

SPECIAL MEETING

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

A G E N D A

Date of Meeting:	Thursday, February 18, 1999	Enquiry:	Christine Archibald
Time:	10:00 a.m.		Committee
Location:	Committee Room 1, 2nd Floor		Administrator, 392-7039
	Toronto City Hall, 100 Queen		carchiba@city.toronto.
	Street West, Toronto		on.ca

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST PURSUANT TO THE MUNICIPAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST ACT.

COMMUNICATIONS/REPORTS

1. HARMONIZATION OF USER FEES

Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism
(February 10, 1999)

Recommending:

- (1) That the Economic Development Committee provide direction on a preferred option for a new harmonization user fee policy as outlined in this staff report;
- (2) That this report be forwarded to the Budget Committee with the Economic Development Committee recommendations for their consideration in the 1999 Budget Process;
- (3) That the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture & Tourism be authorized to implement harmonized rates in keeping with the Council decision on this matter.

(A) City Clerk
(November 25, 1998)

Forwarding to the Economic Development Committee the action of the User Fee Committee on November 24, 1998, and **recommending**:

(1) (a) Policy Principles

- Recreation programs are important municipal services which contribute significant personal, social, economic and environmental benefits which enhance the well-being of Toronto citizens, their neighbourhoods and the local economy;
- the City of Toronto shall ensure all residents year-round accessibility to high quality community recreation and leisure programs regardless of their ability to pay;
- the City of Toronto shall ensure equity and fairness to taxpayers and contribute to the long term vitality of public recreation services provided by the City and the voluntary and not-for-profit sectors; and
- the City of Toronto shall encourage maximum opportunity for the enjoyable, healthful, satisfying and creative use of leisure time;

(b) Policy Elements

- Client and taxpayers at the forefront of pricing decisions ;
- consistency City-wide;
- quality service standards not influenced by user fees;
- accessibility strategies;
- price based on benefits to user, benefits to community and operating costs; and
- accountability;

(c) Implementation Guidelines

- Establish list of services which do not charge a user fee and are available universally;
- where a user fee is to be charged, fees to be based on different levels of cost recovery (10% to over 100%)
- harmonize January 1999, followed by stable price strategy to ensure future adjustments are gradual;
- establish effective measures to provide access to low income individuals and high need communities;
- monitor and adjust fees on an annual basis prior to the submission of the annual budget; and
- utilize a variety of effective user fee methods, including current technologies to enhance customer service (e.g. access “smart” card and improved registration system);

(2) “WHEREAS recreational services in the City of Toronto are a key component in providing a healthy City and contributing to the quality of life in communities across Toronto;

AND WHEREAS Toronto should be committed to equal access to these services, regardless of income, age or geographic location;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the User Fee Committee, after having now completed the public consultation process, recommend the harmonization of all user fees for recreational services by the City of Toronto effective January 1, 1999;

AND FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED THAT the User Fee Committee recommends the elimination of all user fees for drop in programs, subscriber programs and basic instructional programs.”;

- (3) that the surcharge for programs and activities for participants outside the City of Toronto area be retained;
 - (4) that ‘high needs’ communities be exempt from paying user fees for specialized programs;
 - (5) that an access policy be considered that would ensure low income families and individuals are not penalized;
 - (6) that the Budget Committee be requested to consider Parks and Recreation revenues being placed in general revenues and the Parks and Recreation budget being considered outside the framework of revenues generated;
 - (7) that Toronto Community Council’s position (November 12, 1998) that there be no User Fees in the City of Toronto be reiterated; and
 - (8) that the mandate of the User Fee Committee be expanded to address the issue of recreational permits with a similar comprehensive consultation process as that undertaken for user fees for recreation programs.
- (B) Anne Dubas, President, CUPE Local 79
(December 10, 1998)

Opposing the introduction of user fees as it is felt that the principle of universal access will be destroyed forever with the introduction of even minimal user fees.

- (C) City Clerk, North York Community Council
(December 10, 1998)

Reporting that North York Community Council, on December 10, 1998, **referred** the matter of Parks and Recreation User Fees and the following motions to the Chief Administrative Officer to establish a broad priority setting exercise including user fees and all other fees so that Council can collectively arrive at a decision on its priorities:

- (1) Councillor Filion moved that Community Councils be allocated a per capita budget to set priorities on such areas as Parks and Recreation user fees, snow removal and garbage pick-up;

- (2) Councillor King moved that:
- (a) the North York Community Council supports in principle that the harmonization of user fees for Parks and Recreation programs should be revenue neutral; and
 - (b) the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism be requested to develop a clear policy for the subsidization of programs;
- (3) Councillor Shiner moved that the North York Community Council supports in principle the charging of user fees for Parks and Recreation programs, except for public skating and outdoor swimming pools, and that the user fee policy also facilitate the needs of those who cannot afford such programs.

- (D) Ms. Maureen Boulter, Chairperson, Lakeshore Area Multi-Services Project Inc. (LAMP)
(January 12, 1999)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee to vote for Option #5 from the City's Consultation Guide.

- (E) Ms. Jasmin Earle, Chair, The Etobicoke Brighter Futures Coalition
(January 12, 1999)

Requesting that the Economic Development Committee support the removal of most user fees for recreation services.

- (F) Hordofa Guysa, President, Oromo Canadian Community Association in Ontario
(January 15, 1999)

Urging the Committee to eliminate user fees for public recreation programs in the City of Toronto because the association believes, in the long run, that it will pay off in the long run costs and will result in increased productivity and healthy community life.

- (G) Councillor Olivia Chow, Chair, Youth Subcommittee of the Children and Youth Action Committee
(February 2, 1999)

Given that Toronto City Council encourages Toronto youth to actively participate in municipal decision making processes, the Youth Subcommittee of the Children and Youth Action Committee **recommends** that:

- (1) the recommendations developed by the User Fees Committee that relate to youth, which were based on a community consultation process, be respected and acted upon;

- (2) that the remainder of the user fee debate process be accessible to youth and that:
 - (a) the Committee address the issue at the meetings at which the item has been scheduled; and
 - (b) Committee meetings are held at times when youth can attend (e.g. after school hours);
- (3) user fee policies be developed based on a comprehensive recreation policy endorsed by Council, and not be driven solely by economic considerations; and
- (4) recreation programs for all youth aged 13-24 be made available across the City at no cost to the user in recognition that recreation is a preventative investment that avoids later social/health costs, and that user fees function as a barrier to access for many youth.

(H) Ms. Cal Lorimer, Toronto
(February 10, 1999)

(I) Councillors Jakobek and Mammoliti
(February 11, 1999)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee to vote for Option B.

(J) Councillor Kelly
(February 11, 1999)

Submitting a User Fees Questionnaire

(K) President, Local 79
(February 12, 1999)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee to vote for Option A

(L) Joy Connelly
(February 12, 1999)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee to vote for no User Fee.

(M) Maureen P. Boulter, Chair of Board of Directors of LAMP
(February 12, 1999)

Requests that the Economic Development Committee not raise the programmes in the old City of Toronto down to the level of those in the old suburbs, but to raise those in the suburbs up to the level of those in the centre.

(N) Presentation - Economic Development Culture and Tourism and Parks & Recreation Division
(February 12, 1999)

(O) Karen Savage
(February 12, 1999)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee to vote for Option B as a compromise, and to consider to explore opportunities to provide programs for adults as in Option A.

(P) Deany Peters, Community Health Worker
(February 10, 1999)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee to endorse universal access to our recreation resources.

(Q) Doreen Lalor
(February 12, 1999)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee to adopt a no user fee policy.

(R) Lincon Lopez
(February 7, 1999)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee to adopt a no user fee policy.

(S) Mandy Mack
(Undated)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee to adopt a no user fee policy.

(T) Doug Hum, Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto
(February 12, 1999)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee to adopt a no user fee policy.

(U) D.J. Stewart
(February 12, 1999)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee to adopt a no user fee policy.

- (V) Myra Lewis
(February 12, 1999)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee defer this item, until a true vision of recreation has been defined and embraced by the entire Mega City Council; and until a healthy, conscientious, tolerant and responsible community who supports and helps each other can be translated or equated.

- (W) Karen Wirsig, Community Social Planning Council of Toronto
(February 12, 1999)

Requesting the Economic Development Committee defer this item to allow people a fuller opportunity to participate in the process.