



**Corporate Services and Finance Committee –
October 15, 2008**

**REPORT OF THE
COMPOSITION OF COUNCIL COMMITTEE**

Recommendation:

The Composition of Council Committee recommends that this report on the research conducted and analysis carried out on different models of government be received.

Background/Purpose:

Council at its meeting of March 25, 2008 established the Composition of Council Committee. The following is the Membership and Terms of Reference:

Membership

Councillor Best
Councillor Campbell, Chair
Councillor Parks
Tim Barrett
David Calnan, Vice Chair
Don Houghton
C.A.O. and Clerk as resources

Functions

To research and identify optimum sizes, models and structures, using experiences of other communities and MMAH resources;

To analyze and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each model selected as it relates to representation, efficiency of decision making, cost savings, and work load.

To identify various methods and approaches to obtain public input in the process;

To report to Council, through the Corporate Services and Finance Committee with the results of its research and analysis but without recommendations on the understanding that, at that time, Council shall decide if it wishes to commence a full process to consider reducing the size of Council and what model it would prefer.

Analysis/Comment:

The Composition of Council Committee commenced meeting in June, 2008. It approached its task by developing a Work Plan, attached as Appendix A.

In development of the Work Plan the Committee gave consideration to various decisions and processes used by other municipalities which had undergone similar reviews.

The Committee met six times to complete the above tasks. All meetings were open to the public and agendas were circulated to all members of Council. In addition to the appointed members of Council a number of other interested Councillors attended and provided valuable perspective and input.

The Committee developed key dates and timelines for Council's consideration should it choose to proceed with a change to ward boundaries/size of Council. These are included later in this report.

It should be noted that populations figures used are approximate and based on MPAC data from the 2006 enumeration.

Research

Prior to determining options for Council size or ward configuration the Committee reviewed amalgamation experiences from published articles on the City of London, the City of Niagara Falls and the City of Ottawa. Although none of these three experiences were similar to the County of Prince Edward, some facts of interest emerged:

- The City of London restructuring resulted from an appeal to the OMB from a citizen's group that felt it was not getting equitable representation from the existing ward system, and not by a City initiative. The OMB restructured the City, dividing a long standing structure of 7 wards into 14 wards, although not affecting the size of Council, but without public input.
- The City of Ottawa experienced an OMB appeal when it tried to restructure without fully engaging residents and without fully taking into consideration other aspects of representation beyond 'representation by population'. This ruling resulting in this Committee defining 'representation' along the same lines as recommended by the OMB in its Ottawa ruling.
- The City of Niagara Falls went from a ward system to an 'at large' system of voting, and acknowledged that it impacted on the cost to candidates to campaign for election.

The Committee also sought comparison statistics from 16 other municipalities and the chart, attached as Appendix 1, provides the results of this review. Following this examination, a more in-depth review was requested of Brant, Norfolk and Kawartha Lakes Counties, chart attached as Appendix 2.

The key findings of these reviews showed, among other things, the following:

Representation by Population:

Municipality	Population	Council Size	1 Councillor per
Prince Edward County	22,259	15 + Mayor	1,484 people
Brant County	31,392	10 + Mayor	3,139 people
Norfolk County	62,000	8 + Mayor	7,750 people
Kawartha Lakes	74,565	16 + Mayor	4,660 people

Ward Boundaries:

The other municipalities surveyed had strove for and established ward boundaries of equal (or close) population figures. They also stated that they had made a conscious effort to avoid, where possible, historical boundaries to help with identification with the newly amalgamated municipality. One municipality was considering switching to 'at large' voting. Another had reduced from 10 to 5 wards in the past few years.

The County of Prince Edward representation by ward is as follows:

Ward	Ward Population	Number of Councillors	1 Councillor per
1 Picton	3,705	2	1,852 people
2 Bloomfield	575	1	575 people
3 Wellington	1,657	1	1,657 people
4 Ameliasburgh	5,493	3	1,831 people
5 Athol	1,215	1	1,215 people
6 Hallowell	3,700	2	1,850 people
7 Hillier	1,744	1	1,744 people
8 North Marysburgh	1,242	1	1,242 people
9 South Marysburgh	868	1	868 people
10 Sophiasburgh	2,060	2	1,030 people

Staff Support:

Prince Edward County had the same or greater staff support to its Mayor and members of Council as the comparable municipalities.

Cost of Council per Resident:

Municipality	Cost per Resident
Prince Edward County	\$20.05
Brant County	\$11.47
Norfolk County	\$6.77
Kawartha Lakes	\$8.15

Remuneration of Members of Council:

Municipality	Mayor	Councillor
Prince Edward County	\$32,433 plus \$1385 for Chair	\$16,217 plus \$1,385 for Chair
Brant County	\$51,282	\$17,391
Norfolk County	\$50,000	\$25,000
Kawartha Lakes	\$66,504 + \$600	\$ 23,240 + \$600

Workload:

The other municipalities surveyed described a similar workload to Prince Edward County. They managed it with different methods. One municipality had only one Councillor per Advisory (etc.) Committee and in some cases, no Councillors participated on Advisory Committees. One municipality claimed that the use of Committee of the Whole reduced time at Council meetings as matters were not debated twice.

Strengths and Weaknesses Analysis of the basic Governance Models

The Committee conducted a Strengths and Weaknesses Analysis for the three basic models being:

- a) existing ward structure and Council size
- b) Council elected at large
- c) reduced Council size/reduced number of Wards

	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
Existing Ward Structure and Council Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ample representation • Residents know representative • Good attention to individual issues • Familiar/historical identification • Lots of Councillors available to sit on sub-committees 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision making cumbersome • Numbers create extended debate • Too much 'wardism' not enough broad issue • Expensive compared to a smaller council? • Residents contact multiple councillors and mayor – results in duplication of effort • Heavy demand on staff resources re inquiries/support • Unequal representation among wards • Unequal geographic area among wards
Council elected at large	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elimination of 'wardism' • Opportunity for broader representation [every person votes for all councillors] • Could increase voter turnout 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate spending will increase • Campaigning more difficult/challenging • Need for more affluent candidates and excludes many (too much effort) • Risk of unequal representation • More complex ballot for voters • Loss of attention or focus on local issues
Reduced Council Size/No. of Wards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More consideration of County issues as a whole (larger wards/areas) • Broader identification with County as a whole • Potential for rural/urban combination within wards • Council/Committee meetings more efficient • More effective use of time • Realignment of ward boundaries could give equal representation to all residents • Potential reduction of costs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of identification with original townships • Less Councillors available for sub-committees

Reduced Council Size/No. of Wards

In considering the optimum size for Council, the Committee took into consideration the information obtained from the previously mentioned comparable municipalities' survey and agreed to look at ward configurations that would accommodate the following:

- 8 Member Council
- 10 Member Council
- 12 Member Council

These optional sizes of Council compare to Representation by Population as follows:

Municipality	Population	Council Size	1 Councillor per
Prince Edward County	22,259	15 + Mayor	1,484 people
		12 + Mayor	1,855 people
		10 + Mayor	2,259 people
		8 + Mayor	2,782 people
Brant County	31,392	10 + Mayor	3,139 people
Norfolk County	62,000	8 + Mayor	7,750 people
Kawartha Lakes	74,565	16 + Mayor	4,660 people

Criteria for Evaluation

The Committee reviewed the criteria for evaluation as established by Council in the Terms of Reference and expanded upon and defined 'representation', based on the OMB decisions referenced earlier. The Committee identified 'representation' as 'representation by population' as well as 'effective representation' and provided further detail to the latter.

The Committee then assigned weighting, which would be applied to scores, to the criteria as follows:

Criteria	Weight
Representation (see detail below)	50
<u>Representation by Population:</u> Equitable distribution of population to provide for representation by population as nearly as possible	(30)
<u>Effective representation:</u> -Preservation of community integrity and function and recognition of settlement patterns and community groupings – identifiable communities -Means of communication and accessibility -Distinct geographical boundaries that recognize special considerations including the scarcity, density or relative growth or loss of population	(20)
Efficiency of decision making	25
Cost savings	5
Work Load	20
TOTAL	100

Models for evaluation

If a reduced Council size is to be considered and if the goal of equitable distribution of population is achieved, it will be necessary to change the existing ward boundaries. The Committee looked at the following ward boundary configurations and attempted to obtain approximate populations figures for each.

A 2 Ward system with a north/south boundary which would lend itself to the following Council sizes:

- 8 with 4 Councillors per ward
- 10 with 5 Councillors per ward
- 12 with 6 Councillors per ward

A 4 Ward system which would lend itself to the following Council sizes:

- 8 with 2 Councillors per ward
- 12 with 4 Councillors per ward

A 4 Ward system (with different boundaries) which would lend itself to the following Council sizes:

- 8 with 2 Councillors per ward
- 12 with 4 Councillors per ward

A 5 Ward system which would lend itself to the following Council size:

- 10 with 2 Councillors per ward

A 6 Ward system which would lend itself to the following Council size:

- 12 with 2 Councillors per ward

A 8 Ward system which would lend itself to the following Council size:

- 8 with 1 Councillors per ward

Mapping to demonstrate each ward system is provided, although it should be stressed that the lines drawn are conceptual only and would require adjustment to gain more equal population figures in all cases. Each map demonstrates approximate percentage of population per ward.

Method and Tools for Evaluation

By establishing clear and expanded criteria, developing suggested weighting for the criteria and determining a variety of governance models, including the existing model, the Committee had established a method and tools to assist to evaluate and potentially choose a governance model.

The Committee then tested the process by conducting its own scoring based on a score of 1 to 10 for each criteria. It is pointed out that this scoring expressed the viewpoints and was a consensus of the Committee members present, based on its research and information received and discussed. A similar exercise with different participants may result in different scores.

The results of the Committee's evaluation is attached as Appendix D.

Public Consultation

Should Council wish to move forward to public consultation on this matter, two options are suggested. With either option, the complete supporting background information should be prepared in a clear, concise manner, mapping and other data should be provided and public input forms should be prepared. The input could be publicized and gathered via:

- posters
- paid ads
- brochures
- website information and survey
- public meetings in selected areas.

Following the public consultation period(s) Council would choose its preferred option, hold the statutory public meeting and pass the by-law.

Option 1

Carry out two public consultation periods of approximately 2 – 3 weeks (See time-line). Bring forward all or some options with a goal of reducing the number of options to two or three based on the public response.

Hold a second round of public consultation sessions based on the two or three options selected.

Option 2

Council determine two or three preferred options and carry out one public consultation period on the preferred options and following public input, choose the option it wishes to proceed with.

Key Dates and Timelines

June 2008	Composition of Council Committee (CCC) commences review of alternatives
October 15, 2008	CCC reports to Corporate Services and Finance Committee
November 2008	Council decision to commence process
January 2009	Public consultation session(s)
January 30, 2009	Deadline for public comments
February 2009	Report summarizing public comments and recommending one or more options

March 2009	Optional second round of public consultation on options
March 2009	Public meeting to consider recommended options
April 2009	Council decision
*April 27, 2009	Council passes By-law to enact new ward boundaries and 45 day appeal period commences on April 28 and ends on June 15, 2009.
No later than May 12, 2009	Municipality gives notice of the passing of the by-law to the public specifying the last date for filing a notice of appeal
June 15, 2009	Last day for notice(s) of appeal to be received.
No later than June 30, 2009	Notice(s) of appeal to be forwarded to the Ontario Municipal Board.
*November 16, 2009 December 31, 2009	Last day By-law could be passed to apply to 2010 election assuming no appeals. By-law must be in force and 45 day appeal period must have lapsed with no appeals to apply to 2010 election Or OMB issues an order to affirm or amend the by-law

Next Steps

Should the Corporate Services and Finance Committee see merit in proceeding further with a review of alternate governance models it is suggested that the matter be referred to a Committee of the Whole meeting to establish which models Council wishes to consider, obtain more concise ward boundary locations and population figures and determine which public consultation option it wishes to pursue. A reduced number of options would be preferable in any ongoing review.

If this is the direction chosen the following motion would be appropriate:

THAT the report of the Composition of Council Committee on the research conducted and analysis carried out on different models of government be received;

THAT a review of alternate governance models be commenced; and

THAT a Committee of the Whole meeting be scheduled in early November to determine which models and public consultation options it wishes to pursue and to direct staff to commence the process.

Financial Implications:

Should Council wish to pursue a governance review, the public consultation process should have a dedicated budget in the 2009 Operating Budget.

Should there be an appeal to a by-law passed to change ward boundaries, there would be legal fees incurred.

Policy Implications: None

Summary:

The Composition of Council Committee respectfully submits its research and analysis of different Council sizes, different ward configurations and different models of government, along with suggested time-lines and public consultation processes, should Council wish to proceed with revising the size of Council.

Attachments:

1. Appendix A – Work Plan
2. Appendix B - Survey of municipalities
3. Appendix C - Additional detail of three municipalities
4. Appendix D - Evaluation of various models
5. Maps of various approximate ward configurations

Councillor Campbell
Chair
Date:

David Calnan
Vice Chair
Date:

Appendix A

Committee Work Plan

	Tasks	Timeline
1	<p>Review statistics from the following municipalities for comparison purposes: Prince Edward County, Brant County, Quinte West, Norfolk County, town of Caledon, Kawaratha Lakes, City of London, City of Ottawa, County of Hastings, and County of Lennox and Addington on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resident and Non Resident Population • Number of Wards • Number of Councillors/per ward • Council Budget • Total Operating and Capital Budgets • Description of geographic area and rural/urban split • Committee/Council structure including number of sub-committees • Comment on productivity, representation and customer service of current model. 	August
2.	<p>Establish governance models to be evaluated and further define and expand to select optional sizes of Councillors and numbers of wards to evaluate, using (1) as guideline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing 10 ward 16 member Council • Abolition of wards and at large vote for all members • Combination of wards taking into account above criteria for various sizes (8 wards, 3 wards, 2 wards, etc.) 	August
3	<p>Research available information on population distribution, identifiable communities and geographic boundaries having regard to growth trends. Identify as a group "identifiable communities".</p>	August
4	<p>Establish criteria and weighting for evaluation of models (combine previous 4 & 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Equitable distribution of population to provide for representation by population as nearly as possible ➤ Preservation of community integrity and function and recognition of settlement patters and community groupings – identifiable communities ➤ Means of communication and accessibility ➤ Distinct geographical boundaries that provide for a compact and contiguous area and recognize special considerations including the scarcity, density or relative growth or loss of population • Efficiency of decision making • Cost savings • Work Load 	August/ Sept.
5	Evaluate models using criteria	Sept/Oct.
6.	Develop methods and approaches to obtain public input	Oct.
7	Report to Corporate Services	Oct.

Municipality	Population	% Non-resident	Size of Council	# of Wards	# of Councillors per ward	Council Budget	Operating Budget 2008	Capital Budget 2008	Description of geographic area and rural/urban split (see attached)	Committee/Council Structure	# of Committees (statutory, advisory, etc)	Productivity, representation and customer service of current model (see attached)
*single tier												
City of Ottawa*	870,800		Mayor + 23 Councillors	23	1	10,402,000	13,765,280,000	535,873,000	***	6 Standing Cttees C/W - budget, etc 1 quasi-judicial	15 plus 4	***
City of London*	352,395		19 members	14	1	1,724,355	420,469,815	92,689,000	***	Committee of Whole, Executive Cttee and 3 Standing Cttees	31	***
City of Kawartha Lakes*	74,565	25	Mayor + 16 Councillors	16	1	608,065	165,542,740	25,250,444	***	3 Standing Cttees	60	***
County of Norfolk*	62,000	10	Mayor + 8 Councillors	7	1 Ward 5 -2	420,000	56,396,137	38,111,200	***	Committee of Whole	28	***
County of Brant*	31,392	8	Mayor + 10 Councillors	5	2	360,100	32,348,789	24,046,599	***	5 Standing Committees	40	***
County of Prince Edward*	22,259	23	Mayor + 15 Councillors	10	1; additional by representation	446,474	40,940,280	6,270,255	***	5 Standing Committees	41	***
County of Hastings	113,858		14 members			238,500	127,778,762	1,827,800	***	Standing Committees	7 statutory 3 subcttee	***
City of Belleville	48,000+		Mayor + 8 Councillors	2	6 - Ward 1 (urban) 2 - Ward 2 (rural)	331,054	91,983,000 (includes capital levy)	19,385,000	***	Committee of the Whole	47	***
County of Lennox & Addington	40,542	8	8 members			179,000	48,900,000	5,800,000	***	Committees of Council	4, plus 3	***
Loyalist Twp	15,062	7.75	7 members	3	Ward 1 - 1 Ward 2 - 1 Ward 3 - 3 Reeve Deputy Reeve	163,982	19,711,300	5,742,900	***	Standing Committee	13	***
Municipality of Tweed	5153		5		n/a		4,476,007	4,903,925	***	Standing Committee	9	***
Municipality of Centre Hastings	4386		5		n/a	61,550	7,172,086	1,109,145	***	Standing Committee	6	***
Stirling Rawdon Twp	4337	15	5	2	2	51,800	4,033,852	1,490,850	***	Committee of the Whole	12	***
Municipality of Hastings Highlands	4000 12,000 seasonal	67	8	3	2	196,020	4,921,535	4,635,845	***	Council, plus ad-hoc committees	6	***
Faraday Twp	1578		5		n/a	45,000	1,808,060	1,396,693	***	Standing Committees	3	***
Tudor & Cashel Twp	600	65	5	2	n/a	30,000	650,000	50,000	***	Mixed	3	***

APPENDIX B

County of Prince Edward:

Municipality	Population	% Non-resident	Size of Council	# of Wards	# of Councillors per ward	Council Budget	Operating Budget 2008	Capital Budget 2008	Description of geographic area and rural/urban split (see attached)	Committee/Council Structure	# of Committees (statutory, advisory, etc)
*single tier											
County of Prince Edward*	22,259	23	Mayor + 15 Councillors	10	1; additional by representation	446,474	40,940,280	6,270,255	***	5 Standing Committees	41

Remuneration: Mayor \$32,433 Plus 1385 for Committee Chairs
 Councillors \$16,217 Plus 1385 for Committee Chairs

Representation: 1 Councillor per 1,670 people

Staff Support: Mayor has an EA who also does work for Clerk's Department
 Council – none dedicated – Mayor's EA and Clerk's staff provide support

Shared Services: Yes with no lead responsibility

Advisory/Ad Hoc Committees: Lots with multiple Councillors on some but not all

Meetings: Council meetings start at 7:30– usually run 3 - 4 hours – every two weeks
 Standing Committee System (5 meetings per monthly)
 Special Council and Committee meetings for controversial issues

APPENDIX C (1)

County of Brant:

Municipality	Population	% Non-resident	Size of Council	# of Wards	# of Councillors per ward	Council Budget	Operating Budget 2008	Capital Budget 2008	Description of geographic area and rural/urban split (see attached)	Committee/Council Structure	# of Committees (statutory, advisory, etc)
*single tier											
County of Brant*	31,392	8	Mayor + 10 Councillors	5	2	360,100	32,348,789	24,046,599	***	5 Standing Committees	40

Remuneration: Mayor \$51,282.24 Councillors \$17,391.34

Representation: 1 Councillor per 3,139 people

Support Staff: none dedicated – Clerk’s staff provide all support

Shared Services: Yes

Advisory/Ad Hoc Committees:

trying to downsize
 Many don’t have Councillors on them – Rec, Heritage

Meetings:

Council meets twice a month at 7:00 – not a lot of public participation – use special meetings for controversial issues
 Modified C of W system (Corp and Dev. Committee contains all members of Council) meets once a month (PL contains all members of Council) meets once a month
 Comment “it avoids dealing with things twice”
 Deputations can’t come to Council if they have been at Committee unless there is some new information
 2 smaller Standing Committees meets once a month deals with operational issues
 (Community/Emergency Services and PW contains 5 Councillors)

Ward/Council structure

Originally 14 wards 14 Councillors
 3 years ago restructured to 5 wards with 2 each
 Changed standing committee system at that time to modified C of W
 Tried to get rid of historical (pre-amalgamation) boundaries
 “Works well for now – may be desire to further downsize in future”

APPENDIX C (2)

County of Norfolk:

Municipality	Population	% Non-resident	Size of Council	# of Wards	# of Councillors per ward	Council Budget	Operating Budget 2008	Capital Budget 2008	Description of geographic area and rural/urban split (see attached)	Committee/Council Structure	# of Committees (statutory, advisory, etc)
*single tier											
County of Norfolk*	62,000	10	Mayor + 8 Councillors	7	1 Ward 5 -2	420,000	56,396,137	38,111,200	***	Committee of Whole	28

Remuneration: Mayor \$50,000
Councillors \$25,000

Representation: 1 Councillor per 7,750 people

Staff Support: Mayor has an EA who also does work for Clerk's Department
Council – none dedicated – Clerk's staff provide support

Shared Services: Yes with lead responsibility

Advisory/Ad Hoc Committees:
Lots with one Councillor only on all

Meetings: Council meetings start at 5 – usually run 2 hours – every two weeks
Committee of Whole System – every two weeks (alternating with Council)
Planning Public meetings held at beginning of Council – hear deputations only (no debate)– staff report (and sometimes by-law) is listed on regular Council agenda and dealt with there
If large public meeting – roll over to another night
Use e-agenda – more efficient
Committee of the Whole “100% easier – no duplication at Council”

Ward/Council structure
Currently looking at readjusting ward boundaries to reflect pop shifts

County of Kawartha Lakes:

Municipality	Population	% Non-resident	Size of Council	# of Wards	# of Councillors per ward	Council Budget	Operating Budget 2008	Capital Budget 2008	Description of geographic area and rural/urban split (see attached)	Committee/Council Structure	# of Committees (statutory, advisory, etc)
*single tier											
City of Kawartha Lakes*	74,565	25	Mayor + 16 Councillors	16	1	608,065	165,542,740	25,250,444	***	3 Standing Cttees	60

Remuneration: Mayor \$66,504 + 600 per month for travel
 Councillors \$23, 240 + 300 per month for travel within ward

Representation: 1 Councillor per 4,660 people

Sraff Support: Mayor has an EA who also does work for Clerk's Department
 Council – none dedicated – Clerk's staff provide support

Shared Services: Yes with lead responsibility

Advisory/Ad Hoc Committees:
 Lots with one Councillor only on most but a few with more than one (Conservation)

Meetings: Council meetings start at 1 – usually run 4 – 5 hours – lots of public participation
 Standing Committee System (3)
 Currently looking at restructuring Committee system – may consider Committee of Whole

Ward/Council structure
 Existing ward structure doesn't mirror historical (pre-amalgamation) wards – conscious effort to avoid this
 Talk of downsizing and at large vote but no action yet

APPENDIX C (4)

Model Evaluation

Criteria	Weight	A Existing 10 Wards 15C+M	B 2 Wards 8C = 4/w	2 Wards 10C = 5/w	2 Wards 12C = 6/6	C 4 Wards-A 8C = 2/w	4 Wards-A 12C = 3/w	D 4 Wards-B 8C = 2/w	4 Wards-B 12C = 3/w	E 5 Wards 10C = 2/w	F 6 Wards 12C = 2/w	G 8 Wards 8C = 1/w	H At Large 8C	At Large 10C	At Large 12C
1. Representation	[0.50]														
Rep by Population	0.30	0.9	2.4	2.4	2.4	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	2.4	1.5	0.3	2.1	2.1	2.1
Effective Rep'n	0.20	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.3	0.9	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
2. Decision making	0.25	0.8	2.1	1.8	1.3	2.1	1.9	2.1	1.3	1.8	1.3	2.1	2.1	1.8	1.3
3. Cost savings	0.05	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
4. Work load	0.20	1.0	0.6	0.8	1.0	0.6	1.0	0.6	1.0	0.8	1.0	0.6	0.6	0.8	1.0
TOTAL	1.00	4.3	6.4	6.3	5.9	5.7	5.2	5.8	5.3	6.6	4.9	3.9	5.7	5.8	5.2
Ranking		13	2	3	4	6 tied	10 tied	5	9	1	12	14	6 tied	8	10 tied

Note re scoring: Each model was given a score between 1 [worst] and 10 [best] on each criteria. Scores were then multiplied by pre-determined relative importance weightings. The results reflect a mathematical average of individual committee members' assessments.

Composition of Council Committee
Sep 29 2008

APPENDIX D