

**Prince Edward Viaduct - Don Section
Structure Modification, Contract No. T-71-99
(Midtown - Don River)**

(City Council on November 23, 24 and 25, 1999, struck out and referred this Clause back to the Works Committee for further consideration at its next meeting to be held on December 1, 1999.)

The Works Committee:

- (1) submits the following report (October 20, 1999) from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services without recommendation with respect to the cancellation of Contract No. T-71-99, pending submission of a report by the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services directly to Council for its meeting commencing on November 23, 1999, on the option with respect to the \$1.3 million “bus shelter” style barrier as a method of going forward immediately with the safety barrier on the Prince Edward Viaduct; and**
- (2) recommends that:**
 - (i) the four payphones be immediately installed on the Viaduct;**
 - (ii) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to:**
 - (a) negotiate with the three bidders to reduce the budget price, if possible;**
 - (b) work with the Project Steering Committee members to solicit private sector sponsorship;**
 - (c) in conjunction with the City Solicitor and the Chief Administrative Officer, develop the details of an agreement with the media for the non-reportage of suicide attempts on City properties; and**
 - (d) report back to the Works Committee at its next meeting on the status of the aforementioned negotiations and fund-raising; and**
 - (iii) the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit considering this item in camera:**

Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to advise of the results of the Tender issued for the installation of a suicide prevention barrier on the Prince Edward (Bloor Street) Viaduct, in accordance with specifications as required by the Works and Emergency Services Department.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

Council has previously approved an expenditure of \$2.5 million. Acceptance of the low bid would require an additional expenditure in excess of \$3.0 million, but no funds are allocated for the additional expenditure. Other options presented in this report would be within the original approved amount of \$2.5 million. The Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer has reviewed this report and concurs with the financial impact statement.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) Contract No. T-71-99, Tender Call No. 222-1999, for the installation of a safety fence on the Prince Edward Viaduct be cancelled;
- (2) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be authorized to issue a new Request for Proposals with a maximum budget of \$2.5 million, to solicit new design concepts and full engineering services for this project, based on a design/build concept, with the submission being evaluated by a similar Project Steering Committee comprised of representatives from:
 - (a) the Schizophrenia Society of Ontario;
 - (b) the Council on Suicide Preventions;
 - (c) the Toronto Historical Board/Heritage Toronto;
 - (d) Architecture and Civic Improvements, City Planning;
 - (e) the Public Art Policy Advisory Committee; and
 - (f) the Technical Services Division, Works and Emergency Services Department; and
- (3) the appropriate City of Toronto officials be directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

Council Reference:

The Bid Committee at its meeting held on October 6, 1999, opened the following tenders for Contract No. T-71-99, for the structure modification and the installation of a safety fence on the Prince Edward Viaduct – Don Section:

<u>Tenderer:</u>	<u>Price Complete Including all Charges and Taxes</u>
Bridgecon Construction Ltd.	\$5,558,405.92
Grascan Construction Ltd.	\$7,029,900.00
G. Tari Limited	\$8,325,873.84

The Tender submitted by G. Tari Limited contained minor errors in the extension of the unit prices. The revised figure is shown above.

Background:

On July 8, 9 and 10, 1998, Council adopted Report No. 8 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, Clause No. 2, and authorized the Works and Emergency Services Department (WES) to solicit proposals for design concepts and full architectural services for the installation of safety barriers on the Viaduct with a budget set at \$1.5 million. The amount of \$1.5 million was included in the terms of reference informing competitors of the parameters of the project.

On October 1 and 2, 1998, Council adopted Report No. 11 of The Urban Environment and Development Committee, Clause No. 1, recommending the preferred design by Dereck Revington Studios/Yolles Partnership be adopted and that they be retained to prepare the detailed design and tender documents and to provide project management and site supervision services.

Subsequent to Council's endorsement of the design, it was apparent that the design as selected could not be constructed within the original budgeted amount of \$1.5 million.

On May 11, 12 and 13, 1999, Council adopted the recommendation of the Urban Environment and Development Committee (Report No. 7, Clause No. 2) which directed the WES to proceed with the design by Dereck Revington Studios/Yolles Partnership, to prepare the detailed design and tender documents for the construction and to increase the funding for the project by \$1.0 million to \$2.5 million.

Comments:

On October 6, 1999, the Bid Committee opened the tenders, as stated previously in this report. The low bid price was \$5,558,405.92, more than three times the original budget of \$1.5 million and more than double the revised budget of \$2.5 million.

Dereck Revington Studios/Yolles Partnership and their cost consultant, Vermeulens, are of the opinion, as stated in the attached letter (Attachment No. 1), that the tenders are too high for the value of the work indicated and reflect the high levels of risk associated with the project and current market conditions, rather than the underlying cost and scope of work.

In the attached letter, the consultant outlined a proposed course of action. City staff are not in agreement with the proposal mainly because it does not provide the assurances that the project would be completed within the available budget. Should Council decide to proceed with the option of a "test panel", any procurement must be in accordance with the Purchasing Department's procedures.

At present, an amount of \$1.5 million is included in the approved WES 1999 Capital Works Programme under Capital Account TR029, Don Valley Parkway Rehabilitation. The source of the additional funding is yet to be identified.

There are five possible alternatives for this project:

- (1) proceed with the construction of the suicide prevention barrier in the amount of \$5,558,405.92;
- (2) in the design by Dereck Revington Studios/Yolles Partnership and retender the construction utilizing a modified procurement process, including the erection of a “test” section to refine cost projections, prior to proceeding with the balance of construction. Expenditures in excess of \$2.5 million would still require further allocation of funds;
- (3) as an interim measure, install a chain link fence at a cost of approximately \$800,000.00, until such time as the final barrier is installed;
- (4) terminate work on the design by Dereck Revington Studios/Yolles Partnership and initiate a new design competition, based on the design/build concept; or
- (5) terminate work on the design by Dereck Revington Studios/Yolles Partnership and construct a basic barrier at a cost of approximately \$2.0 million.

Option (3) could be implemented by late winter/early spring of 2000. The timelines for Options (1), (2), (4) and (5) are all of a similar duration and would result in scheduled completion in late summer/early fall of 2000.

This matter was discussed with the Project Steering Committee at a meeting on October 19, 1999. The Committee is strongly in favour of Option (2) and has reached a consensus as follows:

- (1) we do not recommend a second design competition;
- (2) we accept the analysis of the tenders provided by Vermeulens Cost Consultants, that market conditions, overhead/access costs and perceived risk have inflated the bids;
- (3) we recommend immediate installation of a temporary barrier and four payphones with appropriate Distress Centre signage;
- (4) we recommend staff and Revington/Yolles negotiate with the lowest bidder to reduce the bid;
- (5) we recommend a sample bay (approximately 6.4 metres) of the winning Revington/Yolles barrier be constructed to determine more accurately the cost and reduce the perceived risk;
- (6) the Project Steering Committee supports a “design build” process to reduce costs and perceived risk of the winning design; and

- (7) we recommend the City seek private sector sponsorships to offset increased costs of construction and complete the Revington/Yolles barrier.

Should the recommendation to proceed with a new Request for Proposal (RFP) be adopted, WES will proceed immediately to reorganize the Project Steering Committee to fast-track the process. Such process will follow closely in line with the previous RFP procedure with a strong emphasis on the budget amount of \$2.5 million. In order to ensure the budget is not exceeded, the work would be tendered as a design/build assignment.

As directed by Council in the May 11, 1998 Urban Environment and Development Committee Report No. 7, Clause No. 2, WES staff have had several discussions with Bell Canada and Toronto Hydro regarding the installation of four payphones on the approaches of the bridge. Cost estimates from Bell and Toronto Hydro to install the two telephone lines and power supply at the southeast and southwest corners of the bridge are in the order of \$15,000.00. A work order for this work has already been issued and we expect completion of the work within four to six weeks. Installation of the telephone lines at the northeast and northwest corners of the bridge is more problematic and they are currently assessing the feasibility and cost to install these lines. As the cost of the installation of these two telephones is expected to be substantially higher, we will report to the Works Committee again once the investigation is completed.

On September 8, 1999, a meeting of the telephone sub-committee was held on the site to discuss and finalize the locations and proposed signage to complement the telephones. The signage shall include the telephone numbers of the Distress Centre.

Conclusions:

This report requests authority to cancel Contract No. T-71-99, Tender Call No. 222-1999, for the installation of a safety fence on the Prince Edward Viaduct and also to issue a new RFP for a new design concept for the project.

Contact:

W. (Bill) G. Crowther, P.Eng.
Director, Works Facilities and Structures
Technical Services Division
Tel. (416)392-8256; Fax (416)392-4594
E-mail: william.g.crowther@metrodesk.metrotor.on.ca

The Works Committee also submits the following communication (November 3, 1999) from Councillor Pam McConnell, Don River:

Today at 2:00 p.m. the Works Committee will be considering the Bloor Viaduct suicide prevention initiative.

I recognize that there is great concern about the significant increase in costs for this project. Starting over, or moving to a temporary barrier is not the answer.

The attached estimate shows that almost \$2 million of the cost overrun is from non-structural costs and connection to the bridge. These costs would apply to any proposal, and therefore make the \$2.4 million estimate originally proposed impossible to meet under any circumstances.

I suggest that the Committee continue to pursue the existing design, and defer the matter until the Commissioner can report on what can be done to reduce the overall cost of the existing proposal (including changes to the contract tendering process) and what can be done to raise money to offset the increased costs.

Too many people have died for us to take short cuts on this issue. People should remember that this issue is not just about the people who commit suicide, it is also about the people who witness the suicides, and the people below who are endangered.

My children enrolled in the high school at the west end of the viaduct. They have seen a lot of deaths. My daughter Maddy saw two deaths in the last three months. She has seen the mutilated bodies, one of which was found in the playing field just before gym class. Those memories will stay with her for a long time.

The local neighbourhood, the architectural community and the mental health community took great pains to come to agreement on this. It would be a great shame to dissolve that consensus. I hope the Committee will agree to give this project a chance by directing staff to make whatever efforts they can to reduce the cost to the City without abandoning the current design.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

The Works Committee reports, for the information of Council, having also had before it during consideration of the foregoing matter a communication (October 29, 1999) from the City Clerk, advising that City Council, at its meeting held on October 26 and 27, 1999, had before it Clause No. 9 contained in Report No. 4 of The Works Committee, headed "Prince Edward Viaduct - Measures to Deter Suicide Attempts"; and directed that the aforementioned Clause be struck out and referred back to the Works Committee for further consideration at its next meeting to be held on November 3, 1999.

The Works Committee further reports having also had before it the following communications:

- (i) (June 11, 1999) from Dr. Richard H. Seiden, Oakland, California, advising that taking positive steps to reduce suicides through environmental modification is not a comparable "displacement" to other places; and that the effectiveness of telephone measures is not so clear, suggesting instead the provision of a general "crisis" line.
- (ii) (October 13, 1999) from Dr. Morton M. Silverman, M.D., Associate Professor of Psychiatry, Editor-in-Chief, Suicide and Life-Threatening Behaviour, stating that limiting access to available means for suicide is a major preventive intervention within an overall

community suicide prevention plan; and urging the City to make every effort to proceed quickly with implementing the Bloor Viaduct suicide prevention project.

- (iii) (October 15, 1999) from Dr. David Lester, Professor of Psychology, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, in support of the fencing in of the Prince Edward Viaduct; and advising that there is good research evidence that restricting access to lethal methods for suicide reduces their use for suicide; that there are no published research reports that evaluate the effectiveness of the use of other measures such as placement of telephones on bridges; and that all privately-owned structures are fenced in.
- (iv) (October 20, 1999) from Staff Inspector W. Fordham, No. 54 Division, Toronto Police Service, respecting the proposal to install a signed telephone system on the bridge where high risk or emotionally disturbed persons would have immediate access to on-line counselling.
- (v) (October 21, 1999) from Dr. D.J. Gunnell, Senior Lecturer in Epidemiology and Public Health Medicine, University of Bristol, outlining experience with efforts to reduce suicides from the Clifton Suspension Bridge in Bristol; and reiterating his support for the erection of safety barriers on the Prince Edward Viaduct.
- (vi) (October 21, 1999) from Dr. Robin R. Richards, Head – Division of Orthopaedics, St. Michael's Hospital, informing the Committee of the medical costs and public health consequences when a person survives a jump from the Bloor Viaduct, and urging City Councillors to complete the suicide barrier without further delay.
- (vii) (October 25, 1999) from Dr. Claude Prevost, Regie Regionale de la Sante et des Services Sociaux, stating that the installation of a safety fence is the most appropriate prevention measure for the suicide problem at the Bloor Street Viaduct; and encouraging City Councillors to examine alternative designs that would meet both suicide prevention and fiscal requirements.
- (viii) (November 1, 1999) from Mr. Michael McCamus, Schizophrenia Society of Ontario, advising Councillors that the international suicide prevention community supports erection of a Viaduct barrier; urging Councillors to adopt the Bloor Viaduct Project Steering Committee's Seven-Point Plan as a realistic and fiscally responsible way to complete the winning barrier design; and forwarding documentation which concludes that bridge patrols do not save lives, that bridge distress phones are not an adequate substitute for barriers and that the costs of suicide and suicide attempts far exceed the cost of preventative measures.
- (ix) (November 1, 1999) from Dr. Isaac Sakinofsky, Professor Emeritus of Psychiatry and Public Health Sciences, University of Toronto, and Centre of Addiction and Mental Health, reviewing several points with respect to the issue of suicide barriers on the Prince Edward Viaduct for members of the Works Committee.
- (x) (November 1, 1999) from Dr. Paul S. Links, Arthur Sommer Rotenberg Chair in Suicide Studies, Professor in Psychiatry, University of Toronto, St. Michael's/Wellesley Hospital,

informing the Committee of the research in favour of bridge barriers, and of the widespread social and economic costs of neglecting suicide.

- (xi) (November 2, 1999) from Mr. Michael McCamus, Schizophrenia Society of Ontario, forwarding additional newspaper articles documenting much of the efforts dedicated to the Bloor Viaduct barrier, and expressing the futility and waste of recommending a second design competition.
- (xii) (November 3, 1999) from Dereck Revington Studio, providing a report on the background to the award of the design contract/tender call for the suicide barrier on the Bloor Street Viaduct; responding to questions with respect to the length of time the project has taken and the costs of the project; and reviewing the site, general conditions and proposed alternatives.
- (xiii) (November 3, 1999) from Marion Joppe, Chair, Heritage Toronto, advising that Heritage Toronto continues to support the Steering Committee process and selection, and that the historic stature of the Prince Edward Viaduct warrants the best design solution obtainable.

The following persons appeared before the Works Committee in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Mr. Dereck Revington, Principal, Dereck Revington Studio, and Professor of Architecture, University of Waterloo;
- Mr. Richard Vermeulen, Vermeulens Cost Consultants;
- Dr. Isaac Sakinofsky, FRCP(C), Professor Emeritus of Psychiatry, University of Toronto; Director of the High Risk Clinic, Clarke Institute; and Member of the Bloor Viaduct Project Steering Committee;
- Police Superintendent Aidan Maher, 52 Division, Toronto Police Service;
- Mr. Michael McCamus, SSO Bridge Committee Spokesperson of Schizophrenia Society of Ontario, and Co-chair of City's Bloor Viaduct Project Steering Committee;
- Mrs. Mary Doucette, bereaved mother of Ray Doucette, Jr., representing the Doucette family;
- Mr. J. A. (Al) Birney, SSO Bridge Committee Chairman, and Past-President of East York Chapter, Schizophrenia Society of Ontario (SSO), and Co-chair of City's Bloor Viaduct Project Steering Committee;
- Ms. Ellis Galea Kirkland, Urban Planning and Development Services, City of Toronto; Past-President of the Ontario Association of Architects; and Member of the Bloor Viaduct Project Steering Committee; and

- Mr. Vincent Brescia, Labourers Union Local 183.

(A copy of Attachment 1 referred to in the foregoing report has been forwarded to all Members of Council with the agenda for the Works Committee meeting of November 3, 1999, and a copy thereof is on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

(City Council on November 23, 24 and 25, 1999, had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause, the following report (November 19, 1999) from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services:

Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to provide further information concerning this project as requested by the Works Committee at its meeting held on November 3, 1999.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

Council has previously approved an expenditure of \$2.5 million. The current bids for the Dereck Revington/Yolles Partnership barrier design are all well in excess of the allocated funds. Other options presented in this report would be within the original approved amount of \$2.5 million. The Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer has reviewed this report and concurs with the financial impact statement.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) *Contract No. T-71-99, Tender Call No. 222-1999 for the installation of a safety fence on the Prince Edward Viaduct be cancelled;*
- (2) *the October 20, 1999 report to the Works Committee be adopted and that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be authorized to issue a new Request for Proposals with a maximum budget of \$2.5 million, to solicit new design concepts and full engineering services for this project, based on a design/build concept, with the submission being evaluated by a similar Project Steering Committee comprised of representatives from:*
 - (a) *the Schizophrenia Society of Ontario*
 - (b) *the Council on Suicide Preventions*
 - (c) *the Toronto Historical Board/Heritage Toronto*
 - (d) *Architecture and Civic Improvements, City Planning*
 - (e) *the Public Art Policy Advisory Committee; and*
 - (f) *the Technical Services Division, Works and Emergency Services Department;*

- (3) *Council consider the recommendations presented by the Project Steering Committee and should Council agree to adopt them, staff will conduct negotiations with the three bidders. On the advise of the solicitor, transfer of any part of the risk that would normally be assumed by the contractor will not be part of the negotiations;*
- (4) *the appropriate City of Toronto officials be directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.*

Council Reference/Background:

On July 8, 9 and 10, 1998, Council adopted Report No. 8 of the Urban Environment and Development Committee (UEDC), Clause No. 2, and authorized the Works and Emergency Services Department (WES) to solicit proposals for design concepts and full architectural services for the installation of safety barriers on the Viaduct with a budget set at \$1.5 million. The amount of \$1.5 million was included in the terms of reference informing competitors of the parameters of the project.

On October 1 and 2, 1998, Council adopted Report No. 11 of UEDC, Clause No. 1, recommending the preferred design by Dereck Revington Studios/Yolles Partnership be adopted and that they be retained to prepare the detailed design and tender documents and to provide project management and site supervision services.

Subsequent to Council's endorsement of the design, it was apparent that the design as selected, could not be constructed within the original budgeted amount of \$1.5 million.

On May 11, 12 and 13, 1999, Council adopted the recommendation of the UEDC (Report No. 7, Clause No. 2) which directed the WES to proceed with the design by Dereck Revington Studios/Yolles Partnership, to prepare the detailed design and tender documents for the construction and to increase the funding for the project by \$1.0 million to \$2.5 million.

On October 6, 1999, the Bid Committee opened the tenders for Contract No. T-71-99, for the structure modification and the installation of a safety fence on the Prince Edward Viaduct – Don Section. The low bid price was \$5,558,405.92, more than three times the original budget of \$1.5 million and more than double the revised budget of \$2.5 million.

At its meeting on November 3, 1999, the Works Committee referred the report dated October 20, 1999, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to Council without recommendation and requested further information regarding the “bus-shelter” style barrier and requested staff to enter into negotiations with the three bidders to reduce the bid prices, if possible and to meet with the Project Steering Committee to solicit private sector sponsorship.

Comments:

At its meeting on November 3, 1999, the Works Committee expressed interest in the “bus shelter” style barrier presented in the initial report prepared by Morrison Hershfield in April 1998. That report reviewed different alternatives and costs for several types of barriers for this

bridge. The “bus shelter” style of barrier was investigated along with a chain link fence, safety nets and an aluminium fence. Proposals for all four types of barriers were submitted during the design competition stage, but all were rejected by the Selection Committee early in the process in favour of the Dereck Revington/Yolles Partnership design.

Prior to the Works Committee meeting on November 3, 1999, staff confirmed the estimated cost of the “bus-shelter” style barrier to be approximately \$1.3 million, but this design has not been reviewed in detail by Heritage Toronto or the Project Steering Committee.

Staff is recommending that a new design competition based on a design/build concept be initiated for the following reasons:

1. A new design/build competition would ensure that the project cost of \$2.5 million would not be exceeded.
2. Heritage Toronto and the Steering Committee would have an opportunity to comment on the selected design.
3. A new design/build competition would provide an opportunity to obtain the best design within the specified budget and would not result in any additional delays over the option of constructing the “bus shelter” style barrier.

A design/build contract would contractually bind the designer/contractor to design and build the barrier within the specified amount of the contract. The designer/contractor would assume all risk associated with cost overruns, unless the City specifically requested changes.

The “bus-shelter” style barrier has not been submitted to Heritage Toronto or the Project Steering Committee for their review and comments. A new design competition would allow them to comment on this option and any other submissions. Both Heritage Toronto and the Project Steering Committee would be involved in the selection of a new barrier design. The “bus-shelter” style barrier may emerge as the preferred option in a new design competition, but a new competition would provide the opportunity to review and select the best design available within the budget specified. Based on past experience, staff would prefer a barrier option as opposed to an enclosed option for ease of maintenance.

A new design/build competition would be fast-tracked to initiate a Request for Proposal by mid January 2000, with proposals being submitted to the City by the end of February 2000. Review of the proposals and final selection by the Project Selection Committee would be completed by mid March followed by award of the contract in mid to late April. The contract would commence immediately after award.

If Council approved the construction of a “bus-shelter” style barrier, installation would proceed in approximately the same timeframe as a new design, due to no construction taking place during the winter months.

In preparing to negotiate with the low bidders, Dereck Revington Studio (DRS) was asked if the barrier design could be modified in any way to lower the cost of the project. DRS responded

verbally that there would be very little that could be changed in the design, since they have already gone through a cost reduction analysis during the final design stage. To date, we are waiting for written confirmation of their comments.

The City Solicitor and the Purchasing Department were contacted to discuss negotiating with the low bidder. Staff were advised that in case we opened negotiations, we would have to negotiate with all 3 bidders and that they must be provided with the same information regarding any changes to the contract requirements or design. The City Solicitor also stated that the City is not prepared to assume additional risk for the work, as proposed by DRS. Our current policy of the contractor assuming all risk of performing the work under a contract must be maintained.

A meeting of the Project Steering Committee was held on November 17, 1999, to discuss possible fundraising initiatives. The outcome of the meeting was a consensus position by the committee which is included in Attachment No. 1.

If the recommendation to proceed with a new Request for Proposal (RFP) is adopted, WES will proceed immediately to activate the Project Steering Committee to fast-track the process. Such process will follow closely in line with the previous RFP procedure with a strong emphasis on the budget amount of \$2.5 million. In order to ensure the budget is not exceeded, the work would be tendered as a design/build assignment.

Should Council adopt the recommendations presented by the Project Steering Committee, staff will conduct negotiations with the 3 bidders. It should also be noted that the progress of the project would be entirely dependent on successful fundraising by the members of the Project Steering Committee and may jeopardize completion of the barrier in the year 2000.

As directed by Council in the May 11, 1998 UEDC, Report No. 7, Clause No. 2, WES staff have authorized Bell Canada and Toronto Hydro to proceed with the installation of 2 payphones located on the south side on the approaches of the bridge. Work orders for this work have been issued to Bell and Toronto Hydro and they are scheduled to complete the installation by mid-December. Installation of the telephone lines at the northeast and northwest corners of the bridge is more problematic and Bell is currently assessing the feasibility and cost to install these lines.

As the cost of the installation of these two telephones is expected to be substantially higher, we will report to the Works Committee again once the investigation is completed.

Conclusion:

This report requests authority to cancel Contract No. T-71-99, Tender Call No. 222-1999, for the installation of a safety fence on the Prince Edward Viaduct and also to issue a new RFP for a new design/build concept for the project.

Contact:

W. (Bill) G. Crowther, P.Eng.

*Director, Works Facilities and Structures
Technical Services Division
Tel. (416)392-8256
Fax (416)392-4594
E-mail: william_g._crowther@metrodesk.metrotor.on.ca*

List of Attachment:

November 19, 1999 letter from Schizophrenia Society of Ontario)

(A copy of Attachment 1, a communication dated November 19, 1999 from the Schizophrenia Society of Ontario, referred to in the foregoing report, is on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

(City Council also had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause, a communication (November 8, 1999) from Mr. Michael McCamus, Schizophrenia Society of Ontario, explaining why the tender bids for the Prince Edward (Bloor) Viaduct suicide prevention barrier have exceeded the budget; and outlining the recommendations from the City's Bloor Viaduct Project Steering Committee (PSC) to lower the bids and to permit completion of the approved barrier design.)