From:	"Mochrie, Paul" <paul.mochrie@vancouver.ca></paul.mochrie@vancouver.ca>
To:	"Direct to Mayor and Council - DL"
Date:	3/8/2022 3:55:05 PM
Subject:	Council Memo - Report Back on a Citizens' Assembly and Independent Election Task
	Force for 2022 - RTS 14354
Attachments:	CCO - Memo - Report Back on a Citizens' Assembly and Independent Election Task ~ RTS 14354(2).pdf

Dear Mayor and Council,

The attached memo from the City Clerk responds to Council's direction for staff to report back with options and a framework to reconvene an Independent Election Task Force (IETF) and the methodology and cost to establish a Citizens' Assembly (RTS 14354) to recommend a preferred electoral system in Vancouver.

- □ This memo contains a preliminary framework and options for Council[®] information respecting reconvening the IETF and establishing a Citizens[®]Assembly.
- □ Staff recommends Council does not take action on either of these initiatives until after the 2022 election.

Please contact Rosemary Hagiwara, Chief Election Officer, with questions in relation to this memo.

Best, Paul

Paul Mochrie (he/him) City Manager City of Vancouver paul.mochrie@vancouver.ca



The City of Vancouver acknowledges that it is situated on the unceded traditional territories of the x^wməθk^wəỳəm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), and səlilwətał (Tsleil-Waututh) Nations.



MEMORANDUM

March 8, 2022

- TO: Mayor and Council
- CC: Paul Mochrie, City Manager Karen Levitt, Deputy City Manager Armin Amrolia, Deputy City Manger Lynda Graves, Administration Services Manager, City Manager's Office Maria Pontikis, Director, Civic Engagement and Communications Anita Zaenker, Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office Neil Monckton, Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office Alvin Singh, Communications Director, Mayor's Office Rosemary Hagiwara, Chief Election Officer and Deputy City Clerk

FROM: Katrina Leckovic, City Clerk

- SUBJECT: Report Back on a Citizens' Assembly and Independent Election Task Force for 2022
- RTS #: 14354

PURPOSE

This memo responds to Council's direction for staff to report back with options and a framework to reconvene an Independent Election Task Force (IETF) and the methodology and cost to establish a Citizens Assembly to recommend a preferred electoral system in Vancouver. This memo contains a preliminary framework and options for Council's information respecting reconvening the IETF and establishing a Citizens Assembly.

1.0 Independent Election Task Force (IETF)

BACKROUND

In 2016, Council established an Independent Election Task Force (IETF) with a mandate to review five Council directives related to the delivery of municipal elections in the City of Vancouver that would lead to improved public confidence in electoral processes at the municipal level and increase voter engagement.

The Task Force was to focus on the following strategic actions:



- 1. Reform campaign financing
- 2. Adopt a proportional voting system
- 3. Conduct an online voting pilot
- 4. Increase voter turnout by:
 - Increasing positive cues
 - Targeting voter registration
 - Extending voting rights to permanent residents
 - Using the election ballot to get feedback on voter satisfaction with the current voting system
 - Employing best practices from other jurisdictions
- 5. Request to Province to make anonymous balloting data available in open data format after an election

The IETF presented its <u>final report to Council in 2017</u>, with the following recommendations from the report implemented by staff in the 2018 General Election:

- C. 1) Employ best practices from other jurisdictions
 - Invest in additional election outreach staff resources, increase outreach, align strategies with civic group work, fund a designated elections social media team, expand reach of the 'Plan Your Vote' tool.
 - ii. Create and implement post-election polling to be administered after each of the next three municipal elections.
- C. 4) Increase positive cues
 - i. Create citizen academies to increase political knowledge.
 - ii. Create and administer grants for civic groups to hold voter education campaigns, registration campaigns, Get Out The Vote campaigns, and celebration events.
- D. 2) Direct staff to make anonymous balloting data available in open data format after an election.
- E. 3) Monitor online voting experiences in other Canadian municipalities.

In 2018, the IETF was reconvened by Council to consider two other issues: (1) the regulation of third party groups wishing to engage on policy during municipal elections and (2) the comparative treatment of contributions to candidates running with elector organizations and those running as independents. In June of 2019, the <u>IETF reported back to Council</u> on its recommendations with many of the recommendations requiring provincial legislative change and/or falling under the jurisdiction of Elections BC.

Other reviews of local election financing legislation were completed by the provincial <u>Local</u> <u>Elections Task Force</u>, which was formed in 2009. The Task Force submitted a report with recommendations to UBCM and the Province of BC in 2010, which helped shape the Local Elections Campaign Financing Act (LECFA), enacted in 2014. Since then, other changes to LECFA have been implemented with one recently on regulating third party advertising.

DISCUSSION

On February 10, 2021, Council directed staff to report back with options and a framework to reconvene an Independent Election Task Force after the 2022 Vancouver general election.

Similar to what was implemented in 2016, staff recommend that Council direct staff to retain the services of an external consultant to facilitate the new Task Force meetings, coordinate the work of the Task Force and assist with the completion of the final report back to Council.

In addition, internal resources will be required to hire the consultant, recruit and complete the selection of the Task Force members and provide ongoing support to the consultant and IETF members. Resources may also be required from various staff to manage the project and work of the IETF, answer questions from members, coordinate, attend and clerk meetings but the resource estimate for this is unknown pending on council directive for the IETF.

As Council has not yet provided direction on what the IETF would be addressing if convened, the following estimated timelines and budget are provided in Table 1 and Table 2 below.

Deliverable	Estimated Duration			
Council report for approval of terms of reference	1 month			
RFP for consultant	3 months			
Recruitment and on boarding of IETF members	4 months			
Meetings	7 months			
RFP for final report graphic designer	2 months			
Final report to Council	1 month			
TOTAL (approximately)	18 MONTHS			

Table 1. Estimated Timeline for IETF

Table 2. Estimated Cost for IETF

Budget Item	Estimated Cost
Consultant*: facilitation and writing services	\$60,000
Design Services: graphic design for final report	\$5,000
Accessibility: ASL interpreters, translation	\$6,000
Meals: lunch or dinner and beverages	\$1,500
Mobility**: reimbursement of travel costs for members	\$500
ESTIMATED TOTAL	\$73,000

*In 2016, estimated cost for the facilitator was \$30,000. Based on lessons learned in 2016, the estimate has increased to accurately reflect the full scope of work required.

**Parking is free at City Hall upper deck (passes provided to committee members for attending meetings)

Staff anticipate that preliminary costs to convene an IETF will be approximately \$73,000 at a minimum, which is based on the 2016 IETF framework of eight meetings and a 12-person committee. However, funding is required to convene an IETF and cost may vary depending on the IETF's mandate and any requirements of the consultant.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommend the IEFT be convened in 2023 and work be completed in 2024 to ensure funding is secured, dedicated staff and resources are assigned to support IETF members and recommendations to Council are presented well before the 2026 General Election.

Prior to implementing the IETF, staff will require further direction from Council on the mandate, deliverables and timeline of the task force, in addition to funding to support this program. The Terms of Reference for the 2016 IETF are attached as Appendix A for reference.

2.0 Citizens' Assembly

BACKGROUND

A Citizens' assembly is a group of people brought together to deliberate an important issue or topic and are considered to be one of the most robust and elaborate models of representative deliberative processes. The model was first introduced in Canada in the early 2000s – 2004 in British Columbia and 2006 in Ontario – to address electoral reform. The BC Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform included the first contemporary use of the term "Citizens' Assembly" and demonstrated that the model could work. It was first proposed as a decision making tool in the local government context by the <u>Vancouver Mayor's Engaged City Task Force (2014)</u>.

Details on the 2004 BC Citizen's Assembly on Electoral Reform, as well as a number of City of Vancouver representative deliberative and participatory processes are found in Appendix C.

It should be noted that although the Province conducted a Citizens' Assembly in 2004 to determine a proportional voting model, in its most recent referendum on proportional voting in 2018, the Province took a different approach and instead conducted public engagement online and placed the voting model options directly on the ballot for voters to choose (see Appendix B for the 2018 Electoral Reform referendum ballot).

In November 2017, leading up to the 2018 Electoral Reform referendum, the BC Attorney General undertook a large public engagement campaign, entitled, How We Vote. It included the opportunity for all voters in BC to learn about the characteristics of voting systems in BC and elsewhere in the world, and to respond to an online questionnaire focused on identifying the values and preferences British Columbians want to see reflected in their voting system. The questionnaire also sought input on the ballot design (what types of questions should be on the ballot) and the types of voting systems to be on the ballot. This same questionnaire was administered in a separate online panel that closely reflected the varying genders, ethnicities and geographic communities in BC. The Province sought written feedback from individuals and organizations and consulted with Indigenous individuals and leadership groups from across BC.

The three models that were selected to be on the ballot were determined based on public engagement input and applying the key principles identified in the public consultation process.

DISCUSSION

On February 10, 2021, Council directed staff to report back on methodology and cost to establish a Citizens' Assembly to review and recommend a preferred electoral system for Vancouver and further that the timing of this work consider an opportunity for voters in the 2022 General Election to provide input.

It should be noted that the IETF included in their 2016 recommendations to adopt a proportional representation (PR) system by establishing a Citizens' Assembly to produce a recommendation for a model of PR voting optimally suited for use in municipal elections.

Establishing a Citizens' Assembly in the City of Vancouver comes with benefits and challenges as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Benefits and Challenges of a Citizen	
Benefits	Challenges
The process can be high profile and provide a good way of drawing attention to proportional voting.	The topic of proportional voting is complex and there are many different voting models that must be clearly and carefully communicated in an impartial manner.
The learning and deliberation phases help participants to evaluate, change and develop their opinions.	Engagement fatigue and community capacity to participate, especially among equity- denied groups.
Offers decision-makers an insight on public opinion based on the public having access to thorough and unbiased information and time for deliberation with peers.	The City of Vancouver does not have the current legislative authority to alter the voting model in Vancouver (this authority resides with the Province of BC). Therefore, the expectations of participants who will be volunteering their time to participate on such an assembly will need to be managed given that the outcomes of the citizens' assembly may be outside of the City's purview.
Displays diverse perspectives on a complex problem.	Requires significant staff time and financial resources to set up and manage based on research and past citizen assembly experiences at the City (Grandview Woodland Citizens' Assembly is an example).
	The staff that would support this initiative do not have the capacity as they are fully engaged in the planning and delivery of the 2022 municipal election.

Given the challenges noted above, staff have prepared the following three options for Council's consideration:

OPTION 1. Establishing a Citizens' Assembly in 2024 after the completion of the IETF

The IETF would convene in 2023 and provide guidance in the creation of a Citizens' Assembly in 2024.

Based on previous models and lessons learned, staff have prepared Table 4 below to outline an estimated process and timeline to implement a Citizen' Assembly in 2024. Convening a Citizens' Assembly in 2024 will allow sufficient time for the planning and scoping phases, engagement with communities and to align a plebiscite with the 2026 General Election.

Deliverable	Estimated Duration
RFP for consultant	May to Jul 2024
Assembly design, development and engagement strategy	Aug 2024 to Feb 2025
Council report for approval of terms of reference	Mar 2025
Recruitment of panel members	Mar to May 2025
Assembly process (launch, learning, listening and deliberation	Jun 2025 to Mar 2026
phases)	
Conclusion of Assembly and development of final report	Mar to May 2026
Assembly final report and recommendations presented to Council	Jun 2026
Public and stakeholder engagement and public awareness	Jul to Oct 2026
campaign	
Plebiscite on assembly recommendations (next general election)	Oct 2026
Post-election - report to Council	Nov to Dec 2026

Table 4. Estimated Process and Timeline for a Citizens' Assembly

Staff anticipate that preliminary costs for a Citizens' Assembly will be approximately \$1.25 million, which is based on a timeline of two years, and includes a 56-person panel over eight sessions with the source of funding to be identified. Estimated costs are provided in Table 5 and are dependent on the specifics of the Citizens' Assembly.

Table 5. Estimated Cost for a Citizens' Assembly

Estimated Budget Item	Estimated Cost
Staffing (Project Manager, secretariat, Communications Specialist, IT Support): to support the citizens assembly	\$310,000
Academic advisors: provide expert advice on issues being discussed, including data, research and reference sources, and produce learning materials	\$10,000
<i>Consultant:</i> process design and facilitation, civic lottery process, strategic advice, background research and curriculum	\$475,000
Communications: education and awareness campaign	\$70,000
Printing/postage: printed materials and mailing invitation letters	\$45,000
Translation: print and or/simultaneous interpretation	\$20,000
Accessibility: ASL interpreters, personal support workers, mobility assistance, child or eldercare	\$25,000
Venue Cost: rental fees, furnishings, AV rental fees	\$35,000
Catering: Morning and afternoon snacks, lunch, special meals as required	\$30,000
Mobility: reimbursement of travel costs for assembly members	\$5,000
ESTIMATED TOTAL	\$1.25M

OPTION 2. Conduct a public consultation and then add a question to the 2026 Vancouver General Election ballot

A second option, similar to the process undertaken by the Province in the most recent provincial referendum in 2018 on proportional voting, would be to ask citizens to vote on both whether they support a proportional voting system and the type of proportional model to be introduced on a future ballot. This option would require the types of models added to the ballot be determined through a public consultation process that could be done online and in-person with the general public and a more targeted panel to ensure representativeness, similar to what the Province conducted¹. Additional staff and financial resources are required to plan and facilitate in-person events, provide communications support and conduct a public education campaign, in addition to engagement.

Similar to a Citizens' Assembly, this process would need to occur after the 2022 election as there is currently not enough time to undertake this consultation prior to the 2022 election. Should Council wish to explore this option further, staff can be directed to provide a more detailed proposal, including budget considerations and resources required.

OPTION 3. Seek Support for Proportional Voting from the Lower Mainland Local Government Association (LMLGA) and Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM)

Any changes to the electoral system will involve complex policy considerations, require legislative amendments and would likely need to be consistent and applicable to local election rules in all B.C. local governments. In order for any changes to be considered by the Province, support is likely required from the LMLGA and UBCM. Staff recommend that Council submit a resolution to the next LMLGA and subsequently to UBCM, to request that the local elections legislative framework be amended to implement a proportional voting model for local governments.

An important consideration

It is important to note that the City of Vancouver and most other municipalities in BC are unusual as they use an at-large voting system, compared to a ward system, which is used in most other jurisdictions in Canada (municipal, provincial and federal). In an at-large system, Vancouver citizens vote for all ten (10) Councillors, seven (7) Park Board Commissioners, and nine (9) School Board Trustees city-wide and, as a result, Vancouver's ballot is much bigger than other ballots in BC and in Canada.

A ward system, used by other jurisdictions, divides regions up into smaller areas and voters select one representative from their ward to represent their ward at the respective democratic forums (parliament, legislature or council).

Using a ranked ballot system in Vancouver under the current at-large voting model could require two to three ballots to accommodate enough columns to rank candidates in the four races on

¹ More details on the Province's process can be found in their report, <u>How We Vote: 2018 Electoral Reform Referendum Report and</u> <u>Recommendations of the Attorney General</u>.

the Vancouver ballot. In addition to the cost of printing more ballots, this would likely create additional challenges for voters having to navigate several ballots with multiple columns. An example of a ranked ballot from Burlington, Ontario is attached in Appendix E. Previously, municipalities in Ontario were allowed to implement a proportional voting model in their local general elections; however, this option for municipalities has recently been removed by the Ontario provincial government.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff do not recommend proceeding with the option of establishing a Citizens' Assembly given the cost and current lack of legal authority to implement any potential recommendations by the Citizens' Assembly. Staff suggest that Council consider alternative options to this approach and consider the implications of proceeding with a proportional voting model in an at-large voting system.

CONCLUSION

At the Standing Committee on Policy and Strategic Priorities meeting on February 10 and 18, 2021, Council directed staff to report back with options and framework to reconvene an Independent Election Task Force and to report back on methodology and cost to establish a Citizens Assembly.

Given the next municipal election is less than a year away, staff do not recommend proceeding with either the IETF or Citizens' Assembly until after the 2022 municipal election as both initiatives will require significant resources to deliver and implement. Staff have provided alternative options for Council's consideration.

Should you have any questions, please contact Rosemary Hagiwara at rosemary.hagiwara@vancouver.ca.

Sincerely,

Katrina Leckovic City Clerk 604.873.7998 | katrina.leckovic@vancouver.ca

APPENDIX A

2016 Terms of Reference – City of Vancouver Election Task Force

The purpose of the Task Force is to recommend changes to Council concerning the delivery of municipal elections in the city of Vancouver that will lead to improved public confidence in the electoral processes at the municipal level and increase voter engagement – with a key goal being to increase voter turnout to at least 60 per cent by 2025.

The Task Force is directed to produce a final report for consideration by Council not later than December 2016. The scope of the Task Force's work will include:

- a) Reviewing the existing legislation that governs municipal elections in the Province of BC with particular emphasis on legislation governing the Vancouver municipal election;
- b) Surveying a representative sample of past candidates and election organizations to obtain their input regarding possible changes to the existing legislative framework for the conduct of municipal elections in Vancouver – including those changes previously approved by Council;
- Conducting a literature review and research concerning election best practices that have been implemented either nationally or internationally and have resulted in an increase in public confidence and voter engagement;
- Reviewing the previously approved Council directives to staff and determining/ confirming which of the directives should be pursued on a priority basis as they contribute to the key goal of improving public confidence and increasing voter engagement;
- e) Identifying other changes to the delivery of the municipal election in Vancouver that will contribute to improved public confidence in the electoral processes and increased voter engagement based on their review of best practices;
- f) Determining which of the Council-directed and other proposed changes can be implemented within the existing legislative structure of local government in BC, and which require legislative change in order to implement;
- g) Identifying the budget implications of implementing each proposed recommendation and prioritize the recommendations; and
- h) Proposing a plan for Council's consideration regarding the implementation of the recommendations that are within Council's ability to control and how to influence change at the provincial level.

With respect to the composition of the Task Force, staff propose the following:

- 1. The Task Force consist of 9-11 members who reflect the diversity of the city;
- 2. The criteria for membership includes:

- Strong knowledge of the principles of democracy, effective operation of democratic institutions, and best practices regarding electoral systems and reform,
- b. Experience in developing strategies and work plans and achieving success within a political environment,
- c. Knowledge of the organization and operation of key provincial ministries,
- d. No affiliation with a political party in the city of Vancouver for the past four elections and has not been a city of Vancouver municipal candidate in any of the past four elections;
- 3. The City publicly advertise for nominations using the City's advisory committee
- a) recruitment process (e.g. online and local media) and reach out to
 - (a) academic institutions,
 - (b) non-profit organizations, and
 - (c) professionals that have an interest in democratic institutions and increasing public confidence in electoral processes;
- 4. The Nomination Sub-committee review and recommend to Council the membership of the Vancouver Electoral Task Force based on the established criteria; and
- 5. Council appoint the members of the Electoral Task Force.

Staff support to the Task Force would be provided by the City Clerk, Director of Legal Services, Senior Public Engagement Advisor, and Director, Intergovernmental and Strategic Relations (or a designate for each position). A professional facilitator/writer would also provide support to the task force.

			Sa
Ballot			
Instructions: To vote, fill in the oval O to the right of yo Use black pen or marker. Do not use pen		ces, lik	e this:
Question 1	1	~ 2	
Which system should British Columbia use for provincia elections? (Vote for only one.)	al		
The current First Past the Post voting system	0		
A proportional representation voting system	0	×	
Output in a			
Question 2	votina	system	
Question 2 If British Columbia adopts a proportional representation which of the following voting systems do you prefer? (Rank in order of preference. You may choose to support three of the systems.)	362		233
If British Columbia adopts a proportional representation which of the following voting systems do you prefer? (Rank in order of preference. You may choose to support	nt one,		all 3
If British Columbia adopts a proportional representation which of the following voting systems do you prefer? (Rank in order of preference. You may choose to support	nt one,	two or a	all 3
If British Columbia adopts a proportional representation which of the following voting systems do you prefer? (Rank in order of preference. You may choose to support three of the systems.)	nt one, 1 Ist Choice	two or a 2 2nd Choice	all 3 3rd Choice
If British Columbia adopts a proportional representation which of the following voting systems do you prefer? (Rank in order of preference. You may choose to support three of the systems.) Dual Member Proportional (DMP)	nt one, 1 1st Choice	2 2nd Choice	all 3 3rd Choise

APPENDIX C

Examples: Citizens' Assemblies and Other Representative Deliberative Processes

BC Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform (2003-2005)

- The BC Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform developed a recommendation to replace first past the post system with single transferable vote system which was put to referendum on ballot of BC's 2005 provincial election.
- 160 members were selected to participate (of 15,800 invitations mailed to 200 randomly drawn names from each electoral district). Selection ensured one man and woman from each of BC's 79 electoral districts with representative numbers from all age groups. Two Indigenous members were later added from the remaining randomly drawn names.
- The learning phase included six weekend sessions, the public consultation phase included 50 public hearings, and the deliberation phase included sessions held over two months and concluded with a recommendation for a single transferable vote electoral system (BC-STV) to be put to public referendum.
- BC-STV narrowly failed to become binding by meeting one of two thresholds: it successfully acquired majority support (50% plus one) from 60% of electoral districts (with 77 of 79 providing majority support); but it failed to acquire 60% "super-majority" support among all voters (with 57.7% voting in favour).
- This citizens' assembly process started in August 2003 and ended in December 2004, taking approximately 17 months (not including scoping and planning phases, and the public referendum). The estimated budget was \$4,474,166.

The following three examples were led by the City of Vancouver:

Citizens' Assembly on the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan (2013-2015)

- The Grandview-Woodland Citizens' Assembly (GWCA) was created as a means to resolve key land-use and policy issues emerging in the Community Plan process, which had begun in spring 2012.
- To prepare for the City of Vancouver's first Citizens' Assembly, staff undertook an extensive review of deliberative democracy models, engaged experts, and consulted with the community between fall 2013 and spring 2014. Details of this research – and related design choices for the proposed Assembly – were published as a discussion paper in January 2014.²
- Later, in 2014, 48 members were selected to participate (of 19,000 invitations mailed to residents, business owners, and property owners in the neighbourhood as defined by the City of Vancouver's Grandview-Woodland community boundary). Selection ensured equal numbers of men and women, as well as representative numbers from defined neighbourhood zones, age groups, Indigenous residents, and those who rented their home, owned their home, or resided in a co-op.
- GWCA members met over three phases: learning, public consultation, and deliberation (recommendations development). They convened over 11 Saturdays, attended walking tours of each of the neighbourhood's seven sub-areas, a tour of the port, and tours of

² City of Vancouver. A Citizens' Assembly for Grandview-Woodland: Discussion Paper. January 2014. <u>https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/Grandview-Woodlands-Citizens-Assembly-Discussion-Paper-2014-01-23.pdf</u>

representative developments in other neighbourhoods. They convened three public roundtable meetings and also participated in City-led sub-area workshops open to the public.

- The GWCA developed recommendations for the Grandview-Woodland Community Plan in a final report presented to Vancouver City Council for information in June 2015.³ The Report included 268 recommendations as well as 80 additional recommendations (endorsements of policy directions from earlier stages in the process or from workshops with the community).These were then referred to staff for analysis and incorporation into the draft Community Plan.
- Almost all of the GWCA's recommendations were approved by Council and included in the draft Grandview-Woodland Community Plan, which was released publicly in June 2016. A detailed tracking of the recommendations was contained in a "Trace Document"⁴ – released in 2016.
- This citizens' assembly process started in June 2014 and ended in May 2015, taking approximately 12 months (not including scoping and planning phases). The estimated budget was \$275,000 (consultant fees were \$169,345), plus 2.0 FTE of staff time.

False Creek Flats Community Panel (2018-2019)

- The False Creek Flats Community Panel recommended a preferred east-west arterial alignment through the False Creek Flats from an initial list of nine options prepared by City of Vancouver staff.
- 37 members (21 residents, 16 local business representatives, and 6 residents from elsewhere in Vancouver) were selected. Over 11,000 invitations were sent to residents and businesses in the False Creek Flats area, some of which were sent to residents across Vancouver.
- The members met over three phases: learning, public consultation, and deliberation (route selection). The Community Panel convened 8 times, including a guided tour of the neighbourhood, and participated in an additional two public workshops.
- After deliberating on route options, the Community Panel used ranked choice voting to select "National-Charles Overpass" (67.6% of the vote) as their top choice.
- After detailed technical assessments, City Staff did not recommend National-Charles and City Council later voted to select the Panel's second preferred route, "Prior-Venables Underpass".
- This community panel process launched in November 2018 and ended in April 2019, taking approximately 6 months (plus an additional 6 months for scoping and planning phases). Implementation was led by a third-party consultant at an awarded amount of \$195,585, plus 1.0 FTE of staff time.

West End Participatory Budgeting Pilot (2018-2020)

³ Grandview Woodland Citizens Assembly. Final Report of the Grandview-Woodland Citizens' Assembly. June 2015. <u>https://council.vancouver.ca/20150624/documents/ptec5_AppB.PDF</u>

⁴ City of Vancouver/Grandview-Woodland Community Plan. *Trace Document: How the Plan Responds to Citizens' Assembly Recommendations*. June 2016. <u>https://vancouver.ca/files/cov/grandview-woodland-community-plan-trace-</u> <u>document.pdf</u>

- The West End Participatory Budgeting Pilot created a process for the selection of community improvement projects to be funded by revenue from West End permit parking fees.
- The process began with the WE Choo\$e Impact Team being appointed by City Staff. The Impact Team then led community idea collection and project proposal development, shortlisted 14 projects (of 1,700 submissions) based on predetermined criteria, and oversaw the community vote at over 15 pop-up stations. More than 8,500 individuals aged 12 and up who live, work, or volunteer in the West End voted.
- The community vote recommended three projects for funding. Two of the projects are complete and the remaining project is currently in the design phase.
- This participatory budgeting process started in August 2018 and ended in March 2020, taking approximately 20 months (not including scoping and planning phases). The estimated budget was \$175,000, including disbursements for community projects and consulting fees, plus 1.0 FTE staff time.

APPENDIX D – Burlington, Ontario's Ranked Ballot

ed Choice ompletely hoice. e candidat late under	ôté de vot Voting fil in the ov le, complete	100000		Utilise	nly the marking z uniquement le Office of / Pos	e stylo fourni.
ompletely hoice. e candidat late under	fill in the ov le, complete	100000		8	Office of / Pos	te de
	we one, wo	e.		8	REGIONAL (Vote for no more Ne voter que p Bryan B/	ithan 1 our 1
l per cand				1	Vexandre Bill	
e vote préf		a 120		8	Christine S	INCLAIR C
					Office of / Pos	te de
candidat d	le choix, re	mple			HDSB TRUS WARDS 1	
an.				1	Vote for no more Ne voter que p	
ovale par	r candidat	8			Matt DL	ICHENE 🤇
Poste de					200 C	HEWITT C
					1000	n KEITH C
		areas.		-	1997	MOYSE C
		A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR O			Kirste	m WALL
1er choix						
	· · · · ·	-				
-						
OUNCIL ice. 1 to be de préférer	elected. nce. 1 pour	etre élu.				
- 1						
0	0	11				
0						
0	01	01				
00	0'0'					
	andidat au candidat a candidat d à côte de s choix, si an. ovale pa Poste de 'OR se. 1 to be de préfere 'I' Chois 'I' Chois 'O' ' O' ' Poste de O' ' Poste de O' ' Poste de O' '	andidat au übe 1er ol candidat de choa, re à côté de ce candidat e choix, si vous en av on. voule par candidat Poste de (OR isc. 1 to be elected. de préference. 1 pour 14 Choix 3 debte 0 0 0 0 7 0 1 0 7 0 1 0 7 0 1 0 7 0 2 0 7 0 0 0	ovale par candidat. Poste de (OR ice. 1 to be elected. de preterence. 1 pour être étu. 197 Chaira 3 and Choixe Stécher 198 Choixe Stécher 0 1 0 2 0 3 0 3 0 2 0 3 0 3	andidat au tibe fer choix. candidat de choix, remplir à côte de ce candidat en vertu e choix, si vous en avez un, on. lovale par candidat. Poste de (OR ce. 1 to be elected. de preference. 1 pour être élu. 11 Cheira 3td Choixe 3té Choixe 12 Cheira 3td Choixe 3té Choixe 12 Cheira 3td Choixe 3té Choixe 12 Cheira 3td Choixe 3té Choixe 13 Cheira 3td Choixe 3té Choixe 14 Cheira 3td Choixe 3té Choixe 15 Cheira 3td Choixe 3té Choixe 16 Cheira 3td Choixe 3té Choixe 16 Cheira 3té Choixe 3té Choixe 16 Choixe 3té Choixe 3té Choixe 3té 16 Choixe 3té Choixe 3té Choixe 3té Choixe 3té 16 Choixe 3té Choixe	andidat au übe 1er choix. candidat de choix, remplé à côté de ce candidat en vertu s choix, si vous en avez un, or. ovale par candidat. Poste de (OR ise. 1 to be elected. de prétenence. 1 pour être élu. 11 (Chais 3nd Choixe 3et Choixe 12 (Chais 3nd Choixe 3et Choixe 13 (Chais 3nd Choixe 3et Choixe 14 (Chais 3nd Choixe 3et Choixe 15 (Chais 3nd Choixe 3et Choixe 15 (Chais 3nd Choixe 3et Choixe 16 (Chais 3nd Choixe 3et Choixe 17 (Chais 3nd Choixe 3et Choixe 18 (Chais 3nd Choixe 3et Choixe 19 (Chais 3nd Choixe 3et Choixe 10 (Chais 3et Choi	hoix et emplir completement andidat au libe fer choix. candidat de choix, reimplir à côte de ce candidat en vertu Office of / Pos HDSB TRUS WARDS 1 Vole for no mor Ne voler que p Ne voler que p Sector S