%

WARD	2018	VARIANCE	2022	VARIANCE	2026	VARIANCE	2030	VARIANCE
RW 35	64,220	5.28%	64,570	5.85%	65,272	7.00%	66,155	8.45%
RW 36	57,817	-5.22%	58,490	-4.11%	58,637	-3.87%	58,764	-3.67%
RW 37	53,553	-12.21%	53,974	-11.52%	54,372	-10.87%	54,748	-10.25%
RW 38	63,014	3.30%	64,242	5.32%	67,016	9.86%	70,194	15.07%
RW 39	61,940	1.54%	62,821	2.98%	64,495	5.73%	66,757	9.44%
RW 40	65,979	8.16%	66,413	8.87%	68,542	12.36%	71,172	16.68%
RW 41	67,393	10.48%	68,402	12.14%	70,307	15.26%	73,894	21.14%
RW 42	63,507	4.11%	65,643	7.61%	66,889	9.65%	68,503	12.30%
RW 43	68,045	11.55%	67,681	10.95%	67,619	10.85%	67,350	10.41%
RW 44	66,035	8.25%	66,253	8.61%	66,060	8.30%	66,237	8.59%
RW 45	64,969	6.51%	64,979	6.52%	64,864	6.33%	64,714	6.09%
RW 46	58,644	-3.86%	59,616	-2.27%	60,815	-0.30%	62,215	1.99%
RW 47	50,847	-16.64%	51,327	-15.86%	51,952	-14.83%	52,646	-13.69%

This option is based on minimizing change to existing ward boundaries by retaining the current average ward population of 61,000. The numerous boundary changes from the original Option 1 – Minimal Change resulted from suggestions for refinements from Members of Council and the public during the original public consultation process in 2015. The recent public consultation process in August - September 2016 has led to further refinements of the Recommended Wards (47 Wards). **Map 6** is the result of incorporating further refinements, where possible.

Table 10 shows the projected ward populations and variances from the average ward population of 61,000. The target year for evaluating variances is 2026 and the variance goal for voter parity is +/- 15%. Of the 47 proposed wards, 44 are within a +/-15% variance range in 2026. The three that are outside this range (RW9, RW20 and RW41) are all between +/-15% and +/-16%. The refined version of the Recommended Wards (47 Wards) achieves voter parity.

The implications of **Map 6**, Recommended Wards with Refinements (47 Wards) compared to the current ward structure are:

- The average ward population remains the same as the current average population at 61,000
- All downtown wards are in the Downtown
- 3 wards are added in the Downtown
- 1 ward is added in Willowdale
- Existing Wards 14, 17 and 18 are combined into 2 wards

Since 4 wards are added and one ward is redistributed, the total number of wards, and hence the number of Councillors, increases to 47.

There were some 70 comments, including 37 ward-specific suggestions for refinements to the Recommend Wards (47 Wards) as a result of the consultations with the public and Members of Council. It was possible to incorporate 13 of the suggested refinements, but 24 others could not be incorporated because of the cascading effects on voter parity in adjacent wards. There were also 22 ‘likes’ of and 4 ‘concerns’ with specific wards.

Recommended Wards (47 Wards) with Refinements results in the following:

- The Humber River and Victoria Park are maintained as historic boundaries
- The following communities of interest are kept together (among others)
 - Church-Wellesley Village
 - Community on either side of Sentinel Road
 - Duke Heights BIA
 - Flemington Park
 - Lawrence Heights
 - Leaside
 - Regent Park
 - St. Lawrence
 - The Beach
 - Thorncliffe Park
 - West Toronto Junction
- The following communities of interest are divided
 - Bridlewood/Corinthian communities
 - Don Mills Residents Association
 - Entertainment District Residents Association
 - Jane-Finch
 - Malvern
 - Mount Dennis Community Association

As mentioned previously, some of the ‘divided’ communities, such as Jane-Finch, Malvern or Don Mills, are too large to be included in one ward. In other instances, it has not been possible to keep communities together in one ward because of issues with voter parity among adjacent wards or the need to preserve a historic ward boundary.

6. GENERAL SUMMARY

In May 2016 the Executive Committee directed the City Manager to request the TWBR Team to provide additional information on 4 issues, conduct a public consultation process and bring back a **Supplementary Report** with the additional information and feedback to the October 26, 2016 meeting of the Committee. This summary provides a snapshot of the information that was gathered and the analysis the TWBR Team completed.

REVIEW OF OPTION 1 (47 WARDS)

The Executive Committee’s direction was to review Option 1 (47 Wards) by focusing only on wards with the highest population discrepancies (the examples given were: Wards 20, 22, 23, 27 and 28) and leaving the other wards intact; to examine the possibility of having only 46 wards; and to ensure that the resulting option achieves *effective representation*.

This Report demonstrates that focusing only on Toronto’s existing large wards does not produce an option that can achieve *effective representation* nor reduce the number of wards below 47. It takes 4 new wards (3 in the Downtown and 1 in Willowdale) to reduce the size of the 4 very large wards. This would result in 48 wards. Also, there are 4 other large wards that need to be reduced in size and 14 small wards that need to be enlarged to achieve *effective representation*. *Effective representation* cannot be achieved by just focusing on the large wards.

REFINEMENTS TO OPTION 2 (44 WARDS)

The TWBR Team reviewed all of the refinements to Option 2 (44 Wards) suggested during the TWBR’s civic engagement and public consultation process in 2015. Each suggested refinement was considered individually and its impact on the three major components of *effective representation* (voter parity; communities of interest, and coherent ward boundaries) was evaluated.

Map 2 depicts Option 2 – 44 Wards with the refinements suggested during the TWBR’s civic engagement and public consultation process in 2015. It was the basis for the discussion of this option during the public consultation process in August - September 2016. Some participants like this option and some have concerns. The most frequently mentioned reason for supporting this revised option is that it “retains the current size of City Council” and keeps certain communities intact (for example: Regent Park; Church-Wellesley Village; West Toronto Junction). Those with concerns mention the “large amount of change to existing ward boundaries”, “reduced ‘capacity to represent’ ”, and the division of certain communities (for example: Lawrence Heights; Flemington Park; Leaside; The Beach).

The public process generated some 164 comments, including 83 suggestions for refinements to this option. The TWBR Team has evaluated all suggestions for their impact on *effective representation* and, wherever possible, has tried to unite communities of interest. Based on that analysis **Map 3**, Additional Revisions – Option 2 – 44 Wards, has been developed. This configuration of wards achieves *effective representation*.

CONSISTENCY WITH FEDERAL RIDING BOUNDARIES

The third component of the Executive Committee’s direction was to determine whether Toronto’s ward boundaries can be consistent with the existing federal and provincial riding boundaries. Using federal / provincial riding boundaries as potential ward boundaries is grounded in the assumption that it is administratively easier for staff and more transparent for residents to have these boundaries coincide.

Currently, 25 federal ridings are completely within the boundaries of the City of Toronto. There are now 22 provincial ridings. However, all indications are that the Province will adopt the federal riding boundaries for the City of Toronto prior to the next provincial election. This analysis is based on the current 25 federal ridings.

The TWBR Team encountered challenges in trying to achieve voter parity, a prime component of *effective representation*, among the potential 25 wards, and has concluded that the least disruptive alternative is to create an extra ward in the Downtown resulting in a total of 26 potential wards. This arrangement still raises some concerns with voter parity between two potential wards in Etobicoke, Etobicoke Centre and Etobicoke-Lakeshore have a 2026 population variance of +22% and +21% respectively. However, attempting to resolve this situation would require altering the boundaries of several federal ridings and crossing the Humber River, a major natural and historic current ward boundary. This contradicts the purpose of making federal riding boundaries and ward boundaries consistent.

Map 4 depicts a possible ward structure for Toronto composed of 26 wards.

There was little support for this option at the public meetings and from Members of Council. The online survey yielded considerable support but not from a majority of the respondents. For those who like this option three reasons stand out. The first is the reduction in Councillors, the second relates to the ease of residents knowing which representatives serve them and the third is that larger wards are able to keep more communities together. For those that have concerns, the main issue is that is the “level of local representation will diminish with wards this size”. Also noted are the dissimilarities between the roles of local Councillors and those of Federal and Provincial Members of Parliament. Finally, some express that “large wards force too many divergent communities together”.

The essence of this option is to use the existing federal riding boundaries as ward boundaries. Therefore, suggestions for boundary changes defeat the purpose of the option and have not been solicited.

REVISIONS TO THE RECOMMENDED WARDS (47 WARDS)

The TWBR Team submitted a recommended ward structure of 47 wards to the Executive Committee in May 2016. During the recent public consultation process Members of Council and public meeting participants suggested a number of boundary refinements. The recommended ward structure was not included as an option for input in the online survey. The Recommended Wards (47 Wards) already reflected input from the 2015 public consultation process.

Map 5 shows the original Recommended Wards (47 Wards). It was the basis for the discussion of this option during the public consultation process in August – September 2016.

Some participants like this option and some have concerns. The most frequently stated reasons for supporting this option are that “it minimizes change to the current ward boundaries”; “is the best option of the three: Revised Option 2 (44 Wards); Wards Consistent with Federal Riding Boundaries (26); and Recommended Wards (47)”; “preserves the ‘capacity to represent’”; and “keeps communities of interest together (for example: Leaside; The Beach)”.

Those not supporting this option note that “the size of Council would increase to 47” and that certain communities of interest are split (for example: Regent Park; Church-Wellesley Village).

In all, the public process generated some 70 comments, including 37 suggestions for refinements. The TWBR Team has evaluated all suggestions for their impact on *effective representation* and has tried, wherever possible, to unite communities of interest.

Based on that analysis, **Map 6** Recommended Wards with Refinements (47 Wards), has been developed. This configuration of wards reunites certain communities: the community on either side of Sentinel Road; Regent Park; and Church-Wellesley Village. It achieves *effective representation*. The Recommended Wards with Refinements (47 Wards) is an improvement on the TWBR Recommended Wards (47 Wards). In addition to achieving voter parity, it manages to keep many communities of interest together.


The following provides an overview of the four issues from the Executive Committee Direction including implications for *effective representation* and observations.

ISSUES	EFFECTIVE REPRESENTATION	OBSERVATIONS
Focus on Large Wards to Minimize Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot achieve <i>effective representation</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not deal with 14 existing small wards
Revised Option 2 - 44 Wards (With Refinements)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieves <i>effective representation</i> • Divides a number of communities of interest (e.g., Lawrence Heights; Flemingdon Park; Leaside; The Beach) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintains the current size of City Council • Average ward population: 70,000 • 3 wards added (Downtown and Willowdale); 2 wards removed (10 and 32); 3 existing wards combined into 2 (14, 17 and 18)
Consistency with Federal Riding Boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not achieve voter parity • ‘Capacity to represent’ reduced significantly • Keeps a number of communities of interest together 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces the current size of City Council • Average ward population: 112,500 • 18 wards removed
Further Refinements to the Recommended Wards (47 Wards)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieves <i>effective representation</i> • Keeps many communities of interest together (e.g., Regent Park, Church-Wellesley Village) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increases the current size of City Council • Average ward population: 61,000 • 4 wards added (3 Downtown, 1 Willowdale); 3 existing wards combined into 2 (14, 17 and 18)

The Recommended Wards with Refinements (47 Wards) is an improvement to the TWBR Recommended Wards (47 Wards). In addition to achieving voter parity, it manages to keep many communities of interest together and has coherent ward boundaries. The Recommended Wards with Refinements (47 Wards) is the TWBR Team’s recommendation.

APPENDIX 'A'

**REVISED OPTION 2 (44 WARDS) -
ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS
FOR REFINEMENTS**



APPENDIX A Revised Option 2 (44 Wards) – Additional Suggestions for Refinements

Note: Appendix A is a summary of additional suggestions received through the online survey, during public meetings and from Members of Council in August and September 2016. ‘W’ followed by a number refers to the relevant Ward in Option 2 (44 Wards).

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W201	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too small; will lose higher income neighbourhoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> W201 adds area from current Ward 2
W201/W207	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move to W207: Islington/Humber River/Humber River/Creek (would mean all of Rowntree Park would be in W207) Move area east of Islington to the Humber River to W207 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; Humber River is a historic and natural boundary Not incorporated; Humber River is historic and natural boundary
W202	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very diverse ward Too large; issues vary dramatically from neighbourhood to neighbourhood Splits North Etobicoke; neighbourhood has more in common with Central and South Etobicoke Area north of The Westway (south of Dixon Road) should stay in W203 North boundary should be Dixon Road (or a line south of properties on south side of Dixon) between Lawrence/Humber River and Highway 401 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Comment W202 has been expanded south Not incorporated; would make W202 too small Not incorporated; would make W202 too small
W203	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single most disruptive to current Ward 3; no continuity Add area to W203: Kipling Avenue; Mimico Creek; Bloor Street Add area to W203: The Kingsway; Dundas Street; Humber River; Bloor Street Add area to W203: Martin Grove; Dixon Road; Kipling Avenue; The Westway from W202 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Incorporated Not incorporated; Humber River is strong natural boundary for W205 Not incorporated; would make W202 too small
W203/W204/ W205		

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add area to W204: Etobicoke Creek; Eglinton Avenue; Kipling Avenue; Rathburn Road Add area to W204: Etobicoke Creek; Dundas; #427; QEW Add area to W204: #427; Burnhamthorpe Road; Kipling Avenue; Bloor Street Add area to W204: #427; Bloor Street; The East Mall; QEW 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated; W 203/204 re-aligned Incorporated Incorporated Not incorporated; #427 is a strong physical boundary
W205/206	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ward 206 is too large with two distinct neighbourhoods - Humber Bay Shores (HBS) and Mimico have different issues; HBS should be incorporated with W205 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; Gardiner is a strong physical boundary
W206	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add area from W204 (Sherway Gardens north of Evans Avenue, 4 apartment towers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; W206 already has large population
W207/W208/W209	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommend adjusting the boundaries of W207 and W208 to not split the Jane and Finch community (3) Jane-Finch is divided; but it's ok Waterloo is not a major street and should not be used to divide the community into W208 and W209 at the northwest corner of Bathurst and Sheppard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; Jane-Finch is too large to be in one ward Comment Not incorporated; shifting boundary to Sheppard would make W209 too small
W208	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Northwood community is north and south of Grandravine; add area from W209: Sheppard/River/Grandravine Keep Waterloo or add area north of Waterloo to W209 instead (to Overbrook?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; would make W208 too large Not incorporated; Waterloo is a more logical boundary than Overbrook
W208/W209	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Core of the Jewish community is split at Bathurst street Bathurst as eastern boundary does not work; use Wilson Heights instead 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shifting the boundaries is result of larger wards in this Option (population of current Ward 10 redistributed) Not incorporated; would make W209 too small

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W210/W212	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mount Dennis Community Association is predominantly in 210; but it should extend to Black Creek Mount Dennis has never extended east of the RR tracks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; RR track is a strong physical boundary Comment
W211/W212	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RR track (Barrie line) separates communities; is a barrier because of employment zones on either side North and south of Castlefield is one community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shifting the boundary east is result of larger wards in this Option Not incorporated; shifting the boundary south would make W212 too small
W211/W221	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The neighbourhood north of Ranees has more in common with W221 than W211 Area north of Ranees should be in W221 (Neptune TCHC now cut off from Lawrence Heights) Lawrence Heights is cut in half 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; any change would make W211 too small Shifting the boundaries is result of larger wards in this Option Shifting the boundaries is result of larger wards in this Option
W212/W220	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use Oakwood as boundary between W212 and 220, not Winona (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; would make W212 too small
W213/W215	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not encompass the current Ward 18 where people are politically similar Divides the community at Bloor St., the natural boundary of the community and most of the downtown is the CPR tracks Using Bloor Street as a boundary cuts community in half and does not reflect the organic community shapes that have developed Eastern boundary should be Ossington or Dovercourt rather than Christie 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current Ward 18 is small and has to be enlarged Shifting the boundaries is result of larger wards in this Option Shifting the boundaries is result of larger wards in this Option
W213/W216/ W220	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add area to W213: Oakwood/Rogers Road/RR tracks/St.Clair (from W212) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; would make W213 too small Not incorporated; would make W212 too small
W214/W215	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Successful at creating one Junction community Socially, geographically, and historically cohesive West Toronto Junction is kept intact, south of the rail tracks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Comment Comment

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like that the West Bend will become part of W214 to the west, it has much more in common with High Park than Parkdale • Like that the Junction is in W214, which groups it with the High Park area that I more identify with • Western boundary should extend to the east side of Roncesvalles – so that community there is in High Park neighbourhood (more in common) instead of Parkdale (from W215 to W214) • South of St. Clair in the Junction should be considered into W214, as the majority of residents identify with the community to the south • Boundaries are ok 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment • Comment • Not incorporated; would make W215 too small • Not incorporated; RR track is strong physical boundary • Comment
W215/W216	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Queen West Triangle community should be in W215 (Queen/Dovercourt/ north of the RR tracks); area south of the RR tracks should be in W216 • Queen West Triangle (Sudbury/Dovercourt/Queen) is very much a part of the Queen West community, but this options splits some parts into W215 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; would make W216 too small • Queen West Triangle is all in W216
W216	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that W216 stretches too far north-south when there is so much development in the area near King West and the Waterfront • Groups too many diverse neighbourhoods together • Condos should be separate so that the Councillor's focus is put on those residents • Change current Ward 19 to include the western half of Liberty Village 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • W216 is already small • Not incorporated; many wards include a variety of neighbourhoods • Comment • All of Liberty Village in W216
W217	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appears to capture the central waterfront and related communities to the near north as well as the Islands (4); would help give the ward a unique identity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W218	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community issues within St. Lawrence are very different from those in the Queen's Quay community A more manageable size Entertainment District Residents Association is split at King St.; boundaries are: the north side of Richmond West on the north; the north side of Front St. West on the south; University to the east and Spadina on the west. A minor adjustment of the southern boundary of W218 to the north side of Front St. West would meet our needs (2) Dissects far too many communities of interest Splits communities of interest around the university; communities have always worked together Wards should run north-south rather than east-west (2) All downtown wards should be in the Downtown 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> St. Lawrence is in W233; Queen's Quay is in W217 Comment Not incorporated; would make W218 too large
W218/W219	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dissects far too many communities of interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
W218/W219/ W232	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Splits communities of interest around the university; communities have always worked together Wards should run north-south rather than east-west (2) All downtown wards should be in the Downtown 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; shifting boundary south would make W219 too large Not incorporated; would split communities of interest Not incorporated; would lead to boundary changes in W216, W220, W22, W230, W232, W233 (would be a different Option) Comment
W218/W233	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like that more downtown wards would reduce workload on downtown Councillors Wards in downtown core cut through established neighbourhoods and have odd boundaries that are like peninsulas into other wards Should not be divided at Jarvis, the little 'jog' east of Jarvis that is in the adjacent W233 should be in 218 St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association is divided The St. Lawrence neighbourhood is really very cohesive and should all be in one Ward (Yonge, the Don and at least Queen to the Gardiner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Comment Not incorporated; W218 is already large St. Lawrence is all in W233 St. Lawrence is all in W233

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W219	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western ward edge should extend to Yonge St. W219 is too large to represent UofT does not have the same interests as Rosedale Having College as a southern boundary is an improvement on Dundas (which the federal boundaries use); UofT is finally unified Taking the boundary of W219 east to include Rosedale brings communities with two different planning contexts, as laid out in the Official Plan, into one ward which is exceedingly problematic and difficult to handle CP railway is not a good boundary in Moore Park/North Rosedale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; would make W217 too small W219 is within +/- 10% of the average ward population in 2026 Comment Comment Shifting the boundaries is result of larger wards in this Option
W219/W232	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CP railway is not a good boundary in Moore Park/North Rosedale Bloor St. East (both sides) plus Charles East, Jarvis to Yonge (including Hayden) should be within W219, consistent with the Yonge/Bloor Planning area and stewardship of the Rosedale Valley ravine (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CP railway is historic and strong physical boundary Not incorporated; would make W219 too large
W219/229	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put North Rosedale into W229 instead of W219 (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; North and South Rosedale together in W219
W220	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Christie is not a good dividing line, use Ossington/Oakwood; add area west of Ossington/Oakwood to W220 (integrated communities) Make Avenue Road or Yonge the eastern boundary of W220 Great that it now includes the west side of Spadina i.e., consolidates Forest Hill community in a single ward Looks considerably bigger than the Ward 21 that it replaces; it will include both wealthy areas (Forest Hill, St. Clair and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; W213 already too small Not incorporated; ravine is a good natural boundary as per earlier refinement Comment Comment

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W220/W221/ W226/W229	<p>Avenue Road) and less wealthy areas (Vaughan and Oakwood) - challenging for one Councillor to represent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The high-density high-rise area at Yonge and Eglinton should not be divided up; would make condo owners a minority within each ward These wards all meet at Yonge and Eglinton and should not split it up Yonge-Eglinton Centre should all be in one ward (2 separate Community Councils; 2 different planning approaches) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; Yonge-Eglinton area too large to be in one ward; now in W221 and 229 Not incorporated; Yonge-Eglinton area too large to be in one ward; now in W221 and 229 Not incorporated; Yonge-Eglinton area too large to be in one ward; now in W221 and 229
W221/W226	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too many changes Odd that everything south of Ranece to the Allen is now in W221 but the portion east of Avenue Road is not Northeast corner of Yonge and Lawrence is cut off Avenue road boundary removes residents and neighbourhoods from their natural affiliation with Avenue Road (3) - the ravine at Yonge is the natural divide W221 should stay more like the current Ward 15 Yonge Street has little in common with the Marlee neighbourhood in W221 Don't think W221 should be extended to the Allen; already highly populated Communities on both sides of Yonge Street (W221 and W226) should be represented by one Council member Should stay as it currently is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Comment Not incorporated; W221/226 population is balanced Not incorporated; would make W226 too small Comment Shifting boundaries is result of larger wards in this Option Shifting boundaries is result of larger wards in this Option Not incorporated; W221 and 226 need to balance populations Comment
W222		

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W222/W223	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should include all condo development at Yonge and Sheppard and not cut off the south-east corner This configuration does not correctly define Willowdale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; W222/224 populations are balanced Not incorporated; current Willowdale wards have to become smaller
W222/W224	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Splits ethnic community along Finch - ethnically south of Finch is more Korean and north of Finch is more Persian W222/W224 boundary leaves a small section of residential homes cut off from their neighbourhood and having to compete with growing number of condos Dividing at Yonge St. so the east and west sides are in different wards is not a good solution Arranged well because it accounts for the explosion of development along the North York Centre corridor Appears to have complicated boundaries, with W224 in particular stretched diagonally over a very large area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; Finch is a historic physical boundary Not incorporated; W222/224 populations are balanced Not incorporated; W222/224 populations are balanced Comment
W223	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no relationship with Steelesview to the rest of W223 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shifting the boundaries is result of larger wards in this Option Not incorporated; many wards include a variety of neighbourhoods
W224	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decrease the size of W223 by changing the western boundary to Bathurst 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; would make W223 too small
W224/W225	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> W224 looks reasonable and encompasses like areas Boundary between W224 and W225 is an improvement over using the river as a west boundary for current Ward 33 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Comment
W226	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broadway boundary is crazy, but no real issue with the boundaries Avenue Road should not be western boundary (communities too different) (4); Bathurst has always worked as boundary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Not incorporated; would make W221 too small

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W226/W227	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don Mills Residents Association is currently represented by different Councillors; better to shift the boundary of W227/W226 at the south from Don Mills west to Leslie Land to the east of Mud Creek (Leslie St.) should be excluded from W226 and included in W227 Unacceptable that town of Leaside is split (10) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; Don Mills Residents Association area too large to be in one ward Not incorporated; would make W227 too small Not incorporated; would make W226 too small; shifting boundaries is the result of larger wards in this Option
W226/W229	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The boundary should be changed to include all of North Leaside in the ward (3) Eglinton should not be a boundary here (3) North Leaside is surrounded by Sunnybrook and so it doesn't adjunct with any other community Leaside/Bennington Heights (including North Leaside) must remain together and not be split Odd that the boundary is at Broadway; Erskine or Keewatin might be better boundaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; would make W226 too small; shifting boundaries is the result of larger wards in this Option Not incorporated; would make W226 too small; shifting boundaries is the result of larger wards in this Option Comment Not incorporated; Bennington Heights in W229; North Leaside in W226
W227/228	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't divide the north west corner of Victoria Park; better if the boundary went along Lawrence and south down DVP and across Eglinton to Don Mills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; would make W226 too small Not incorporated; would make W228 too small

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W228/229	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ward gets chopped up badly; Flemington and Thorncliffe Park need to be in one ward (Thorncliffe Neighbourhood Office serves both); do not split between 2 wards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; W229 already too small
W229	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ward is a good size (2) Broadway is not a recognizable boundary and should be changed Northern boundary of W229 should extend north to Erskine or Keewatin to incorporate the complete Yonge & Eglinton condo/rental zone Ward joins Davisville Village with Leaside areas; these areas are quite similar and would allow for management of many common concerns Use of the railway line is not effective in this area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Not incorporated; would make W229 too small Not incorporated; would make W229 too small Comment Not incorporated; RR tracks are a strong physical boundary Comment
W230	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ward 230 is ok; reunifies Monarch Park, Riverdale and Withrow Park (separated since 2000) Boundary awkwardly crosses the Don River, a far larger natural boundary, in the northwest in order to meet the rail line Riverdale is split in half Chinatown East BIA is split in half Don't group Bennington Heights and Thorncliffe into a ward that spans the entire Don Valley Neighbourhoods west of the DVP shouldn't be included in W230 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Not incorporated; boundary keeps Lower Don Parkland in W230 Riverdale is in W230 Not incorporated; many BIAs are in more than one ward Not incorporated; many wards include a variety of neighbourhoods Not incorporated; Don Valley parkland in this area all in W230 as per earlier refinement Comment
W230/W231	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Successfully encompasses Danforth neighbourhoods on both the north and south sides 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment


WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W231	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not opposed to W231; both sides of the Danforth in one ward is good Coxwell and Victoria Park are good boundaries The neighbourhoods north of Taylor Creek have very little in common with those south of the creek despite being in the same ward Only 3 administrative jurisdictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Comment Not incorporated; many wards include a variety of neighbourhoods Comment
W232	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Church-Wellesley Village should not be split down the middle between W219 and W232 (3) Option cuts into 519 Community Centre service area Good that the Church-Wellesley Village remains intact W232 makes a lot of sense except that it might be desirable to bring the western boundary to Bay Street (instead of Yonge) between Bloor and College 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Village is all in W232 Comment Comment Not incorporated; would make W232 far too large
W232/W233	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unfortunate that Cabbagetown north and south are separated Regent Park is split into two wards, W232 and W233, which would negatively impact the positive work of the current Regent Park redevelopment and Social Development Plan Keep Regent Park united as Ward 28 so a single Councillor can take up residents' concerns Boundaries for this region should match the historical layout of this neighborhood Include all of St. Lawrence to RR tracks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Regent Park is all in W233 Regent Park is all in W233 Comment All of St. Lawrence in W233
W233	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good that this area is separated from the central core, as the needs of this less populated area are very different from the more congested central wards Ward is a good size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Comment

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W234/W235	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This boundary divides and splits the Beach (a very community-oriented neighbourhood) in half (27) Lee/Main boundary breaks up the Beach (2) Disrupts the border with Scarborough & the old City of Toronto which is not ideal (8) Victoria Park should be respected as a historic boundary (5) Neighbourhood between Lee and Victoria Park, and Kingston and Queen have much more in common with W234 than W235 New configuration may actually bring communities together The west border of W234 should be Coxwell or Woodbine, separate from Leslieville, to allow the Beaches to thrive and grow together North border of Gerrard seems reasonable Detach the west end of the proposed W234 and attach it to the east end of the proposed W233 Very different communities north to south; current ward should stay the same RR track is a big divider and should be a boundary Boundaries are ok; 401 is a good boundary Boundaries are ok; 401 is a good boundary Add triangle from W236 (Markham/Eglinton/RR tracks) Bridlewood community is split north and south of Huntingwood Corinthian community split also 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; shifting boundaries is the result of larger wards in this Option; current Ward 32 has been redistributed Not incorporated; would make re-aligned W236 too small Comment Comment Comment Comment Not incorporated; would make W234 far too small Comment Not incorporated; DVP is a strong physical boundary Incorporated Mostly incorporated; W235 and 236 re-aligned Comment Comment Not incorporated; would make reconfigured W236 too small Not incorporated; would make W239 too small Not incorporated; would make W239 too small
W235		
W236		
W237		
W238		
W239/W240		

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
W240	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ward is fine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment
W241/W242	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Splits Malvern community (2) • Move the line from Neilson to Morningside to keep Malvern together • Both wards are fine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; Malvern is too large to be in one ward • Not incorporated; Malvern is too large to be in one ward • Comment
W243	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently eastern boundary is Morningside; instead of left turn an Ellesmere, take Morningside straight up to 401; put Seven Oaks area into W243 (isolated area north of Ellesmere) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not incorporated; would make W244 too small
W243/W244	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morningside is a good boundary • W243 and W244 splits the Manse Valley and Coronation neighbourhoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment • Morningside is a physical boundary; Manse Valley is all in W244
W244	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does an excellent job of conglomerating like properties and reflecting infrastructure boundaries • Western boundary should be Neilson Road instead of the river 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment • Not incorporated; would make W244 too small

APPENDIX 'B'

**RECOMMENDED WARDS -
SUGGESTIONS FOR REFINEMENTS**



APPENDIX B Recommended Wards – Suggestions for Refinements

Note: Appendix B is a summary of suggestions received from Members of Council and during public meetings. ‘RW’ followed by a number refers to the relevant Ward among the Recommended Wards.



WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
RW3/4/5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move Willow Ridge community (south of 401 west of Martin Grove) into RW4; is not connected to RW3 (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move area east of Martin Grove/east of Mimico Creek into RW3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move triangle Kipling/Mimico Creek/Dundas into RW5 (2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; would make RW5 too large
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could use Dundas as southern boundary (north and south sides are different; deeper lots on south side) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add isolated area north of Evans Avenue (Sherway Gardens) from RW3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; Gardiner is a historic and strong physical boundary
RW8/9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eddystone is ok as boundary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Duke Heights BIA is east and west of Keele; employment area that is part of Duke Heights BIA is connected to York University; the Keele boundary would split BIA from development area (3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated; Duke Heights BIA in RW8
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development in industrial area (currently in RW9) is connected to York University; it would be helpful to put industrial area in RW8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Run southern boundary of RW8 along Grandravine to Dufferin; Liberty area south of De Boers can go either into RW8 or RW9; William Baker community (south of Grandravine) should be in RW9 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated; Liberty area and William Baker community in RW9

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
RW9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community on either side of Sentinel is split (7); area between Humber River and Keele St. should remain connected into the ward William Baker community should remain in RW9; would mean all of Downsview Park is in one ward Keeps York University together Mount Dennis community should extend to Black Creek 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated Incorporated Comment Not incorporated; RR tracks are a historic boundary
RW11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mount Dennis has never extended east of RR tracks Allen Road is in a ditch, only 2 crossings north of Lawrence Clearer, better boundaries Communities are north and south of Eglinton (Little Jamaica is cut in half) Use original Option 1 for RW13 and RW14 instead of Recommended Alignment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Comment Comment Not incorporated; Eglinton is a clear boundary Not incorporated; RW13 now has clear boundaries based on suggested refinements; any change would affect RW12, 14 and 27
RW13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bathurst is a good boundary Eglinton is comprehensible; makes sense RW15 is fine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Comment Comment
RW14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shift eastern boundary of RW15 to Spadina south to St. Clair; east on St. Clair; south on Avenue Rd. Ward probably too large 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated RW16 is within +/- 15% of average ward population in 2026 Not incorporated; both RW16 and RW18 are balanced re population sizes
RW15/26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shift area to RW18: Dufferin/RR tracks/Dovercourt/Bloor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boundaries in Davenport are ok 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW16/18		

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
RW17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boundaries are good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW19/20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Christie Pits area is together as it should be RW19 and RW20 make sense 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Comment
RW20/22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> John Street Cultural Corridor is centre of Entertainment District; use Peter or Duncan instead of John Street as a boundary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; would affect voter parity
RW21/23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boundary between RW21 and RW23 could, perhaps, be Shuter (to keep Regent Park together) Must keep Regent Park together; use Gerrard as northern boundary of RW21 (3) Is it possible to have Moss Park in RW22? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated Incorporated; Regent Park is together in RW23 Not incorporated; Moss Park in RW 21
RW22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Islands are in the correct place RW22 could go over to Sherburne south of the RR tracks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Not incorporated; would make RW 21 too small
RW23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perhaps RW23 can be a little smaller Don Vale can be separate from St. Jamestown Gerrard and Jarvis are inappropriate boundaries; should be College and Carleton; the southern boundary clips Regent Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Comment RW23 and 25 have been re-aligned
RW 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HVRA supports RW24. It reflects our experience in the City, our local political institutions and rights a democratic wrong. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW23/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Village is split (5); move eastern boundary to Jarvis; community of interest has to trump voter parity in this case; cannot move western boundary of RW23 to Yonge (3) RW25 could go to Davenport in the north [would put part of RW26 into Downtown] St. Jamestown/Village/Cabbagetown are ok in one ward Expand RW25 east to Parliament north of RW23 to keep BENA contiguous, gives stewardship to the Rosedale Valley Ravine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated Not incorporated; all downtown wards are in the Downtown Comment Not incorporated; RW 25 and RW 23 re-arranged

WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
RW26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and uses Charles East, Selby and Howard respecting old and new communities of interest Boundaries are nice and clean 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW26/33/34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could these wards be re-arranged north-south? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; affects too many wards; would make RW34 too small
RW28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RW28 is great; should not change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW30/31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change boundary to ravine, if it works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporated; historic boundary
RW31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Like the boundaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perfect; Leaside is ok; Flemington Park and Thorncliffe Park are together Leaside should be part of East York 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW33/34/35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can these wards be re-aligned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; RW33 keeps Leaside together Not incorporated; affects too many wards; would make RW34 too small
RW34	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ravine would be a better boundary than the railway and would connect with the Bayview extension Not a lot of population at the bottom of ward; just a Loblaws East York and Rosedale should not be in one ward; have different communities of interest (different by-laws) (4) East York should be kept together Perhaps Thorncliffe Park and Flemington Park should be part of RW34 (believe north part of current Ward 29 has its community services in Thorncliffe Park) Rosedale Valley boundary is fine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; RR tracks are strong physical boundary Comment Not incorporated; RW34 has to get larger Not possible; currently divided Not incorporated; in RW33
RW34/35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic issues north and south of O'Connor are the same; add area from RW35 to RW34; O'Connor/Coxwell/DVP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Incorporated


WARD	SUGGESTED REFINEMENT	ACTION/COMMENT
RW35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Splits the Danforth; can southern boundary be the RR tracks? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; Danforth is boundary among current Wards 29, 30, 31, 32
RW37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Northern section is very different neighbourhood (fence separates TCHC buildings) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coxwell is a logical boundary Markham road should extend all the way down to the lake 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment Not incorporated; would make population of RW38 too small
RW39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good that current ward stays the same; good boundaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RW40 is fine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW40/41/46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preference for current Ward 38 to stay the same, but ok with RW boundaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment
RW41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add triangle from RW38 (Markham/Eglinton/RR tracks) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; would make RW41 too large
RW46	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Move Galloway to RW38 – a City Councillor could focus more on that ward Could RW46 go down to the Lake? (extend Markham southwards) Bottom part –area south of the train tracks has joined the ward below Historically Guildwood was part of neighbourhoods to the north; boundaries are Markham Road to Morningside (south: of Kingston Road) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not incorporated; would put RW38/46 populations greatly out of balance Not incorporated; would make population of RW46 too large Comment Not incorporated; would put RW38/46 populations greatly out of balance



This is **Exhibit 9** refer to in the Affidavit of
Susan Dexter, sworn August 21, 2018

City of Toronto Ward Profiles - 2018


Ward 24



 Ward 24







Court File No. CV-18-00602494-0000
Court File No. CV-18-00603633-0000

ONTARIO (HON. DOUG FORD, PREMIER OF ONTARIO),
Respondent
ONTARIO (ATTORNEY-GENERAL), and CITY OF TORONTO
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

-and-

ROCCO ACHAMPONG

Applicant
CHRIS MOISE, ISH ADERONMU, and PRABHA KHOSLA, on
her own behalf and on behalf of all members of Women Win TO
Applicant

-and-

Respondent

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE
PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT
TORONTO**

AFFIDAVIT OF SUSAN DEXTER

Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP
155 Wellington Street West, 35th Floor
Toronto, ON M5V 3H1

Donald K. Eady (LSO #30635P)
Tel.: 416.646.4321
email: don.eady@paliareroland.com

Caroline V. (Nini) Jones (LSO #43956J)
Tel.: 416.646.7433
email: nini.jones@paliareroland.com

Fax: 416.646.4301

Lawyers for the Intervenor

Court File No. CV-18-00602494-000

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

BETWEEN:

ROCCO ACHAMPONG

Applicant(s)

and

**ONTARIO (HON. DOUG FORD, PREMIER OF ONTARIO), ONTARIO
(ATTORNEY-GENERAL), and CITY OF TORONTO**

Respondent(s)

Court File No. CV-18-00603633-0000

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

BETWEEN:

**CHRIS MOISE, ISH ADERONMU, and PRABHA KHOSLA, on her own
behalf and on behalf of all members of Women Win TO**

Applicants

and

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondent

-2-

Court File No.

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

B E T W E E N:

CITY OF TORONTO

Applicant

and

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondent

AFFIDAVIT OF GEOFFREY KETTEL

I, Geoffrey Kettel, of the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, MAKE OATH
AND SAY AS FOLLOWS:

1. I am a resident and voter in the City of Toronto, and have previous experience in municipal electoral campaigns. I am also actively involved in civic associations, including the Leaside Property Owners' Association and the Federation of North Toronto Residents' Association.

2. As such, I have knowledge of the matters set out in this affidavit, except where I have indicated that my statements are made on information and belief, in which case I have stated the source of my information and I believe this information to be true.

Background

3. I currently reside at 129 Hanna Road in the City of Toronto, in what is the former Borough of East York. I have resided there since 1981, but have been a resident of Toronto since 1973. Prior to living in Toronto, I resided in London, Ontario. I immigrated to Canada from the United Kingdom in 1970.

4. My present ward under the 47-ward system (which was enacted pursuant to a by-law passed by Council and became effective January 1, 2018) is Ward 33. Under the previous, 44-ward system (which existed before January 1, 2018), I resided in Ward 26.

5. My academic background is in geography, and I became a land use planner. I have been retired since 2005 from the Ontario Public Service, where I served for 33 years in a number of ministries in policy and senior management positions.

6. Since retiring, I have become very active in community and civic initiatives. Presently, I am the Co-President of the Leaside Property Owners' Association ("LPAO"), Co-Chair of the Federation of North Toronto Residents' Association ("FoNTRA"), and member of the Board of Directors of Flemingdon Community Legal Services. I also sit on a City-appointed committee as Chair of the North York Community Preservation Panel. By virtue of that position, I am also a member of the Toronto Preservation Board. I also write a column on Planning and Heritage for the monthly Leaside Life magazine.

Political Experience

7. I am a regular voter, and use every chance I have to cast a ballot in an election, whether it be a municipal, provincial, or federal election. Though I was non-partisan while

-4-

working for the Ontario Public Service, since retirement I have become a member of the Liberal Party and occasionally provide financial support to that Party.

8. In 2006, there was a vacancy in my municipal ward since Jane Pitfield, who had represented the ward as councillor since 1998, chose to run for mayor in the 2006 mayoral campaign. I decided to run in order to raise awareness of issues around planning and representation. Ultimately, 15 candidates contested the election, and I came in fourth. The election was won by John Parker.

9. I have considered running in municipal elections since then. However, given my active involvement in certain endeavours, especially around municipal planning and heritage issues, I felt my energies were better spent making meaningful contributions to these organizations, helping to shape municipal policies in different capacities.

2018 Toronto Ward Boundary Review

10. In 2014, I became aware that the City of Toronto had initiated a ward boundary review in anticipation of the municipal election scheduled to be held in October, 2018. I decided to participate in the public consultation portions of the boundary review because I am passionate about the representation of my community on council, and how citizens and groups can affect change in our neighbourhood. Civic engagement is, in my view, a cornerstone to a healthy democracy.

11. I participated in two public consultations of the Ward Boundary Review in my capacity as a resident and concerned citizen. The first meeting occurred on January 7, 2015, at the Walter Stewart Library in East York. The second meeting I attended was on

-5-

October 8, 2015, at the Riverdale Hub on Gerrard Street. I also reviewed the proposals as they became available publicly.

12. At these meetings, I participated in both small group and plenary discussions. The submissions I made were to ensure that the Ward's distinct character was preserved. There have been changing demographics and an increasing population in my ward, and I wanted to support changes that took account of these factors.

13. My position at the ward boundary review was that there should be additional wards added to the existing 44 wards. Further, I wanted to ensure that my community, Leaside, was not split during the boundary review. My ward under the 44-ward system was a mix of low- and medium-density communities (including Leaside), as well as high-density communities like Thorncliffe Park and Flemingdon Park. This structure, in my view, represented the spirit of the ward and gave the ward a suitable balance, while keeping together important and unified communities.

14. To my recollection, there was no discussion of a 25-ward system at any of the meetings or consultations that I attended. Maintaining a relationship with, but not mirroring, the federal and provincial riding boundaries was discussed. Also to my recollection, the meetings and consultations were not contentious. There seemed to be broad support for modest changes to the current ward boundaries.

15. The LPAO submitted written representations to the Ward Boundary Review to ensure that our input was formalized and considered as part of the consultation process. I attach those representations as **Exhibit 1** to this Affidavit.

-6-

16. FoNTRA's position in these discussions was to encourage residents' associations to participate in the process and ensure that their communities were properly geographically represented with appropriate boundaries.

17. Both LPOA and FoNTRA supported the final, 47-ward plan approved by City Council. The 47-ward plan was significantly better compared with the five other options examined by the consultants. In my opinion, it reflected my community and was reflective of the comments that I made, and that I heard, at the meetings.

18. I followed the appeal of the City Council decision to the Ontario Municipal Board through the newspapers. I also followed the subsequent appeal to Divisional Court, which dismissed the appeal from the Ontario Municipal Board's decision to uphold the City's decision.

Provincial Government Announces Intention to Change Ward Boundaries

19. I first heard that the Provincial Government intended to change the municipal ward boundaries to mirror provincial electoral boundaries on or around July 27, 2018, as I was preparing to bike the Great Waterfront Trail Adventure. Based on my recollection, the Premier stated that he campaigned during the June 2018 provincial election on reducing the size of government and that there were too many politicians at the municipal level. These media reports were surprising and alarming.

20. I viewed the ward boundary review process as an excellent exercise in consultative democracy, and felt a strong affinity with the communities in my ward. The Provincial Government's introduction of Bill 5 disregards the process I took part in. The

-7-

ward boundary review process had considered all kinds of factors, including representation, population growth, and the needs of communities. I was not aware of any similar process having been undertaken by the Provincial Government to consider similar factors in re-drawing ward boundaries.

21. The 2018 Great Waterfront Trail Adventure ran approximately 600 km from Ajax to the Québec border along Lake Ontario, and took place between July 29 and August 3. Throughout the trip I spoke with other participants and residents of the towns we visited. Everyone I spoke with, including municipal politicians, was shocked and concerned about what precedent the Provincial Government's actions set for interfering in municipal elections.

22. Having worked on municipal issues, the Premier's comments on there being too many councillors confused me. Councillors have always had a considerable burden in keeping up with local demands. From my experience, councillors have a dual role. Not only do they assist our organizations with routine matters like renovations, garbage removal, tree clearing, planning, and development, but they have an important policy role. Our present councillor, John Burnside, attends our residents' associations about once a month in addition to his duties attending city council and city committee meetings. I worried, based on my knowledge of Mr. Burnside's current workload, that our councillor under a 25-ward system would not be able to ensure regular attendance at our residents' association meetings.

-8-

Impact of the Legislative Change on My Vote

23. I followed news reports of the legislation introduced to change the ward boundaries, and I am aware that Bill 5, *Better Local Government Act, 2018*, received royal assent on August 14, 2018. This unexpected legislative change significantly impacts my vote, my representation, and my participation in processes used to establish ward boundaries.

24. I live in the federal and provincial electoral district of Don Valley West, which is effectively an amalgam of Wards 25 and 26 from the 44-ward system. This is a huge area. Ward 25 is a much more suburban riding. My ward, Ward 26, is diverse and higher density. Further, the number of residents' associations will grow significantly with these two wards being merged.

25. As noted above, my ward under the 47-ward system was Ward 33. Bill 5 does not simply move the entirety of Ward 33 into a different ward under the 25-ward system. It breaks up Ward 33, such that constituents in what was previously Ward 33 are now split mainly between the Don Valley West and Don Valley East wards. Small geographic portions of the old Ward 33 also fall within the Toronto-Danforth and Beaches East York wards. As a result, I do not know if all of the potential candidates who were previously running under Ward 33 will now be running in my new ward, Don Valley West, or in a different ward, such as Don Valley East. The maps demonstrating how Ward 33 would be split are attached as **Exhibit 2** to this Affidavit.

26. I do not understand the justification used to move to a 25-ward system based on provincial electoral boundaries. I thought that municipal ward boundaries were drawn

-9-

based on principles like representation and voter parity. I did not think that the number of politicians or the perceived collegiality of previous councils would impact ward boundaries.

27. From my involvement with community groups, I am familiar with how much work is expected from a city councillor. Similarly, based on my time as a bureaucrat in the Ontario Public Service, I understand the scope of provincial politics. The breadth and depth of the work on a municipal level is vastly different, and much more granular, focusing on issues like development, construction, parks and traffic. The larger the ward, then the more issues a councillor must learn. We already worry about the capacity of our city councillor to stay up to date with briefings and council attendance.

28. I worry that my community will not be properly represented on city council. Municipalities are the grassroots of democracy, and we ask our city councillor to become involved in issues that are much more connected to the daily “nuts and bolts” of our community. The 25 ward system means that the councillor for my area will be overworked and will have to rely on staff, rather than dealing with issues themselves. In my view, it is important for understanding these local issues that the councillor be able to visit sites, talk to the residents in the area, and to residents associations.

29. I have also spoken with my neighbours and other residents, and they are also concerned about the representation they will receive as voters. I believe that there is already inadequate involvement in the civic life of neighbourhoods. There are many people who are voiceless in our community, and increasing the ward boundary size will

-10-

only further the distance between voters and their elected candidates on the local issues that matter to them.

30. I do not think the election rules should be changed in an election year. It seems like an inappropriate intervention. It is an outrage that any government, of any level, would change something as fundamental to a full and fair election as ward boundaries or nomination dates in the middle of the election.

Conclusion

31. The legislation introduced by the Provincial Government will negatively impact the representation of my community on city council. Individually, I worry about precedent that this action sets for interfering with municipal elections, and for civic engagement more broadly.

32. I swear this affidavit for the sole purpose of intervening in an application in respect of Bill 5, and for no other improper purpose.

SWORN BEFORE ME at the City of
Toronto, in the Province of Ontario on
August 21, 2018



Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or as may be)



Geoffrey Kettel

This is **Exhibit 1** refer to in the Affidavit of
Geoffrey Kettel, sworn August 21, 2018

EX18.2.11

Leaside Property Owners' Association Incorporated

**1601 Bayview Avenue
P.O. Box 43582
Toronto ON M4G 3B0**

Executive Committee
att.: Jennifer Fowkes
10th floor, West Tower, City Hall 100 Queen Street West
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2 email: exc@toronto.ca

October 25, 2016.

Re EX18.2 (Municipal Boundary proposed changes) – October 26, 2016 Agenda

Dear Members of the Executive Committee:

The LPOA requests that you support the 47 ward option (Recommended Option 1) as the design most beneficial to the city as a whole and which respects the historic identity of our community, Leaside.

This option preserves Leaside as a single community within one ward. The 44 ward option, in contrast, divides Leaside into two separate wards, with two separate councillors, ignoring the community's historical, geographic, and social connections established since 1913 and continuing today.

We do understand the desire of those supporting the 44 ward option to think in purely economic terms, to keep costs down by not increasing the number of councillors. However this would be false economy, done at the cost of good government, destroying neighbourhood identity and interests.

A recent article in the Toronto Star quoted Councillor Pasternak as saying, "To erase a ward as if there's no history or meaning there is terribly misguided." He is right. Cost is important, but value is more important.

The value of the 47 ward option far outweighs its cost. The LPOA urges you to support it.

Yours sincerely,

Carol Burtin Fripp,
Co-President with Geoff Kettel.
LPOA

Cc Councillor Jon Burnside

This is **Exhibit 2** refer to in the Affidavit of
Geoffrey Kettel, sworn August 21, 2018


City of Toronto Ward Profiles - 2018


Ward 33




 Ward 33











Court File No. CV-18-00602494-0000
Court File No. CV-18-00603633-0000

ROCCO ACHAMPONG

Applicant

CHRIS MOISE, ISH ADERONMU, and PRABHA KHOSLA, on
her own behalf and on behalf of all members of Women Win TO
Applicant

-and-

ONTARIO (HON. DOUG FORD, PREMIER OF ONTARIO),
ONTARIO (ATTORNEY-GENERAL), and CITY OF TORONTO
Respondent

-and-

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondent

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT
TORONTO

AFFIDAVIT OF GEOFFREY KETTEL

Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP
155 Wellington Street West, 35th Floor
Toronto, ON M5V 3H1

Donald K. Eady (LSO #30635P)

Tel.: 416.646.4321

email: don.eady@paliareroland.com

Caroline V. (Nini) Jones (LSO #43956J)

Tel.: 416.646.7433

email: nini.jones@paliareroland.com

Fax: 416.646.4301

Lawyers for the Intervenor

Court File No. CV-18-00602494-000

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

BETWEEN:

ROCCO ACHAMPONG

Applicant(s)

and

**ONTARIO (HON. DOUG FORD, PREMIER OF ONTARIO), ONTARIO
(ATTORNEY-GENERAL), and CITY OF TORONTO**

Respondent(s)

Court File No. CV-18-00603633-0000

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

BETWEEN:

**CHRIS MOISE, ISH ADERONMU, and PRABHA KHOSLA, on her own
behalf and on behalf of all members of Women Win TO**

Applicants

and

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondent

-2-

Court File No.

**ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE**

B E T W E E N:

CITY OF TORONTO

Applicant

and

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondent

AFFIDAVIT OF DYANOOSH YOUSSEFI

I, Dyanoosh Youssefi, of the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario, AFFIRM
AS FOLLOWS:

1. I am a registered candidate in the 2018 Toronto Municipal Election. I have been a registered candidate since May 1, 2018, and I have been actively campaigning since that time. I am a resident and voter in Toronto, and have previous experience in municipal elections.
2. As such, I have knowledge of the matters set out in this affidavit, except where I have indicated that my statements are made on information and belief, in which case I have stated the source of my information and I believe this information to be true.

Background

-3-

3. I was born to a Jewish-Iranian family in Iran. In 1982, when I was 11, my family fled Iran due to ongoing conflict in the area. We traveled first through Pakistan to Spain, where we waited for 5 months before arriving in Canada as landed immigrants in 1983.

4. I have mostly resided in Toronto since my family arrived in Canada. My family moved to Richmond Hill in 1987. From 1994-1998, I lived in Montreal, where I attended McGill Law School. I moved to the Yonge and Eglinton area in 1999, and have been living in mid-town since then.

5. I have been living at 158 Montgomery Avenue since 2005. Our home is located in Ward 16 under the 44-ward municipal system. It was to continue to be Ward 14 after the new Council's election, under the 47-ward municipal system. I live in the federal and provincial electoral district of Eglinton-Lawrence.

6. I received a Bachelor of Arts (Hons.) in Criminology, Ethics, and Society and the Law from the University of Toronto in 1994. I then received my LLB and BCL degrees in Common Law and Civil Law from McGill University in 1998. Between 2000 and 2005, I practiced criminal defence as a sole practitioner.

7. From 2010 to 2016, I was a Professor of Legal Studies at Seneca College of Applied Arts and Technology. I became a Professor of Legal Studies at Humber College in May 2016. I have been active in my community, serving on the Board of Directors of Parkdale Activity Recreation Centre, and the Board of Directors Results Canada.

8. The flexibility of my academic positions allowed me to focus on social initiatives. In February 2015, I founded All IN, a non-profit advocacy organization that promotes

-4-

inclusive communities. We engage the public and decision-makers on issues such as housing, mental health, and policing. I continue to serve as the Executive Director of All IN, though we have not been active since I began work on my campaign. I have also spent time writing on criminal justice and social justice issues, and been published in *The Toronto Star*, the *Canadian Jewish News*, and on *Huffington Post*

9. I am also a single mother to two daughters, ages 13 and 11. I have volunteered at their schools, including Allenby Junior Public School and Associated Hebrew Day School.

Political Experience

10. I have always been interested in politics. As a voter, I take my right to vote seriously. I am not a registered member of a party. What draws me to municipal politics is the ability to focus on residents' needs and the issues, and to vote according to my moral conscience.

11. In 2014, I decided to run for city council in my local ward, which was then known as Ward 16. I wanted to represent my community to advocate for issues like responsible development, integrated and modern transit, and accessible affordable housing. There were 16 candidates in that race, which was eventually won by Christin Carmichael-Greb with 3,949 votes. I came in third place, with 3,145 votes, a difference of only 804 votes.

My Decision to Run in the 2018 Toronto Municipal Election

12. Though I was unsuccessful in 2014, I remained committed to addressing the concerns of my neighbourhood and continued to follow municipal issues. I did not agree with the approach of Councillor Carmichael-Greb to my community's concerns, and felt

-5-

that many of the positions she took were contrary to the views of the majority of residents of the ward.

13. Between 2014 and 2017, I regularly contemplated running again. I thought about balancing my family and work commitments, the chance of winning, the kind of team I would need to assemble, and the profile of the ward. I spoke with supporters, potential volunteers, city councillors, Members of Parliament, and Members of Provincial Parliament about running again.

14. Based on my outreach and information, it also became clear that, other than the incumbent, I was the only candidate from the list of 16 candidates in the 2014 Ward 16 election that was going to run again. This would raise my chances of winning the election in Ward 14 (formerly Ward 16), and impacted my decision as well as strategy.

My Campaign

15. Ultimately, I decided to run in the 2018 Toronto Municipal Election (the "Election"). I had a volunteer team in place by January 2018, several months before the official start of campaigning. A core team of volunteers met every 2-3 weeks after that. Throughout the winter of 2018, I focused on and spent a significant amount of time developing flyer content, website content, and strategy, and held meetings to develop voter engagement strategies and team growth. I met with Residents' Associations to get to know their issues, so I could more fully understand resident concerns and develop a platform that reflected the community's needs.

-6-

16. In the meantime, I also assembled a Volunteer Guide, a Code of Conduct, and a Canvassing Guide for use on my campaign. I trained canvassers with information and strategy related to the unique features of Ward 14.

17. I had followed the Toronto Ward Boundary Review (the "Review") through news reports and City of Toronto documents. Based on that, I understood that Ward 14, the successor to Ward 16 as it was before the Review, was largely the same. I also understood that the ward boundaries were finalized and appeals of the ward boundaries had been exhausted. This meant that all the time spent preparing to run was based on a ward that was, I thought, essentially the same ward as the one I had run in during the 2014 Toronto Municipal Election, with only a minor addition of several streets at the north-east corner of Bathurst and Eglinton, an area that I already knew.

18. On May 1, 2018, I filed my official nomination papers. May 1 was the first day that candidates could register under the *Municipal Elections Act*. On May 2, 2018, I started campaigning.

19. My fundraising efforts started as soon as I was registered. Before May 1, my volunteer team had collected information from my last campaign and put together contacts to identify potential donors. We researched and adopted a tiered approach to contacting donors in order to maximize our time. After May 2, we started contacting donors and seeking contributions to my campaign. We had a fundraising cap set by the electoral rules that was based on the size of our ward, and we based our strategy off this concrete objective. Had our fundraising limit been higher, we would have adopted a different strategy to ensure our fundraising efforts were sufficient.

-7-

20. My campaign also ordered various promotional materials and established a web presence. We ordered flyers, all of which had been printed with language indicating I was running in Ward 14. I recycled t-shirts from my previous election, but had them touched up to indicate my candidacy was in Ward 14.

Media Reports of Provincial Involvement in the Election

21. I learned on the evening of Thursday, July 26, 2018, one day before the nominations for City Council were supposed to close, that the Provincial Government planned to intervene in the municipal election. I understood that the Provincial Government wanted to reduce the size of council from 47 wards to 25 wards, and that the boundaries of the 25 wards would mirror the federal and provincial electoral boundaries.

22. As a lawyer, I am familiar with the Province's constitutional authority over municipal institutions. But I was concerned that a mid-election interference would throw the election into chaos, and cause confusion for residents. It is important to me that elections are fair and that the rules are respected. This proposed action did not seem fair to voters or candidates.

23. I was very worried about my campaign. I had spent almost three months knocking on the doors of Ward 14, and felt that I had significant momentum. All of my planning had focused on the concerns and the needs of the approximately 55,000 residents of Ward 14. With the population of the ward doubling under the 25-ward model, I did not know how I would be able to re-orient my campaign, or reach so many more residents. I have attached maps of Ward 14 and the new Eglinton-Lawrence ward as **Exhibit 1** to this Affidavit.

-8-

24. On the evening of Thursday, July 26, my campaign went into overdrive in order to communicate with residents that I would remain in the race, and to let them know about the proposed changes and our position. In the following days, we e-mailed supporters, communicated with volunteers, issued a press release, and held an online meeting, all with the specific purpose of clarifying that I intended to continue my campaign.

25. After the Provincial Government's announcement, it took several weeks before they took legislative action. In the meantime, I continued canvassing and talking to electors. Many residents were confused about what was happening, and concerned about having less access to their councillor. While I could speak to residents about the larger impact of mid-election rule changes and what our ward boundaries would be under the new system, I could not provide any other answers or re-assurances that they would continue to have the same access to their Councillors.

26. On August 14, 2018, I understand that the Provincial Government's bill enacting these changes, Bill 5, *Better Local Governments Act, 2018*, ("Bill 5") received Royal Assent.

Impact of Bill 5 on My Campaign

27. I have spent a considerable amount of time and energy into dealing with this new and unexpected situation. I had put too much work into the campaign to abandon it. I still wanted to run, to represent the residents of Ward 14, and to help build a better city for all of us. I did not want to let the residents of my ward and my supporters down.

-9-

28. Eglinton-Lawrence is roughly the combination of my ward, Ward 14, and our adjoining ward, Ward 13. Ward 13 has several distinct features from Ward 14, including a higher proportion of visible minorities and immigrants, a lower average household income, and a higher number of renters. As a result, it has different needs. I have begun to take the steps to develop networks in that ward and learn about their issues, as I did with Ward 14. Bill 5 has required changing my communication strategy so that voters in Ward 13 know I am familiar and passionate about their communities.

29. My campaign strategy must also be completely revised. My team of volunteers and I were on track to have covered the entirety of Ward 14 by the election date, October 22. The strategy was rolling out well, and was proving to be effective with voters. Now, everything must be revamped for a much broader scope. It is not possible for me to reach all the voters in both wards. I did not cultivate the same local connections in Ward 13 in the run up to the election. If I had known that the rules were to change, I would have broadened my outreach, from the outset, to include that ward.

30. Now, I am facing an additional 7 candidates (presuming they all remain in the race), including high profile candidates such as a former Member of Provincial Parliament. The factors I had balanced in deciding to enter the race are considerably different. It is hard to predict the likelihood of success.

31. I have had to spend a considerable amount of time, in talking to voters and residents, to explain the impacts of Bill 5. This means that I am not speaking as much about other, pressing municipal issues on the door steps. I have also had to expend additional campaign time to inform voters that I am remaining in the race. This has

-10-

included a press release and a video explaining Bill 5, hoping to clarify our position and the impact of the bill, and outlining next steps as we understand them. I attach the press release as **Exhibit 2** to this Affidavit.

32. Financially, I understand that the maximum campaign fundraising limit will be raised given the size of the ward has doubled. However, it is unlikely that we will be able to utilize the additional allowance, since it is too late in the race to make the new connections needed to fundraise. My campaign will have to make do with the funding targets we established while running for a single ward, while campaigning in a ward double the size of what we expected.

33. Much of the campaign material that had been ordered was branded with language indicating I was running in Ward 14. We will have to expend additional campaign resources to re-order campaign material.

Impact of Bill 5 on My Personal and Professional Life

34. Professionally, I have structured my work commitments to allow for my campaign. I requested that my teaching course load at Humber College be reduced. This is resulted in a significant reduction of income that I will not be able to recoup.

35. Personally, I have been campaigning 12-15 hours a day. A candidate does a considerable amount of canvassing, e-mailing and organizing herself. As a result, I have carefully structured my time to ensure that I maximize the time with my two daughters. I do my best to ensure that we have dinner together when they are with me, which often

-11-

means a very early dinner at around 5 p.m., and then continue campaign work after dinner and then again after they have gone to bed.

36. There has been little opportunity for extended periods of family time during the campaign. This is difficult for my children, and to have the added pressure and stress of a mid-election rule change has strained the careful arrangements I made.

37. There were significant public consultations on the ward boundaries. It is my belief that the City of Toronto needs enough councillors to represent the numerous and diverse requests of city residents. My impression is that our hard work, time, money, resident needs, and democratic interests are of no value to the Province.

Conclusion


38. I firmly believed that, in Ward 14, I had great momentum, appeal, and decent chance of winning. I had carefully structured my personal and professional life to accommodate my campaign. I spent considerable time, money, and energy planning and campaigning for Ward 14. Now the rules of the election have changed, which demonstrates a disregard for the electoral processes that formed the basis of candidates' decisions.

39. I affirm this affidavit for the sole purpose of intervening in an application in respect of Bill 5, and for no other improper purpose.

AFFIRMED BEFORE ME at the City of Toronto, in the Province of Ontario on August 22, 2018



Commissioner for Taking Affidavits
(or as may be)




Dyanooosh Youssefi

This is **Exhibit 1** refer to in the Affidavit of
Dyanoosh Youssefi, sworn August 22, 2018


City of Toronto Ward Profiles - 2018

Ward 14



 Ward 14





This is **Exhibit 2** refer to in the Affidavit of
Dyanoosh Youssefi, sworn August 22, 2018

VOTE FOR
DYANOOSH YOUSSEFI

26 Jul

Ward 14 Candidate Dyanoosh Youssefi Opposes Doug Ford's Changes to Toronto City Council

(TORONTO) "A disdain for democracy and lack of respect for the electorate" is how Dyanoosh Youssefi, Ward 14 Candidate for City Council, described Premier Doug Ford's decision to introduce a bill that would reduce Toronto City Council to 25 members, instead of 47.

"By introducing this bill halfway through the municipal election, without any public consultation, Doug Ford makes a mockery of our democracy and disrespects the people of Toronto," states Youssefi.

"Not only candidates, but hundreds of volunteers who are residents of this city and who care deeply about municipal government and the future of Toronto, have already spent thousands of hours on these campaigns. People have made donations and campaigns have made expenditures for months. By redrawing the boundaries at this stage, Doug Ford tells the people of Toronto that their time, money, and democratic interests and values are of no interest or value."

Youssefi stated that there were significant consultations on the ward boundaries before Council moved to 47 wards. The increase in Councillors was because the City of Toronto is larger than 6 provinces, and that its needs require a larger City Council.

"Residents want and need Councillors to hear and represent them on the many challenges facing Torontonians. The hard-working Councillors of this City already work very long days and on weekends to serve the residents. A smaller City Council would mean less direct representation for Toronto residents."

Youssefi is calling on all City Council candidates, regardless of their political leanings, to

work together to fight this anti-democratic measure.

For further information, contact:

Dyanoosh Youssefi

dyanoosh@dyanooshyoussefi.ca

647-545-8647

or Kaveh Shahrooz

kshahrooz@gmail.com 416-432-4191

Court File No. CV-18-00602494-0000
Court File No. CV-18-00603633-0000

ROCCO ACHAMPONG

Applicant

CHRIS MOISE, ISH ADERONMU, and PRABHA KHOSLA, on
her own behalf and on behalf of all members of Women Win TO
Applicant

-and-

ONTARIO (HON. DOUG FORD, PREMIER OF ONTARIO),
ONTARIO (ATTORNEY-GENERAL), and CITY OF TORONTO
Respondent

-and-

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondent

ONTARIO
SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT
TORONTO

AFFIDAVIT OF DYANOOSH YOUSSEFI

Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP
155 Wellington Street West, 35th Floor
Toronto, ON M5V 3H1

Donald K. Eady (LSO #30635P)
Tel.: 416.646.4321
email: don.eady@paliareroland.com

Caroline V. (Nini) Jones (LSO #43956J)
Tel.: 416.646.7433
email: nini.jones@paliareroland.com

Fax: 416.646.4301

Lawyers for the Intervenor

Court File No. CV-18-00602494-0000
Court File No. CV-18-00603633-0000
Court File No., CV-18-00603633-0000

ROCCO ACHAMPONG

Applicant

CHRIS MOISE, ISH ADERONMU, and PRABHA KHOSLA, on her own behalf and on behalf of all members of Women Win TO

Applicant

CITY OF TORONTO

Applicant

-and-

**ONTARIO (HON. DOUG FORD, PREMIER OF ONTARIO),
ONTARIO (ATTORNEY-GENERAL), and CITY OF TORONTO**

Respondent

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondent

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ONTARIO

Respondent

ONTARIO

SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE

PROCEEDING COMMENCED AT
TORONTO

RECORD OF THE INTERVENORS,

**JENNIFER HOLLETT, LILY CHENG, SUSAN DEXTER,
GEOFFREY KETTEL and DYANOOSH YOUSSEFI
(Volume 2 of 2)**

Paliare Roland Rosenberg Rothstein LLP
155 Wellington Street West, 35th Floor
Toronto, ON M5V 3H1

Donald K. Eady (LSO #30635P)
Tel.: 416.646.4321
email: don.eady@paliareroland.com

Caroline V. (Nini) Jones (LSO #43956J)
Tel.: 416.646.7433
email: nini.jones@paliareroland.com

Jodi Martin (LSO #54966V)
Tel.: 416.646.7482
email: jodi.martin@paliareroland.com

Fax: 416.646.4301

**Lawyers for the Intervenor, Jennifer Hollett, Lily Cheng, Susan
Dexter, Geoffrey Kettel and Dyanoosh Youssefi**