

**BUDGET COMMITTEE**      **APRIL 17, 2007**

**COUNCIL BUDGET**

**Recommendation**

The City Clerk recommends:

- 1) That Council select the preferred option to be used for the 2007 Mayor, Regional Councillors and individual Ward Councillors budgets; and
- 2) That Council receive the 2007 draft Council Corporate budget.

**Economic Impact**

The economic impact will depend on the option selected.

**Communications Plan**

N/A

**Purpose**

To present the 2007 draft Corporate Council budget for consideration and provide options for consideration with respect to the Mayor, Regional Councillors and individual Ward Councillors budgets.

**Background - Analysis and Options**

This matter was previously the subject of a report to Budget Committee on February 6, 2007. At that time, the current population estimates presented were incorrect. Consequently the following report has been revised to reflect the correct figures and revised budget figures resulting from the application of the equalization formula. As well an additional option, Option 4, has been included for consideration that was discussed at the February 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Up to and including 2002, the budgets of members of Council were similar in that the Local (Ward) Councillors had the same budgets, and the Regional Councillors had the same, although larger budget than the Local (Ward) Councillors. The Mayor's budget was greater as was appropriate.

Over the years the variances in ward population increased and in 2002 a need was recognized to devise a formula to equalize funding for Local (Ward) Councillors to provide a more consistent level of service for constituents.

On February 10, 2003 Council approved and implemented an equalization formula (refer to the Council Extract - Attachment #1). Consequently the formula was applied and implemented commencing with the 2003 budget. At that time the formula was applied to the 2002 base budget. The budgets of the Local (Ward) Councillors were adjusted in accordance with the formula.

In subsequent years, the equalized bases became the bases upon which the formula was applied. This was done so that no budget would be less in any ensuing year. Last term, Council approved new ward boundaries to better equalize the ward populations and also directed that a further review be undertaken prior to the next election in 2009 (now 2010) (refer to the Council Extract - Attachment #2).

The new ward boundaries are now in place and the estimated rounded populations as at December 31, 2006 are:

Ward 1	61,100
Ward 2	55,000
Ward 3	46,800
Ward 4	48,800
Ward 5	<u>38,700</u>
Total	<u>250,400</u>

As a result of the new ward boundaries, the ward populations are now fairly equitable. If the current methodology of using the 2006 lowest Ward Councillor budget as the base is applied, the end result would be that a smaller ward will receive more funding than larger wards when the equalization formula is factored in.

In order to address this, an option being proposed is the establishment of a *new* base calculated by averaging the total 2006 Ward Councillors budgets. The equalization formula could be applied if Council desires.

The following options are being provided for Council's consideration:

**Option 1**

It is suggested that a *new* base be calculated based on the average budgets of the Ward Councillors for 2006 (total Ward Councillors budgets divided by 5 which equals \$110,086). The Mayor's budget would remain the same as 2006 (\$226,834) and the Regional Councillors budgets would remain the same as 2006 (\$144,905).

Under this option the proposed 2007 budget for Mayor, Regional Councillors and Ward Councillors would be:

Mayor	-	-	\$226,834
Regional Councillors	-	-	\$144,905
Ward Councillors	-	-	\$110,086

**Option 2**

Applying the equalization formula using the *new* base (total Ward Councillors budgets divided by 5 which equals \$110,086)

**Step 1**

Average ward size (estimated population at December 31,2006 - 250,400/5) = 50,080

**Step 2**

Number of residents above the average:

Ward 1	61,100 minus 50,080 = 11,020
Ward 2	55,000 minus 50,080 = 4,920
Ward 3	46,800
Ward 4	48,800
Ward 5	38,700

**Step 3**

Ward Councillors Budget discretionary costs:  
Budget minus (remuneration + incidental expenses + benefits + Council Corporate copier)  
\$110,086 minus (\$66,090 +2,400 +16,525 + 1,200)

$$\$110,086 - 86,215 = 23,871$$

**Step 4**

Discretionary costs divided by ward average

$$\$23,871/50,080 = 0.48 \text{ per resident}$$

**Step 5**

Funding equalization for Ward Councillors:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ward 1} - 11,020 \times 0.48 &= \$5,290 \\ \text{Ward 2} - 4,920 \times 0.48 &= \$2,362 \end{aligned}$$

**Step 6**

Equalization for Mayor and Regional Councillors  
(Ward Councillors Budget Discretionary Costs x 5 ) + funding equalization for Wards 1 and 2) /4

$$(\$23,871 \times 5) + 7,652 / 4 \text{ minus } \$23,871 = \$7,880$$

Under this option the proposed 2007 budget for Mayor, Regional Councillors and Ward Councillors would be:

Mayor	(\$226,834 + 7,880)	=	\$234,714
Regional Councillor	(\$144,905 + 7,880)	=	\$152,785
Ward 1 Councillor	(\$110,086 + 5,290)	=	\$115,376
Ward 2 Councillor	(\$110,086 + 2,362)	=	\$112,448
Ward 3 Councillor		=	\$110,086
Ward 4 Councillor		=	\$110,086
Ward 5 Councillor		=	\$110,086

**Option 3**

Using the existing methodology (lowest 2006 Ward Councillor budget as the base).

**Step 1**

Average ward size (estimated population at December 31, 2006 - 250,400/5) = 50,080

**Step 2**

Number of residents above the average:

Ward 1	61,100 minus 50,080 = 11,020
Ward 2	55,000 minus 50,080 = 4,920
Ward 3	46,800
Ward 4	48,800
Ward 5	38,700

**Step 3**

Ward Councillors Budget discretionary costs:

2006 Lowest Ward Councillor base budget = \$98,290

Budget minus (remuneration + incidental expenses + benefits + Council Corporate copier)  
 \$98,290 minus (\$66,090 + 2,400 + 16,525 + 1,200)

\$98,290 – 86,215 = 12,075

**Step 4**

Discretionary costs divided by ward average

\$12,075/50,080 = 0.24 per resident

**Step 5**

Funding equalization for Ward Councillors:

Ward 1 – 11,020 x 0.24 = \$2,645

Ward 2 – 4,920 x 0.24 = \$1,181

**Step 6**

Equalization for Mayor and Regional Councillors

(Ward Councillors Budget Discretionary Costs x 5 ) + funding equalization for Wards 1 and 2) / 4

(\$12,075 x 5) + 3,826 / 4 minus 12,075 = \$3,975

Under this option the proposed 2007 budget for Mayor, Regional Councillors and Ward Councillors would be:

Mayor	(\$226,834 + 3,975)	=	\$230,809
Regional Councillor	(\$144,905 + 3,975)	=	\$148,880
Ward 1 Councillor	(\$135,656 + 2,645)	=	\$138,301
Ward 2 Councillor	(\$109,711 + 1,181)	=	\$110,892
Ward 3 Councillor		=	\$ 98,290
Ward 4 Councillor		=	\$ 104,483
Ward 5 Councillor		=	\$ 98,290

**Option 4**

Another option that could be used is to establish a set amount per resident to be added where the ward population is above the average as opposed to using the equalization formula to determine this amount. The amount could be set by Council from time to time as may be appropriate. The following option utilizes the new base as set out in Option 1 above and \$0.50 per resident.

Mayor	\$226,834
Regional Councillors	\$144,905
Ward Councillors	\$110,086

**Step 1**

Average ward size (estimated population at December 31, 2006 – 250,400/5 = 50, 080

**Step 2**

Number of residents above the average:

Ward 1	61,100 minus 50,080 = 11,020
Ward 2	55,000 minus 50,080 = 4,920
Ward 3	46,800
Ward 4	48,800
Ward 5	38,700

**Step 3**

Funding equalization for Ward Councillors:

Ward 1 – 11,020 x 0.50 =	\$5,510
Ward 2 – 4,920 x 0.50 =	\$2,460

**Step 4**

Equalization for Mayor and Regional Councillors:

(Ward Councillors Budget Discretionary Costs x 5 ) + funding equalization for Wards 1 and 2) / 4

$$(\$23,871 \times 5) + 7,970 / 4 \text{ minus } 23,871 = \$7,960$$

Under this option the proposed 2007 budget for Mayor, Regional Councillors and Ward Councillors would be:

Mayor	(\$226,834 + 7,960)	=	\$234,794
Regional Councillor	(\$144,905 + 7,960)	=	\$152,865
Ward 1 Councillor	(\$110,086 + 5,510)	=	\$115,596
Ward 2 Councillor	(\$110,086 + 2,460)	=	\$112,546
Ward 3 Councillor		=	\$110,086
Ward 4 Councillor		=	\$110,086
Ward 5 Councillor		=	\$110,086

The following table summarizes the four options provided versus the 2006 budgets for comparison purposes:

Ward Population	Position	Option 1 Budget (\$)	Option 2 Budget (\$)	Option 3 Budget (\$)	Option 4 Budget (\$)	2006 Budget (\$)
	Mayor	226,834	234,714	230,809	234,794	226,834
	Regional Councillor	144,905	152,785	148,880	152,865	144,905
61,100	Councillor Ward 1	110,086	115,376	138,301	115,596	135,656
55,000	Councillor Ward 2	110,086	112,448	110,892	112,546	109,711
46,800	Councillor Ward 3	110,086	110,086	98,290	110,086	98,290
48,800	Councillor Ward 4	110,086	110,086	104,483	110,086	108,483
38,700	Councillor Ward 5	110,086	110,086	98,290	110,086	98,290
<b>Total Population 250,400</b>	<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>922,169</b>	<b>945,581</b>	<b>929,945</b>	<b>946,059</b>	<b>922,169</b>

### Council Corporate Budget

The Council Corporate base budget for 2007 is the same as 2006. Certain line items were adjusted as necessary following a review of the expenses incurred in 2006.

### Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2007

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council and the necessary resources have been allocated and approved.

### Regional Implications

N/A

### Conclusion

Four options have been provided for Council's consideration. Option 1 establishes a new base that has been calculated by averaging the total Ward Councillors 2006 budgets. Option 2 uses the new base plus the application of the equalization formula. Option 3 uses the current methodology i.e. using the 2006 lowest Ward Councillor budget as the base plus the application of the equalization formula. Option 4 uses the new base and a set of equalization factor of 0.50 per resident.

Staff is requesting Council select the preferred option to be used for the Mayor and Councillors 2007 budgets.

### Attachments

- Attachment #1 – Council Extract – Item 4, Report No. 90 Special CW (Budget),  
adopted February 10, 2003
- Attachment #2 – Council Extract – Item 1, Report No. 21, Special CW (Working Session),  
adopted April 11, 2005
- Attachment #3 - Draft 2007 Council Corporate Budget

### Report prepared by:

John D. Leach, City Clerk

Respectfully submitted,

---

John D. Leach,  
City Clerk

---

Janice Atwood-Petkovski,  
Commissioner of Legal and Administrative Services

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 10, 2003

Item 4, Report No. 90, of the Special Committee of the Whole (Budget), which was adopted, as amended, by the Council of the City of Vaughan on February 10, 2003, as follows:

*By directing that the words "the Mayor and" contained in Clause 3 of the Committee recommendation be deleted.*

4

COUNCIL BUDGET

The Special Committee of the Whole (Budget) recommends:

- 1) That Option 1, Step 1 to Step 5, contained in the following report of the City Clerk, dated December 16, 2002, be approved;
- 2) That Step 6, "Equalization for Mayor and Regional Councillors" be calculated as follows:
 

*[(Local Councillors 2002 Budget discretionary costs x 5) + (funding equalization for Wards 1 and 2)] / 3;*
- 3) That the Mayor and Members of Council be given the option to either claim mileage or receive an allowance up to a maximum of \$450 per month for 2003;
- 4) That a full-time position with the position title of "Secretary to Mayor and Members of Council", be approved;
- 5) That staff provide a report on the budget implications respecting plaques for new high schools;
- 6) That Council continue to support the Woodchoppers Ball, York Central Hospital Gala, York Finch Hospital Gala and the Police Chief's Dinner fundraising events to a maximum of \$3,000 per event; and
- 7) That an additional line item of \$15,000 a year be included to cover charges for Blackberries, Personal Digital Device (PDA) upgrades, etc.

Recommendation

The City Clerk in consultation with the Director of Budgeting and Financial Planning (Acting) recommends that Council provide direction respecting the 2003 budgets for the Mayor and Members of Council.

Purpose

To present the 2003 budgets for the Mayor and Members of Council, Council Corporate and Council Administrative Assistants (CAA's) for consideration and to report on budget related issues including a ward funding equalization formula and receptionist position/Council Offices.

Background - Analysis and OptionsAnalysis and Options

The attached draft budgets for the Mayor and Members of Council (Attachment #1) and Council Corporate (Attachment #2) are submitted for consideration. Also attached for ease of reference is the current Council Budget/Expenditure Policy/Procedure as amended (Attachment #3). Council Member remuneration and benefits have been adjusted to reflect current salaries as approved by council at its meeting held on Monday, December 16, 2002.

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 10, 2003

Item 4. SPCW(BDGT) Report No. 90 – Page 2

It is noted that the Council Corporate Budget and CAA's Budget is included in the Clerk's Department budget. The Council Corporate budget has not been increased over the 2002 base to take into account inflationary increases as well as any adjustments pertaining to furniture, equipment, computer hardware/software that may be appropriate. Committee may wish to consider an adjustment to cover such things as "line" charges for Blackberries, etc. and Personal Digital Device (PDA) upgrades which were not provided for in the 2002 base. The CAA's budget has been adjusted to reflect current salaries.

Ward Funding

Council at its meeting held on October 15, 2002 considered a report from the City Clerk respecting a ward review and in so doing adopted the following recommendation:

- 1) *That the ward boundaries remain unchanged at this time and that commencing in 2003 staff conduct a review of the ward boundaries and provide a report on the results, for implementation in the 2006 election; and*
- 2) *That staff prepare a report with respect to the expense portion of the Mayor and Members of Council budget being based on ward population for implementation in 2003.*

Because of the substantial difference in the population figures for the various wards due to significant growth a need has been recognized to devise a formula to equalize funding to provide for a more consistent level of service for constituents in the various wards. Set out below is a number of options for consideration.

OPTION 1

This option would utilize a funding base being the discretionary costs within the 2002 Local Councillor's Budgets equalized by a per resident dollar amount over a ward population average.

Formula

Step 1           Average ward size (population divided by 5) =  $215,461 \div 5 = 43,092$

Step 2           Number of residents above the average

Ward 1	$55,482 - 43,092 = 12,390$
Ward 2	$50,105 - 43,092 = 7,013$
Ward 3	27,110
Ward 4	40,992
Ward 5	41,772

Step 3           Local Councillors 2002 Budget discretionary costs:

Budget: 78,020	less remuneration, benefits and incidental expenses and allowance
$78,020 - 51,335 = 26,685$	

Step 4           Discretionary costs divided by ward average –  
 $\$26,685 \div 43,092 = \$0.62$  per resident



CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 10, 2003

Item 4, SPCW(BDGT) Report No. 90 – Page 3

**Step 5** Funding equalization for Local Councillors:  
- add \$0.62 per resident above the average  
Ward 1 – 12,390 X \$0.62 = \$7,681  
Ward 2 - 7,013 X \$0.62 = \$4,348

**Step 6** Equalization for Mayor and Regional Councillors = \$7,681

**OPTION 2**

This option utilizes a dollar amount multiplied by the annual increase in the number of households.

Use \$0.62 per resident (from Step 4 above) x 3.66 which is the average persons per household in Vaughan  
 $\$0.62 \times 3.66 = \$2.27$

Increase in Households 2002 over 2001

Ward 1	1,982 x \$2.27 - \$ 4,499
Ward 2	762 x \$2.27 - \$ 1,729
Ward 3	81 x \$2.27 - \$ 183
Ward 4	1,020 x \$2.27 - \$ 2,315
Ward 5	

Equalization for Mayor and Regional Councillors  
 $3,845 \times \$2.27 = \$8,728$

**OPTION 3** an arbitrary amount

**OPTION 4** status quo

Receptionist Position – Council Offices

Council at its meeting held on June 10, 2001 considered enhancing the level of receptionist services for the Council offices and deferred the matter to the fall. The following is an excerpt from the report considered at the June 10<sup>th</sup> meeting:

*During a review of the policy and through ongoing input and discussions with the Council staff, the need for an enhanced level of receptionist services has been identified. As the City continues to grow and the Council offices and staff become busier and busier, it becomes obvious that there is a need for reception services to be available at all times.*

*The current situation is that the Mayor's Secretary divides her time between duties for the Mayor and receptionist duties on a 50/50 basis. Her job description lists her receptionist duties as "receives and directs visitors to Councillors and/or their Assistants". A copy is attached. Due to the nature of her duties, she is limited in the functions she can perform. When she is absent from her desk due to other duties or illness, there is no one to greet the public when they arrive.*

Staff are suggesting that this matter be addressed by creating a full-time position for the Members of Council with the position title of Secretary to Members of Council which would provide an enhanced and more consistent service to the Council and public. The incumbent Secretary to the Mayor had indicated a willingness to move into this position. Should this occur the Secretary to the Mayor's position would be backfilled. The primary duties would consist of:

**CITY OF VAUGHAN**

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 10, 2003**

**Item 4, SPCW(BDGT) Report No. 90 – Page 4**

- Greet visitors, direct them to appropriate office and/or supply refreshments
- Order and maintain all "common" supplies and equipment, such as photocopy, fax, kitchen supplies, etc.
- Schedule and set up Boardroom
- Pick up and/or distribute mail, faxes or deliveries
- Act as "forward" or "default" telephone for Administrative Assistants to ensure a "live" voice on the line
- Respond to general inquiries from the public
- Assist with corporate duties such as attendance management, purchasing and budget preparation and control
- Other duties as assigned

Should this position be approved, staff would consult with the Council Administrative Assistants (CAA's) and the Mayor's Administrative Assistant to further define the job description to ensure the highest level of service is provided consistently to all Members of Council.

**Conclusion**

It would be appropriate for direction to be given respecting the budgets for Mayor and Members of Council, Council Corporate, CAA's, the ward equalization formula and the Secretary to Members of Council position.

**Attachments**

City of Vaughan Council Expenditure Report  
City of Vaughan Council corporate Revenues, Expenses, Net  
Council Budget/Expenditure Policy/Procedure

**Report prepared by:**

John D. Leach

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005

Item 1, Report No. 21, of the Special Committee of the Whole (Working Session), which was adopted, as amended, by the Council of the City of Vaughan on April 11, 2005, as follows:

*By approving that "Option 5, Ward D" ward boundary proposal be presented at a public meeting for public input as soon as possible;*

*By approving that the public meeting be advertised in the City Page including Council's intention to pass a by-law to implement new ward boundaries;*

*By directing that all registered Ratepayers Associations be advised of the date of the public meeting;*

*By approving that the preferred ward boundary proposal be posted on the City's website with a request that comments be submitted in writing to the City Clerk; and*

*By receiving the memorandum from the City Clerk, dated April 11, 2005.*

1

WARD BOUNDARIES

(Referred from the Committee of the Whole (Working Session) meeting of March 22, 2005)

The Special Committee of the Whole (Working Session) recommends:

- 1) That a five ward option that addresses the current inequality in ward populations be considered as an interim measure for the 2006 election and that a review be undertaken prior to the 2009 election;
- 2) That staff provide for the Council meeting of April 11, 2005 a map illustrating the revised wards as suggested by members of Council and include the related ward populations;
- 3) That the following report of the City Clerk, dated March 22, 2005, be received and
- 4) That the memorandum from the City Clerk, dated April 1, 2005, be received.

Committee of the Whole (Working Session), at its meeting of March 22, 2005, recommended:

- 1) That the following report of the City Clerk, dated March 22, 2005, be received and referred to a Special Committee of the Whole (Working Session) meeting on April 4, 2005;
- 2) That the City Clerk provide the related costs of a 6 and 7 ward option in terms of an additional local councillor and two additional local councillors respectively; and
- 3) That the written submission of Councillor Yeung Racco, dated March 22, 2005, be received.

Report of the City Clerk, dated March 22, 2005

Recommendation

The City Clerk, in consultation with the Commissioner of Legal and Administrative Services, recommends that Council select the preferred ward option to be presented at a public meeting to be scheduled as soon as possible.

## CITY OF VAUGHAN

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005

#### Item 1, SPCW(WS) Report No. 21 – Page 2

##### Purpose

To respond to a Council directive respecting proposals for revised wards including 5, 6 and 7 ward options based on criteria established by Council and to report on the matter of regional wards.

##### Background - Analysis and Options

##### HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Over the years, numerous ward boundary reviews have been conducted by Vaughan Councils. When York Region came into existence on January 1, 1971, Vaughan Council consisted of 1 Mayor, 1 Regional and 5 Local Councillors all elected at large. In 1980 staff were directed to report on a ward system. Council ultimately selected a 6 ward proposal that was submitted to the

OMB for approval in 1982. At that time and until 1996 all ward proposals required OMB approval. The Board did not approve the Council preferred 6 ward system but instead adopted a 3 ward system with one councillor for ward 1 and two councillors each for wards 2 and 3 (Attachment No. 1). This surprised both supporters and opponents of the Council recommended plan. Council appealed the decision to Cabinet but was unsuccessful and a 3 ward system was adopted which remained in place until 1994. In the intervening years, Council considered numerous ward proposals including an 8 ward system but no changes were made until 1994. However, Vaughan did gain additional regional councillors with one being added in 1988 and another in 2004 resulting in the current Council of 9, one Mayor, 3 Local and Regional Councillors and 5 Local Councillors.

In 1992 – 1993, Council considered options for a 5 and 6 ward system ultimately opting for a 5 ward system which was approved by the OMB and implemented for the 1994 election and is still in place today. Council considered a ward review in October of 2002 and decided to retain the current ward boundaries for the 2003 election but directed staff to report on a ward boundary review for implementation at the 2006 election. More recently, staff reported to a Committee of the Whole (Working Session) on November 9, 2004 and Council adopted the following resolutions:

- 1) That this matter be referred to a Special Committee of the Whole meeting on November 22, 2004 at 11:00 a.m.;
- 2) That staff provide a legal opinion on the regulations and statutory requirements respecting Regional Wards;
- 3) That staff provide a report on the Regional Ward system in Mississauga and Brampton; and
- 4) That the Electoral count for each of the five wards as at the 2003 election be provided.

At the Special Committee of the Whole on November 22, 2004, the matter of regional wards was considered. Staff reports addressing regulations, statutory requirements and the regional ward systems in Mississauga and Brampton were received. In addition, the following direction was given and subsequently ratified by Council:

- 1) That staff be directed to prepare revised ward maps providing for 5, 6 and 7 local wards based on the following principles, in order of importance:

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005

Item 1, SPCW(WS) Report No. 21 – Page 3

1. Population:  
Equity based on expected populations as of November 2009 with variances no greater than 15% from the average populations between the wards as of that date;
2. Respecting the concept of distinctive communities; and
3. Acknowledgement of natural or built boundaries between communities;

And that such report be presented no later than March 31, 2005; and

- 2) That the City of Vaughan ask the Region of York if it would approve, in principle, the creation of Regional wards in the City of Vaughan for the purpose of electing regional councillors from the City of Vaughan to sit on Regional Council.

As directed in clause 2 of the resolution correspondence was forwarded to the Region to determine if Regional Council would support in principle regional wards for the City of Vaughan. Regional Council received the correspondence and took no action. (Attachment No. 2)

WARD CRITERIA

As noted above, Council has set out some criteria to be used in establishing the ward boundaries presented in this report. In addition Council may wish to be guided by criteria considered by a previous Council when the current boundaries were established:

- 1) Representation by population;
- 2) Use of natural and/or easily identifiable boundaries;
- 3) Recognition of communities of interest; and
- 4) Accommodation of future growth.

Also, the OMB, which prior to 1996, approved all ward revisions utilized this criteria:

Total electors divided by number of councillors (or wards) to find an average, and then create wards to make them equal.

Reasons to have them less than equal:

- Preserve communities of interest
- Recognition of natural (rivers, lakes, swamps) or Man-made (highways, railways) barriers/dividers
- Recognition of areas of growth/decline
- Recognition of density (ward with a few people over a large geographic area equals ward with large population in a small geographic area)
- Accessibility/communication

Size of variance from the average is up to Council but closer to equal is always better.

On the matter of an acceptable variance from the average ward population, Council has recognized  $\pm 15\%$  which is a desirable goal. There may be circumstances that justify a greater variance. Recently municipalities have been working to  $\pm 25\%$ . And, in fact, the Province directed that  $\pm 25\%$  be used when Toronto's wards were established which was appealed to the OMB. The Board upheld the use of  $\pm 25\%$ . All this said, Council has directed that 15% be the deviation from the average which is certainly a figure to be strived for in equalizing the populations of the wards.

**CITY OF VAUGHAN**

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005**

**Item 1. SPCW(WS) Report No. 21 – Page 4**

One of the challenges in equalizing ward populations is to avoid splitting communities in the process. In Vaughan's case, amongst the communities to be recognized are Woodbridge, Kleinburg, Maple, Thornhill and Concord. That is not to say that one ward councillor may not represent more than one community. Such has been the case to date with Kleinburg and Maple. Recently more and more municipalities are recognizing communities of interest when considering ward boundaries. Vaughan was one of the first councils, if not the first, to do this in creating the current ward structure back in 1993. It is worthy of noting that the OMB in its 1994 order recognized this as a "very innovative" approach. Consequently the boundaries presented in this report were drawn with this in mind. Certainly there may be a need to deviate from this to accommodate population between various wards and/or to provide for a clear recognizable boundary as recognized by the criteria previously used by the OMB. Attachment No. 3 shows the boundaries of Vaughan's ratepayers associations registered with the City in 2004.

**COUNCIL SIZE**

Council has directed that 5, 6 and 7 ward options be provided for consideration. The matter of the number of wards was considered at a Committee of the Whole (Working Session) on November 9, 2004 (Attachment No. 4). As noted in that report, Vaughan has a relatively small Council and high ratio of population per members of Council.

The following charts serve to illustrate the disparity between the ratios of numbers of members of Council per resident and numbers of local councillors per resident when comparing Vaughan to comparable high growth municipalities:

**CHART #1**

<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>POPULATION*</b>	<b>NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS</b>	<b>NUMBER OF WARDS</b>	<b>RATIO</b>
Vaughan	182,022	5	5	1:36,404
Richmond Hill	132,030	6	6	1:22,005
Markham	208,615	8	8	1:26,076
Brampton	325,428	10	10	1:32,542

\*Taken from 2001 Census

Average Ratio

1:29,256

**CHART #2**

<b>MUNICIPALITY</b>	<b>POPULATION*</b>	<b>COUNCIL SIZE</b>	<b>NUMBER OF WARDS</b>	<b>RATIO</b>
Vaughan	182,022	9	5	1:20,224
Richmond Hill	132,030	9	6	1:14,670
Markham	208,615	13	8	1:16,047
Brampton	325,428	11	10	1:29,584

\*Taken from 2001 Census

Average Ratio

1:20,131

The charts serve to illustrate that members of Vaughan Council represent considerably more residents per member than those of comparable municipalities. When comparing all members of Council, Vaughan councillors represent approximately the same number of residents on average. However, when comparing the number of residents per local councillor Vaughan local councillors

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005

Item 1. SPCW(W/S) Report No. 21 – Page 5

represent approximately 7,000 more residents on average. A good case can be made for increasing the number of local councillors. Vaughan residents enjoy excellent services including the representation provided by members of Council. The quality of this representation is a function of workload and the numbers of residents each member of Council represents. Vaughan residents demand high quality representation from its Council. Whether this high level of service can be sustained by Vaughan's relatively small Council particularly in light of Vaughan's continuing high growth rate, is a question to be considered.

As noted above, Vaughan Councils have considered expanding the size of Council. As far back as 1982, Council favoured 6 wards. It is noted that Council size has increased over the years by two regional councillors to reflect Vaughan's increasing population and size relative to other York Region municipalities.

WARD PROPOSALS

As directed by Council, options have been prepared for 5, 6 and 7 wards. Three options for each of the 5, 6 and 7 ward scenarios are presented. Population projections are for 2009 as requested as well as for 2014. The current ward boundaries were considered with 10 year population projections and are now in their eleventh year. With this in mind, it seemed appropriate to provide the longer term projections in addition to those requested by Council.

The following comments are provided on the ward options attached hereto: (Attachment No. 5)

**5 Ward A - This is the preferred 5 ward option**

**Pros**

- The  $\pm 15\%$  population variance is met in the longer term
- Clear identifiable lines
- Ratepayers association boundaries are respected
- Each ward has a rural/urban mix with the exception of ward 5

**Cons**

- Kleinburg included with the Woodbridge community, as opposed to the Maple community
- Current population variance exceeds  $\pm 15\%$

**5 Ward B**

**Pros**

- Reasonably good population distribution in the longer term
- Keeps the communities of Kleinburg and Maple in the same ward
- Ratepayers associations boundaries are respected
- Major arterial roads form the boundaries.

**Cons**

- Highway 400 divides Ward 1
- Current population variance exceeds  $\pm 15\%$

**5 Ward C**

**Pros**

- Meets the  $\pm 15\%$  population variance in the longer term
- Ratepayers associations boundaries are respected except for Kleinburg Area Ratepayers Association

**Cons**

- Current population variance exceeds  $\pm 15\%$
- Splits Kleinburg Area Ratepayers Association
- Highway 400 splits Ward 1

**CITY OF VAUGHAN**

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005**

**Item 1. SPCW(WS) Report No. 21 – Page 6**

**6 Ward A - This is the preferred 6 ward option**

**Pros**

- Good population distribution in the longer term
- Ratepayers associations boundaries are respected except for Beverly Glen Ratepayers Association
- Major community boundaries are respected for the most part.

**Cons**

- Current population variance exceeds  $\pm 15\%$

**6 Ward B**

**Pros**

- Good population distribution in the longer term
- Ratepayers associations boundaries are respected except for Beverly Glen Ratepayers Association

**Cons**

- Current population variance exceeds  $\pm 15\%$
- Boundary lines somewhat irregular
- Highway 400 splits Ward 1

**6 Ward C**

**Pros**

- Good population distribution in the longer term
- Ratepayers associations boundaries are respected except for Beverly Glen Ratepayers Association
- Boundaries are major arterial roads for the most part

**Cons**

- Current population variance exceeds  $\pm 15\%$
- Highway 400 splits Ward 1

**7 Ward A – This is the preferred 7 Ward option**

**Pros**

- Very good population distribution in the longer term
- Community boundaries respected
- Clear identifiable lines
- Ratepayers associations boundaries respected except for Beverly Glen Ratepayers Association

**Cons**

- Current population variance exceeds  $\pm 15\%$

**7 Ward B**

**Pros**

- Reasonably good population distribution in the longer term
- Clear identifiable lines
- Ratepayers associations boundaries respected except for Beverly Glen Ratepayers Association and Gates of Maple Ratepayers Association

**Cons**

- Current population variance exceeds  $\pm 15\%$
- Splits the Maple community



**CITY OF VAUGHAN**

**EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 2005**

**Item 1, SPCW(WS) Report No. 21 – Page 7**

**7 Ward C**

**Pros**

- Very good population distribution in the longer term
- Clear identifiable lines
- Ratepayers associations boundaries respected except for Beverly Glen Ratepayers Association and Gates of Maple Ratepayers Association.

**Cons**

- Current population variance exceeds  $\pm 15\%$
- Splits the Maple community

**PROCESS**

Council has the authority under the Municipal Act to enact by-laws to change the size of Council by adjusting the number of local councillors. As well, Council can enact a by-law to re-align ward boundaries. In each case notice of intention to pass a by-law must be given and at least one public meeting held. It would be desirable for Council to select a ward option for presentation at a public meeting and any public consultation process deemed appropriate. By-laws would need to be enacted both to change the number of local councillors and to re-align ward boundaries. In the case of a boundary change there is a 45 day appeal period during which the Minister or any other person or agency may appeal to the OMB. Any changes and/or approvals must be completed prior to January 2, 2006.

**Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2007**

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council and the necessary resources have been allocated and approved.

**Conclusion**

Council has directed that a ward review be conducted. It would be in order for Council to select a preferred ward configuration for consideration at a public meeting.

**Attachments**

- Attachment No. 1 – Ward Map 1982
- Attachment No. 2 – Letter from York Region dated October 21, 2005 re Ward Review
- Attachment No. 3 – Ratepayers 2004 Map
- Attachment No. 4 – Committee of the Whole (Working Session), Report No. 81, Item No. 4
- Attachment No. 5 – Ward Options
- Attachment No. 6 – Written submission of Councillor Yeung Racco, dated March 22, 2005.

**Report prepared by:**

John D. Leach, City Clerk

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

Vaughan  
City Departments Operating Budget  
Department P&L Report - Council Corp. Budget  
For the Fourteen Periods Ending December 31, 2007

R551000026  
VGN0007

	2007	2006	Budget	Variance
	Budget	Budget		
GEN General Operating Accounts				
060 City Clerk				
020020 Council - Corporate				
EXP Expenditure Accounts				
7110.01 General Dept. Meets	19,470	19,470	0	
7110.03 Task Force - Safety & Security	0	5,000	(5,000)	
7126 Newsletters & Mailings	1,000	0	1,000	
7135 Advertising	7,840	2,840	5,000	
7200 Office Supplies	3,910	3,910	0	
7205.01 Central Computer Supplies	590	590	0	
7205.02 Dept. Computer Supplies	5,000	2,930	2,070	
7210 Office Equip. & Furniture	7,990	9,790	(1,800)	
7211.01 Computer Hardware	9,410	12,480	(3,070)	
7220.01 Copier/Fax/Lease Charges	3,050	3,050	0	
7220.03 Copier/Fax Supplies	2,000	200	1,800	
7225.02 Council Postage	440	440	0	
7410 Rental, Leases - Equipment	7,100	7,100	0	
7445 Awards	600	600	0	
7630 Wireless/Internet Commun.	10,760	10,760	0	
7640 Cable TV/Satellite Service	340	340	0	
7699.01 Dept. Sundry Expenses	8,940	8,940	0	
EXP Expenditure Accounts	88,440	88,440	0	
020020 Council - Corporate	88,440	88,440	0	
060 City Clerk	88,440	88,440	0	
GEN General Operating Accounts	88,440	88,440	0	