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1. Study Overview

1.1 Terms of Reference

Watson & Associates Economists Ltd., in association with Robert J. Williams, Trust Learning Solutions and ICA Associates Inc., was retained to undertake a comprehensive Ward Boundary Review (W.B.R.) for the City of Hamilton. The Consultant Team has operated independently from Council and City staff and has conferred with residents and stakeholders to evaluate the existing ward structure, and design possible alternative ward boundary configurations. The final phase of the study provides Council with a final report and alternative ward boundary structures for their consideration, as presented herein.

A Final Report for the Hamilton Ward Boundary Review, dated October 11, 2016, was prepared by the Consultant Team and was referred to the General Issues Committee (G.I.C.) of Hamilton City Council for consideration on October 27, 2016. The Report presented two ward boundary options for Council’s consideration: a modified 15-ward Option and a 16-ward Option. The ward designs presented were the responsibility of the Consultant Team and were not solicited from or vetted or endorsed by elected officials ahead of publication.

After hearing from delegations and a presentation by the Consultant Team, questions by Councillors and debate at the October 27, 2016 G.I.C. meeting, members of Hamilton City Council requested an opportunity to forward to the Consultant Team “any further suggestions that the Council members may have for alternative ward boundary model options” and that the consultants report back to a future meeting of the General Issues Committee in the form of a consolidated report that includes “any additional ward boundary model options that may be provided by members of Council” as well as the two options included in the City of Hamilton Ward Boundary Review Final Report.¹ This Final Report, as amended, and presented herein, constitutes the response to that request.

A number of Councillors – individually or in collaboration with colleagues – responded with suggestions to the consultants through the City Clerk’s Office. All but one of these submissions suggested adjustments to the existing 15-ward configuration. The one exception included a request to consider a modification to a ward boundary in the

¹ Minutes of the Special General Issues Committee meeting, October 27, 2016, page 11.
proposed 15-ward option presented in the Final Report dated October 11, 2016. In addition, close to 100 residents of the present Ward 6 contacted the Clerk’s Office to object to a specific provision of the proposed 15-ward Option as it affected the East Mountain area. No suggestions were submitted in relation to the 16-ward Option.

To comply with Council’s request, this amended Final Report presents three alternative Options: the existing 15-ward system modified in light of submissions made by Councillors (Option 1), the 15-ward Option included in the Final Report as modified in light of concerns and suggestions directed to the Consultant Team (Option 2), and the 16-ward Option included in the October 11, 2016 Final Report (Option 3). The assessment of these three Options is presented in Chapter 5 of this report and is based on the guiding principles as established at the outset of the Review.

During the G.I.C. meeting, members of Council also identified a couple of discrepancies and oversights in the Final Report, dated October 11, 2016. These have been reviewed and corrected in the amended Final Report presented herein.

1.2 Context

The basic requirement for any electoral system in a representative democracy is to establish measures to determine the people who will constitute the governmental body that makes decisions on behalf of electors. Representation in Canada is organized around geographic areas, units referred to as constituencies in the federal and provincial parliaments and typically as wards at the municipal level, as is the case in the City of Hamilton. At present, Hamilton’s City Council consists of fifteen Councillors elected in fifteen wards (one Councillor per ward) and a Mayor elected at-large.

A ward boundary review is a task designed to develop such units of representation that reflect the distribution of the inhabitants of a municipality for electoral purposes. Since municipalities experience demographic shifts as a result of new residential development, intensification and changes in the composition of their population, electoral arrangements need to be reviewed periodically to ensure that representation remains fair and that electors have an opportunity to elect candidates they feel can truly represent them and their neighbours.

Hamilton’s existing ward boundary structure, as presented in Figure 1, dates from amalgamation in 2001 – 15 years ago. Since that time, the City has seen notable population growth and shifts and changes in its composition and structure, suggesting that now is an appropriate time to undertake a review of this nature.
The 2015-2016 W.B.R. represents the first opportunity that the local electoral needs of all the residents of the amalgamated City are being considered collectively through the same terms of reference and guiding principles offering a genuine “Made in Hamilton” review. As discussed in the Interim Report, the current ward structure for the City of Hamilton was assembled from its component parts without the benefit of a comprehensive local review and without formal local approval.

Prior to amalgamation in 2001, each of the former six municipalities\(^1\) that now comprise the City of Hamilton made their own decisions about how to represent its residents in the election of their respective local Councils without regard for the broader context. For example:

- One municipality elected its council at-large (the Town of Dundas); all other councils were elected in wards;
- The Town of Ancaster was moving “to improve the distribution of electors” in its five wards in 1996. Steps were being taken to develop options that consolidated most of the rural vote “so that rural electors predominate in at least one ward”;
- In at least one case, deciding ward boundaries was a contentious process. The City of Stoney Creek was engaged in a redivision of its seven wards in 1996 that was (a) being appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board, and (b) then terminated when a decision was taken in relation to dissolving Hamilton-Wentworth Region and replacing it with the new City of Hamilton; and
- In pre-amalgamation Hamilton, the system of representation had gone through changes at the end of 1980 related to the elimination of the Board of Control and a change to the composition of Council (16 members in 8 wards sitting on both councils). Hamilton had revised its ward boundaries in 1971 and again in 1985; in both designs, there were five wards in the lower City and three on the Mountain.

Given the diversity of the amalgamated City, it will require some vision and new perspectives to achieve an equitable, effective and accurate result. The W.B.R. is premised on the legitimate democratic expectation that municipal representation in Hamilton will be effective, equitable and an accurate reflection of the contemporary distribution of communities and people across the City.

\(^1\) On January 1, 2001, the new City of Hamilton was formed through the amalgamation of the former city and five other lower-tier municipalities including the City of Stoney Creek, the Towns of Ancaster, Flamborough and Dundas and the Township of Glanbrook.
1.3 Study Objectives

The primary purpose of the W.B.R. is to prepare Hamilton City Council to make a decision about whether to maintain the existing ward structure or to adopt an alternative arrangement.¹ The project has a number of key objectives in accordance with the project terms of reference, as follows:

- Develop a clear understanding of the present ward system, including its origins and operations as a system of representation;
- Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the present ward system on the basis of the identified guiding principles;
- Conduct an appropriate consultation process to ensure community support for the review and its outcome;
- Identify plausible modifications to the present ward structure; and

¹ Municipal councils have the legal right to create, change and even eliminate ward boundaries for the purpose of electing municipal councillors as per the Municipal Act (sections 222 and 223).
- Deliver a report that will set out recommended alternative ward boundaries to ensure effective and equitable electoral arrangements for the City of Hamilton, based on the principles identified.

1.4 Project Structure and Timeline

The W.B.R. commenced in October, 2015 and is anticipated to be completed in October, 2016.

The study encompasses four main phases, of which Phases 1 through 3 have been completed:

Phase 1 – Review background data and technical analysis, develop public engagement strategy and initiate the consultation process with City staff and elected officials to gather insights into the present ward system;

Phase 2 – Hold public information and engagement sessions concentrating on the existing ward structure and guiding principles (Round 1 Consultation);

Phase 3 – Prepare an interim report on preliminary options and hold public consultations on preliminary options (Round 2 Consultation); and

Phase 4 – Finalize alternatives and prepare a final report with recommendations for Council.

The study is currently in Phase 4 and this document constitutes the Final Report.

Work completed through Phases 1 through 4 has included:

- Research and data compilation;
- Development and implementation of a Public Engagement Strategy;
- Interviews with Councillors, the Mayor and municipal staff;
- Consultation with representatives of school boards;
- Population and growth forecasting and data modelling to 2026;
- Round 1 of Public Consultation;
- Preparation of a Progress Report which was presented to the City of Hamilton General Issues Committee (G.I.C.) on June 1, 2016;
- Development of eight preliminary ward boundary alternatives;
- Preparation of an Interim Report, released to the public on June 9, 2016;
- Round 2 of Public Consultation;
• Development of final options and recommendations, and preparation of Final Report; and
• In collaboration with Communications staff at the City:
  o A project web page was set up – see http://hamilton.ca/wardboundaryreview, along with a dedicated project email address;
  o A video of the research findings and context of the review was recorded and posted on the website;
  o Study reports, maps and findings were posted on the City website;
  o Social media comments were tracked; and
  o Local media was invited to attend and report.

1.5 The Interim Report

An Interim Report was released to the Hamilton community on June 9, 2016, just ahead of the second round of Public Consultations (Phase 3 of the study). That report serves as a platform for the Final Report since it includes:

• An explanation of the Terms of Reference and Objectives for the W.B.R.;
• An outline of the format and timeline for the project, as well as an explanation of the purpose and strategies followed in the public consultation component and a summary of the findings of Round 1 of consultation;
• The context for the 2015-2016 Hamilton W.B.R., including the rationale for utilizing population and not electors to assess parity, and the consideration of post-secondary students in the City’s total population;
• A detailed discussion and explanation of the six Guiding Principles that frame the study;
• An analysis of the distribution of the present (2015) City population and a forecast of population growth over the 2015-2026 period;
• An analysis and evaluation of the present Wards within the context of the six Guiding Principles; and
• Preliminary Alternative Ward Options developed by the Consultant Team around four models of representation.

The Final Report, as presented herein, does not explore these topics in detail except in summary form to provide context and assumes that those interested in the recommendations included herein have reviewed the Interim Report.
1.6 Public Consultation

The Hamilton W.B.R. incorporated a comprehensive public engagement component which included two distinct phases of public consultation – Round 1 and Round 2. Details on the public engagement component are presented in the Public Engagement Plan which is provided in Appendix A.

The purpose of the public engagement component was twofold:

- To engage the people of Hamilton in a manner that provides valuable input to the evaluation of the existing ward structure and development of alternative ward boundaries; and
- To ensure Council that ward boundary alternatives reflect municipal vision, principles of the Public Engagement Charter and community input.

The outcomes of the public engagement component include the following:

- Citizens learned about the reason for the W.B.R. and the key factors that were considered in the review;
- Citizens provided useful input to the Consultant Team in the evaluation of the existing system and in developing design alternatives; and
- Citizens were given a sense that their input might genuinely influence the review.

Public Consultations in Round 1 and Round 2 are discussed in detail below.

Round 1

In Round 1 of consultation, conducted in February 2016, the views of residents were sought on the continued suitability of the present ward structure and on the guiding principles. Through the public consultation meetings and through the project website online comment/feedback form, participants were invited to provide their input/opinions with regard to the following:

- What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of the current ward system? and
- What do the given “principles” mean to you and which principles should be given the highest priority in the evaluation of the existing ward structure and development of ward boundary options?

The feedback and comments received from Round 1 of consultation were reflected in the analysis included in the Interim Report released to the community in June 2016.
**Round 2**

The second round of public consultations was completed in Phase 3 of the study during the period June 9 to June 29, 2016. Through the public consultation meetings in Round 2 and the project web page, the public was provided with information and context with respect to the evaluation of the existing ward structure and was presented eight preliminary ward boundary alternatives based on four distinct models of representation.

In Round 2 of consultation, residents were asked to evaluate the preliminary alternative ward models for Hamilton through a series of public outreach initiatives:

- Nine public consultation meetings held throughout Hamilton where the preliminary alternatives were presented, along with the issues being addressed in each option, through a series of display boards and a PowerPoint presentation. Attendees were asked to comment on the preliminary options through a “Passport” comment form;
- Project materials, including all project display boards, a PowerPoint presentation and the Interim Report, were made available through the project website;
- Online comment/feedback form provided through the project web page; and
- Dedicated email address for general comments/input from the public.

Round 2 of consultation achieved a moderate level of public engagement, as follows:

- Approximately 90 people attended the public meetings;
- 105 online submissions were received using the feedback/comment form; and
- Numerous emails from the public were received.

The feedback and comments received from Rounds 1 and 2 of consultation are reflected in the analysis presented herein and have helped inform the findings and recommendations.

Feedback received through both rounds of public consultations is summarized in Appendix A.
2. Guiding Principles for Hamilton’s Ward Boundary Review

2.1 Overview of Guiding Principles

Hamilton’s W.B.R. is framed by six guiding principles (presented to the General Issues Committee (G.I.C.) – Clerk’s Report CM15004, March 30, 2015) established for evaluating the existing ward boundary structure and potential alternative options. The principles are guidelines and do not preclude additional contributing factors being considered. The six principles (discussed in more detail in Chapter 3 of the Interim Report) are:

- Representation by Population – Ensure that every Councillor generally represents an equal number of constituents while allowing for some variation;
- Population and Electoral Trends – Look at future changes in population to keep wards as balanced as possible;
- Means of Communication and Accessibility – Group neighbourhoods into wards that reflect current transportation and communication patterns;
- Geographical and Topographical Features – Use natural features as ward boundaries while keeping wards as compact as possible;
- Community or Diversity of Interests – Draw ward boundary lines around recognized settlement areas, traditional neighbourhoods, and community groupings; and
- Effective Representation – Evaluate the capacity of each ward to give residents an effective voice in decision-making.

2.2 Relative Weighting of Guiding Principles

No ward system design can uniformly meet all of the guiding principles since some criteria may work at cross-purposes to one another. As well, the priority attached to certain principles makes some designs more desirable in the eyes of different observers.

The public consultation activities during Phase 1 of this Review (Round 1 of public consultation) were designed to better understand the priorities attached to the six principles among Hamilton residents. As part of the consultation process, residents were asked: “What principles should be given the highest priority in redesigning the ward system in Hamilton?”
While it is important to consider all the guiding principles in the evaluation process, based on feedback received from the public, the highest priority principles seem to be Effective Representation, Representation by Population, and Communities of Interest, as illustrated in Figure 2.

**Figure 2: Relative Priority of Guiding Principles Based on Public Feedback**

![Relative Priority of Guiding Principles Based on Public Feedback](image)

Source: Based on aggregated responses from online submissions and public workshops through Hamilton Ward Boundary Review Round 1 of public consultation.

Those who participated in Round 2 of public consultation of this review were requested to rank their preferred Preliminary Options in light of the guiding principles. The preferences identified were highly influenced by a desire for options that satisfied the goals of representation by population, effective representation and preserving communities of interest.

Ultimately, the ward design adopted by Hamilton Council should be the one that best fulfills as many of the six guiding principles as possible, but it should have regard for the input received from the public through the consultation process.
3. Hamilton – A Changing City with Implications for Ward Boundary Design

3.1 Origins of a Diverse City

As previously discussed, the City of Hamilton was created through provincial legislation that took effect January 1, 2001. The present-day City is an amalgamation of six existing lower-tier municipalities (Ancaster, Dundas, Glanbrook, Flamborough, Hamilton and Stoney Creek) and the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth, an entity itself created in the 1970s that embraced both the City of Hamilton and municipalities in the surrounding Wentworth County, some of which were also amalgamated at that time.

Through Provincial Regulation 448/00, a City Council consisting of a Mayor and 15 Councillors was established. The ward structure implemented maintained the eight existing wards in the old City of Hamilton. Four wards utilized the boundaries of other pre-amalgamation municipalities and three wards were created in Ancaster and Flamborough, one of which relied largely on Highway 403 as a ward boundary west of Shaver Road rather than the historical municipal boundary along Governor’s Road west of Middletown Road.

With a land area of 1,138 km² and a population of approximately 565,000, Hamilton is one of Ontario’s largest municipalities with respect to population and geographic area. Due to its large geographic size and origins through an amalgamation, Hamilton is a highly diverse City comprised of numerous urban, suburban and rural communities with varying population densities. This includes a number of distinct communities with unique origins and historical settlement patterns including downtown Hamilton and the upper city, Stoney Creek, Winona, Binbrook, Mount Hope, Ancaster, Dundas and Waterdown. The varied structure of the City is complicated by the Niagara Escarpment which dissects the City and has influenced its settlement patterns.

Like virtually every contemporary city, patterns of settlement and density reflect demographic and socio-economic variations that relate to family size and structure, occupation and income, commuting patterns and dwelling characteristics (e.g. age and type). The urban centre of Hamilton is built upon its long and well-earned status as an

---

1 The boundaries used for Wards 1 through 8 were first been used in the 1985 municipal election and have not been revised since.
2 Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. estimate for 2015; includes Census undercount and non-permanent post-secondary student population.
industrial centre with an associated high population density and distinctive residential pattern that clustered around the historic employment lands, a large portion of which are located along the City’s waterfront.

The earliest settlement in what is now central Hamilton (the lower City) follows a formal grid pattern from the waterfront, south towards the base of the escarpment. That area was largely developed by the end of the nineteenth century. By the early twentieth century, widespread residential development began on the Mountain and, over the decades, stretched southward in a similar pattern. Before the time of regional government and the creation of the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth in 1974, the geographic area of the current City of Hamilton contained vast areas of rural lands and an urban base comprised of the former City of Hamilton with relatively compact settlement areas in the surrounding municipalities. At the time, Hamilton’s distinct communities were more geographically separated by extensive rural areas than today, as illustrated in Figure 3. Over the past decades, suburban greenfield development has filled in most of the rural areas that once separated the various distinct communities that comprise the City, creating one large contiguous urban area, with the exception of Waterdown and Binbrook, which are still individual urban nodes. This has been most apparent in the west Mountain area in Ancaster and in Stoney Creek (upper and lower) which are now part of a contiguous urban area with the rest of Hamilton. With future growth, this expansion of the urban area into the periphery of the City is expected to continue.
As Hamilton has grown and evolved, the former municipal boundaries that formed the pre-amalgamated City have begun to blur in the manner in which residents engage or associate with their broader community. For example, school attendance boundaries, Canada Post Forward Sortation Areas (FSAs) and retail trade areas, often cross these previous municipal boundaries. With the possible exception of the urban nodes in Waterdown and Binbrook, the urban population clusters in Hamilton today are interconnected and not isolated from one another – nor are they free-standing communities.

It is important to recognize that municipalities are in a constant state of change, with respect to population growth and shifts, as well as demographic and socio-economic changes which influence the character of the neighbourhoods and communities within them. While it is recognized that Hamilton is still a City of communities that once defined the various pre-amalgamated municipalities, the pre-amalgamation municipal boundaries no longer represent the definitive boundaries of these communities.

Conversely, the present system of representation appears to be built on compartmentalization: some wards are in “the City” and the others are “in the suburbs.” That is, the model of representation established in 1999-2000 was built on the basis of what were perceived to be a hard set of lines that perpetuated the boundaries of the
pre-existing municipalities, some of which were established in the nineteenth century and others that were devised only in the 1970s when the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth was created. Beverly Township (dating from 1816) and Saltfleet Township (dating from the 1780s), for example, were both absorbed by neighbouring municipalities at that time. The wards established in 1999-2000 kept the pre-amalgamation borders that amalgamation was intended to overcome or at least blur.

3.2 Population Growth Trends and Population Balance by Ward

Since amalgamation, Hamilton’s permanent population has increased by 7%, from 510,000 in 2001 to an estimated 548,000 in 2015. Over this period, the City has also experienced moderate growth in a non-permanent post-secondary student population. Population growth over the past two decades has been concentrated in suburban communities including Waterdown, Stoney Creek, Binbrook, Upper Mountain and Ancaster.

As of 2015, the City has an estimated total population of 565,000, including both permanent and non-permanent post-secondary student population. The City is expected to experience relatively strong population growth over the next decade, with the population expected to expand by approximately 68,000 over the 2015-2026 period, an increase of 12%. Population growth is expected to be concentrated in Stoney Creek, the Upper Mountain area, Binbrook and Waterdown through greenfield development. Over the period, the City is expected to also see a moderate amount of residential intensification, largely within the urban core and along the King Street corridor within the lower City.

Since 2001, population growth has varied widely by ward, with strongest rates of growth occurring in the suburban wards, including Wards 11, 12, 9, and 15, as presented in Figure 4. Wards 7 and 8 also saw moderate population growth over the period, while a number of the lower city wards experienced population declines during the period.

Over the 2015-2026 forecast period, population growth by ward is expected to continue to vary widely, as shown in Figure 4. The highest population growth is expected in Ward 11, followed by Wards 9, 15, 12, 2 and 1. Wards 5, 7 and 8 are expected to see

---

1 2001 population derived from Statistics Canada Census. 2015 population an estimate by Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. Permanent population includes Census undercount but excludes non-permanent post-secondary student population.

2 Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. estimate; includes Census undercount of approximately 4%.
minimal population growth, while Wards 3, 10, 14, 4, 13 and 6 are expected to see marginal population declines over the period.

Figure 4: City of Hamilton Population Growth by Ward, 2001-2015 and 2015-2026

![Population Growth by Ward](image)

Since the City is comprised of varying types of residential clusters, its population and growth trends are not dispersed uniformly across its geographic area. The population distribution reflected in the present wards demonstrates this. Since 2001, the City has experienced growth that has increased the disparity in the population of the wards to a significant extent – the widest variation is between Wards 7 and 14, where the population of the former is more than 3½ times larger than that of the latter (approximately 62,000 vs. 17,000). As presented in Figure 5, several wards in the old City of Hamilton, including Wards 7 and 8, are well above the optimal population for a typical ward in Hamilton and others, including Wards 10, 13 and 14, are well below the optimal population for a typical ward in Hamilton. The imbalance in population by ward is expected to worsen over time, with Ward 11 expected to have a population well above the optimal range by 2026.

1 Population variations of up to 25% above or below the optimal (average) size will be considered generally acceptable, a range consistent with legislated federal redistribution provisions. The optimal (average) population size per ward in Hamilton in 2015 and 2026 is 37,685 and 42,190, respectively.
Over the 2001-2015 period, a number of major structural changes have begun to take shape in Hamilton which are expected to continue over the next decade. These trends have, and are expected to, perpetuate the population imbalances that exist by ward. These include:

Former City of Hamilton vs. Suburb Population Balance

At the time of amalgamation in 2001, the former City of Hamilton, represented by Wards 1 through 8, accounted for about two-thirds of the City’s population base, with the remaining one-third comprised of suburban and rural population within the former municipalities of Stoney Creek, Glanbrook, Ancaster, Dundas and Flamborough, as shown in Figure 6. Due to rapid population growth in suburban areas over the past 15 years compared to limited growth in the urban core, the former City of Hamilton’s share of total population declined to 62% by 2015. Despite expected residential intensification and moderate population growth over the coming decade within the urban core, the decline in population share is expected to continue, with the former City of Hamilton expected to account for 56% of total population by 2026. Over the 2015-2026 period, only about 10% of population growth is expected to occur within the former City of Hamilton compared to 90% within other areas.
Urban vs. Rural Population Growth Trends

While Hamilton has a diverse urban and rural population base, over the past 15 years the City’s urban population has expanded significantly while the City’s rural population has declined. This has resulted in a shift in the City’s population base from rural to increasingly urban. In 2001, 91% of the City’s population was urban while 9% was rural, as illustrated in Figure 7. By 2015, the City’s urban share had increased to 92%. Over the next decade, Hamilton’s population is expected to continue to shift increasingly to a more urban character. By 2026, the City’s urban population is expected to account for 93% of the total population base.
West vs. East Population Balance

Geographically, the City of Hamilton can be divided east-west by Highway 403, which dissects the City approximately in the centre. The area to the east of Highway 403 has historically contained the majority of the City’s population base. At the time of amalgamation in 2001, approximately 80% of the City’s population resided east of Highway 403, while 20% were located west of the highway.

Over the past 15 years, population growth has also been concentrated east of Highway 403 and the population base continues to shift gradually to the east. Over the 2001-2015 period, 88% of the City’s population growth was accommodated east of Highway 403, as shown in Figure 8. This trend is expected to continue, with 86% of population growth over the 2015-2026 period expected to be accommodated east of Highway 403, as illustrated in Figure 8.
3.3 Hamilton’s Attributes and Considerations for Optimal Ward Design

The analysis in section 3.2, discussing Hamilton’s diverse nature, origins and population growth trends, raises a number of opportunities and challenges with respect to ward boundary design. Key themes are discussed below.

Achieving Population Parity by Ward within a Municipality without Population Uniformity

The guiding principles are clear: in an ideal scenario, the population of all wards would be close to parity (the actual principle is stated as: “Ensure that every Councillor generally represents an equal number of constituents while allowing for some variation”). In fact, two of the present wards far exceed the optimal size and three are smaller than optimal. Theoretically, a ward redivision would be directed towards trying to bring the larger wards down to the optimal range and the smaller wards up to the optimal threshold.

Pursuing such a strategy has spatial implications for the entire ward design in the sense that the overall distribution of population in Hamilton is concentrated in the central and eastern parts of the City and growth is shifting further south and east. The western areas of the City (including the communities of Dundas, Ancaster and Flamborough),
conversely, are relatively lightly populated and have lower growth prospects than areas to the east over the next decade. Major growth nodes (with the exception of Waterdown) are located to the south and east of the present built up area. In other words, a redivision that adheres strictly to population parity will skew the ward configuration away from the western side of the City.

Urban-Rural Divide and the Rural Area as a Distinct Precinct

As noted earlier, the stereotypical image of Hamilton is urban. In the immediate pre-amalgamation decades, the idea that there was still a rural (or agricultural) Hamilton would have been implausible since the City had virtually no areas of active agriculture. Amalgamation changed that condition dramatically since, today, approximately 79% of the present City’s land area is classified as agricultural/rural (i.e. outside the urban boundary).¹

In terms of representation, the ward profiles posted on the City website designate three as “primarily rural,” three as “urban and rural,” one as “primarily urban” and eight as “urban.” It is apparent that there is significant rural territory within present-day Hamilton and it surrounds the urban area on three sides. Rural and agricultural economic activity is important in seven of the wards. Rural Hamilton, however, is also diverse in the sense that it includes a variety of forms of agriculture, as well as numerous conservation areas, parks and open spaces. Most of the rural territory on the west side of the City is expected to remain in rural form indefinitely, but rural areas to the south and east are transitioning into new suburban communities. In the public consultation sessions, the value of this rural community of interest was asserted consistently.

Rural Hamilton is, however, sparsely populated which makes the application of population parity a challenge. In this context, it is imperative to take account of an important decision made by the Ontario Municipal Board in relation to an attempt to design ward boundaries in another Ontario municipality where a rural perimeter was added to an urban core; this is the case of the appeal of Osgoode Rural Communities Association, et al against the City of Ottawa (2003).

In that case, a City of Ottawa ward boundary by-law was based on recommendations from a Task Force appointed by the City Council that merged rural communities with suburban communities. It was rejected by the Board on the grounds that the City “did not properly take into consideration the concerns of the rural community and the protection of the communities of interest that exist within that segment of the City.” In

¹ Based on share of City’s land area located outside of current urban boundary.
addition, the Board found that it was unacceptable for the Task Force to simply see the rural areas as “extensions” of the suburban communities and to recommend “the combination of the rural population with the fringe suburban population for the purpose of achieving higher populations in certain wards.” Furthermore, the adoption of the “concept that rural areas no longer enjoyed a distinct character became a convenient rationale to ignore any obligation to preserve rural communities of interest. The evidence [heard by the Board] supports the contention that the City of Ottawa does contain rural communities with historical economic and social differences.”

In the Hamilton W.B.R., it is acknowledged and understood that Hamilton’s rural area has “a distinct character” that must be protected. In this respect (as was the case in Ottawa), the Carter principles assume significance. In a large diverse municipality, strict application of population principles can lead to untenable wards. The Board has made it clear that such designs are unacceptable when they ignore a clear community of interest.

4. Assessment of the Existing Ward Structure and Preliminary Options

The Interim Report presented a detailed evaluation of the existing ward boundary structure, and presented eight preliminary ward boundary options based on four models of representation which were taken to the public for input and comment. Based on the responses received, the Consultant Team was able to draw some conclusions about their suitability as candidates for finalized options, and the public responses helped inform subsequent recommendations. The following section provides a summary of the existing ward structure evaluation and a summary of the preliminary options, along with the public input received on them.

4.1 Hamilton’s Existing Ward Structure

A detailed evaluation of the existing ward structure in Hamilton is found in section 5 of the Interim Report. That discussion rigorously applies the six guiding principles to the individual wards and the overall design.

1 See the City of Hamilton Ward Boundary Review Interim Report pages 3-4 to 3-6 for an explanation of the Carter case and the principles that have been applied in the context of municipal representation.
The evaluation suggested that the existing ward boundary configuration does not successfully meet the expectations for any of the six guiding principles, as illustrated in Figure 9. In addition, from the perspective of those who participated in the public consultations, the existing ward boundary structure has some strengths, but the weaknesses identified are significant and outweigh the identified strengths.

Based on public feedback from Rounds 1 and 2 of consultation, there is a strong desire for change. There is a strong interest from the public in seeing the ward structure changed to address identified shortcomings in the current system, while the support from the few respondents who favoured retaining the current system was lukewarm (for example, it is “acceptable”) or counterfactual (“population will balance over time as rural wards expand”).

It would be improbable that a ward system review aiming to meet the principles set out herein would recommend a structure using the existing ward boundaries and, therefore, it is our conclusion that Council should move to change from the status quo.

Figure 9: Existing City of Hamilton Ward Boundary Configuration Evaluation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Does Existing Ward Structure Meet Requirements of Principle?</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation by Population</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Two wards above acceptable range, three below range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Electoral Trends</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Three wards above acceptable range, three below range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Communication and Accessibility</td>
<td>Partially successful</td>
<td>Generally clear markers with minor deficiencies; limited access highways divide five wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical and Topographical Features</td>
<td>Largely successful</td>
<td>Two wards include neighbourhoods above and below Escarpment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or Diversity of Interests</td>
<td>Partially successful</td>
<td>Very few communities of interest are divided internally, some groupings questionable (Wards 5 and 11 especially)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Representation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Significant dilution of representation (Wards 7 and 8 and Ward 11 in 2026), lack of coherence (Ward 11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Preliminary Ward Boundary Options

As presented in the Interim Report, four preliminary approaches to representation in Hamilton were derived from the guiding principles, the initial public consultation meetings (Round 1), and other insight derived from the Consultant Team’s experiences in developing ward boundary systems in other Ontario municipalities. This included:

- Preliminary Option 1: Derivative of Federal Constituency Boundaries – based on the recently established federal constituency boundaries;
- Preliminary Option 2: Preservation of the Pre-Amalgamation Balance – which works within the “balance of representation” model found in the present ward system;
- Preliminary Option 3: Post-Amalgamation 15-Ward Model – places greater emphasis on population parity with less regard for previous municipal boundaries; and
- Preliminary Option 4: Post-Amalgamation 16-Ward Model – similar to Option 3 except a 16-ward model.

As previously discussed, public input on the preliminary options was solicited through Round 2 of public consultation via a survey “passport” circulated at the public open houses and through an online survey form posted on the project web page. A key question asked residents to rank their top three choices, selecting from the eight preliminary options (Preliminary Options 1, 2A, 2B, 3A, 3B, 4A, 4B, 4C) and the existing ward structure (No Change). The aggregated responses from the public open houses and the online survey, summarizing the top choice (1st choice), by the four option “themes” is presented in Figure 10. As shown, Preliminary Option 4 (16-ward post-amalgamation option) was chosen as the top choice by 66% of respondents. This is compared to 14% for Preliminary Option 2 (15-ward pre-amalgamation option), 8% for Preliminary Option 3 (15-ward post-amalgamation option) and 5% for Preliminary Option 1 (Derivative of Federal Constituency Boundaries). Of the respondents, only 7% selected the current ward configuration (No Change) as their top choice.
Figure 10: Preliminary Options and Preference of Respondents based on 1st (Top) Choice

A recap of the Preliminary Options, along with a discussion of public reactions to the Options, is provided below:

Preliminary Option 1 – Derivative of Federal Constituency Boundaries

Preliminary Option 1 was developed to create fifteen wards within the five federal constituency boundaries in response to suggestions made during the first round of public consultations. One feature was the apparent balance in population of the five constituencies (i.e. federal ridings) that made the idea initially attractive. It was acknowledged in the Interim Report, however, that the design actually had a number of limitations, primarily with respect to the population metrics utilized to generate the five federal constituencies, which resulted in notable population imbalances in practice: the figures used were out of date (from the 2011 Census), there was no provision for population growth and non-permanent post-secondary students were excluded from the population count.

Public support for this Option ranked near the bottom and no meaningful defence for the approach was provided in comments submitted to the Consultant Team. Given this
assessment, the idea of drawing ward boundaries within the five federal constituencies is not recommended.

Preliminary Option 2– Preservation of the Pre-Amalgamation Balance

The Interim Report included two Preliminary Options that were developed with regard to the guiding principles for this Review while still retaining the “representative balance” between the old City of Hamilton (eight wards) and the other pre-amalgamation municipalities (seven wards). See the Interim Report page 6-5.

The most striking observation is that the population distribution in the wards proposed in these two Preliminary Options continues to be inequitable in 2015 and 2026 and that includes the distribution within both the wards in the “urban” subgroup (Wards 1 to 8) and the wards in the “suburban” subgroup (Wards 9 to 15), which persists across the entire ward structure. The positive attributes of the present system that are carried forward (but related to the least valued principles – Communication and Accessibility, and Geographical and Topographical Features) are maintained and the proposed modifications to Wards 9 and 11 create a more plausible grouping of communities of interest. While the proposed Ward 11 is less diverse than the present Ward 11, the voices of the residents in the proposed Wards 7 and 8 continue to be significantly diluted. Effective representation may be marginally improved, but the population imbalances continue to prevent the conclusion that these models are a notable improvement on the present system.

Public support for this approach was relatively limited and was frequently couched in terms of negative assessments of incumbent elected officials. Ward Boundary Reviews are often seen by residents as an invitation to offer critiques of a range of policy (and political) decisions, but we must point out that this Review is not about incumbent Councillors, nor is it about those who may wish to seek office in 2018 or later. It is about determining an acceptable grouping of residents to make those choices at election time – not about who they select.

The insistence that “cultural and historical identities” must be preserved at the cost of population parity was widely endorsed, as was an attachment to the theme that preserving the provincial “solution” at amalgamation so that the interests of the suburbs “would not be overwhelmed by those of the old city.” As one resident put it, “a deal is a deal.”

Given that one of the key priorities for the Review was to address population inequities, these Preliminary Options that preserve the urban/suburban “balance” simply does not
work and would be extremely difficult to defend to the O.M.B. in light of other more equitable alternatives.

Preliminary Option 3 – Post-Amalgamation 15-Ward Model

The guiding principles include an explicit reference to “representation by population” in both the present and future. Given the distribution of population across the City (as discussed in section 3.2), a design that places emphasis on this principle will undoubtedly include proportionately more wards from the more highly populated areas of the City, and inevitably fewer from the more sparsely populated parts. Applying this principle also means overcoming the demonstrated limitations of the “balance” options illustrated in Preliminary Option 2 by creating some wards that cross the pre-amalgamation former City of Hamilton boundary with the goal of achieving better population parity across the entire City.

At the same time, since the principles also direct the Consultant Team to recognize “settlement patterns, traditional neighbourhoods, and community groupings,” any such wards will have to be designed to preserve local community identities within a new ward combination.

Preliminary Options 3A and 3B actually received limited public support, mainly because they were perceived as not having gone far enough to address parity (representation by population). The two Options demonstrate clearly, however, the challenges of working with a 15-ward model to maintain communities of interest and to provide effective representation all the while achieving population parity. The “cost” required to provide adequate representation to the areas of higher population in the eastern part of the City can only be met by a trade-off: the share of 15 wards assigned to less heavily populated areas in the western part of the City must be reduced. With these perspectives in mind, the Consultant Team has prepared a final 15-ward Option (Option 2 – see Chapter 5) which addresses the parity issue while maximizing effective representation and preserving communities of interest to the extent possible under a 15-ward configuration.

Preliminary Option 4 – Post-Amalgamation 16-Ward Model

The idea of “simply” adding a new ward within the Hamilton Upper Mountain area (and increasing the number of Councillors to 16) had been frequently floated publicly even before this Review began, since the adjoining Wards 7 and 8 together amounted to almost a quarter of the City’s 2015 population. Such a “simple” modification would have implications for the larger balance of representation issue (see above) but would
sidestep an overdue evaluation of the success of the remaining wards in delivering effective representation. It is primarily for this reason that the 2015-2016 Ward Boundary Review is intended to be comprehensive rather than partial in nature.

Therefore, in an attempt to meet the guiding principles and to achieve a better distribution of population across the City, Preliminary Option 4 proposed a 16-ward design. Preliminary Options 4A, 4B and 4C proposed an additional ward (or two in the case of Preliminary Option 4C) to address the high population concentration in the west Mountain area.

The overall premise of Preliminary Option 4 resonated with respondents largely because it achieved relatively good overall representation by population, particularly in the case of Preliminary Option 4C. Those who preferred Preliminary Options 4A and 4B saw strengths with respect to preserving communities of interest and providing effective representation while still achieving reasonable population balance by ward.

4.3 Observations

Given the overwhelming preference for Preliminary Option 4, as demonstrated in the second round of public consultation, the Consultant Team examined more closely the positive attributes of Preliminary Options 4A, 4B and 4C, as the basis for the development of final options. This included the manner in which these three Preliminary Options reached, in varying degrees, population balance (parity) while achieving effective representation and preserving communities of interest. The Consultant Team also concluded from the feedback received that a 16-ward option should be one of the ward designs recommended to Council.

These perspectives were applied to both a 15-ward and 16-ward design as represented in Options 2 and 3, respectively in Chapter 5 of this report.

5. Alternative Options

The goal of this Review is to design a system of effective representation that seeks relative parity in the population of the wards, with some degree of variation acceptable in light of population densities and demographic realities across the City. The design of suitable ward alternatives, however, is not dependent only on relative parity since it involves applying all six principles established for this Review. The challenge is that sometimes a structure that best serves one principle cannot fulfill another with similar success. Therefore, ward design alternatives need to be assessed in terms of meeting
as many of the six principles as possible and in terms of which principles are best realized.

Based on public feedback on the Preliminary Options, and Council and public feedback on the Final Report dated October 11, 2016, three ward boundary alternatives (Options) are presented herein. This includes:

- **Option 1** – a modified version of the existing ward structure based on Council feedback provided by members of Council after the G.I.C. meeting of October 27, 2016;
- **Option 2** – a 15-ward Option which strives to optimize population parity (representation by population). This Option manages to create better parity through allocation of four wards in the Mountain area. This configuration involves shifting the distribution of the wards to capture the high concentration and growing population on the eastern side of the City. This option is a modified version of the 15-ward Option presented in the Final Report dated October 11, 2016; and
- **Option 3** – 16-ward Option that, through the addition of one ward, achieves a reasonable population balance by ward and preserves communities of interest while finding better effective representation than a 15-ward Option. The Option has virtually the same configuration as the 16-ward Option presented in the Final Report dated October 11, 2016.¹

### 5.1 Option 1

As previously discussed, Councillors voted at the October 27, 2017 G.I.C. meeting to request the Consultant Team to consider “further suggestions that the Council members may have for alternative ward boundary model options.” With two exceptions (to be addressed below), the suggestions addressed particulars of the existing 15-ward design. In accordance with Council’s request, all of the suggestions have been applied to the existing ward boundaries; the modified design is presented as Option 1 herein and has been subject to the guiding principles for this Review.

The specific modifications, based on direction from members of Council, reflect relatively minor refinements to the existing ward structure, as outlined below:

---

¹ One minor adjustment was made from the previous 16-ward design: the boundary between Wards 6 and 9 utilizes Upper Red Hill Valley Parkway between Red Hill Valley Parkway and Rymal Road.
- The boundary between Ward 5 and Ward 9 modified to follow the centre of Centennial Parkway from King Street to Queenston Road and the centre of Queenston Road between Centennial Parkway and Grays Road;
- The boundary between Ward 5 and Ward 10 changed to follow the centre of Grays Road from Queenston Road to Lake Ontario. At the northern terminus of the boundary between Wards 5 and 10, boundary adjusted so that residential cul de sac (Lakepointe Place) located on the west side of Grays Road adjacent to Confederation Park, is included in Ward 10;
- The eastern boundary of Ward 6 adjusted to follow the Red Hill Valley Parkway and Trinity Church Road from the southern boundary of Ward 5 at the Escarpment. The residential area located north of Mud Road, east of Red Hill Valley Parkway and west of Upper Mount Albion Drive, currently located in Ward 6, placed into Ward 9. Between Red Hill Valley Parkway and Rymal Road, the boundary between Wards 5 and 9 adjusted to follow Upper Red Hill Valley Parkway;
- An area bounded by Mohawk Rd. E., Upper Gage Avenue, Rymal Road E. and Upper Sherman Avenue moved to Ward 6 from Ward 7;
- The boundary between Ward 8 and Ward 12 adjusted to follow Stone Church Rd. west from Omni Blvd. to where the current boundary is closest to Stone Church Rd. Westridge Drive and Copperhill Court removed from Ward 12 and placed in Ward 8;
- The area bounded by Rymal Road, the hydro corridor, Trinity Church Road and Highway #56/Upper Centennial Parkway moved from Ward 11 to Ward 9;
- The boundary between Ward 10 and Ward 11 shifted further east to follow the centre of Jones Road from Lake Ontario to the Escarpment and adjusted slightly at the southeast corner to follow the Escarpment instead of Ridge Road; and
- An area south of Highway 6, bound by Concession Rd. 6 to Moffat Road, Moffat Road to Concession Road 5, Ofield Road to the current Ward 13/15 boundary to the west and bound by Valley Road, Rock Chapel Road, Highway No. 5, Millgrove Sideroad and Concession Road 4 to the east, moved from Ward 15 and included in Ward 14.

The modified ward boundary configuration is presented in Figure 11 with more detailed mapping and description provided in Appendix B.
An important consideration in evaluating the proposed changes to the existing ward structure is understanding how it alters the assessment of the existing ward system as summarized in section 4.1. Key observations include:

- The proposed changes aim to mitigate the most problematic population imbalances that have been identified, such as those in Wards 7, 10 and 11, and would improve the population balance by ward marginally. The most significant population change involves the addition of population to Ward 6 from Ward 7. In three other areas, moderate population shifts between wards would occur (moving population from Ward 11 to Ward 9, from Ward 11 to Ward 10 and from Ward 15 to Ward 14);

- Despite the refinements, the net impact is that eight wards fall within 25% of that optimal size (as opposed to ten under the current ward structure), as shown in Figure 12. Seven wards are outside the acceptable range of variation (as opposed to five under the existing ward structure): three (Wards 6, 7 and 8) are above and four (Wards 10, 13, 14 and 15) are below. The modified ward system (i.e. Option 1), therefore, fails to meet the principle of representation by population.

Figure 12: 2015 Population by Ward - Existing Ward Structure vs. Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Existing Ward Structure</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population¹</td>
<td>Variance²</td>
<td>Population¹</td>
<td>Variance²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 1</td>
<td>41,340</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td>41,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2</td>
<td>40,635</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td>40,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 3</td>
<td>40,365</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td>40,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 4</td>
<td>36,040</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td>36,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 5</td>
<td>39,835</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td>41,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 6</td>
<td>41,025</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td>50,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 7</td>
<td>62,435</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>OR+</td>
<td>52,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 8</td>
<td>53,875</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>OR+</td>
<td>53,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 9</td>
<td>29,980</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td>33,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 10</td>
<td>25,130</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>OR-</td>
<td>25,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 11</td>
<td>43,690</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td>39,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 12</td>
<td>39,510</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td>39,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 13</td>
<td>25,310</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>OR-</td>
<td>25,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 14</td>
<td>16,640</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>OR-</td>
<td>18,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 15</td>
<td>29,460</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>WR</td>
<td>27,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal Ward Population</td>
<td>37,685</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Reflects permanent population including Census undercount of approximately 3.8% as well as non-permanent post-secondary student population.

2. Variance from average ward size. Variance within +/- 25% is considered within acceptable range (WR) while that above/below threshold is out of range OR+ and OR-, respectively.
• Comparing the ward population balance in future year 2026 under the existing ward structure and Option 1, some of the most extreme population figures are moderated (that is, Wards 7 and 11 at the upper end and Wards 10 and 14 at the lower end), as illustrated in Figure 13;

• As shown in Figure 13, under Option 1, six wards would be outside the acceptable range of variation (the same number as in the existing system): two (Wards 7, 8 and 11) above and three (Wards 10, 13 and 14) below. Option 1, therefore, fails to meet the principle of Population and Electoral Trends;

• The majority of ward boundaries in Hamilton are based on clear and well-understood markers. Some illogical boundaries have been cleared up around pre-amalgamation municipal boundaries (in particular associated with the existing Ward 9, but also those for Wards 8 and 12 and Wards 5 and 10 boundaries) by utilizing major roadways as boundaries instead of parcel boundaries. Six wards cross over significant transportation corridors (Red Hill Valley Parkway, Lincoln Alexander Parkway and Highway 403 east of Shaver Road). The modified existing wards generally meet the principle of Means of Communication and Accessibility but maintain some of the deficiencies of the existing system;

• The modified Wards 9 and 11 include communities that are isolated from one another since both wards include neighbourhoods above and below the Escarpment. The modified wards generally meet the principle of Geographic and Topographic Features with the two important exceptions just noted;

• The modified Wards 5, 9 and 11 consist of neighbourhoods and communities that are isolated from one another. The other wards generally meet the principle of Community or Diversity of Interests with the three exceptions just noted; and

• The obvious population discrepancy among the modified wards would mean that, by 2026, the population of the modified Ward 11 (70,000 people) would have one representative at the Council table, while the combined population of the modified Wards 10, 13 and 14 (also 70,000 people) would have three. The modified existing ward system, therefore, fails to meet the Effective Representation principle.
Figure 13: 2026 Population by Ward – Existing Ward Structure vs. Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Existing Ward Structure</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population¹</td>
<td>Variance²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 1</td>
<td>43,900</td>
<td>1.04 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2</td>
<td>45,225</td>
<td>1.07 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 3</td>
<td>40,125</td>
<td>0.95 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 4</td>
<td>35,325</td>
<td>0.84 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 5</td>
<td>40,625</td>
<td>0.96 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 6</td>
<td>38,850</td>
<td>0.92 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 7</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>1.49 OR+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 8</td>
<td>55,100</td>
<td>1.31 OR+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 9</td>
<td>41,700</td>
<td>0.99 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 10</td>
<td>24,825</td>
<td>0.59 OR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 11</td>
<td>78,850</td>
<td>1.87 OR+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 12</td>
<td>45,075</td>
<td>1.07 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 13</td>
<td>24,350</td>
<td>0.58 OR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 14</td>
<td>16,075</td>
<td>0.38 OR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 15</td>
<td>39,850</td>
<td>0.94 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal Ward Population</td>
<td>42,190</td>
<td>1.00 WR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Reflects permanent population including Census undercount of approximately 3.8% as well as non-permanent post-secondary student population.

2. Variance from average ward size. Variance within +/- 25% is considered within acceptable range (WR) while that above/below threshold is out of range OR+ and OR-, respectively.

The overall evaluation of Option 1 is summarized in Figure 14.

The Consultant Team identified a number of locations along the existing ward boundaries that could be improved (such as along Grays Road or in the Old Mud Street-Winterberry Drive area: see Interim Report p. 5-4) that have been addressed through Option 1. While the refinements to the existing ward design does expand the use of logical features such as major roadways as ward boundaries and enhances communities of interest, as identified in the Interim Report (page 5-8), minor adjustments of this kind do not address the fundamental inequities of the overall system. Proposed changes as presented in Option 1 do not address the structural imbalance that exists between the “urban” subgroup (Wards 1 to 8) and the wards in the “suburban” subgroup (Wards 9 to 15). Under Option 1, the population distribution in the wards continues to be inequitable in the existing and future year (2026) context. The positive attributes of the present system that are carried forward (but related to the least valued principles – Communication and Accessibility, and Geographical and Topographical Features) are maintained and the proposed modifications to Wards 9 and 11 create a more plausible grouping of communities of interest and improves the
population imbalance. While the proposed Ward 11 is less diverse than the current Ward 11, the voices of Mountain residents (in Wards 6, 7 and 8) continue to be understated. Effective representation may be marginally improved, but the population imbalances continue to prevent the conclusion that this Option is a notable improvement on the present system.

Figure 14: Option 1 Evaluation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Does Existing Ward Structure Meet Requirements of Principle?</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation by Population</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Three wards above acceptable range, four below range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Electoral Trends</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Three wards above acceptable range, three below range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Communication and Accessibility</td>
<td>Partially successful</td>
<td>Improved markers (e.g. Grays Road/Queenston Road); limited access highways divide six wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical and Topographical Features</td>
<td>Largely successful</td>
<td>Two wards include neighbourhoods above and below Escarpment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or Diversity of Interests</td>
<td>Partially successful</td>
<td>Very few communities of interest not divided internally, some groupings questionable (Wards 5 and 11 especially)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Representation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Significant dilution of representation (Wards 7 and 8 in 2015, Ward 11 in 2026), lack of coherence (Ward 11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Option 2

A number of scenarios to elect fifteen City Councillors were developed and presented in the Interim Report. Many helpful perspectives on them were gathered from the public in the consultations held in June, 2016.

Two Preliminary Options worked with the “representative balance” model that underpins the existing ward system; that is, they retained eight wards within the former City of Hamilton boundary and seven wards within the other pre-amalgamation municipalities. In recognition, however, of the explicit reference in the guiding principles to “representation by population” and the data analyzing the distribution of population across the City since amalgamation and into the future, three designs that placed emphasis on the population principles were also developed and presented in the Interim Report. In contrast to the designs just noted, the pre-amalgamation “balance” was set
aside to include proportionately more wards from the more highly populated areas of Hamilton and inevitably fewer from the more sparsely populated parts.

Both the “balance” options and the “population” options received limited public support, mainly for failing to address successfully the goal of “population parity” (a high priority among the principles for those participating in the public consultations). Further reflection and testing led to the development of the 15-ward Option that appeared in the Final Report dated October 11, 2016 to Council, that addressed the parity issue while maximizing effective representation and preserving communities of interest to the extent possible under a 15-ward configuration.

Some residents and some Councillors did not concur with the 15-ward Option presented in the October 11, 2016 Final Report and, in particular, pointed out the incongruity of grouping established East Mountain neighbourhoods with communities beyond Albion Falls in the former Stoney Creek and Glanbrook. This is a concern that the Consultant Team sought to address; to do so, however, required an adjustment of the entire proposed ward configuration on the Mountain. The Consultant Team also received a specific suggestion that the southern boundary of the proposed Ward 9 be moved south from Rymal Road East to the hydro utility corridor extending from the end of Twenty Road east to the City boundary, thereby removing territory from the proposed Ward 11. These two suggestions were reviewed and have been addressed in a revised 15-ward Option included herein as Option 2.

The major changes involve:

- Re-aligning the proposed Wards 6, 7, 8 and 14 so that all four now run from the Mountain brow south to the hydro utility corridor south of Rymal Road (similar to the current southern ward boundary for the existing Wards 6, 7 and 8). The 15-ward Option proposed in the Final Report used the Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway as a boundary but the idea that “the Linc” necessarily serves as a natural boundary was not universally endorsed, so it has been set aside in favour of better realizing the population and community of interest principles;
- Adjusting the eastern boundary of the proposed Ward 6 along Trinity Church Road and Upper Red Hill Valley Parkway as suggested in the modified design for the existing wards (Option 1 – see above);
- Placing an area south of “the Linc” between Upper Gage Avenue and Upper Sherman Avenue in the proposed Ward 6 to improve the population distribution across the four Mountain wards. Because of the high population density in the existing (and proposed) Ward 7, it is still the largest by population but only
exceeds the acceptable population range by about 2,000 residents in 2015. It drops well within the acceptable range of variation over the next three elections;

- Including a proposed fourth ward for the western portion of the Mountain in the north-south alignment (labeled Ward 14) that results in a domino effect: where Upper James Street has traditionally served as a boundary, in this Option it would serve as a focal point or main street for the proposed Ward 8;
- Shifting boundary between the proposed Wards 9 and 11 further south to the hydro utility corridor from Rymal Road East. Entire northern boundary of Ward 11 runs along the hydro utility corridor; and
- Returning the western boundary of the proposed Ward 11 to its existing location in order to accommodate the significant population growth forecast in the Elfrida area and to better address population concentration in the proposed wards along the Mountain brow.

Option 2 is illustrated in Figure 15 with more detailed mapping and description provided in Appendix C. Key features of this Option include:

- Maintains present Wards 1 to 3 with minor modifications;
- Modifies present Wards 4 and 5 by using the Red Hill Valley Parkway as a boundary. Downtown Stoney Creek is also included in Ward 5;
- Proposed Ward 10 to include area from Grays Road to the Town of Grimsby municipal boundary below the Escarpment;
- Four wards on the Mountain extending between Red Hill Valley Parkway and Highway 403, extending north-south from the Escarpment to the east-west hydro utility corridor south of Rymal Road;
- Proposed Ward 9 from Red Hill Valley Parkway east to the municipal boundary above the Escarpment and north of the east-west hydro utility corridor;
- Proposed southeast Ward 11 below the east-west hydro utility corridor extending west to Glancaster Road;
- Proposed southern Ward 12 anchored in Ancaster bound by Glancaster Road to the east and Highway 8 and the former Dundas/Ancaster municipal boundary to the north;
- Proposed western Ward 13 to include Dundas and Greensville and rural areas to the west; and
- Proposed northern ward similar to present Ward 15.

1 In the Options included herein, ward numbers that correspond to the present wards are used wherever possible. It would be appropriate for wards in a revised system to be re-numbered (or named) to reflect a City-wide system.
With the changes discussed above, Option 2 represents an even stronger alternative than the 15-ward Option presented in the October 11, 2016 Final Report. Key observations include:

- The current year (2015) population distribution, as illustrated in Figure 16, shows that two wards are outside the acceptable range of variation: one (Ward 7) is above and one (Ward 11) is below. Option 2 is close to meeting the Representation by Population principle for 2015;
- As illustrated in Figure 16, by 2026 all proposed wards are within 25% of optimal size with respect to population with no wards outside the acceptable range of variation. Option 2 meets the “population and electoral trends” principle;
- The majority of ward boundaries in Option 2 are based on clear and well-understood markers. Six wards cross over significant transportation corridors (Red Hill Valley Parkway, Lincoln Alexander Parkway and Highway 403 east of Shaver Road) but these exceptions have all been deliberately given a low priority in this design. Option 2 generally meets the Means of Communication and Accessibility principle;
- The proposed Wards 12 and 13 include communities and neighbourhoods above and below the Escarpment. Option 2 generally meets the Geographical and Topographical Features principle with the two exceptions just noted;
- The six proposed wards around the periphery of the City (i.e. Wards 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15) each consist of a collection of adjacent neighbourhoods and communities, albeit in the largest wards by geographic area. The communities grouped in the proposed wards, though, are historically related to one another (as in the proposed Ward 11 that closely parallels the former Glanbrook Township) or are naturally connected by such factors as roads, schools and commercial activities. This is evident even in the two cases (the proposed Wards 12 and 13) which include areas above and below the Escarpment. The existing wards generally meet the Community or Diversity of Interests principle with the two exceptions just noted; and
- The population discrepancy among the proposed wards has been significantly reduced from that apparent under the current ward structure. As has been noted several times in this report, various configurations place greater weight on certain principles: in this case, the goal of population parity in the urban area has been successfully met in conjunction with the explicit need to capture the rural community of interest, primarily on the west side. Option 2, therefore, can be said to meet the Effective Representation principle.
Figure 15: Option 2
The overall evaluation of Option 2 is summarized in Figure 17. This Option has successfully addressed the two population principles and the community of interest principle, while only proposing two wards that include areas above and below the Escarpment (in the Ancaster and Dundas-Greensville area). The Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway cuts through the Mountain area wards and portions of Highway 403 cut through two wards, but other boundaries use plausible easily identified markers. The coherence and population distribution of the proposed wards contributes to effective representation even though significant population growth is expected in two wards with large areas. On the whole, Option 2 could be defended to the O.M.B. as more equitable than the present system over the time period envisioned for a new ward system (three election cycles) even though it may not realize its full potential until after the first election (2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Population 2015</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Population 2026</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 1</td>
<td>41,340</td>
<td>1.10 WR</td>
<td>43,900</td>
<td>1.04 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2</td>
<td>37,220</td>
<td>0.99 WR</td>
<td>41,855</td>
<td>0.99 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 3</td>
<td>43,780</td>
<td>1.16 WR</td>
<td>43,485</td>
<td>1.03 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 4</td>
<td>40,235</td>
<td>1.07 WR</td>
<td>39,395</td>
<td>0.93 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 5</td>
<td>44,070</td>
<td>1.17 WR</td>
<td>44,620</td>
<td>1.06 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 6</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>1.05 WR</td>
<td>37,880</td>
<td>0.90 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 7</td>
<td>49,170</td>
<td>1.30 OR+</td>
<td>48,770</td>
<td>1.16 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 8</td>
<td>35,730</td>
<td>0.95 WR</td>
<td>38,180</td>
<td>0.90 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 9</td>
<td>28,390</td>
<td>0.75 WR</td>
<td>43,530</td>
<td>1.03 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 10</td>
<td>38,175</td>
<td>1.01 WR</td>
<td>48,085</td>
<td>1.14 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 11</td>
<td>24,230</td>
<td>0.64 OR-</td>
<td>46,105</td>
<td>1.09 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 12</td>
<td>43,755</td>
<td>1.16 WR</td>
<td>49,140</td>
<td>1.16 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 13</td>
<td>36,795</td>
<td>0.98 WR</td>
<td>35,425</td>
<td>0.84 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 14</td>
<td>34,585</td>
<td>0.92 WR</td>
<td>33,740</td>
<td>0.80 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 15</td>
<td>28,295</td>
<td>0.75 WR</td>
<td>38,755</td>
<td>0.92 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal Ward Population</td>
<td>37,685</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>42,190</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Reflects permanent population including Census undercount of approximately 3.8% as well as non-permanent post-secondary student population.

2. Variance from average ward size. Variance within +/- 25% is considered within acceptable range (WR) while that above/below threshold is out of range OR+ and OR-, respectively.
Figure 17: Evaluation Summary of Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Does Proposed Ward Boundary Structure Meet Requirements of Principle?</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation by Population</td>
<td>Largely successful</td>
<td>Thirteen wards within desired range of variation and two outside of the range (one above, one below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Electoral Trends</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All wards within acceptable range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Communication and Accessibility</td>
<td>Partially successful</td>
<td>Generally clear markers; limited access highways cut through six wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical and Topographical Features</td>
<td>Largely successful</td>
<td>Two wards on the western side include neighbourhoods above and below the Escarpment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or Diversity of Interests</td>
<td>Largely successful</td>
<td>Communities of interest not divided internally but some groupings include diverse settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Representation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No significant population discrepancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3 Option 3

Hamilton’s City Council, at present, consists of fifteen Councillors elected in fifteen wards and a Mayor elected at-large. It is within the powers of a Council to modify the “composition of council” (as it is called in the Municipal Act) but the position of Mayor is not within the powers of Hamilton Council to change, since all municipalities in Ontario must have a “head of council” elected at-large.

As previously discussed, a 16-ward model (Preliminary Option 4) was the preferred choice of the public in the second round of public consultation. Public responses and further analysis have led to a hybrid 16-ward Option; that is, it incorporates many of the features of the preliminary designs from the Interim Report that were labelled “Preliminary Option 4” but has addressed some of the shortcomings identified through the public consultations.

There are merits to a 16-ward model in the context of Hamilton. These include:
• Making it possible to achieve both a better population balance and more coherent individual wards if the composition of Council is increased;
• The addition of one seat means that the population of an optimal ward and range of variation are adjusted downward, thereby contributing to the possibility that some wards can be designed with smaller populations and still be deemed to deliver parity;
• Returning to an even number of Councillors means that when all members of Council are participating in a decision, the Mayor could cast a tie-breaking vote rather than voting to create a tie – a move that blocks actions but cannot affirm a decision since a tied vote is deemed to be a lost vote. In other words, it would be a contribution to better governance for the City; and
• The City of Hamilton has seen notable population growth since amalgamation and the implementation of a 15-ward system. At the time of amalgamation, the average size of a ward with respect to permanent population was approximately 34,000.\(^1\) In 2015, the average size of a ward increased to approximately 36,500 and by 2026 it is forecast to increase to 40,900. In a 16-ward configuration, the current permanent population per ward (based on 2015 population figures) would be comparable to the population per ward under the 15-ward structure in 2001. In other words, over the 2001 to 2015 period, the City’s population has increased by the equivalent of one ward.

Based on preliminary discussions with City staff, it was estimated that an additional Councillor would add approximately $230,000 to the City’s annual operating budget.\(^2\) This figure would represent about a 0.01% increase to the City’s annual operating budget.\(^3\) At the October 27, 2016, G.I.C. meeting, Council directed the General Manager of Finance and Corporate Services to review the capital and operating costs of increasing the composition of Council by one member in more detail and to report back.

The 16-ward Option (Option 3) is presented in Figure 18 with more detailed mapping and descriptions of proposed ward boundaries provided in Appendix D.

---

\(^1\) Includes Census undercount of approximately 4% but excludes non-permanent post-secondary student population.
\(^2\) This figure reflects the salary of one Councillor and an Administrative Assistant and discretionary items.
\(^3\) City of Hamilton approved 2016 gross operating budget (rate and tax supported) is $1,643,014,160.
The key characteristics of this Option include:

- Six wards below the Escarpment aligned north-south from Highway 403 to the Grimsby boundary;
- Five wards on the central and west Mountain from Upper Centennial Parkway to Highway 403 with two running from the Mountain brow to the Lincoln Alexander Parkway and two from the Lincoln Alexander Parkway south to Twenty Road. The fifth ward would run from Upper Ottawa Street to Upper Centennial Parkway north and from the Mountain brow to Twenty Road-Rymal Road;
- A ward consisting of a very large geographic area that includes Upper Stoney Creek from Upper Centennial Parkway to the Grimsby boundary and the southeast quadrant of the City below Twenty Road-Rymal Road and over beyond the John C. Munro Hamilton International Airport;
- A proposed ward centred on Ancaster;
- A proposed ward to include Dundas and Greensville;
- A proposed rural ward that circles the western suburban communities; and
- A proposed ward based on Waterdown.
With an additional ward to consider, this Option uses a lower optimal size for a ward (35,330 in 2015 as opposed to 37,685 in a 15-ward design) and a range of variation in which smaller ward populations are judged acceptable, as shown in Figure 19. As can be expected, areas in the City where population is concentrated fall closer to the top of the range (including one outside the range) and wards in areas of lower population density tend towards the lower end of the range or outside it. While proposed Wards 11 and 15 are moderately below the minimum population threshold in 2015, based on recent development activity and forecast growth, Ward 11 is expected to be above the minimum threshold by the election in 2018, while Ward 15 will approach the threshold by that year and is expected to surpasses the minimum threshold in time for the 2022 election. Wards 13 and 14, however, are on the western and northern fringes of the City where growth is not forecast, and are expected to continue to be at the lower end of the population range throughout the forecast period. In comparison, proposed Ward 16 will remain marginally above the maximum desired population variance through 2026.

Figure 19: Option 3 – Population by Proposed Ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>2015 Population</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>2026 Population</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward 1</td>
<td>41,340</td>
<td>1.17 WR</td>
<td>43,900</td>
<td>1.11 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 2</td>
<td>40,635</td>
<td>1.15 WR</td>
<td>45,225</td>
<td>1.14 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 3</td>
<td>40,360</td>
<td>1.14 WR</td>
<td>40,120</td>
<td>1.01 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 4</td>
<td>40,235</td>
<td>1.14 WR</td>
<td>39,395</td>
<td>1.00 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 5</td>
<td>44,070</td>
<td>1.25 WR</td>
<td>44,620</td>
<td>1.13 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 6</td>
<td>39,500</td>
<td>1.12 WR</td>
<td>37,880</td>
<td>0.96 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 7</td>
<td>33,460</td>
<td>0.95 WR</td>
<td>31,285</td>
<td>0.79 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 8</td>
<td>38,225</td>
<td>1.08 WR</td>
<td>36,785</td>
<td>0.93 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 9</td>
<td>28,390</td>
<td>0.80 WR</td>
<td>43,530</td>
<td>1.10 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 10</td>
<td>38,175</td>
<td>1.08 WR</td>
<td>48,085</td>
<td>1.22 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 11</td>
<td>24,230</td>
<td>0.69 OR-</td>
<td>46,105</td>
<td>1.17 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 12</td>
<td>39,425</td>
<td>1.12 WR</td>
<td>44,980</td>
<td>1.14 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 13</td>
<td>28,815</td>
<td>0.82 WR</td>
<td>27,775</td>
<td>0.70 OR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 14</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>0.55 OR-</td>
<td>18,910</td>
<td>0.48 OR-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 15</td>
<td>23,100</td>
<td>0.65 OR-</td>
<td>33,580</td>
<td>0.85 WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward 16</td>
<td>45,810</td>
<td>1.30 OR+</td>
<td>50,695</td>
<td>1.28 OR+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal Ward Population</td>
<td>35,330</td>
<td></td>
<td>39,555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Reflects permanent population including Census undercount of approximately 3.8% as well as non-permanent post-secondary student population.

2. Variance from average ward size. Variance within +/- 25% is considered within acceptable range (WR) while that above/below threshold is out of range OR+ and OR-, respectively.
There is a better capacity to group together communities of interest into units of representation in a 16-ward system. In contrast to Option 2, for example, the four southern and western wards (Wards 11, 12, 13 and 14) are each a coherent entity built upon long-standing and well-understood inter-connections of economic and social networks. As a result, the reservations expressed by the O.M.B. in relation to the representation of the fringes of the municipality in the 2002 Ottawa ward by-law are not applicable.

The overall evaluation of Option 3 is summarized in Figure 20. Key observations include:

- **Based on the City's estimated population in 2015, four wards are outside the acceptable range of variation:** one (Ward 16) is above and three (Wards 11, 14 and 15) are below, as illustrated in Figure 19. Option 3 falls just short of meeting the Representation by Population principle;
- **By 2026, 13 wards would fall within 25% of that optimal size.** Three wards are outside the acceptable range of variation: one (Ward 16) is above and two (Wards 13 and 14) are below. Option 3 falls just short of meeting the Population and Electoral Trends principle;
- **The majority of ward boundaries in Option 3 are based on clear and well-understood markers, including portions of the Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway and Highway 403.** The 16-ward Option generally meets the Means of Communication and Accessibility principle;
- **The proposed Wards 12, 13 and 14 include communities and neighbourhoods above and below the Escarpment.** Option 3 generally meets the Geographical and Topographical Features principle with the exceptions just noted;
- **The proposed Ward 15 is concentrated on Waterdown, an area expected to grow significantly, while the proposed Ward 14 remains predominantly rural.** The proposed Ward 13 includes neighbourhoods above and below the Escarpment since it extends from Dundas to include Greensville and West Flamborough. Four other wards around the periphery of the City (Wards 9, 10, 11 and 12) are large geographic areas but each consists of a collection of adjacent and naturally connected neighbourhoods and communities. Option 3 meets the Community or Diversity of Interests principle; and
- **The population discrepancy among the proposed wards in Option 3 will be significantly reduced over the next three elections, with the exception of the proposed Ward 14.** That area will continue to remain a distinctive community of interest within Hamilton deserving of some accommodation in the representation
system. Option 3, therefore, can be said to meet the Effective Representation principle.

![Figure 20: Evaluation Summary of Option 3](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Does Proposed Ward Boundary Structure Meet Requirements of Principle?</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representation by Population</td>
<td>Largely successful</td>
<td>One ward above the top of the range, three below the range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Electoral Trends</td>
<td>Largely successful</td>
<td>One ward just above the top of the range, two below the range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Communication and Accessibility</td>
<td>Partially successful</td>
<td>Generally clear markers; limited access highways cut through two wards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical and Topographical Features</td>
<td>Largely successful</td>
<td>Two wards include neighbourhoods above and below Escarpment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or Diversity of Interests</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Communities of interest not divided internally but some new groupings to experience are proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Representation</td>
<td>Largely successful</td>
<td>No significant dilution of representation and all wards are coherent collections of communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Option 3 can provide residents of all areas of Hamilton with equitable and effective representation over the next three elections. Despite the wide variations in population density and forecast population growth, the population principles are largely met for 2015 and 2026. Only two wards include areas above and below the Escarpment (in the Ancaster and Dundas-Greensville area). Portions of Highway 403 cut through two wards but other boundaries use plausible easily identified markers. The coherence and population distribution of the proposed wards contributes to effective representation, since higher population wards are comparatively small in area and the major rural community of interest is preserved despite its low population.

As discussed, it’s within the powers of Council to modify the “composition of council.” In essence, an enlarged Council would mean working with a reduced optimal population range for wards, a better decision-making model for Council and a recognition that the City’s population has grown roughly by the equivalent of one ward since amalgamation.
6. Conclusions

This report has evaluated the existing ward structure in terms of the principles established for the 2015-16 Ward Boundary Review and the public input received. Based on extensive technical analysis, public consultation and feedback received from members of Council, three alternative options to the existing ward structure were prepared. The extent to which the existing ward structure and the three alternative options meet the guiding principles adopted for this review and offer the City of Hamilton an effective and equitable system to electing members of Council, is summarized in Figure 21.

This evaluation suggests strongly that the existing ward boundary configuration does not meet the expectations of three of the guiding principles – representation by population, population and electoral trends, and effective representation. This includes two guiding principles – effective representation and representation by population – that were identified as high priorities in a ward design through the feedback received in the public consultations. This suggests highly that Hamilton would be better served by an alternative ward boundary configuration.

While Option 1 represents a marginal improvement to the status quo, the option doesn’t address the structural deficiencies present in the existing ward structure, which prevents the conclusion that this option is a viable alternative.

Option 2 (15-ward configuration) and Option 3 (16-ward configuration) both successfully address shortcomings identified in the present system. Options 2 and 3 provide wards that are better balanced in population now and over the next three elections while accommodating a significant geographic community of interest (rural Hamilton) and the various emerging neighbourhoods across the City. Option 2 or Option 3 are recommended as viable ward boundary options for the City to ensure effective and equitable representation for the residents of Hamilton both today and over the next decade.
### Figure 21: Summary of Evaluations – Existing Ward Structure and Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Ward Structure</th>
<th>Option 1 (modified existing ward structure)</th>
<th>Option 2 (15-ward Option)</th>
<th>Option 3 (16-ward Option)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population and Electoral Trends</td>
<td>Effective Representation</td>
<td>Community or Diversity of Interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographical and Topographical Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means of Communication and Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population and Electoral Trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Communication and Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or Diversity of Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation by Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical and Topographical Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or Diversity of Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Representation by Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical and Topographical Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Electoral Trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Communication and Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community or Diversity of Interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of Communication and Accessibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meet Requirements of Guiding Principle?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>Highly Successful</th>
<th>Partially Successful</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Higher Rating                          Lower Rating
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**Context**
The City of Hamilton commissioned Watson & Associates Economists Ltd., in association with ICA Associates Inc., Trust Learning Solutions and Robert J. Williams (the Consultant Team), to conduct a comprehensive review of the municipal ward system. The Request for Proposal and resultant Terms of Reference for the project specified two rounds of public consultation and engagement in the process. The City is in the midst of raising the standard for citizen engagement based on a Public Engagement Charter. The Consultant Team has endeavoured to live up to this high standard even though the Charter has not yet been converted into policy. This document embodies the City’s principles and converts them into procedures.

**Outcome of the Ward Boundary Review**
The Ward Boundary Review process will develop and present to the City of Hamilton some alternative ways to ensure effective and equitable arrangement of the City of Hamilton’s electoral wards.

**Decision Maker**
Ultimately, the Council of the City of Hamilton will decide which ward design alternative to adopt, including the option of staying with the status quo. The Ward Boundary Review Study provides expert input into their decision.

**Purpose of this Citizen Engagement Plan**
- To engage the people of Hamilton in a manner that provides valuable input to the evaluation of the existing ward structure and development of alternative ward boundaries.
- To ensure Council that ward boundary alternatives reflect municipal vision, principles of the Public Engagement Charter, and community input.

**Outcomes of this Citizen Engagement Plan**
- Citizens will learn about the reason for the Ward Boundary Review and the key factors that will be considered in the review.
- Citizens will provide useful input to the Consultant Team in the evaluation of the existing system and researching design alternatives on behalf of Council.
- Citizens will have a sense that their input might genuinely influence the review.

**Goals of Round One Consultations**
Interested citizens of Hamilton will learn about the review process and the design principles given in the Terms of Reference for the project. They will assess the strengths and weaknesses of the current ward boundary structure, then rank the design principles in order of importance for consideration in the development of alternatives. This ranking of design principles is important because it will inform the Consultant Team on how to narrow the range of alternatives for development and exploration.

**Goals of Round Two Consultations**
Interested citizens of Hamilton will learn about the alternative ward boundary options, assess the trade-offs among them using the adopted design principles, indicate their preferences, and provide thoughtful feedback to the Consultant Team that informs the development of recommended options.
Roles in This Citizen Engagement
The City and the Consultant Team will be collaborating throughout the Review.

The City will use its expertise in communications and logistics for:
- Website hosting, design, and maintenance;
- Communications using: social media, traditional media, posters, and mailings;
- Promotional materials publication and distribution;
- Media relations;
- Advertising;
- Venue logistics: find, book, equip, and provide refreshments as needed;
- Outreach to community groups;
- Branding; and
- Added forms of engagement not contained in the original terms of reference.

The Consultant Team will use its subject matter expertise for:
- Informing participating citizens about the subject of ward boundary reviews;
- Group process design and facilitation;
- Content for communications, such as descriptive text added to a website;
- Key messages advice to the City;
- Capturing and documenting the basic components of the citizen input for future reference; and
- Reviewing any citizen input captured by the City from their social media and web-based sources.

Alignment with City Policy
An engagement plan is essential to the Ward Boundary Review because it upholds two overarching pillars of the City:
- The existing Vision for the City of Hamilton: “To be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities.”
- The Core Principles of the City’s new Public Engagement Charter expand on the elements of the vision:
  - Transparency and trust;
  - Accountability and action;
  - Inclusion and diversity;
  - Create opportunities for active participation;
  - Collaboration, co-operation and shared purpose;
  - Ongoing engagement and open communication;
  - Learning, reflection and evaluation; and
  - Capacity for engagement.

The public engagement plan of the Ward Boundary Review process seeks to align itself with the City’s Core Principles of Public Engagement:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Principles of Public Engagement</th>
<th>Ward Boundary Review Design Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trust and transparency</td>
<td>A website is being created by City staff to share all background information, reports and location of public consultations. City staff will monitor social media comments. Consultant Team will provide content for the City in a timely fashion to use in updating the project web page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Accountability and action</td>
<td>Products/outputs of each round of engagement will be reviewed by the Consultant Team and referenced in their analysis, design, and recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inclusion and diversity</td>
<td>Public meetings will be held in different parts of the City scheduled at different times of the day and days of the week. City staff will book functional meeting rooms that are wheelchair accessible, with ample space to move around during interactive sessions. Consultant Team will ensure that materials shared in public meetings will use both visual and auditory processes. Facilitators will ensure that the interactive components of the meeting will engage different ways of learning and communicating: kinesthetic through body movement and making tangible products, interpersonal through small and large group discussions, etc. Language of the public meetings will be English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Create opportunities for active participation</td>
<td>Group process design begins with reframing the objectives in terms of what the participants need to know, learn, decide or produce. Face-to-face meetings with the public will include interactive components that encourage participants to meet new people and ideas without unnecessary criticism. Small group discussions invite participants to record their own ideas. Sharing key insights will be through the use of index cards, push-pins, sticky notes and lists projected on an overhead screen. Large display boards will contain the key information and be available for review at the beginning of the event. Questions will be organized to build on the other and reveal deeper insights, not just opinions and positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collaboration, cooperation and shared purpose</td>
<td>The City will be taking the lead role in public communications. Communication and outreach will be through a number of media vehicles. City staff will invite Councillors to reach out through their networks, the media will be asked to play a role, local community groups will be engaged directly in soliciting participation from their membership. A set of “participation guidelines” will be reviewed with participants at public meetings in order to set an inclusive, collaborative tone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ongoing engagement and open communication</td>
<td>The City will set up, manage and monitor a website which will be changing throughout the life of the review. The City’s own social media outlets will be receiving and encouraging community conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Learning, reflection and evaluation</td>
<td>The design of the engagement process was refined after consulting with elected representatives and City staff. The design of the second round of consultations will reflect some of the lessons learned from the first round. Public meetings will end with a short reflective dialogue on the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Capacity for engagement</td>
<td>The first round is partly educational about the topic and the process. Questions of clarification will be asked and answered. Participants will be asked the deeper questions after the informational ones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meetings for Round One Consultations
- Nine 3-hour meetings to be held at locations throughout the City of Hamilton.

Round One Consultation Meeting Process
Purpose: Interested citizens of Hamilton will learn about the review process and the design principles given in the terms of reference for the project. They will assess the strengths and weaknesses of the current ward boundary structure after ranking the design principles in order of importance for the future. This ranking of design principles is important because it will inform the Consultant Team on how to narrow the range of alternatives for development and exploration.

Round One Consultation Agenda
1) Brief Open House
   - Purpose: To introduce the topic and understand the participants’ perspectives.
   - Process: Individually review informative display boards and indicate (with a pin) on a map where each participant lives.
2) Welcome, context, overview
   - Purpose: To equip people to engage with one another comfortably.
   - Process: Brief presentation describing the agenda and participation guidelines.
3) The Ward Boundary Review Presentation (25 minutes)
   - Purpose: To equip people to discuss the topic of ward boundary review.
   - Process: Presentation by an expert, reviewing the maps, history, terms of reference (especially the design principles), and how the input will influence the work.
4) Clarification Discussion (5 + 10 + 10 = 25 minutes)
   - Purpose: To ensure people are clear about the topic.
   - Process: 1) A brief table discussion and note taking and 2) sharing questions with the whole group, followed by 3) answers to what can be answered by the presenter.
   - Key question: “What questions of clarification do you have?”
5) Current Situation Discussion (10 + 10 + 10 = 30 minutes)
   - Purpose: To better understand and apply the City’s design principles to the current ward boundaries in order to build up a principled impression of strengths and weaknesses.
   - Process: 1) Small group discussions of the design principles and note taking about strengths and weaknesses of the current situation, 2) sharing some key insights from each small group with the large group, and 3) a short whole-group discussion of their summary.
   - Key question: “What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of the current ward system?”
6) Ranking of Design Principles for the Future (10 + 10 + 10 + 10 = 40 minutes)
   - Purpose: To apply the design principles this time for future consideration.
   - Process: 1) Small groups review the design principles again and discuss which are important for the ward system to reflect and uphold in the future; 2) individually select the top 3 most important design principles to apply.
   - Key question: “What principles do we want the ward system to uphold and reflect in Hamilton?”
7) Wrap-up and next steps (10 + 10 = 20 minutes)
   - Purpose: To summarize the event, learn how the results will be used, and how to stay engaged.
   - Process: One short presentation and one short whole-group discussion.
   - Key Question: “What will we tell people who were not here when they ask what happened?”
Materials for Round One Consultation Events

- Stacking chairs for 35 people, with an additional 75 or more available for a potentially large crowd.
- Folding tables, preferably round, 6 set up with 6 chairs per table, with another 8 tables ready to be set up if a large crowd arrives.
- Large display boards including:
  - “Engagement Charter” including vision, mission, and principles diagram (supplied by the City – because it is theirs and they can re-use it);
  - “Where do YOU come from?” A large simple B&W map of the current ward boundaries and major streets on a foam-core panel (so pushpins can be stuck through it);
  - “The Ward Boundary Review Process” containing:
    - A simple flow chart of the whole process including a “you are here” marker, next steps and contact information to add input; and
    - Website URL and Twitter hashtag and phone number selected by the City for Communications

- Wall Posters:
  - Purpose and Agenda;
  - Participation Guidelines poster posted near the agenda:
    - Everyone has wisdom;
    - We need everyone’s wisdom for the wisest results;
    - There are no “wrong” answers;
    - The whole is greater than the sum of its parts; and
    - Everyone will “hear” and “be heard.”

- Pre-printed (B&W on plain bond paper) 3’x3’ tablecloths with questions and places to write answers during small group discussion.
- Pre-printed large vertical strips of paper (maybe 18” to 24” wide by 36” tall) each containing another of the design principles from the Terms of Reference printed large at the top. When hung together on an accessible wall space these will be:
  - Referred to by the presenter; then
  - Used by participants for their coloured sticky notes ranking the top three principles.

- Sets of three coloured sticky notes for individuals to use for ranking the principles
- Projector and screen.
- A small set of chunky marker pens for writing/drawing on every tablecloth.
- Sign-in sheets so the City can keep in touch with participants and to send them a thank-you note.
- A registration table near the entrance.
- If supplied by the City or a sponsor, a refreshments table.
- Sets of small-headed colour pushpins for participants to stick in the map during the open house (colour coded to help identify where the consultation was located).
- Microphone (wireless preferred), amplifier and loudspeaker.
Meetings for Round Two Consultations
- Nine 3-hour meetings to be held at locations throughout the City of Hamilton.
- The goal is to complete the consultations before the end of June in order to capture as many participants as possible before the summer vacation season begins and to allow time for reviewing the input before developing the final options to Council.

Round Two Consultation Meeting Process

**Purpose:** Interested citizens of Hamilton will learn about the alternative ward boundary structures, assess the trade-offs among them using the City’s ranked design principles, indicate their preferences, and provide feedback to the Consultant Team.

Allowance is made for individuals to examine all the alternatives in an informed and informal manner. Participants will be equipped with a “passport” to allow them to take notes and keep track of both the design principles and the various options. The process requires casual 1:1 support and instruction with less group facilitation.

Round Two Agenda
1) Open house;
2) Welcome and overview of the event;
3) Presentation on input from Round One consultations;
4) Presentation on the draft alternative ward boundaries;
5) Discussion of the alternatives using the input from the round one consultations (Q&A);
6) Participations were handed a passport in order to take notes and rank their preferences;
7) Indication of preferences as “walkabout” with subject matter experts very accessible;
8) Discussion of assumptions and reasons behind preferences; and
9) Wrap-up and next steps.

Materials for Round Two Consultations
- A dozen display board easels for the preliminary options and explanatory posters;
- Chairs arranged for a presentation;
- Projector and screen for a presentation;
- Reception table;
- Tables for participants to write their answers at, if they chose; and
- “Passport” booklets for each participant containing information about the overall process, ranked design principles from Round One consultations, a few defining characteristics of the ward boundary options, space to express opinions, and some evaluation questions.
Meeting Locations of Round One Consultations:

- Nine 3-hour meetings were held between February 3rd and February 27th, 2016, at locations throughout the City of Hamilton, as summarized below.
- This included seven weekday meetings scheduled in the evenings and two meetings scheduled on Saturday afternoons.

### Locations of Round One Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting #</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harry Howell Arena</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 3, 2016 6:00-9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Canadian Warplane Heritage Museum</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 9, 2016 6:00-9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Old Beasley Community Centre</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 10, 2016 5:30-8:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sackville Seniors Centre</td>
<td>Thursday, February 11, 2016 6:00-9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Rockton Fairgrounds</td>
<td>Tuesday, February 16, 2016 6:00-9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ancaster Rotary Centre</td>
<td>Wednesday, February 17, 2016 6:00-9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stoney Creek Recreation Centre</td>
<td>Saturday, February 20, 2016 12:30-3:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bocce Club – Chedoke Twin Pad Arena</td>
<td>Monday, February 22, 2016 6:00-9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dundas Lions Memorial Community Centre</td>
<td>Saturday, February 27, 2016 12:30-3:30 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Meeting Locations of Round Two Consultations

- Nine 3-hour meetings were held between June 9th and June 29th, 2016, at locations throughout the City of Hamilton, as summarized below.
- This included seven weekday meetings scheduled in the evenings and two meetings scheduled on Saturday afternoons.

Locations of Round Two Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting #</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Public Meeting Date/Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sir Winston Churchill Recreation Centre</td>
<td>Thursday, June 9, 2016 6:00-8:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tim Hortons Field</td>
<td>Saturday, June 11, 2016 12:30-3:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mountain Arena</td>
<td>Tuesday, June 14, 2016 6:00-9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ancaster Rotary Centre</td>
<td>Thursday, June 16, 2016 6:00-9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Westdale Secondary School</td>
<td>Friday, June 17, 2016 6:00-9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Waterdown Legion Hall</td>
<td>Monday, June 20, 2016 6:00-9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Winona Community Centre</td>
<td>Thursday, June 23, 2016 6:00-9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rosedale Arena</td>
<td>Saturday, June 25, 2016 12:30-3:30 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Binbrook Agricultural Hall</td>
<td>Wednesday, June 29, 2016 6:00-9:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A-2

Round 1 of Public Consultation
City of Hamilton Ward Boundary Review
Public Information and Engagement Workshop – Round 1
Comments/Feedback Form

1. What are the key strengths of the current ward boundary system in Hamilton?

2. What are the key weaknesses of the current ward boundary system in Hamilton?

3. What issues do you believe are most important to address in the ward boundary review process?

4. Additional comments?

Thank you for your interest and participation.
Please leave your completed form in the Comments Box.

Or return to:

Email: feedback@watson-econ.ca

Return of comments is requested by March 3, 2016.
**Ranking:** Which are your top 3?

- Representation by population
- Population and electoral trends
- Means of communication and accessibility
- Geographical and topographical features
- Community or diversity of interests
- Effective representation
- What other principles need to be given high priority?

**System be changed? (if you have specific suggestions)**

(2b) Where and how should the present ward

Strengths

- What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of the current ward boundaries?

Weaknesses

- Reminders:
  - Encourage everyone to speak.
  - Write or draw what people say.
  - Help each other to be clear.
  - There's no pressure to agree or persuade.
Hamilton Ward Boundary Review

Public Consultation Round 1 – Feedback Received via Comment Sheets Circulated at Public Open Houses

What are some of the STRENGTHS of the current ward boundaries?

- Well-established (i.e. they've been around for a long time, people know which ward they reside in)
- Recognizes Geographic Areas
- Fits within Historical Boundaries
- Suburban and Rural Divide

What are some of the WEAKNESSES of the current ward boundaries?

- It is not representative of the population
- The Wards vary in size
- Maintains interest of rural versus urban interest preventing a sense of overall community

What issues do you believe are most important to address in the ward boundary review process?

- Ensuring equal population per ward, while also ensuring there is no conflict between urban and rural divide
- Community identity - common interest
- Geographic and Topographic features
- Effective Representation
- Diversity of Interest
- Keeping the Historical Guides
- Even Ward Sizes
- Separation of Rural Zone
- Greenbelt Recognition

Additional Comments

- This boundary review needs to be done as population patterns have changed over time
- Additional ward on mountain + eliminate rural wards
- Hamiltonians from all over must realize we are all in this together and not separate entities
- A community attitude must be maintained
- Regardless of rural boundaries, Councillors should represent the ward and work for good of all
What are some of the STRENGTHS of the current ward boundaries?

**City-Wide:**
- Strong geographical features
- Contiguous
- Preserves neighbourhoods and shows the uniqueness of each
- Diversity and identity is evident
- Ward 14 is the best example of a Ward with multiple small communities that have come together
- Familiarity

**Waterdown Area:**
- Current system reinforces different socio-economic & cultural interests
- The Mountain is a good division of wards

**Ancaster and Dundas Area:**
- Dundas is Dundas
- Established heritage
- Neighbourhood identity and cohesion maintained
- Protects suburban Town’s character
- Reflects the uniqueness of the communities (e.g. rural communities)

**Rural Area:**
- Ward 14 is a great example of effective representation
- Stability after amalgamation
- Geographically equitable
- The current ward system provides for effective representation in the suburban and rural areas

**Inner City:**
- Preserves neighbourhoods
- Legacy Communities

**Mountain:**
- Current system reinforces existing interest of different socio-economic & cultural interests
- Geographically equitable
- There is strength is having a balance between rural and urban wards as it creates balance
East End:
- Easy to identify Stoney Creek
- Self-contained
- Strong sense of community

What are some of the WEAKNESSES of the current ward boundaries?

City-Wide:
- Major split/divide between Urban and Rural
- Inequitable representation
- Ward 11 feels like a hodgepodge
- Population imbalance
- Urban-Suburban divide

Waterdown Area:
- Current system divides us into socio-economic classes with different needs
- The Mountain may be an artificial barrier

Ancaster and Dundas Area:
- Some Councillors want to maintain status quo which inhibits decision making for City-wide issues and encourages "fiefdom"
- Narrow perspective
- City dominates rural areas
- the current make-up does not represent natural communities (i.e. Ward 7 is very large)
- Rural voice is often left out and does not have representation on committees (e.g. farm & agriculture)

Rural Area:
- City does not understand Rural issues
- No services offered in rural area (Bus, Water, Sewer, etc.)
- Current system divides us into socio-economic classes with different needs

Inner City:
- Too conforming to boundaries of former municipalities
- Better to have more wards, fewer residents
- New wards should make sure lower income residents have fair representation
- Councilors in high density and high needs areas are overwhelmed and under resourced
- Urban issues underrepresented (1/3 pop = 1/2 Council)
- Some communities of interest that are not adequately represented

Mountain:
- Major Split between urban & rural
- Population representation is unfairly distributed
• Tunnel vision Councilors (worrying on just your ward)
• No representation by population

East end:
• Winona should be with Stoney Creek (education & ward 10)
• The mountain may be an artificial barrier
• Amalgamation animosity
• Ward 9 & 11 split by the escarpment
• Interest pitted against each other

Where and how should the present ward system be changed? (if you have specific suggestions)

Waterdown Area:
• No comments provided

Ancaster and Dundas Area:
• Following the Federal riding boundary, have 3 Ward representatives elected into each riding (divide each Federal riding into 3 Wards)
• Divide Ward 11 into two as it has population growth
• Consider larger geographical wards with 2,3,4,5 reps elected at large in the wards
• Look again at the idea of having a Regional Municipality, as before
• Community nodes (e.g. Copetown/ Lynden) need to be kept together in one ward
• If Necessary, Ward 13 west of Highway 6, south of #5 to either Middletown rd. or Hwy 52 to Jerseyville Rd. people who live in Greensville & Glen Drummond survey to Copetown area already think they are part of Dundas
• Propose 3 'at-large" Councillors to represent wards 1-5, wards 6-9, and wards 10-15
• Impose 1 or 2-year term limits
• benefits: Injects new blood into Council,
creates profile to challenge incumbent in future election,
provides ""apprenticeship"" for new Councillors to lead ward work and duties,
could be springboard for future mayoral candidates"
• Extend ward 10 - below mountain / lakefront to east boundary
• Extend ward 13 - capture Greenbelt areas below mountain from wards 12 & 14
• Use Upper Sherman as east/west boundary for wards 6&7
• Use Hwy. 6 as east/west boundary for wards 14&15
• Extend ward 5 to Grays Rd. from ward 9 (below mountain)

Rural Area:
• Current ward system works well to represent each ward’s needs and community interest
• Ward 14 could encompass part of Ward 15 west of Highway 6 to increase population of ward 14
• Ward 15 will increase population in Waterdown
• Orkney could be added to Ward 14 also to increase population
- To increase the population of Ward 14, the only option is to join (partially) with another Ward. This would increase the size of Ward 14 to a size which would be impossible for a Councilor to manage
- Regrowth of Waterdown - add to Ward 14 section of Ward 15, everything West of Highway 6
- We want No more expense - No more Councillors, No less
- We do not want to lose any Rural Councillors

**Inner City:**

- Ancaster could reasonably take in Copetown and Mount Hope. The schools feed into Ancaster High
- Constituents elect trustees as well as City Councillors. Take into consideration the make-up of school communities
- Some communities of interest that are not adequately represented

**Mountain:**

- Reduce to 9-11 Councillors
- Create a spoke & wheel ward that includes city to rural for all councilors
- Councillors would have to gain a knowledge of city/medium density / rural issues
- Start from zero - choose optimal number of wards first
- Merge some of the rural wards
- Dividing some of the urban wards
- Highest population areas
- More equitable representation must be implemented
- Council changed to ward rep and Regional elected at large
- More equitable representation must be implemented
- Council changed to ward rep and Regional elected at large

**East end:**

- Escarpment as a boundary for Wards 9 & 11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Population and electoral trends</th>
<th>Means of communication and accessibility</th>
<th>Geographical and topographical features</th>
<th>Community or diversity of interests</th>
<th>Effective Representation</th>
<th>Total Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harry Howell Arena (Flamborough)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Warplane Heritage Museum (Mount Hope)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Beasley Community Centre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville Hill Seniors Recreation Centre</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockton Fairgrounds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster Rotary Centre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Creek</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocce Club - Chedoke Twin Pad Arena</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundas Lions Memorial Community Centre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Votes</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>313</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ranking**

| | 4 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
City of Hamilton Ward Boundary Review

Online Comments/Feedback Form – Summary of Submissions Received

February 3 – March 3, 2016

- Received 62 submissions

- Respondents were asked about the key strengths/weaknesses in the current Hamilton ward boundary system:

- Key strengths of current system:
  - The dominant response was “none”. Of the few key strengths identified include:
    - Respects/maintains communities of interest and pre-amalgamated municipalities
    - Well established and understood
    - Gives rural population a “voice”

- Key weaknesses of current system (in order of number of responses – highest to lowest):
  - Population imbalance
  - Promotes urban vs. suburban/rural divisiveness and “us vs. them” mindset on Council
  - System based on pre-amalgamated municipality lines which makes it difficult to move forward as an amalgamated city.
  - Boundaries don’t follow logical lines.

- High share of respondents indicated that Hamilton’s ward boundary system should be redesigned and shown below:
Should Hamilton's Ward Boundary System be Redesigned?

- Of those that responded that Hamilton's ward boundary system should be redesigned, respondents were asked what issues are most important to address in the redesign process. Top responses are:
  - Redesign should consider representation by population, preserving communities of interest, effective representation
  - Minimize urban vs. suburban/rural divide and “us vs. them” thinking and creates a system based on an amalgamated city
  - Add additional wards to address population imbalance

- Of those that responded that Hamilton’s ward boundary system should not be redesigned, respondents were asked why they believe the system should remain unchanged. Only one respondent answered: “It’s okay the way it is.”

- Respondents were asked what principles should be given the highest priority in redesigning the ward system in Hamilton. Population and Electoral Trends and Representation by Population received the highest number of responses, followed closely by Effective Representation. Communities of Interest received a moderate number of responses, as illustrated below. Geographic and Topographic Features and Communications and Accessibility received the lowest number of responses.
What principles should be given the highest priority in redesigning the ward system in Hamilton?

- Population and Electoral Trends: 39 responses
- Representation by Population: 39 responses
- Effective Representation: 34 responses
- Communities of Interest: 21 responses
- Geograph. And Topo Features: 12 responses
- Communication and accessibility: 12 responses

Number of Responses
Appendix A-3

Round 2 of Public Consultation
Passport

Hamilton Ward Boundary Review

Open House
Round Two of Public Consultation

June 2016

Purpose:
To gather detailed insights and suggestions from the citizens of Hamilton about what changes to the ward boundaries make the most sense and WHY.

- There are two pages in the middle of this passport for taking notes about each of the maps around the room.
- Walk around the room to look closely at the maps of each option.
- Make notes in this passport of what you think are the strengths and weaknesses of all the options.
- Any questions raised for you can be written on the large Post-It notes at each location around the room.
- After you have looked at all the options, pick up a worksheet marked “Preferences” and rank your top 1, 2, or 3 preferred options.
- Please say WHY you prefer them.
- Before you leave, drop this Passport booklet and your “Preferences” worksheet into the big box near the exit.

The Ward Boundary Review Process

In October 2015, the Council of the City of Hamilton decided to conduct a ward boundary review. Consultants were hired and began their research.

In the fall of 2016 Council will decide what they want to do: keep the wards the same, or change them based on expert recommendations that also reflect public input.

The study has several phases including two rounds of public input:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Council decided to do a review – October 2015</td>
<td>To make an informed decision in the fall of 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Researched current situation – November to January</td>
<td>To gain insight from Councillors and stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public consultation Round One – February 2016</td>
<td>To learn from the community and to give direction to the consultants on Guiding Principles, and issues of priority and importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Develop draft options</td>
<td>To apply the community’s sense of guiding principles, and show the community what’s possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Public consultation Round Two – June 2016</td>
<td>To learn which options make the most sense to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Refine options – July and August 2016</td>
<td>To develop a short list of recommendations that reflect community feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Present recommendations to Council</td>
<td>Council receives the consultant’s recommendations through a committee of Council, for discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Council decides what they want to do with ward boundaries – October 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priority Guiding Principles

Guiding Principles for the study include:

- Representation by Population;
- Population and Electoral Trends;
- Means of Communication and Accessibility;
- Geographical and Topographical Features;
- Community or Diversity of Interests; and
- Effective Representation.

Participants in Round One of the public consultations (February 2016) ranked the Guiding Principles in order of importance. Ranked higher were the principles of:

1. Representation by population;
2. Population and electoral trends; and
3. Community or diversity of interests.

Ranked lower were principles of:

4. Means of communication and accessibility; and
5. Geographical and topographical features.

The principle of “Effective Representation” is an overarching principle that takes all the others into consideration.

This input from citizens was important because the options offered for consideration in this second round of consultations attempt to hold these prioritized principles.

Please consider these principles when thinking about the strengths and weaknesses of the draft options.
Your Notes

As you look at each of the options, keep track of your ideas and questions on this page if you wish. This is not an exam. This is a place to take notes, draw connection lines... whatever helps you keep track of all your ideas.

What do you think about each option? How do they reflect the PRINCIPLES listed on page 3?

What are some of the...

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...STRENGTHS of an option?</th>
<th>...WEAKNESSES of an option?</th>
<th>...QUESTIONS these options raises for me?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Parallel federal constituency boundaries</td>
<td>2A: Preservation of pre-amalgamation balance</td>
<td>3A: Post-amalgamation 15 ward system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Parallel federal constituency boundaries</td>
<td>2A: Preservation of pre-amalgamation balance</td>
<td>3A: Post-amalgamation 15 ward system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Parallel federal constituency boundaries</td>
<td>2A: Preservation of pre-amalgamation balance</td>
<td>3A: Post-amalgamation 15 ward system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Parallel federal constituency boundaries</td>
<td>2A: Preservation of pre-amalgamation balance</td>
<td>3A: Post-amalgamation 15 ward system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: Parallel federal constituency boundaries</td>
<td>2A: Preservation of pre-amalgamation balance</td>
<td>3A: Post-amalgamation 15 ward system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Options (page 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK your 1, 2, or 3 MOST preferred</th>
<th>WHY Do you prefer it? (What features do you prefer?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Parallel federal constituency boundaries</td>
<td>2A: Preservation of pre-amalgamation balance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Preservation of pre-amalgamation balance</td>
<td>3A: Post-amalgamation 15 ward system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Preservation of pre-amalgamation balance</td>
<td>4A: Post-amalgamation 16 ward system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Post-amalgamation 16 ward system</td>
<td>4B: Post-amalgamation 16 ward system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Post-amalgamation 16 ward system</td>
<td>4C: Post-amalgamation 16 ward system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Post-amalgamation 15 ward system</td>
<td>5: Current (page 4 &amp; 6) No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Current (page 4 &amp; 6) No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Passport” workbook for citizens to keep track of their ideas while reviewing possible ward boundary changes.
### Aggregated Responses of Top 3 Choices from Second Round of Consultation

#### Total Count of Votes (Ranks 1, 2 and 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir Winston Churchill Recreation Centre &amp; Tim Hortons Field</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Arena</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster Rotary Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westdale Community Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterdown Legion Branch 551</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona Community Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binbrook Agricultural Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Votes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Online Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir Winston Churchill Recreation Centre &amp; Tim Hortons Field</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Arena</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster Rotary Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westdale Community Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterdown Legion Branch 551</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona Community Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binbrook Agricultural Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Votes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Votes by Option:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Current - No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on aggregated responses of top three choices of options from online submissions and passport feedback from public open houses through Hamilton Ward Boundary Review Round 2 of public consultation.
Aggregated Responses for First Choice from Second Round of Consultation

Total Count of Votes (Rank 1 Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sir Winston Churchill Recreation Centre &amp; Tim Hortons Field</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Arena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster Rotary Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westdale Community Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterdown Legion Branch 551</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona Community Centre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binbrook Agricultural Society</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Votes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Times Chosen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Votes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
<th>Option 4</th>
<th>Current - No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on aggregated responses of Rank 1 choices of options from online submissions and passport feedback from public open houses through Hamilton Ward Boundary Review Round 2 of public consultation.
Appendix B – Option 1 Proposed Ward Boundaries
Option 1 – Proposed Boundaries

Proposed Ward 1

- Identical to existing Ward 1.

Proposed Ward 2

- Identical to existing Ward 2.

Proposed Ward 3

- Identical to existing Ward 3.

Proposed Ward 4

- Identical to existing Ward 4.

Proposed Ward 5

- Similar to existing Ward 5 except along eastern boundary:
  - Boundary follows Centennial Parkway from King Street to Queenston Road;
  - Boundary follows Queenston Road between Centennial Parkway and Grays Road; and
  - Boundary follows Grays Road from Queenston Road to Lake Ontario except at the northern terminus where the boundary would follow the eastern boundary of Confederation Park.

Proposed Ward 6

- Similar to existing Ward 6 except:
  - Bound by Red Hill Valley Parkway, Upper Red Hill Valley Parkway and Trinity Church Road to the east; and
  - Bound by Miles Road and Upper Sherman Avenue to the west.

Proposed Ward 7

- Similar to existing Ward 7 except eastern boundary runs along Miles Road and Upper Sherman Avenue.
Proposed Ward 8

- Identical to existing Ward 8 except for minor adjustment where boundary follows Stone Church Road west from Omni Blvd. to the north-south Hydro One Networks transmission corridor.

Proposed Ward 9

- Similar to existing Ward 9 except that bound to the south by the east-west Hydro One Networks transmission corridor (located south of Rymal Road) and bound by Red Hill Valley Parkway, Upper Red Hill Valley Parkway and Trinity Church Road to the west.

Proposed Ward 10

- Similar to existing Ward 10 except bound to the east by Jones Road south of the Q.E.W.

Proposed Ward 11

- Similar to existing Ward 11 except that northern boundary between Trinity Church Road and Regional Road 56 located along the east-west Hydro One Networks transmission corridor and the north-south boundary with Ward 10 along Jones Road south of the Q.E.W.

Proposed Ward 12

- Identical to existing Ward 12 except for minor adjustment where boundary follows Stone Church Road west from Omni Blvd. to the north-south Hydro One Networks transmission corridor.

Proposed Ward 13

- Identical to existing Ward 13.

Proposed Ward 14

- Similar to existing Ward 14 except along the eastern boundary with Ward 15, boundary follows Valley Road, Highway 5, Millgrove Sideroad and Concession Road 4.

Proposed Ward 15

- Similar to existing Ward 15 except along the western boundary with Ward 14, boundary follows Valley Road, Highway 5, Millgrove Sideroad and Concession Road 4.
Appendix C – Option 2 Proposed Ward Boundaries
Option 2 – Proposed Boundaries

Proposed Ward 1

- Identical to existing Ward 1.

Proposed Ward 2

- Identical to existing Ward 2 except that the southeastern part of the ward bound by Wellington Street and Claremont Access (Stinson neighbourhood is in proposed Ward 3).

Proposed Ward 3

- Identical to existing Ward 3 except that the southwestern part of the ward bound by Wellington Street and Claremont Access (Stinson neighbourhood is in proposed Ward 3).

Proposed Ward 4

- Similar to existing Ward 4 except that the southern part of the ward bound by Niagara Escarpment instead of Lawrence Road and bound to the east by the Red Hill Valley Parkway (Rosedale neighbourhood is in proposed Ward 4).

Proposed Ward 5

- Bound to the north by Lake Ontario (and includes Hamilton Beach neighbourhood);
- Bound to the east by Grays Road except north of the Q.E.W. where the boundary would follow the eastern boundary of Confederation Park;
- Bound to the south by the Niagara Escarpment; and
- South of the Q.E.W., bound to the west by the Red Hill Valley Parkway.

Proposed Ward 6

- Bound by the Niagara Escarpment to the north and east, Red Hill Valley Parkway, Upper Red Hill Valley Parkway and Trinity Church Road to the east, Hydro One Networks transmission corridor to the south, and Miles Road, Upper Sherman Avenue and Upper Gage Avenue to the west.
Proposed Ward 7

- Bound by the Niagara Escarpment to the north, Miles Road, Upper Sherman Avenue and Upper Gage Avenue to the east, Hydro One Networks transmission corridor to the south, and Upper Wellington Street to the west.

Proposed Ward 8

- Bound by the Niagara Escarpment to the north, Upper Wellington Street to the east, Hydro One Networks transmission corridor to the south, and Garth Street to the west.

Proposed Ward 9

- Bound by the Niagara Escarpment to the north, the City of Hamilton municipal boundary to the east, the east-west Hydro One Networks transmission corridor to the south, and Red Hill Valley Parkway, Upper Red Hill Valley Parkway and Trinity Church Road to the west.

Proposed Ward 10

- Bound by Lake Ontario to the north, the City of Hamilton municipal boundary to the east and the Niagara Escarpment to the south; and
- The ward is bound by Grays Road to the west, except north of the Q.E.W. where the boundary follows the eastern edge of Confederation Park.

Proposed Ward 11

- Bound by the east-west Hydro One Networks transmission corridor to the north, the City of Hamilton municipal boundary to the east and south, and Glancaster Road to the west.

Proposed Ward 12

- Bound by Highway 8, Middletown Road and the Ancaster-Dundas Community boundary to the north, Highway 403 and the north-south Hydro One Networks transmission corridor and Glancaster Road to the east, and the City of Hamilton municipal boundary to the south and west.
Proposed Ward 13

- Bound by Highway 6, Millgrove Sideroad, Highway 5, Rock Chapel Road and the Niagara Escarpment to the north and east;¹
- Bound by the Dundas-Lower Hamilton Community boundary to the east;
- Bound by the Ancaster-Dundas Community boundary, Highway 8, and Middletown Road to the south; and
- Bound by the City of Hamilton municipal boundary to the west.

Proposed Ward 14

- Bound by the Niagara Escarpment to the north, Garth Street to the east and the east-west Hydro One Networks transmission corridor to the south; and
- Glancaster Road and the north-south Hydro One Networks transmission corridor serve as the western boundary south of the Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway. North of the Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway extends west to Highway 403.

Proposed Ward 15

- Bound to the south and east by Highway 6, Millgrove Sideroad, Highway 5, Rock Chapel Road and the Niagara Escarpment;¹ and
- Bound by the City of Hamilton municipal boundary to the west, north and northeast.

¹ Hamlet of Millgrove entirely within proposed Ward 15 with boundary between proposed Wards 13 and 15 following hydro corridor immediately west of Millgrove.
City of Hamilton
Option 2 - Ward 4

Map showing various areas such as Highway, Railways, Niagara Escarpment, Parks, Natural Open Space, Downtown Area, Major Commercial Nodes/Corridors, Employment Areas, Other Built Up Area, Environmentally Sensitive Areas, Ward, Major Utility Corridors, and Niagara Escarpment.
City of Hamilton
Option 2 - Ward 8

Map showing various areas including wards, roads, parks, and other features within the City of Hamilton.
Appendix D – Option 3 Proposed Ward Boundaries
Option 3 – Proposed Boundaries

Proposed Ward 1

- Identical to existing Ward 1.

Proposed Ward 2

- Identical to existing Ward 2.

Proposed Ward 3

- Identical to existing Ward 3.

Proposed Ward 4

- Similar to existing Ward 4 except that the southern part of the ward bound by Niagara Escarpment instead of Lawrence Road and bound to the east by the Red Hill Valley Parkway (Rosedale neighbourhood is in proposed Ward 4).

Proposed Ward 5

- Bound to the north by Lake Ontario (and includes Hamilton Beach neighbourhood);
- Bound to the east by Grays Road except north of the Q.E.W. where the boundary would follow the eastern boundary of Confederation Park;
- Bound to the south by the Niagara Escarpment; and
- South of the Q.E.W., bound to the west by the Red Hill Valley Parkway.

Proposed Ward 6

- Bound by the Niagara Escarpment to the north, Red Hill Valley Parkway, Upper Red Hill Valley Parkway and Trinity Church Road to the east, Hydro One Networks transmission corridor to the south, and Miles Road, Upper Sherman Avenue and Upper Gage Avenue to the west.

Proposed Ward 7

- Bound by the Niagara Escarpment to the north, Upper Gage Avenue to the east, Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway to the south and Upper Wellington Street to the west.
Proposed Ward 8

- Bound by the Niagara Escarpment to the north, Upper Wellington Street to the east, Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway to the south, and a Hydro One Networks transmission corridor to the west.

Proposed Ward 9

- Bound by the Niagara Escarpment to the north, the City of Hamilton municipal boundary to the east, Regional Road 20 and a Hydro One Networks transmission corridor to the south and Red Hill Valley Parkway, Upper Red Hill Valley Parkway and Trinity Church Road to the west.

Proposed Ward 10

- Bound by Lake Ontario to the north, the City of Hamilton municipal boundary to the east and the Niagara Escarpment to the south; and
- The ward is bound by Grays Road to the west, except north of the Q.E.W. where the boundary follows the eastern edge of Confederation Park.

Proposed Ward 11

- Bound by Hydro One Networks transmission corridor and Regional Road 20 to the north, the City of Hamilton municipal boundary to the east and south, and Glancaster Road to the west

Proposed Ward 12

- Bound by the Ancaster-Dundas Community boundary to the north, Hydro One Networks transmission corridor and Glancaster Road the east, the City of Hamilton municipal boundary to the south, and Highway 403 to the west

Proposed Ward 13

- Bound by Highway 5, Rock Chapel Road and the Niagara Escarpment to the north, the Dundas-Lower Hamilton Community boundary to the east, the Ancaster-Dundas Community boundary to the south and Middletown Road to the west.
Proposed Ward 14

- Bound by the City of Hamilton municipal boundary to the south, west and north; and
- Bound to the east by Concession 7, Concession 6, Ofield Road, Moffat Road, Highway 5, Middletown Road, and Highway 403.

Proposed Ward 15

- Bound by the City of Hamilton municipal boundary to the north and east, the Niagara Escarpment, Rock Chapel Road and Highway 5 to the south, and Ofield Road, Moffat Road, Concession 6 and Concession 7 to the west.

Proposed Ward 16

- Bound by the Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway to the north, Upper Sherman Avenue and Miles Road to the east, and the Hydro One Networks transmission corridor to the south and west.
City of Hamilton
Option 3 - Ward 6

Map showing various areas and zoning types such as markets, parks, and built-up areas within Ward 6 of City of Hamilton.
City of Hamilton
Option 3 - Ward 16

Map showing various areas and locations within Ward 16, including Niagara Escarpment, Parks, Downtown Area, Major Road, Railways, Natural Open Space, Employment Areas, and Environmentally Sensitive Areas.