

[Guide to Minutes](#)

**MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL
OF THE
CITY OF TORONTO**

**WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 2000,
THURSDAY, JUNE 8, 2000 AND
FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 2000**

City Council met in the Council Chamber, City Hall, Toronto.

CALL TO ORDER

- 8.1 Deputy Mayor Ootes took the Chair and called the Members to order.

The meeting opened with O Canada.

8.2 **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

Councillor Mihevc, seconded by Councillor Chow, moved that the Minutes of the regular Council meeting held on the 11th, 12th and 13th days of April, 2000, and the special meeting held on the 26th day of April, 2000, be confirmed in the form supplied to the Members, which carried.

PRESENTATION OF REPORTS

June 7, 2000:

- 8.3 Councillor Pantalone presented the following Reports for consideration by Council:

Report No. 12 of The Administration Committee,
Report No. 10 of The Works Committee,
Report No. 5 of The Etobicoke Community Council,
Report No. 3 of The Board of Health,
Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee,

Report No. 11 of The Works Committee,
Report No. 12 of The Works Committee,
Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee,
Report No. 5 of The Community Services Committee,
Report No. 6 of The Economic Development and Parks Committee,
Report No. 5 of The Planning and Transportation Committee,
Joint Report No. 2 of The Works Committee and The Economic
Development and Parks Committee,
Report No. 9 of The Toronto Community Council,
Report No. 6 of The York Community Council,
Report No. 6 of The East York Community Council,
Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council,
Report No. 7 of The North York Community Council,
Report No. 6 of The Scarborough Community Council, and
Report No. 4 of The Board of Health,

and moved, seconded by Councillor Valenti, that Council now give consideration to such Reports, which carried.

8.4 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Adams declared his interest in Clause No. 54 of Report No. 9 of The Toronto Community Council, headed "Removal of Trees - 83 Cottingham Street (Midtown)", in that he resides in the vicinity of the subject site.

Councillor Balkissoon declared his interest in Clauses Nos. 3 and 4 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Conditions of Employment - Council Staff Members" and "Council Office Support Staff", respectively, in that a member of his family is an employee in the office of another Member of Council.

Councillor Berger declared his interest in Clause No. 1 of Joint Report No. 2 of The Works Committee and The Economic Development and Parks Committee, headed "City of Toronto New Sewer Use By-law", in that his son-in-law is engaged in the dental profession.

Councillor Bussin declared her interest in Clause No. 8 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Rehabilitation and Redevelopment of the Canada Malting Complex, Metronome Canada Incorporated (Ward 24 - Downtown)", in that her spouse is involved in negotiations for the applicant.

Councillor Cho declared his interest in Clauses Nos. 3 and 4 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Conditions of Employment - Council Staff Members" and "Council Office Support Staff", respectively, in that a member of his family is an employee in his office.

Councillor Feldman declared his interest in Notice of Motion J(4), moved by Councillor Berardinetti, seconded by Councillor Ootes, regarding access to personal information by Members of Council, in that he receives a pension from the Company to which he sold TEELA.

Councillor Gardner declared his interest in Clauses Nos. 3 and 4 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Conditions of Employment - Council Staff Members" and "Council Office Support Staff", respectively, in that a member of his family is an employee in his office.

Councillor Giansante declared his interest in Clause No. 14 of Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed "Negotiations with Rogers Cable and Bell Canada, Retention of Outside Legal Counsel", in that his wife is an employee of Bell Canada.

Councillor Jones declared her interest in Item (e), entitled "New Development Applications for the West District (Etobicoke)", as embodied in Clause No. 11 of Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council, headed "Other Items Considered by the Community Council", in that her husband is employed by an associate of the developer.

Councillor Kelly declared his interest in Clauses Nos. 3 and 4 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Conditions of Employment - Council Staff Members" and "Council Office Support Staff", respectively, in that a member of his family is an employee in his office.

Councillor King declared her interest in Clause No. 15 of Report No. 7 of The North York Community Council, headed "Official Plan and Zoning Amendment UDOZ-98-29 - Northeast Corner of Sheppard Avenue East and Bayview Avenue and Zoning Amendment UDZ-98-31 - 2901 Bayview Avenue (Bayview Village Shopping Centre) Seneca Heights", insofar as it relates to Recommendation No. (6)(f) and Exhibit L of the report (May 3, 2000) and revised Exhibit L (May 23, 2000) from the Director, Community Planning, North District, Urban Development Services, in that those sections refer to a proposed park in front of the Thomas Clarke House, which is a property owned by a member of her extended family.

Mayor Lastman declared his interest in Clause No. 6 of Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed "Complaint Made Under the Development Charges Act", and Clause No. 15 of such Report, headed "Claim by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Regarding 354 Jarvis Street", and Clause No. 15 of Report No. 7 of The North York Community Council, headed "Official Plan and Zoning Amendment UDOZ-98-29 - Northeast Corner of Sheppard Avenue East and Bayview Avenue and Zoning Amendment UDZ-98-31 - 2901 Bayview Avenue (Bayview Village Shopping Centre) Seneca Heights", in that the applicants' solicitors are employed by the same law firm as his son who is not a real estate lawyer and does not personally act on these files; and in Clause No. 14 of Report No. 7 of The North York Community Council, headed "The Allen/Sheppard Urban Design and Development Framework Study – UD03-ASU - North York Spadina", in that his son owns a home in the vicinity of the subject area;

and in Clause No. 58 of Report No. 9 of The Toronto Community Council, headed "Variances From Chapter 297, Signs, of the Former City of Toronto Municipal Code - 2 St. Clair Avenue West (Midtown)", in that he has purchased a condominium within 400 feet of the subject site.

Councillor Li Preti declared his interest in Clause No. 14 of Report No. 7 of The North York Community Council, headed "The Allen/Sheppard Urban Design and Development Framework Study – UD03-ASU - North York Spadina", in that he owns property in the vicinity of the subject area.

Councillor Mahood declared his interest in Clauses Nos. 3 and 4 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Conditions of Employment - Council Staff Members" and "Council Office Support Staff", respectively, in that a member of his family is an employee of the City of Toronto.

Councillor Mammoliti declared his interest in Clauses Nos. 3 and 4 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Conditions of Employment - Council Staff Members" and "Council Office Support Staff", respectively, in that a member of his family is an employee in his office.

Councillor Moscoe declared his interest in Clause No. 1 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Proposed Election Sign By-law", in that he is in the business of manufacturing and selling election signs.

Councillor Palacio declared his interest in Clause No. 3 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Conditions of Employment - Council Staff Members", in that a member of his family is an employee in his office; and in Clause No. 4 of such Report, headed "Council Office Support Staff", in that he was formerly employed as an Executive Assistant to a Member of Council.

Councillor Rae declared his interest in Clause No. 15 of Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed "Claim by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Regarding 354 Jarvis Street", in that he owns property within the vicinity of the subject site.

Councillor Shiner declared his interest in Clauses Nos. 3 and 4 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Conditions of Employment - Council Staff Members" and "Council Office Support Staff", respectively, in that a member of his family is an employee in his office; and in Notice of Motion J(29), moved by Councillor Pantalone, seconded by Councillor Silva, regarding the boulevard area at 667 King Street West, in that his family owns property within the area.

**CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS
CLAUSES RELEASED OR HELD FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION**

8.5 The following Clauses were held by Council for further consideration:

Report No. 12 of The Administration Committee, Clause No. 1.

Report No. 10 of The Works Committee, Clause No. 1.

Report No. 5 of The Etobicoke Community Council, Clause No. 1.

Report No. 3 of The Board of Health, Clause No. 1.

Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee, Clauses Nos. 1, 3, 6, 7, 12, 16, 17, 18 and 19.

Report No. 11 of The Works Committee, Clause No. 1.

Report No. 12 of The Works Committee, Clauses Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13.

Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, Clauses Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 16 and 18.

Report No. 5 of The Community Services Committee, Clauses Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 12 and 13.

Report No. 6 of The Economic Development and Parks Committee, Clauses Nos. 2, 5 and 10.

Report No. 5 of The Planning and Transportation Committee, Clauses Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11.

Joint Report No. 2 of The Works Committee and The Economic Development and Parks Committee, Clause No. 1.

Report No. 9 of The Toronto Community Council, Clauses Nos. 14, 31, 42, 51 and 59.

Report No. 6 of The York Community Council, Clauses Nos. 5, 6 and 8.

Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council, Clauses Nos. 4, 5 and 7.

Report No. 7 of The North York Community Council, Clauses Nos. 3, 14, 16 and 17.

Report No. 6 of The Scarborough Community Council, Clause No. 12.

Report No. 4 of The Board of Health, Clause No. 1.

The following Clauses which were held by Council for further consideration were subsequently adopted without amendment or further discussion:

Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee, Clauses Nos. 3, 6 and 7.

Report No. 12 of The Works Committee, Clauses Nos. 2 and 13.

Report No. 5 of The Community Services Committee, Clauses Nos. 1, 4 and 13.

Report No. 6 of The Economic Development and Parks Committee, Clause No. 2.

Report No. 9 of The Toronto Community Council, Clause No. 42.

Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council, Clause No. 7.

Report No. 7 of The North York Community Council, Clause No. 14.

The Clauses not held by Council for further consideration were deemed to have been adopted by Council, without amendment, in accordance with the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law.

CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS CLAUSES WITH MOTIONS, VOTES, ETC.

8.6 Clause No. 12 of Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed “Implementation of Sustainability Measures in City-Owned Facilities as Part of the Better Buildings Partnerships Program (All Wards)”.

Motion:

Councillor Layton moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the joint report dated June 1, 2000, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, be adopted, subject to amending Recommendation No. (2) by inserting, after the words ‘in consultation with’, the words ‘the Chief Administrative Officer’, so that the recommendations embodied in such report shall now read as follows:

‘It is recommended that:

- (1) the Commissioners of Corporate Services and of Works and Emergency Services, be authorized to request a proposal from Toronto Hydro Energy Inc. (THES Inc.) to implement

sustainability measures in a group of City-owned facilities using funding sources other than the funding available through the Better Buildings Partnership;

- (2) the Commissioners of Corporate Services and of Works and Emergency Services, in consultation with the Chief Administrative Officer and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, report to the Policy and Finance Committee with an evaluation of the benefits of the THES Inc. proposal, compared to utilizing the City's process for implementation of sustainability measures in City-owned buildings under the Better Buildings Partnership and with recommendations as to whether an agreement between THES Inc. and the City should be implemented; and
- (3) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.' ”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Layton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.7 **Clause No. 19 of Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed “Sustainability Roundtable Membership – 3 Members at Large”.**

Motion:

Councillor Layton moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that:

- (a) the recommendations of the Environmental Task Force embodied in the communication dated May 30, 2000, from the City Clerk, be adopted, viz.:

‘The Environmental Task Force recommends that:

- (1) the following be appointed as citizen members of the Sustainability Roundtable for a term of office to expire November 2003, and until their successors are appointed:
 - Vicky J. Sharpe;
 - Greg Allen; and
 - Lisa Caton; and

- (2) should a vacancy occur for a citizen appointee during the term of office, the following be appointed to fill such vacancy:
- Shannon Thompson.’; and
- (b) Ms. Elizabeth Dowdeswell be appointed to the Sustainability Roundtable as a Member Emeritus.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Layton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.8 **Clause No. 4 of Report No. 12 of The Works Committee, headed “Deep Lake Water Cooling Project Pre-Design Study”.**

Motion:

Councillor Layton moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Deep Lake Water Cooling Project Pre-Design Study be considered by the Chief Administrative Officer and relevant City staff, for the various federal funding programs being made available through the Federation of Canadian Municipalities’ Green Municipal Enabling and Investment Funds, and the Federal Government’s Infrastructure Program.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Layton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.9 **Clause No. 7 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed “Relocation of 51 Police Division (Ward 25 - Don River)”.**

Motion:

Councillor McConnell moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the confidential report dated June 5, 2000, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, be adopted, such report to remain confidential, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, having regard that it contains information related to the acquisition of property, save and except the following recommendations embodied therein:

‘It is recommended that:

- (1) the purchase price in the Agreement of Purchase and Sale (“Agreement”) for the Property in the amount of \$4,375,000.00 be amended to \$4,175,000.00, plus all applicable taxes, for the reasons detailed herein, and authority be given to enter into an amending agreement with the Vendor to revise the Purchase Price;
- (2) specific exemption for the purchase of this property be granted to the policy of the former City of Toronto prohibiting the acquisition of contaminated property, as contained in Clause No. 46 of Report No. 11 of The Executive Committee adopted by Council at its meeting of June 21 and 23, 1993;
- (3) in the event that the authority requested in Recommendations Nos. (1) and (2) above is provided, then authority be provided to waive the conditions in favour of the City detailed in the Agreement for the reasons detailed herein, and authority be granted to complete the purchase of the property;
- (4) all other terms as set out in Clause No. 7 of Report No. 4 of The Administration Committee adopted, as amended, by Council at its meeting on February 29, March 1 and 2, 2000, be confirmed; and
- (5) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.’ ”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor McConnell carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.10 Clause No. 12 of Report No. 5 of The Community Services Committee, headed “Establishment of a ‘211’ Community Information Telephone Service”.

Motion:

Councillor Adams moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that, as recommended by the Telecommunications Steering Committee in the communication dated June 2, 2000, from the City Clerk, the report dated May 24, 2000, from the City Solicitor, embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

‘It is recommended that:

- (1) the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services and other City staff as appropriate, be authorized to register the City of Toronto as an interested party in any Public Notice proceeding initiated by the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (“CRTC”) as a result of the application by Community Information Toronto, the United Way of Greater Toronto, Inform Canada and the United Way of Canada – Centraide Canada (the “Applicants”) to the CRTC for the designation of 2-1-1 as a community information service, and participate in the proceeding, as needed, to assist and support the Applicants;
- (2) the City Clerk be requested to immediately provide a letter of endorsement as requested by the Applicants so that it may be included in the Application; and
- (3) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.’ ”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Adams carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.11 Clause No. 14 of Report No. 9 of The Toronto Community Council, headed “Installation/Removal of On-Street Parking Spaces for Persons With Disabilities (High Park, North Toronto and Trinity-Niagara)”.

Motion:

Councillor Disero moved that the Clause be amended by adding the following new location to the list of on-street parking spaces which are to be established for persons with disabilities, as embodied in Table “A” appended to the report dated May 9, 2000, from the Director, Transportation Services, District 1:

“Ward	Location
21	Hallam Street, north side, between a point 29 metres east of Concord Avenue and a point 5.5 metres further east thereof. (Source: Concetta Deangelis, a resident of 62 Hallam Street, Toronto, Ontario, M6H 1W6).”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Disero carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.12 **Clause No. 51 of Report No. 9 of The Toronto Community Council, headed “Draft Zoning By-law Amendment - 134 Edgewood Avenue and Part of 130 Edgewood Avenue (East Toronto)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Ashton moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the reports requested by the Toronto Community Council, of the Commissioner of Urban Development Services pertaining to policies related to infill housing projects, also be submitted to the Scarborough Community Council for information.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Ashton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.13 **Clause No. 59 of Report No. 9 of The Toronto Community Council, headed “Tree Removal - 241 Wellington Street West on the John Street Flank (Downtown)”.**

Motion:

Councillor McConnell moved that the Clause be amended by striking out the recommendations of the Toronto Community Council and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“It is recommended that the report dated June 2, 2000, from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

‘It is recommended that:

- (1) Council authorize the removal of the four existing street trees within the John Street right-of-way, subject to the applicant paying all associated costs totalling \$1,027.44;

- (2) removal of the City-owned trees be permitted, subject to the applicant constructing the glass canopy required by the Sign By-law amendments related to this site and implementing the outstanding landscaping required at 253 Wellington Street West; and
- (3) Council authorize the applicant to replace the four removed trees with four skyline honeylocust, subject to the applicant providing a Letter of Credit in the amount of \$1,372.76, for a period of two years, as a guarantee that the trees will remain in good health.’ ”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor McConnell carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.14 **Clause No. 5 of Report No. 6 of The York Community Council, headed “Appointment of Citizens to Fill Vacancies on the York Museum Management Board, Ward 27 - York Humber, and Ward 28 - York Eglinton”.**

Motion:

Councillor Ashton moved that the Clause be amended by inserting in Recommendation No. (1) embodied in the report dated May 4, 2000, from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, after the date “November 30, 2003”, the words “despite subsection 5(4) of By-law No. 793-1999”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

- “(1) York Community Council nominate citizens Ms. Michelle Clement, Mr. Tim Morris and Ms. Colleen Young for a term expiring on November 30, 2003, despite subsection 5(4) of By-law No. 793-1999, or until their successors are appointed;”.

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Ashton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.15 **Clause No. 4 of Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council, headed “Citizen Appointments to the Montgomery's Inn Museum Management Board (Kingsway-Humber)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Ashton moved that the Clause be amended by inserting in Recommendation No. (1) embodied in the report dated May 4, 2000, from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, after the date “November 30, 2003”, the words “despite subsection 5(4) of By-law No. 793-1999”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

- “(1) Etobicoke Community Council nominate citizens Ms. Jean Sinclair, Mr. Paul O’Connor, Mr. Robert Wigle and Mr. Nick Doran for a term expiring on November 30, 2003, despite subsection 5(4) of By-law No. 793-1999, or until their successors are appointed;”.

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Ashton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.16 **Clause No. 5 of Report No. 6 of The Etobicoke Community Council, headed “Appointment of Etobicoke Historical Society Representative on the Montgomery's Inn Museum Management Board (Kingsway - Humber)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Ashton moved that the Clause be amended by inserting in Recommendation No. (1) embodied in the report dated May 4, 2000, from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, after the date “November 30, 2003”, the words “despite subsection 5(4) of By-law No. 793-1999”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

- “(1) Etobicoke Community Council nominate Mr. Robert Given as the representative from the Etobicoke Historical Society to serve on the Montgomery’s Inn Museum Management Board for a term expiring on November 30, 2003, despite subsection 5(4) of By-law No. 793-1999, or until his successor is appointed;”.

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Ashton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.17 **Clause No. 3 of Report No. 12 of The Works Committee, headed “Lester B. Pearson International Airport (LBPIA) Noise Monitoring and Impact Review and Assessment (Wards 2, 3, 4 and 5)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Miller moved that the Clause be amended by inserting in Recommendation No. (1) embodied in the report dated May 2, 2000, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, after the acronym “(EFRRA)”, the words “Toronto Community Council, concerned residents of Ward 19”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

- “(1) this report, including the study report ‘LBPIA Noise Impact Assessment and Review’ prepared by Aeroustics Engineering Ltd., dated March 23, 2000, be forwarded to the Greater Toronto Airports Authority (GTAA), the Etobicoke Community Council, the Etobicoke Federation of Residents and Ratepayers Association (EFRRA), the Toronto Community Council, concerned residents of Ward 19 and Transport Canada for review and comment; and”.

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Miller carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.18 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed “Proposed Election Sign By-law”.**

Motions:

(a) Councillor Davis moved that the Clause be amended:

- (1) by deleting Recommendation No. (5) of the Administration Committee, viz.:

“(5) with respect to public utility poles, signs be required to be made of paper;” and

- (2) to provide that the time period for the display of election signs be 90 days in lieu of 30 days.

(b) Councillor Soknacki moved that the Clause be amended by striking out the following subsections 9(1) and 9(2) of the proposed election sign by-law:

“9(1) Election Signs shall not be erected or displayed for a federal or provincial election until the day the writ of election is issued.

9(2) Election Signs shall not be erected or displayed for a municipal election until the day following nomination day.”

(c) Councillor Ashton moved that the Clause be amended by deleting Recommendation No. (5) of the Administration Committee and inserting in lieu thereof the following new Recommendation No. (5):

“(5) the placement of election signs not be permitted on utility poles;”.

(d) Councillor Minnan-Wong moved that the Clause be amended by:

(1) striking out Recommendation No. (1) of the Administration Committee, viz.:

“(1) amending Recommendation No. (2) embodied in the report dated May 11, 2000, from the City Clerk, and the proposed by-law, by striking out the requirement for a \$200.00 election sign deposit;”.

so that the \$200.00 election sign deposit is required as recommended in the report dated May 11, 2000, from the City Clerk;

(2) deleting Recommendation No. (2) of the Administration Committee and inserting in lieu thereof the following new Recommendation No. (2):

“(2) signs be permitted on public highways, excluding expressways and major arterial roads, subject to the following restrictions:

- on highways with sidewalks, signs cannot be located within 0.5 metres of the edge of the sidewalk;
- on highways without sidewalks, signs cannot be located within 1.5 metres of the curb or the edge of the pavement;
- signs cannot be located within 15 metres of an intersection or pedestrian crossover;
- signs must not interfere with the safe operation of vehicular traffic or the safety of pedestrians;
- prohibited adjacent to a voting place or any City-owned property;
- prohibited on a median or island;
- must obtain the consent of the abutting property owner/occupant;”

- (3) amending subsection 11(1) of the proposed election sign by-law to provide that the fee charged for removing an unlawful election sign be increased from \$20.00 to \$50.00;
 - (4) adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the City Clerk and the Executive Director of Municipal Licensing and Standards be requested to submit a joint report to the next meeting of City Council scheduled to be held on July 4, 2000, through the Administration Committee, on plans to enforce the proposed by-law to regulate election signs, such report to include details of the review requested in Recommendation No. (6) of the Administration Committee; and
 - (5) amending subsections 9(1) and 9(2) of the proposed election sign by-law to provide that the election sign period be 37 days long.
- (e) Councillor Bussin moved that the Clause be amended by:
- (1) amending Recommendation No. (6) of the Administration Committee to read as follows:

“(6) the Executive Director of Municipal Licensing and Standards be requested to submit a report to the next meeting of the Administration Committee on the number of inspectors who will be available to enforce the by-law the night before election day and on election day;”;
 - (2) adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the City Clerk be requested to submit a report to the Administration Committee on the democratic rights of voters who wish to post a sign in their home or on their property at the direction of their candidate.”; and
 - (3) amending subsection 9(2) of the proposed election sign by-law to provide that election signs shall not be erected or displayed for a municipal election until October 1st in an election year.
- (f) Councillor Mihevc moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:
- “It is further recommended that the Bill to regulate election signs be introduced and confirmed as soon as possible after the conclusion of the debate in this regard.”

- (g) Councillor Pantalone moved that the Clause be amended by adding to the end of Recommendation No. (2) of the Administration Committee, the words “with the exception of those instances where the public property is the untravelled portion of the public right-of-way, (i.e. front yards on residential streets) such placement to be with the consent of the abutting private property owner”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

“(2) the placement of election signs not be allowed on public property/highways, with the exception of those instances where the public property is the untravelled portion of the public right-of-way, (i.e. front yards on residential streets) such placement to be with the consent of the abutting private property owner;”.

- (h) Councillor Moeser moved that the Clause be amended to provide that the time period for the display of election signs be 25 days in lieu of 30 days.
- (i) Councillor Giansante moved that the Clause be amended by adding to the definition of “election signs” in the proposed election sign by-law, the words “despite (a) and (b) above, signs within 100 feet of a campaign office do not constitute an election sign for the purposes of this by-law as long as the number of campaign offices for any candidate does not exceed two”, so that such definition shall now read as follows:

“ ‘Election Sign’ means any sign:

- (a) advertising or promoting a candidate in a federal, provincial or municipal election, including an election of a local board or commission; or
- (b) intended to influence persons to vote for or against any question or by-law submitted to the electors under section 8 of the Municipal Elections Act, 1996,

despite (a) and (b) above, signs within 100 feet of a campaign office do not constitute an election sign for the purposes of this by-law as long as the number of campaign offices for any candidate does not exceed two;”.

- (j) Councillor Shiner moved that the Clause be amended:
- (1) to provide that a sign be permitted on campaign offices to identify the candidate up to 60 days prior to election day, and the size of this sign not be subject to the maximum 1.2-square metre restriction;
- (2) to provide that the size of election signs on hydro poles be a maximum of 6 inches by 6 inches;

- (3) by deleting from Schedule "A" respecting public utility poles, as embodied in the proposed election sign by-law, all reference to roads located in the North York district, and that the schedule of hydro poles which were permitted for posterage in the former City of North York be inserted in lieu thereof;
- (4) by deleting from Recommendation No. (5) of the Administration Committee, the words "required to be made of paper", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "either paper or soft plastic", so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:
 - "(5) with respect to public utility poles, signs be either paper or soft plastic;"
- (5) to provide that election signs not be permitted; and
- (6) by adding to the end of Recommendation No. (3) of the Administration Committee, the words "(or 12.92 square feet)", so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:
 - "(3) the size of election signs be restricted to 1.2 square metres (or 12.92 square feet);".
- (k) Councillor Kelly moved that the Clause be amended by adding to the end of Recommendation No. (3) of the Administration Committee, the words "save and except bill board signs and signs on campaign offices, with such exceptions to apply to candidates for federal, provincial and municipal elections", so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:
 - "(3) the size of election signs be restricted to 1.2 square metres, save and except bill board signs and signs on campaign offices, with such exceptions to apply to candidates for federal, provincial and municipal elections;"
- (l) Councillor Cho moved that the Clause be amended to provide that the election sign by-law include the following provisions:
 - (1) that candidates be restricted to placing election signs on no more than every fifth utility pole on the roads identified in the Schedule to such by-law; and
 - (2) that candidates be prohibited from placing one sign on top of another.

- (m) Councillor Disero moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that:

- (1) upon approval of the election sign by-law, and following receipt of a list of non-conforming signs as of the passage of the by-law, the City Clerk be requested to write to the property owners explaining the new by-law and advising them that they have the option to keep the sign or take it down; and
- (2) the City Clerk be requested to submit a report to the Administration Committee on a strategy to advise property owners of the new by-law, and clarify that they have the option to say yes or no to the erection of election signs on their property.”

- (n) Councillor Jakobek moved that the Clause be amended by adding the following words to the recommendation of the Administration Committee:

“subject to the proposed election sign by-law not being applied to the ward in which Councillor Moscoe has placed signs and will be running in the upcoming election”.

- (o) Councillor Mammoliti moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Executive Director of Municipal Licensing and Standards be requested to submit a report to the Administration Committee on plans to enforce existing election by-laws, including any federal or provincial laws, such report to detail actions which can be taken against persons found to be illegally removing signs.”

- (p) Councillor Johnston moved that the Clause be amended by striking out the recommendation of the Administration Committee and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“It is recommended that the Clause be received, and further, in the interests of dealing with escalating costs, sign pollution, decreasing landfill space, and public education, that:

- (1) instead of allowing the proliferation of signs on public and private property, the City erect signs on public property, including bus shelters, indicating for that ward, those individuals who are running for the office of Mayor, Councillor and School Trustee, at locations to be determined by the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, such locations to be no closer than every 300 feet;

- (2) candidates be assessed their share of these signage costs; and
- (3) Councillor Moscoe, and any other candidate who has erected election signs, be requested to remove their signs within the next 24 hours, as a gesture of good faith.”
- (q) Councillor Saundercook moved that the Clause be amended to provide that only one sign per candidate be permitted on a utility pole.

Permission to Withdraw Motions:

Councillor Davis, with the permission of Council, withdrew Part (2) of his motion (a).

Councillor Johnston, with the permission of Council, withdrew Part (3) of her motion (p).

Ruling by the Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the nature of Part (5) of motion (j) by Councillor Shiner, ruled such part out of order.

Councillor Layton challenged the ruling of the Deputy Mayor.

Vote to Uphold the Ruling of the Deputy Mayor:

Yes - 31	
Councillors:	Altobello, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Chong, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, King, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pitfield, Prue, Saundercook, Shaw, Soknacki, Walker
No - 18	
Councillors:	Adams, Ashton, Brown, Chow, Fillion, Johnston, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Mahood, McConnell, Miller, Moeser, Nunziata, Pantalone, Rae, Shiner, Tzekas

Carried by a majority of 13.

Ruling by the Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the nature of motion (c) by Councillor Ashton, ruled such motion out of order.

Councillor Ashton challenged the ruling of the Deputy Mayor.

Vote to Uphold the Ruling of the Deputy Mayor:

Yes - 25 Councillors:	Altobello, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Chong, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, King, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Minnan-Wong, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva, Soknacki
No - 25 Councillors:	Adams, Ashton, Berardinetti, Chow, Davis, Filion, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Mahood, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Nunziata, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shiner, Tzekas, Walker

Lost, there being an equal division of votes.

Votes:

Adoption of Parts (1) and (2) of motion (p) by Councillor Johnston:

Yes - 10 Councillors:	Bossons, Brown, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Moeser, Nunziata
No - 41 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Kelly, Kinahan, Layton, Li Preti, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 31.

Adoption of Part (1) of motion (d) by Councillor Minnan-Wong:

Yes - 27 Councillors:	Adams, Berger, Brown, Chow, Davis, Disero, Feldman, Filion, Giansante, Holyday, Kelly, King, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, O'Brien, Palacio, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas
No - 22 Councillors:	Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bussin, Chong, Duguid, Flint, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Mahood, McConnell, Miller, Moeser, Ootes, Pitfield, Shaw, Silva, Walker

Carried by a majority of 5.

Adoption of Part (2) of motion (d) by Councillor Minnan-Wong, save and except as it pertains to major arterial roads:

Yes - 11 Councillors: Adams, Berger, Davis, Filion, Johnston, King, Li Preti, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, Palacio, Saundercook
No - 38 Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 27.

Adoption of Part (2) of motion (d) by Councillor Minnan-Wong, insofar as it pertains to major arterial roads:

Yes - 13 Councillors: Berger, Davis, Disero, Filion, Flint, Johnston, Jones, Li Preti, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, Palacio, Saundercook, Walker
No - 36 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Duguid, Feldman, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas

Lost by a majority of 23.

Adoption of motion (g) by Councillor Pantalone:

Yes - 33 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Jones, Kinahan, King, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Prue, Saundercook, Shiner, Silva
No - 15 Councillors:	Bussin, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Kelly, Korwin-Kuczynski, Mahood, Mammoliti, O'Brien, Pitfield, Rae, Shaw, Soknacki, Tzekas, Walker

Carried by a majority of 18.

Adoption of Part (1) of motion (j) by Councillor Shiner:

Yes - 32 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Giansante, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Nunziata, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki
No - 16 Councillors:	Berardinetti, Berger, Filion, Flint, Holyday, Jakobek, King, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, O'Brien, Rae, Tzekas, Walker

Carried by a majority of 16.

Adoption of motion (i) by Councillor Giansante:

Yes - 13 Councillors:	Adams, Berger, Duguid, Feldman, Giansante, Kelly, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Pitfield, Prue, Saundercook, Silva, Soknacki
No - 35 Councillors:	Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Filion, Flint, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kinahan, King, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Rae, Shaw, Shiner, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 22.

Adoption of Part (2) of motion (l) by Councillor Cho, moved by Councillor Feldman in the absence of Councillor Cho:

Yes - 20 Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Bussin, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Flint, Holyday, Jones, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mihevc, Moeser, O'Brien, Palacio, Pitfield, Shaw, Silva
No - 28 Councillors: Adams, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Chong, Chow, Davis, Feldman, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Kelly, Kinahan, Layton, Mammoliti, McConnell, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, Ootes, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 8.

Part (6) of motion (j) by Councillor Shiner carried.

Adoption of motion (k) by Councillor Kelly:

Yes - 25 Councillors: Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Chong, Chow, Davis, Duguid, Feldman, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kelly, Li Preti, Mahood, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Ootes, Prue, Saundercook, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas
No - 24 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Bussin, Disero, Filion, Flint, Jakobek, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Miller, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Shaw, Shiner, Walker

Carried by a majority of 1.

Adoption of motion (c) by Councillor Ashton:

Yes - 39 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Jones, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas
No - 10 Councillors:	Berger, Brown, Holyday, Jakobek, Kelly, Mammoliti, McConnell, Minnan-Wong, Pitfield, Walker

Carried by a majority of 29.

Ruling by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the foregoing decision of Council, declared Part (1) of motion (a) by Councillor Davis, Parts (2), (3) and (4) of motion (j) by Councillor Shiner, Part (1) of motion (l) by Councillor Cho, and motion (q) by Councillor Saundercook, redundant.

Votes:

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Soknacki, insofar as it pertains to subsection 9(1) of the proposed election sign by-law:

Yes - 13 Councillors:	Adams, Berger, Brown, Flint, Kelly, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Miller, Minnan-Wong, O'Brien, Rae, Saundercook, Soknacki
No - 36 Councillors:	Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kinahan, King, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 23.

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Soknacki, insofar as it pertains to subsection 9(2) of the proposed election sign by-law:

Yes - 14 Councillors: Berger, Brown, Davis, Flint, Jones, Li Preti, Miller, Nunziata, Palacio, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas
No - 35 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Shaw, Shiner, Walker

Lost by a majority of 21.

Adoption of motion (h) by Councillor Moeser:

Yes - 25 Councillors: Adams, Brown, Chong, Disero, Feldman, Filion, Holyday, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mihevc, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shiner, Tzekas
No - 24 Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Duguid, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Mammoliti, McConnell, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva, Soknacki, Walker

Carried by a majority of 1.

Ruling by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the foregoing decision of Council, declared Part (5) of motion (d) by Councillor Minnan-Wong, and Part (3) of motion (e) by Councillor Bussin, redundant.

Votes:

Adoption of Part (3) of motion (d) by Councillor Minnan-Wong:

Yes - 21 Councillors:	Adams, Chong, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Jakobek, Kinahan, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Shaw, Soknacki, Tzekas
No - 28 Councillors:	Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Ootes, Prue, Saundercook, Shiner, Silva, Walker

Lost by a majority of 7.

Adoption of Part (4) of motion (d) by Councillor Minnan-Wong:

Yes - 38 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Holyday, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Mahood, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Palacio, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas
No - 11 Councillors:	Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Jones, King, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, O'Brien, Pantalone, Silva, Walker

Carried by a majority of 27.

Part (1) of motion (e) by Councillor Bussin carried.

Adoption of Part (2) of motion (e) by Councillor Bussin:

Yes - 18	
Councillors:	Adams, Berardinetti, Berger, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Gardner, Jakobek, Kelly, Layton, Li Preti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Saundercook, Silva, Tzekas
No - 31	
Councillors:	Altobello, Ashton, Brown, Chong, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shaw, Shiner, Soknacki, Walker

Lost by a majority of 13.

Motion (f) by Councillor Mihevc carried.

Adoption of Part (1) of motion (m) by Councillor Disero:

Yes - 17	
Councillors:	Bussin, Chow, Disero, Filion, Gardner, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Mihevc, Nunziata, Palacio, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shaw, Shiner, Tzekas
No - 32	
Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Chong, Davis, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, King, Layton, Li Preti, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Saundercook, Silva, Soknacki, Walker

Lost by a majority of 15.

Adoption of Part (2) of motion (m) by Councillor Disero:

Yes - 10 Councillors:	Adams, Disero, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Mihevc, Nunziata, Palacio, Rae, Shaw
No - 39 Councillors:	Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, King, Layton, Li Preti, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Saundercook, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 29.

Adoption of motion (n) by Councillor Jakobek:

Yes - 22 Councillors:	Altobello, Berardinetti, Berger, Chong, Davis, Disero, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Kelly, Kinahan, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, Palacio, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva
No - 28 Councillors:	Adams, Ashton, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Holyday, Jones, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker

Lost by a majority of 6.

Adoption of motion (o) by Councillor Mammoliti:

Yes - 24 Councillors:	Ashton, Chow, Davis, Disero, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Palacio, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Tzekas, Valenti
No - 26 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, King, Minnan-Wong, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Soknacki, Walker

Lost by a majority of 2.

Adoption of Clause, as amended:

Yes - 38 Councillors: Adams, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mahood, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shaw, Shiner, Tzekas, Valenti
No - 12 Councillors: Altobello, Bussin, Davis, Flint, Jakobek, Mammoliti, McConnell, Miller, Saundercook, Silva, Soknacki, Walker

Carried by a majority of 26.

Motion to Re-Open:

Councillor Chow, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, the vote upon motion (k) by Councillor Kelly be re-opened.

Vote:

Adoption of motion by Councillor Chow:

Yes - 26 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Chow, Disero, Feldman, Flint, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mihevc, Miller, Nunziata, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Rae, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki
No - 16 Councillors: Balkissoon, Berger, Brown, Duguid, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Kelly, Li Preti, Minnan-Wong, O'Brien, Pitfield, Prue, Saundercook, Valenti

Lost, less than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

In summary, Council amended the Clause:

- (1) by striking out Recommendation No. (1) of the Administration Committee, viz.:
 - “(1) amending Recommendation No. (2) embodied in the report dated May 11, 2000, from the City Clerk, and the proposed by-law, by striking out the requirement for a \$200.00 election sign deposit;”,

so that the \$200.00 election sign deposit is required as recommended in the report dated May 11, 2000, from the City Clerk;
- (2) by adding to the end of Recommendation No. (2) of the Administration Committee, the words “with the exception of those instances where the public property is the untravelled portion of the public right-of-way, (i.e. front yards on residential streets) such placement to be with the consent of the abutting private property owner”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:
 - “(2) the placement of election signs not be allowed on public property/highways, with the exception of those instances where the public property is the untravelled portion of the public right-of-way, (i.e. front yards on residential streets) such placement to be with the consent of the abutting private property owner;”;
- (3) by adding to the end of Recommendation No. (3) of the Administration Committee, the words “(or 12.92 square feet), save and except bill board signs and signs on campaign offices, with such exceptions to apply to candidates for federal, provincial and municipal elections”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:
 - “(3) the size of election signs be restricted to 1.2 square metres (or 12.92 square feet), save and except bill board signs and signs on campaign offices, with such exceptions to apply to candidates for federal, provincial and municipal elections;”;
- (4) by deleting Recommendation No. (5) of the Administration Committee, and inserting in lieu thereof the following new Recommendation No. (5):
 - “(5) the placement of election signs not be permitted on utility poles;”;
- (5) by amending Recommendation No. (6) of the Administration Committee to read as follows:
 - “(6) the Executive Director of Municipal Licensing and Standards be requested to submit a report to the next meeting of the Administration Committee on the number of inspectors who will be available to enforce the by-law the night before election day and on election day;”;

- (6) to provide that:
- (a) the time period for the display of election signs be 25 days in lieu of 30 days; and
 - (b) a sign be permitted on campaign offices to identify the candidate up to 60 days prior to election day, and the size of this sign not be subject to the maximum 1.2-square metre restriction; and

- (7) by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that:

- (1) the City Clerk and the Executive Director of Municipal Licensing and Standards be requested to submit a joint report to the next meeting of City Council scheduled to be held on July 4, 2000, through the Administration Committee, on plans to enforce the proposed by-law to regulate election signs, such report to include details of the review requested in Recommendation No. (6) of the Administration Committee; and
- (2) the Bill to regulate election signs be introduced and confirmed as soon as possible after the conclusion of the debate in this regard.”

8.19 **Clause No. 16 of Report No. 7 of The North York Community Council, headed “Final Report – Zoning Amendment and Subdivision Applications UDZ-99-29, UDSB-1243 and Further Report UDOP-00-11 - Metrodome Properties Inc. - 5365 Leslie Street - Seneca Heights”.**

Motion:

Councillor King moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that:

- (1) Recommendation No. (3)(d)(v) embodied in the report dated May 23, 2000, from the Director, Community Planning, North District, Urban Development Services, be adopted, viz.:

‘(d)(v) The applicant shall consent to designation of the former McDougald estate house under the Ontario Heritage Act and enter into a heritage conservation easement agreement with the City of Toronto;’; and

- (2) the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, or the Director, Community Planning, North District, as appropriate, and the City Solicitor be authorized to continue discussions with the applicant and report directly to North York Community Council, if possible, or to City Council respecting any proposed settlement arising therefrom.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor King carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.20 Clause No. 6 of Report No. 5 of The Community Services Committee, headed “Expanded Tenant Hotline Service”.

Motion to Re-Open:

Councillor Duguid, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, this Clause be re-opened for further consideration, which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Motion:

Councillor Duguid moved that the Clause be amended by striking out the recommendation of the Community Services Committee and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“It is recommended that the report dated June 1, 2000, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

‘It is recommended that:

- (1) the Federation of Metro Tenants Associations continue to operate the current (basic) tenant hotline service;
- (2) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services work with the Federation to assess its ability to deliver the expanded service by the fall; and
- (3) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services report back to the Community Services Committee in the fall on the results of this review.’ ”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Duguid carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.21 **Clause No. 10 of Report No. 12 of The Works Committee, headed “Appointment of Representative to Sustainability Roundtable”.**

Having regard that the Clause was submitted without recommendation:

Motion:

Councillor Saundercook moved that Council adopt the following recommendation:

“It is recommended that Councillor Jack Layton be appointed to the Sustainability Roundtable as the Sustainability Advocate.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Saundercook carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

Motion to Re-Open:

Councillor Saundercook, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, this Clause be re-opened for further consideration, which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Motion:

Councillor Saundercook moved that Council also adopt the following recommendation:

“It is recommended that Councillor Ila Bossons be appointed to the Sustainability Roundtable as the representative of the Works Committee.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Saundercook carried.

The Clause, as further amended, carried.

8.22 **Clause No. 5 of Report No. 6 of The Economic Development and Parks Committee, headed “City of Toronto Culture Plan (All Wards)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism be requested to include in the Culture Plan, methods of securing a sustainable source of funding for the art acquisition fund.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Moscoe carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.23 **Clause No. 6 of Report No. 6 of The York Community Council, headed “Glenholme Avenue Between St. Clair Avenue West and Rogers Road: (1) Traffic Calming Survey Results; and (2) Installation of Speed Humps, Ward 28 - York Eglinton”.**

Motion:

Councillor Mihevc moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the raised intersection proposed at Holland Park Avenue and Glenholme Avenue also be approved.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Mihevc carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.24 **Clause No. 6 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed “Update on Largest Tax Receivables, Including 1000 Finch Avenue West”.**

Motion:

Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Administration Committee for further consideration, and to permit the Bailiffs an opportunity to address the Committee in this regard.

Vote on Referral:

The motion by Councillor Moscoe carried.

8.25 **Clause No. 2 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed “Preparation of the Voter’s List for the 2000 Municipal Election”.**

Motion:

Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Ontario Property Assessment Corporation be requested to extend its request for updated tenant information to landlords of buildings with fewer than seven units.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Moscoe carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.26 **Clause No. 3 of Report No. 7 of The North York Community Council, headed “Request for Exemption to the Sign By-law - Variance for Ground Sign – 5000 Jane Street - Black Creek”.**

Motion:

Councillor Augimeri moved that the Clause be amended by striking out the recommendation of the North York Community Council and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“It is recommended that the report dated May 3, 2000, from the Director and Deputy Chief Building Official, Urban Development Services, embodying the following recommendation, be adopted:

‘It is recommended that the request for a minor variance from the sign by-law be refused.’ ”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Augmieri carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.27 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 12 of The Administration Committee, headed “Future Use of the Dempsey Store (Ward 10 - North York Centre)”.**

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Filion moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Administration Committee for further consideration and report thereon to the next regular meeting of City Council scheduled to be held on July 4, 2000, and the Commissioner of Corporate Services, the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer and the City Clerk be requested to submit a joint report to the Administration Committee with respect to the proposal from the Learning Centre for Children with Autism for use of the Dempsey House, such report to fully address the nature and costs of any changes to the building or its surroundings that would be required to accommodate the proposal, sources of funding, parking requirements and availability, zoning, the availability of alternative space for either the Learning Centre or the historical organizations, and any other matters the Commissioners feel are relevant to Council’s decision on this matter.
- (b) Councillor Prue moved that motion (a) by Councillor Filion be amended by adding thereto the words “and that the North York Historical Society and the Preservation Board be consulted in the preparation of this joint report”.
- (c) Councillor Bossons moved that motion (a) by Councillor Filion be amended by adding thereto the words “and that the Preservation Board be requested to submit a report to the next meeting of the Administration Committee scheduled to be held on June 13, 2000, on the historical significance of the Dempsey House in the context of the former City of North York’s inventory of historical buildings”.
- (d) Councillor Minnan-Wong moved that motion (a) by Councillor Filion be amended:
 - (1) to provide that the Administration Committee report to the Council meeting scheduled to be held on August 1, 2000; and
 - (2) by adding thereto the words “and that Members of Council be encouraged to visit the Dempsey House site in order to make an informed decision”.
- (e) Councillor O’Brien moved that motion (a) by Councillor Filion be amended to provide that the Commissioner of Corporate Services, in consultation with the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, report directly to Council for its meeting scheduled to be held on July 4, 2000, on a suitable location that will be utilized by the Learning Centre for Children with Autism and specifics on implementing this project.

Votes:

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Prue:

Yes - 38 Councillors: Altobello, Berardinetti, Bossons, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva, Soknacki
No - 8 Councillors: Berger, Brown, Bussin, Feldman, Kelly, Shiner, Valenti, Walker

Carried by a majority of 30.

Motion (c) by Councillor Bossons carried.

Adoption of Part (1) of motion (d) by Councillor Minnan-Wong:

Yes - 16 Councillors: Berardinetti, Bossons, Filion, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Pitfield, Prue, Soknacki
No - 32 Councillors: Altobello, Berger, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Gardner, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Valenti, Walker

Lost by a majority of 16.

Part (2) of motion (d) by Councillor Minnan-Wong carried.

Adoption of motion (e) by Councillor O'Brien:

Yes - 42 Councillors:	Adams, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Giansante, Jakobek, Jones, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Walker
No - 7 Councillors:	Altobello, Berger, Gardner, Holyday, Kelly, Soknacki, Valenti

Carried by a majority of 35.

Adoption of motion (a) by Councillor Filion, as amended:

Yes - 18 Councillors:	Adams, Berardinetti, Bossons, Chong, Filion, Flint, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, O'Brien, Prue, Soknacki
No - 31 Councillors:	Altobello, Berger, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Miller, Nunziata, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Valenti, Walker

Lost by a majority of 13.

Motions:

(f) Councillor Gardner moved that the Clause be amended by:

- (1) striking out the recommendation of the Administration Committee and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“It is recommended that the report dated May 30, 2000, from Councillor Gardner, be adopted, subject to adding to Recommendation No. (3) the words ‘such inspection to include zoning requirements and any other pertinent information that may be necessary’, and deleting Recommendation No. (4) and re-numbering the remaining recommendation accordingly, so that the recommendations embodied in such report shall now read as follows:

‘It is recommended that:

- (1) the Archives Association of Ontario and the North York Historical Society be relocated to an appropriate facility, such as the North York Civic Centre, beginning September 1, 2000;
- (2) the Children’s Services Division of the Community Services Department undertake an inspection of the Dempsey Building to determine its suitability vis-à-vis legislation, e.g., the Day Nurseries Act, for its intended use by the Learning Centre for Children with Autism;
- (3) the appropriate City of Toronto staff undertake an inspection with respect to the suitability of the building structure for the intended purpose and use by the number of anticipated persons expected to use Dempsey Store under the auspices of the Learning Centre for Children with Autism, such inspection to include zoning requirements and any other pertinent information that may be necessary; and
- (4) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.’ ”; and

- (2) adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Learning Centre for Children with Autism be requested to provide for representation on its Board by a member of the North York Historical Society.”

- (g) Councillor Prue moved that Part (2) of motion (f) by Councillor Gardner be amended by adding thereto the words “and further, that the Commissioner of Corporate Services be authorized to enter into a lease of the Dempsey Store by the Learning Centre for Children with Autism, such lease to be for a period of no longer than five years”.

Vote Be Now Taken:

Councillor Shiner, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with subsection 37(e) of the Council Procedural By-law, the vote be now taken, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 32 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Balkissoon, Berger, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Moscoe, Nunziata, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker
No - 11 Councillors:	Berardinetti, Bossons, Chow, Filion, Flint, Holyday, Kinahan, Layton, Li Preti, Ootes, Prue

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Votes:

Adoption of motion (g) by Councillor Prue:

Yes - 19 Councillors:	Adams, Brown, Chong, Filion, Flint, Giansante, Layton, Li Preti, McConnell, Mihevc, Moscoe, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Soknacki, Valenti
No - 27 Councillors:	Altobello, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Gardner, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Nunziata, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 8.

Part (1) of motion (f) by Councillor Gardner carried.

Adoption of Part (2) of motion (f) by Councillor Gardner, without amendment:

Yes - 43 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Walker
No - 4 Councillors: Berger, Layton, Pantalone, Valenti

Carried by a majority of 39.

Adoption of Clause, as amended:

Yes - 39 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Miller, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker
No - 9 Councillors: Bossons, Filion, Flint, Holyday, Korwin-Kuczynski, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Moscoe, Prue

Carried by a majority of 30.

8.28 Clause No. 1 of Report No. 10 of The Works Committee, headed "Toronto Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management ('TIRM') Process - Proven Diversion Capacity - Envelope 1 Informal Submissions".

Having regard that the Clause was submitted without recommendation:

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Saundercook moved that Council adopt the following recommendation:

"It is recommended that:

- (1) the joint report dated May 9, 2000, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services and the City Solicitor, embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

‘It is recommended that:

- (1) the responses provided in connection with the Works Committee direction of April 25, 2000, that TIRM Diversion respondents be given an additional time period until May 3, 2000, to respond further to the issues raised at the aforementioned meeting, be received; and
- (2) the following recommendations contained in the joint reports dated April 18, 2000, and April 25, 2000, respectively, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services and the City Solicitor, be adopted:

“It is recommended that:

- (a) the TIRM Proven Diversion Capacity RFP submissions from All Treat Farms Limited, HUWS Corporation, Stone and Webster Canada Limited and Canada Composting Inc., and SUBBOR be declared informal [for the reasons set out in this report (joint report dated April 18, 2000, from Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services and the City Solicitor)] and that they not be considered further in the current RFP process; and
- (b) City Council agree to the revisions in the composition of the consortium of Groupe Comporec, Inc., and Services Matrec, Inc., [as described in this report (joint report dated April 25, 2000, from Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services and the City Solicitor)] and that the RFP proposal submission from the consortium of Groupe Comporec, Inc., and Services Matrec, Inc., proceed to the Comparative Evaluation of Performance step of the evaluation process, subject to confirmation by the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer of the acceptability of the financial statements provided by Services Matrec, Inc.” ; and
- (2) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee outlining a proposed process to facilitate consideration of firms declared informal in the Proven Diversion Category in the New and Emerging Category of the TIRM Process.”

- (b) Councillor Shiner moved that Council adopt the following motion:

“**WHEREAS** eight respondents were qualified through the TIRM Diversion Request for Expressions of Interest (REOI) to have the technical and financial capabilities to respond to the Request for Proposals (RFP); and

WHEREAS only two respondents have met the requirements in order to proceed to the next comparative evaluation phase, contrary to the expectations resulting from the REOI; and

WHEREAS it is in the interests of the City that the City be able to consider a wide range of diversion proposals;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

- (1) the current TIRM Diversion RFP be cancelled and the unopened price envelopes and security documentation be returned to the respondents;
 - (2) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the next meeting of the Works Committee on security requirements to be contained in the new RFP;
 - (3) the modified security requirements provide for appropriate security to be in place at or about the time of contract execution but otherwise remain flexible in allowing a consideration of a broad range of proposals from qualified respondents; and
 - (4) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit the results of the RFP to Council no later than the September 2000 Council meeting.”
- (c) Councillor Miller moved that motion (b) by Councillor Shiner be amended by adding to Recommendation No. (2) the words “to be issued to the qualified respondents resulting from the REOI”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:
- “(2) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the next meeting of the Works Committee on security requirements to be contained in the new RFP to be issued to the qualified respondents resulting from the REOI;”.
- (d) Councillor Layton moved that consideration of the Clause be deferred until the third day of this meeting of Council, pending the publication of the report of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services outlining his recommendations on disposal.

Votes:

Adoption of motion (d) by Councillor Layton:

Yes - 19 Councillors:	Adams, Chow, Davis, Filion, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Moscoe, Pantalone, Pitfield, Saundercook, Soknacki, Tzekas
No - 29 Councillors:	Altobello, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, O'Brien, Ootes, Prue, Rae, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Valenti, Walker

Lost by a majority of 10.

Adoption of motion (c) by Councillor Miller:

Yes - 27 Councillors:	Adams, Balkissoon, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Duguid, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, O'Brien, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti
No - 21 Councillors:	Altobello, Berardinetti, Berger, Davis, Disero, Flint, Holyday, Jakobek, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva, Walker

Carried by a majority of 6.

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Shiner, as amended:

Yes - 19 Councillors:	Adams, Balkissoon, Bossons, Brown, Chow, Gardner, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, O'Brien, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Shiner, Valenti
No - 29 Councillors:	Altobello, Berardinetti, Berger, Chong, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 10.

Adoption of Part (2) of motion (a) by Councillor Saundercook:

Yes - 47	
Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker
No - 1	
Councillor:	Kelly

Carried by a majority of 46.

Adoption of Part (1) of motion (a) by Councillor Saundercook:

Yes - 30	
Councillors:	Altobello, Berardinetti, Berger, Chong, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Walker
No - 18	
Councillors:	Adams, Balkissoon, Bossons, Brown, Chow, Gardner, Kinahan, Layton, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, O'Brien, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Shiner, Valenti

Carried by a majority of 12.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.29 Clause No. 5 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "New Visual Identity Program for Toronto Ambulance Service".

Motion:

- (a) Councillor Moeser moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Administration Committee for further consideration.

Vote on Referral:

Adoption of motion (a) by Councillor Moeser:

Yes - 2 Councillors:	Korwin-Kuczynski, Moeser
No - 34 Mayor: Councillors:	Lastman Altobello, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, King, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti

Lost by a majority of 32.

Motion:

- (b) Councillor Miller moved that the Clause be amended by deleting from Recommendation No. (2) of the Administration Committee, the words "Appendix D-1, D-2", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Appendices D-1 Vehicle Visual Identity (Option 2 - Alternate)", so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

"(2) that Appendices D-1 Vehicle Visual Identity (Option 2 - Alternate) and D-3 Vehicle Visual Identity (Option 2) be adopted as the preferred design for the City of Toronto's Ambulance Service."

Vote Be Now Taken:

Councillor Duguid, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with subsection 37(e) of the Council Procedural By-law, the vote be now taken, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 35 Mayor: Councillors:	Lastman Altobello, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Jones, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Lindsay Luby, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti
No - 9 Councillors:	Adams, Chow, Holyday, Kinahan, Layton, Miller, O'Brien, Ootes, Walker

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Votes:

Motion (b) by Councillor Miller carried.

Adoption of Clause, as amended:

Yes - 43	
Mayor:	Lastman
Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Rae, Saundercook, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker
No - 1	
Councillor:	Moeser

Carried by a majority of 42.

8.30 Clause No. 6 of Report No. 5 of The Planning and Transportation Committee, headed "The Use of Alternative Fuels in the Taxicab Industry".

Motion:

Councillor Layton moved that the Clause, together with the report dated May 31, 2000, from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, be received.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Layton carried.

Motion to Re-Open:

Councillor Giansante, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, this Clause be re-opened for further consideration, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 19 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Balkissoon, Berger, Brown, Feldman, Giansante, Holyday, Kelly, King, Li Preti, Mammoliti, Pantalone, Pitfield, Saundercook, Shiner, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker
No - 19 Councillors:	Ashton, Berardinetti, Bossons, Bussin, Davis, Duguid, Flint, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Prue, Rae, Soknacki

Lost, less than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

8.31 **Clause No. 2 of Report No. 5 of The Community Services Committee, headed "Provision of Ambulance Services at Rave Parties".**

Motion:

Councillor Flint moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

"It is further recommended that the Executive Director of Municipal Licensing and Standards be requested to:

- (1) submit a report to the Community Services Committee for its meeting scheduled to be held on July 13, 2000, on:
 - (a) the Jury verdict and recommendations arising from the Chief Coroner's Inquest into the death of Allen Ho;
 - (b) the implications to the City of Toronto from the provincial Private Member's Bill - 'Rave Act 2000'; and
 - (c) improvements required to amend the City of Toronto's protocol governing rave parties; and
- (2) co-ordinate the various reports and efforts underway in all other departments, agencies, boards and commissions with respect to this issue."

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Flint carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.32 Clause No. 1 of Joint Report No. 2 of The Works Committee and The Economic Development and Park Committee, headed “City of Toronto New Sewer Use By-law”.

Motions:

(a) Councillor Saundercook moved that the Clause be amended:

(1) by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the report dated May 30, 2000, from the Medical Officer of Health, embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

‘It is recommended that:

- (1) Toronto City Council receive this report for information; and
- (2) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, in consultation with the Medical Officer of Health, be directed to report to the Works Committee on the final results of the dental waste management study currently underway in Toronto.’ ”; and

(2) in accordance with the report dated June 6, 2000, from the City Solicitor, embodying the following recommendations:

“It is recommended that:

(1) should Council wish to permit the use of Sectoral Pollution Prevention Plans in the Sewer Use By-law as set out in the report of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, dated May 25, 2000, the following subsections be added to the draft Sewer Use By-law with the By-law being re-numbered accordingly:

‘1(jj) “sector plan” means a pollution prevention plan, prepared by or on behalf of more than one industry, containing pollution planning provisions common to all participants in the sector plan;’

‘(kk) “sector plan summary” means the summary of a sector plan including a statement setting out the progress of each industry participating in the sector plan’s progress toward

the three and six year pollution prevention goals, contained in the sector plan;’, and

‘5(17) notwithstanding any other requirement of this By-law to the contrary, those industries in an industrial category designated by the City, may, in place of meeting the requirements of subsection 5(1) of this By-law, participate in the preparation of a sector plan and submit a sector plan summary with respect to its premises. The sector plan and sector plan summary shall be in the form designated by the City for that purpose from time to time. The City may designate a different form with respect to any class of commercial or industrial premises’; and

(2) in order to correct typographical errors in Draft 6 of the Sewer Use By-law, the following changes be made:

(i) the words, ‘subject sector’, where they appear in subsection 5.(14) of the draft Sewer Use By-law be amended to read, ‘subject sector industry’;

(ii) the first three words of subsection 1.(tt) of the draft Sewer Use By-law be amended to read as follows:

‘(tt) “subject sector industry” ’;

(iii) the words ‘to the Commissioner a plan summary with respect to the premises from which the discharge occurs’, be inserted in lieu of the words, ‘a plan summary to the Commissioner’ in subsection 5.(1) of the draft Sewer Use By-law;

(iv) the word and numbers ‘subsection 5.(1)’, be inserted in place of the word and numbers, ‘subsection 5.(6)’ in subsection 5.(10) of the draft Sewer Use By-law; and

(v) the words ‘subject sector’, where they appear in subsection 5.(14) of the draft Sewer Use By-law be amended to read, ‘subject sector industry’.”

(b) Councillor Soknacki moved that the Clause be amended by:

(1) amending joint Recommendation No. (1) of the Works Committee and the Economic Development and Parks Committee to provide that Table 1, Limits for Sanitary and Combined Sewers Discharge, be amended by revising the following discharge limits:

“Controlled Substance	Change From:	To:
Nonylphenols	0.001 mg/l	0.02 mg/l
Nonylphenols ethoxylate	0.01 mg/l	0.2 mg/l ”; and

- (2) adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee, in the event that any provincial or federal ministry responsible for discharges in water recommends a more stringent discharge level for any controlled substance, such report to detail the relevant changes.”

- (c) Councillor O’Brien moved that the Clause be amended by amending joint Recommendation No. (1) of the Works Committee and the Economic Development and Parks Committee to provide that, in accordance with the recommendation embodied in the communication dated May 16, 2000, from the Director, Watershed Management Division, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, subsection 11.(20)3. of Section 11, Sewer Connections, of the proposed Sewer Use By-law be deleted, and the following new subsections 11.(20)3. and 4. be inserted in lieu thereof:

“11.(20)3. over a valley/ravine wall; and

11.(20)4. such that it may cause erosion or instability of the valley or ravine slope.”

- (d) Councillor Pitfield moved that the Clause be amended by amending joint Recommendation No. (1) of the Works Committee and the Economic Development and Parks Committee to provide that subsection 5.(3) and 5.(4) of Section 5, Pollution Prevention Planning, of the proposed Sewer Use By-law be deleted, and the following inserted in lieu thereof:

“5.(3) (a) The plan shall be in the form designated by the City for that purpose from time to time.

(b) In addition to any other matter or requirement designated by the City, and notwithstanding subsection 5.(3)(c), each plan shall include the following:

(i) a description of the processes at the premises which use or produce subject pollutants;

- (ii) a description of those processes at the premises which are to be the subject of pollution prevention planning;
 - (iii) a list of the subject pollutants present at the premises at any stage of the operations of the premises;
 - (iv) a description setting out the types, quantities and concentrations of all subject pollutants discharged, directly or indirectly, to a sewer;
 - (v) a description of current waste reduction, recycling, waste treatment and pollution prevention activities with respect to sewer discharges at the premises;
 - (vi) a description of pollution prevention options for subject pollutants and sewer discharge and an evaluation of those options;
 - (vii) a list of possible three- and six-year targets to reduce or eliminate the discharge of subject pollutants to the City's sewers; and
 - (viii) a declaration from an authorized person that the content of the plan is, to the best of that person's knowledge, true, accurate and complete.
- (c) The City may designate a different form for the plan with respect to any class of industrial, commercial or institutional premises, or with respect to any class of industry.
- 5.(4) (a) The plan summary shall be in the form designated by the City for that purpose from time to time.
- (b) In addition to any other matter or requirement designated by the City, and notwithstanding subsection 5.(4)(c), each plan summary shall include the following:
- (i) a description of the processes at the premises which use or produce subject pollutants;
 - (ii) a description of those processes at the premises which are to be the subject of pollution prevention planning;
 - (iii) a list of the subject pollutants present at the premises at any stage of the operations of the premises;

- (iv) a summary of the plan; and
 - (v) a declaration from an authorized person that the content of the plan summary is, to the best of that person's knowledge, true, accurate and complete.
 - (c) The City may designate a different form for the plan summary with respect to any class of industrial, commercial or institutional premises, or with respect to any class of industry."
- (e) Councillor King moved that the Clause be amended by:
 - (1) deleting joint Recommendation No. (1)(i) of the Works Committee and the Economic Development and Parks Committee; and
 - (2) adding to joint Recommendation No. (1)(v) of the Works Committee and the Economic Development and Parks Committee, the words "subject to the stormwater discharge limits", so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:
 - "(v) Section 11, Sewer Connections, subsection (20), be amended to exclude rainwater from swimming pools from the restrictions on discharge to the sewer system, subject to the stormwater discharge limits;"; and
 - (3) deleting from joint Recommendation No. (3) of the Works Committee and the Economic Development and Parks Committee, the words "four years", and inserting in lieu thereof the words "two years", so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:
 - "(3) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services consult with the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, the Medical Officer of Health and officials from Environment Canada, the Canadian Centre for Pollution Prevention, industry and environmental stakeholders and report thereon within two years on any modifications to the new limits contained in Section 2 and Section 4 of the new Sewer Use By-law;".
- (f) Councillor Layton moved that Part (2) of motion (a) by Councillor Saundercook be amended to provide that Recommendation No. (1) embodied in the report dated June 6, 2000, from the City Solicitor, be deleted.

Motion to Extend Time for Questioning:

Councillor Kelly, having questioned for a period of five minutes, Councillor Kinahan, seconded by Councillor Gardner, moved that subsection 25(5) of the Council Procedural By-law be waived and that Councillor Kelly be granted a further period of five minutes, in order to permit the conclusion of his questions, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 30 Councillors:	Adams, Ashton, Augimeri, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Gardner, Giansante, Jones, Kinahan, King, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Moscoe, Palacio, Saundercook, Sinclair, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker
No - 6 Councillors:	Holyday, Korwin-Kuczynski, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Shiner

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Permission to Withdraw Motion:

Councillor Saundercook, with the permission of Council, withdrew Part (2) of his motion (a).

Councillor Shiner, with the permission of Council, assumed carriage of Part (2) of motion (a) by Councillor Saundercook.

Votes:

Adoption of motion (e) by Councillor King:

Yes - 21 Councillors:	Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bossons, Chong, Disero, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, O'Brien, Palacio, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Valenti
No - 27 Councillors:	Adams, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Duguid, Filion, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 6.

Adoption of Part (1) of motion (b) by Councillor Soknacki:

Yes - 14 Councillors: Ashton, Balkissoon, Bossons, Chong, Disero, Feldman, Giansante, Kelly, King, Lindsay Luby, Moeser, Shiner, Soknacki, Valenti
No - 34 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Duguid, Filion, Flint, Holyday, Jones, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker

Lost by a majority of 20.

Part (2) of motion (b) by Councillor Soknacki carried.

Adoption of motion (c) by Councillor O'Brien:

Yes - 45 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Moscoe, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker
No - 3 Councillors: Mammoliti, Nunziata, Palacio

Carried by a majority of 42.

Adoption of motion (d) by Councillor Pitfield:

Yes - 45 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker
No - 3 Councillors:	Kelly, Mammoliti, Pantalone

Carried by a majority of 42.

Adoption of motion (f) by Councillor Layton:

Yes - 31 Councillors:	Adams, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Duguid, Filion, Giansante, Jones, Kinahan, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sinclair, Walker
No - 17 Councillors:	Altobello, Berardinetti, Disero, Feldman, Flint, Holyday, Kelly, King, Li Preti, Mammoliti, Moeser, O'Brien, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti

Carried by a majority of 14.

Part (2) of motion (a) by Councillor Shiner, as amended, carried.

Adoption of Part (1) of motion (a) by Councillor Saundercook:

Yes - 41 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker
No - 7 Councillors:	Disero, Giansante, Holyday, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Mammoliti, Sinclair

Carried by a majority of 34.

Adoption of Clause, as amended:

Yes - 45	
Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Giansante, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker
No - 3	
Councillors:	Ashton, Chong, Holyday

Carried by a majority of 42.

In summary, Council amended the Clause by:

- (1) amending joint Recommendation No. (1) of the Works Committee and the Economic Development and Parks Committee to provide that:
 - (a) subsection 5.(3) and 5.(4) of Section 5, Pollution Prevention Planning, of the proposed Sewer Use By-law be deleted, and the following inserted in lieu thereof:
 - “5.(3) (a) The plan shall be in the form designated by the City for that purpose from time to time.
 - (b) In addition to any other matter or requirement designated by the City, and notwithstanding subsection 5.(3)(c), each plan shall include the following:
 - (i) a description of the processes at the premises which use or produce subject pollutants;
 - (ii) a description of those processes at the premises which are to be the subject of pollution prevention planning;
 - (iii) a list of the subject pollutants present at the premises at any stage of the operations of the premises;

- (iv) a description setting out the types, quantities and concentrations of all subject pollutants discharged, directly or indirectly, to a sewer;
 - (v) a description of current waste reduction, recycling, waste treatment and pollution prevention activities with respect to sewer discharges at the premises;
 - (vi) a description of pollution prevention options for subject pollutants and sewer discharge and an evaluation of those options;
 - (vii) a list of possible three- and six-year targets to reduce or eliminate the discharge of subject pollutants to the City's sewers; and
 - (viii) a declaration from an authorized person that the content of the plan is, to the best of that person's knowledge, true, accurate and complete.
- (c) The City may designate a different form for the plan with respect to any class of industrial, commercial or institutional premises, or with respect to any class of industry.
- 5.(4) (a) The plan summary shall be in the form designated by the City for that purpose from time to time.
- (b) In addition to any other matter or requirement designated by the City, and notwithstanding subsection 5.(4)(c), each plan summary shall include the following:
- (i) a description of the processes at the premises which use or produce subject pollutants;
 - (ii) a description of those processes at the premises which are to be the subject of pollution prevention planning;
 - (iii) a list of the subject pollutants present at the premises at any stage of the operations of the premises;
 - (iv) a summary of the plan; and

- (v) a declaration from an authorized person that the content of the plan summary is, to the best of that person's knowledge, true, accurate and complete.
- (c) The City may designate a different form for the plan summary with respect to any class of industrial, commercial or institutional premises, or with respect to any class of industry.”;
- (b) in accordance with the recommendation embodied in the communication dated May 16, 2000, from the Director, Watershed Management Division, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, subsection 11.(20)3. of Section 11, Sewer Connections, of the proposed Sewer Use By-law be deleted, and the following new subsections 11.(20)3. and 4. be inserted in lieu thereof:
 - “11.(20)3. over a valley/ravine wall; and
 - 11.(20)4. such that it may cause erosion or instability of the valley or ravine slope.”;
- (c) typographical errors in Draft 6 of the Sewer Use By-law be corrected in accordance with Recommendation No. (2) embodied in the report dated June 6, 2000, from the City Solicitor, viz.:
 - “(2) in order to correct typographical errors in Draft 6 of the Sewer Use By-law, the following changes be made:
 - (i) the words, ‘subject sector’, where they appear in subsection 5.(14) of the draft Sewer Use By-law be amended to read, ‘subject sector industry’;
 - (ii) the first three words of subsection 1.(tt) of the draft Sewer Use By-law be amended to read as follows:
 - ‘(tt) “subject sector industry” ’;
 - (iii) the words ‘to the Commissioner a plan summary with respect to the premises from which the discharge occurs’, be inserted in lieu of the words, ‘a plan summary to the Commissioner’ in subsection 5.(1) of the draft Sewer Use By-law;

- (iv) the word and numbers 'subsection 5.(1)', be inserted in place of the word and numbers, 'subsection 5.(6)' in subsection 5.(10) of the draft Sewer Use By-law; and
 - (v) the words 'subject sector', where they appear in subsection 5.(14) of the draft Sewer Use By-law be amended to read, 'subject sector industry'; and
- (2) adding thereto the following:

"It is further recommended that:

- (a) the report dated May 30, 2000, from the Medical Officer of Health, embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

'It is recommended that:

- (1) Toronto City Council receive this report for information; and
 - (2) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, in consultation with the Medical Officer of Health, be directed to report to the Works Committee on the final results of the dental waste management study currently underway in Toronto.; and
- (b) the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee, in the event that any provincial or federal ministry responsible for discharges in water recommends a more stringent discharge level for any controlled substance, such report to detail the relevant changes."

8.33 Clause No. 8 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Rehabilitation and Redevelopment of the Canada Malting Complex, Metronome Canada Incorporated (Ward 24 - Downtown)".

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski moved that the Clause be amended by striking out the recommendation of the Administration Committee and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"It is recommended that Metronome Canada Incorporated (MCI) be granted a time extension to February 2001 to satisfy a condition of the Agreement to Lease relative to the acquisition of \$10,000,000.00 in capital funding."

- (b) Councillor Chow moved that motion (a) by Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski be amended by adding thereto the following:

“and further that:

- (1) the Ireland Commemorative Park be incorporated into the site plan for the project, and the Commissioner of Corporate Services be requested to submit a report to the Toronto Community Council in this regard;
- (2) the extension of time to February 2001, be the final extension granted by City Council; and
- (3) the Commissioner of Corporate Services, in consultation with officials of Metronome Canada Incorporated, be requested to submit a report to the Economic Development and Parks Committee, clarifying the terms of the Agreement to Lease concerning MCI’s financial obligation, specifically as it relates to in-kind contributions.”

Vote Be Now Taken:

Councillor Prue, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with subsection 37(e) of the Council Procedural By-law, the vote be now taken, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 27	
Councillors:	Adams, Bossons, Chong, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Jones, Kelly, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Moscoe, Nunziata, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas
No - 15	
Councillors:	Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Chow, Holyday, Kinahan, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, O’Brien, Ootes, Walker

Lost, less than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Motions:

- (c) Councillor Berardinetti moved that motion (a) by Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski be amended by adding thereto the words “and further that Metronome Canada Incorporated be requested to submit its business plan and fundraising strategy to the Economic Development and Parks Committee for consideration”.

- (d) Councillor Minnan-Wong moved that motion (a) by Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski be amended by adding thereto the words “subject to a provision that should Metronome Canada Incorporated be unable to raise \$10,000,000.00, with a minimum of 50 percent being in cash, the Commissioner of Corporate Services be directed to proceed with a Request for Proposals for alternatives”.
- (e) Councillor Holyday moved that motion (a) by Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski be amended by adding thereto the words “and further, that Metronome Canada Incorporated (MCI) be requested to give the \$272,182.33 in funds raised for the project to the City of Toronto, to be held in trust, and should MCI not meet its funding requirements by February 2001, the City retain the funds”.

Votes:

Motion (b) by Councillor Chow carried.

Adoption of motion (c) by Councillor Berardinetti:

Yes - 32	
Councillors:	Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Chow, Davis, Disero, Feldman, Holyday, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shiner, Soknacki, Walker
No - 9	
Councillors:	Adams, Duguid, Flint, Giansante, Mammoliti, Moscoe, Saundercook, Tzekas, Valenti

Carried by a majority of 23.

Adoption of motion (d) by Councillor Minnan-Wong:

Yes - 13	
Councillors:	Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Feldman, Giansante, Holyday, Li Preti, Minnan-Wong, O'Brien, Ootes, Pitfield
No - 28	
Councillors:	Adams, Balkissoon, Bossons, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Flint, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker

Lost by a majority of 15.

Adoption of motion (e) by Councillor Holyday:

Yes - 4 Councillors: Holyday, Minnan-Wong, O'Brien, Ootes
No - 37 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas, Valenti, Walker

Lost by a majority of 33.

Adoption of motion (a) by Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski, as amended:

Yes - 38 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas, Walker
No - 3 Councillors: Holyday, O'Brien, Valenti

Carried by a majority of 35.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

In summary, Council amended this Clause by striking out the recommendation of the Administration Committee and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) Metronome Canada Incorporated (MCI) be granted a time extension to February 2001 to satisfy a condition of the Agreement to Lease relative to the acquisition of \$10,000,000.00 in capital funding, such extension to be the final extension granted by City Council, and further, that MCI be requested to submit its business plan and fundraising strategy to the Economic Development and Parks Committee for consideration;

- (2) the Commissioner of Corporate Services, in consultation with officials of Metronome Canada Incorporated, be requested to submit a report to the Economic Development and Parks Committee, clarifying the terms of the Agreement to Lease concerning MCI's financial obligation, specifically as it relates to in-kind contributions; and
- (3) the Ireland Commemorative Park be incorporated into the site plan for the project, and the Commissioner of Corporate Services be requested to submit a report to the Toronto Community Council in this regard."

8.34 **Clause No. 16 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "City of Toronto - Accessibility Issues".**

Motion:

Councillor Johnston moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

"It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Corporate Services and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer be requested to submit a joint report to the Administration Committee on an audit and financial plan to ensure that the City of Toronto is an accessible city by 2008."

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Johnston, moved by Councillor Shiner in the absence of Councillor Johnston, carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.35 **Clause No. 12 of Report No. 12 of The Works Committee, headed "Review of Specific Road Classifications".**

Motion:

Councillor Bussin moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

"It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee, in one year's time, on the experience of designating Dundas Street East, from Broadview Avenue to Jones Avenue, as a minor arterial road."

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Bussin carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.36 Clause No. 1 of Report No. 12 of The Works Committee, headed “Kraft Bag Leaf and Yard Waste Collection”.*Motions:*

- (a) Councillor King moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee on a strategy for distributing free kraft bags and refuse collection calendars to the public, together with an explanation for the City’s transition from plastic to kraft leaf and yard waste bags.”

Councillor Disero in the Chair.

- (b) Councillor Davis moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that curb-side vacuum leaf collection cease to exist in areas of the City of Toronto where it is now provided, and yard waste be collected only in rigid open-top containers and kraft bags.”

Deputy Mayor Ootes in the Chair.

- (c) Councillor Disero moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to instruct yard waste collectors to immediately commence pick-up of yard waste in kraft paper bags, should some residents choose to start using such bags sooner than 2001.”

- (d) Councillor Walker moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee, in the event that technical advances lead to the development of alternative collection methods which provide equivalent or better program performance, in order that such developments can be considered by City Council.”

Vote Be Now Taken:

Councillor Shiner, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with subsection 37(e) of the Council Procedural By-law, the vote be now taken, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 24	
Councillors:	Adams, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Moeser, Nunziata, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas
No - 9	
Councillors:	Ashton, Davis, Holyday, Layton, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Ootes, Saundercook, Walker

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Permission to Withdraw Motion:

Councillor Davis, with the permission of Council, withdrew his motion (b).

Votes:

Motion (a) by Councillor King carried.

Adoption of motion (c) by Councillor Disero:

Yes - 33	
Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas, Walker
No - 0	

Carried, without dissent.

Motion (d) by Councillor Walker carried.

Adoption of Clause, as amended:

Yes - 34 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas
No - 1 Councillors: Walker

Carried by a majority of 33.

8.37 Clause No. 18 of Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed “Toronto Transit Commission - Policy Respecting the Placement of Names on TTC Tickets”.

Motion:

Councillor Jakobek moved that the Clause be received.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Jakobek carried.

8.38 Clause No. 5 of Report No. 5 of The Community Services Committee, headed “Enhancing the Co-ordination of Services to People who are Homeless”.

Motion:

Councillor Layton moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that:

- (1) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services be requested to continue to pursue the development of an infirmary option, and that the emphasis be on harm reduction efforts in the service co-ordination and discharge planning; and
- (2) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services be requested to investigate the feasibility of having bottled City water distributed to the homeless during the summer months, due to the shortage of bottled water resulting from the Walkerton crisis, and submit a report to the Community Services Committee on an implementation strategy.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Layton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

Motion to Re-Open:

Councillor Layton, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, this Clause be re-opened for further consideration, which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Motion:

Councillor Layton moved that the Clause be further amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Chief Administrative Officer and the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, in consultation with the Medical Officer of Health, be authorized to initiate a City water bottling program for emergency use, with funding of up to \$25,000.00 to be provided from the Corporate Contingency Account, if necessary, the details of such water bottling program to be as set out in the communication dated June 9, 2000, from the General Manager, Water and Wastewater Services, an extract from which is as follows:

‘Using Local 416 labour on regular time, we could prepare 5,000 half-litre bottles to have in storage, within two weeks, should an emergency occur. We estimate that, throughout the summer, we could produce 15,000 bottles at an estimated cost of \$25,000.00.’ ”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Layton carried.

The Clause, as further amended, carried.

8.39 **Clause No. 11 of Report No. 5 of The Planning and Transportation Committee, headed “Official Plan Policy Approach to Parkland Acquisition, City-Wide Applicability”.**

Motion:

Councillor Jones moved that the Clause be amended by adding to Recommendation No. (1) of the Planning and Transportation Committee, the following additional direction to the Commissioner of Urban Development Services and the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism:

- “(d) incorporate, as part of the new Official Plan, an appropriate waterfront access policy, including policies regarding the retention and acquisition of waterfront lands;”.

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Jones carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.40 **Clause No. 10 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed “Disposal of Surplus Library Property”.**

Motion:

Councillor Jones moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that:

- (1) the Commissioner of Corporate Services, in consultation with the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, be requested to submit a report to the Administration Committee on opportunities for non-profit and community service organizations to acquire the use of surplus Library Board properties; and
- (2) no further action be taken with respect to the 525 Horner Avenue property until the report requested in Recommendation No. (1), above, is considered by the Administration Committee.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Jones carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

Motion to Re-Open:

Councillor Moscoe, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, this Clause be re-opened for further consideration, which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Motion:

Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be further amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer be requested to develop a methodology to determine what share of the surplus property shall accrue to the originating agency, board or commission, and submit a report thereon to the Administration Committee.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Moscoe carried.

The Clause, as further amended, carried.

8.41 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 4 of The Board of Health, headed “Air Pollution Burden of Illness in Toronto - Summary Report”.**

Motion:

Councillor Layton moved that the Clause be amended by striking out and referring the following Recommendation No. (5) of the Board of Health to the Chief Administrative Officer and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, with a request that they submit a joint report to the Policy and Finance Committee on the financial implications of such recommendation:

“(5) ensure that adequate and sustained funding is provided in a timely fashion to implement the recommendations contained in the Environmental Plan that are directed at the improvement of air quality in Toronto, including Phase II of the Toronto Smog Plan;”.

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Layton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.42 **Clause No. 3 of Report No. 5 of The Planning and Transportation Committee, headed “Accessible Taxicab Class of Licence”.**

Motion:

Councillor Moscoe, seconded by Councillor Minnan-Wong, moved that the Clause be amended by:

- (1) adding to additional Recommendation No. (3) proposed by the Planning and Transportation Committee, the words “the allotment of licences be issued firstly to applicants on the Drivers’ List and secondly to the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) in the event that any licences remain from the allotment (licences issued to the TTC would be for the sole purpose of fulfilling the WheelTrans contract and would be issued only to licensed taxicab brokerages)”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

“(3) the City of Toronto approve the issuance of 50 Accessible Taxicab licences for the current year and an additional 25 Accessible Taxicab licences in 2001, the allotment of licences be issued firstly to applicants on the Drivers’ List and secondly to the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) in the event that any licences remain from the allotment (licences issued to the TTC would be for the sole purpose of fulfilling the WheelTrans contract and would be issued only to licensed taxicab brokerages);”;

- (2) inserting in additional Recommendation No. (4) proposed by the Planning and Transportation Committee, after the words “Accessible Taxicab”, the words “obtaining a licence from the Drivers’ List”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

“(4) every owner of an Accessible Taxicab obtaining a licence from the Drivers’ List, be required to personally drive his/her vehicle on a full time basis and be permitted to hire up to three drivers to cover the periods beyond the twelve hour per day working limit and weekend hours;”;

- (3) deleting additional Recommendations Nos. (6), (7) and (8) proposed by the Planning and Transportation Committee and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“(6) all owners and drivers operating Accessible Taxicabs be required to attend and successfully complete specialized training developed and delivered by the Municipal Licensing and Standards Division relative to the needs of the disabled community; and

(7) all taxicab brokerages that receive licences from the TTC shall ensure that all vehicles used for the purpose of Accessible Taxicab service be properly licensed taxicabs within the City of Toronto.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Moscoe, seconded by Councillor Minnan-Wong, carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.43 **Clause No. 31 of Report No. 9 of The Toronto Community Council, headed “Tree Removal - 4 Glen Edyth Drive (Midtown)”.**

Motion:

Councillor Davis moved that consideration of the Clause be deferred to the next regular meeting of City Council scheduled to be held on July 4, 2000.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Davis carried.

8.44 **Clause No. 11 of Report No. 12 of The Works Committee, headed “Traffic Calming Measures and Policies”.**

Councillor Saundercook advised the Council of his intention to place a motion with respect to traffic calming.

Ruling by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the nature of the proposed motion, and to the recommendation of the Works Committee, which pertains to traffic enforcement only, ruled that, if such a motion was placed, it would be out of order, as the matter of traffic calming was not before Council.

Councillor Saundercook challenged the ruling of the Deputy Mayor.

Vote to Uphold the Ruling of the Deputy Mayor:

Yes - 34	
Councillors:	Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Shiner, Soknacki, Walker
No - 6	
Councillors:	Davis, Fillion, Flint, Minnan-Wong, Saundercook, Tzekas

Carried by a majority of 28.

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Ashton moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Toronto Police Services Board be requested to review:

- (1) the effectiveness of the Divisional organization of traffic enforcement; and
- (2) the potential for traffic enforcement by non-police officers.”

- (b) Councillor Filion moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Chief Administrative Officer, in consultation with the Chair of the Toronto Police Services Board, be requested to submit a report to Council, through the Works Committee, on the possibility of creating a separate police unit, to be financed from revenues from ticketing, to enforce speed limits throughout the City of Toronto.”

Councillor Disero in the Chair.

- (c) Councillor Miller moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Chair of the Toronto Police Services Board, in consultation with the Mayor, be requested to submit a report to the Works Committee, through the Toronto Police Services Board, on the possibility of using the existing Community Action Policing program for traffic enforcement.”

- (d) Councillor Davis moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that:

- (1) the Chief Administrative Officer, in consultation with the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, be requested to submit a report to the Policy and Finance Committee, through the Works Committee, on the possibility of dedicating \$900,000.00 from the Corporate Contingency Account to the Toronto Police Service, specifically for officers dedicated exclusively to local neighbourhood traffic enforcement during the months of March to September each year;
- (2) the Toronto Police Services Board be requested to participate in a risk/benefit analysis of all traffic mitigation projects being conducted by the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services; and

- (3) the Medical Officer of Health, in consultation with the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, be requested to submit a report to Council, through the Works Committee, on the potential impacts of increased smog emissions.”

Deputy Mayor Ootes in the Chair.

Ruling of the Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the nature of Part (3) of motion (d) by Councillor Davis, ruled such motion out of order.

Motions:

- (e) Councillor Kelly moved that Part (1) of motion (d) by Councillor Davis be amended by adding thereto the words “and further, that the Chief Administrative Officer also be requested to investigate alternatives for non-policing options which may be available to enforce traffic regulations, and include in his report the experiences of other cities or jurisdictions which have implemented similar options”.
- (f) Councillor Nunziata moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the Toronto Police Services Board be requested to investigate the possibility of parking police vehicles which are not being used in active service in appropriate locations, in order to encourage reductions in speed.”

Votes:

Motion (a) by Councillor Ashton carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Filion carried.

Motion (c) by Councillor Miller, moved by Councillor Saundercook in the absence of Councillor Miller, carried.

Motion (e) by Councillor Kelly carried.

Adoption of Part (1) of motion (d) by Councillor Davis, as amended:

Yes - 15	Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Bussin, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Giansante, Holyday, Kelly, Mihevc, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas
No - 29	Councillors: Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Cho, Chong, Chow, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Jones, Kinahan, King, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Shiner, Soknacki, Walker

Lost by a majority of 14.

Adoption of Part (2) of motion (d) by Councillor Davis:

Yes - 15	Councillors: Adams, Berardinetti, Davis, Holyday, Kelly, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, Palacio, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas
No - 29	Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Bossons, Brown, Cho, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, King, Layton, McConnell, Mihevc, Moscoe, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Shiner, Soknacki, Walker

Lost by a majority of 14.

Motion (f) by Councillor Nunziata carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.45 Clause No. 1 of Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed “Review of Business Reference Group Recommendations, Proposed Tax Policy Tools for 2001 Assessment”.

Motion:

Councillor Kinahan moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Policy and Finance Committee for further consideration, and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer be requested to clarify, with provincial officials, the reasons why City Council’s previous request for the policy referenced in the following Recommendation No. (1)(iv)(b) of the Policy and Finance Committee, was modified to allow only an eight-year cap, rather than a permanent change for this tax class, and submit a report thereon to the Policy and Finance Committee for consideration therewith:

- “(1)(iv)(b) the optional ‘New multi-residential’ class that taxes newly-constructed rental buildings at the residential rate for an eight-year period be changed to allow for a permanent tax rate reduction for this class;”.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Kinahan carried.

8.46 **Clause No. 9 of Report No. 5 of The Planning and Transportation Committee, headed “Harmonization of Fence By-law”.**

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Balkissoon moved that the Clause be amended by amending the harmonized fence by-law:
- (1) in accordance with Recommendation No. (1) of the Scarborough Community Council, embodied in the communication dated May 29, 2000, from the City Clerk (Scarborough Community Council), viz.:
- “(1) deleting subsection (3) from ‘Part 2 - Fences’, under Section 3. ‘Fence Height’, viz.:
- ‘(3) Despite subsection (1), no part of a fence on single residential property that is closer than 1.8 metres to a window located above the basement in a dwelling on abutting single residential property shall exceed a height of 1.2 metres or, subject to subsection (1), the height of the sill of the window, whichever is higher, unless the fence is a chain link fence with open mesh.’ ”;
- (2) by amending the Section 3 Table, headed “Maximum Height of Fences”, to provide that:
- (a) the maximum height for those fences, other than chain-link, be increased from 800 millimetres to 1 metre when located in a front yard and within 2.4 metres of a front lot line, for single residential properties; and
- (b) there be a requirement that fences, constructed of any material, located on the lot line in a front yard or flankage yard, be located no less than 3 metres from:
- (i) a sidewalk which forms part of a highway; and

- (ii) the travelled portion of a highway in instances where there is no sidewalk,

provided that such fence does not exceed 2 metres in height; and
- (3) in accordance with the report dated April 17, 2000, from the City Solicitor, wherein it is recommended that:
 - “(1) Sections 11 and 12 of the draft harmonized fence by-law be re-worded as outlined in this report, viz.:
 - ‘11. Exemptions

Where a person is required to erect a specified fence under another City by-law or under an order made under subsection 15.7(1) or 17(1) of the Building Code Act, 1992, the fence is exempt from any provision of this by-law with which it does not comply.’
 - ‘12. Conflict

Subject to Section 11, where this by-law conflicts with any other by-law, this by-law prevails to the extent of the conflict.’; and
 - (2) Ward Councillors be informed when a Property Standards Officer or the Chief Building Official has made an emergency order under the Building Code Act, 1992 requiring that a fence be erected that does not comply with the harmonized fence by-law.”
- (b) Councillor Bossons moved that the Clause be amended by inserting in the harmonized fence by-law the words “or equivalent open fence construction that does not restrict sight lines” after all occurrences of the phrase “open mesh chain link fence”, in the Section 3 Table, headed “Maximum Height of Fences”, and elsewhere in the by-law, with the exception of those references to regulations for swimming pool fences.

Votes:

Motion (a) by Councillor Balkissoon carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Bossons carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.47 **Clause No. 5 of Report No. 5 of The Planning and Transportation Committee, headed "Taxicab Driver Safety".**

Motion:

Councillor Ashton moved that the Clause be amended by adding to Recommendation No. (9) of the Planning and Transportation Committee, the words "and driver safety, and further, that the Commissioner of Urban Development Services be requested to submit a report thereon, to the Planning and Transportation Committee and Council, in one year's time", so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

- "(9) the Municipal Licensing and Standards Division support the work of the Sub-Committee, and continue to study the impact of various safety devices/procedures on ridership and driver safety, and further, that the Commissioner of Urban Development Services be requested to submit a report thereon, to the Planning and Transportation Committee and Council, in one year's time;"

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Ashton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.48 **Clause No. 12 of Report No. 6 of The Scarborough Community Council, headed "Request for Direction, Draft Plan of Subdivision Application SC-T19990011, Canada Lands Company, North side of McLevin Avenue, East and West of Tapscott Road, Malvern Community (Ward 18 - Scarborough Malvern)".**

Motion:

Councillor Layton moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

- "It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, in consultation with officials of the Canada Lands Company and other appropriate City staff, be requested to explore the possibility of other stormwater mitigation techniques that may be incorporated into the development, such as french drains, permeable or oversized piping or other kinds of retention and mitigation measures."

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Layton carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.49 Clause No. 10 of Report No. 6 of The Economic Development and Parks Committee, headed “Establishment of a Task Force on User Fees (All Wards)”.

Motions to Re-Open:

- (a) Councillor Nunziata, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, this Clause be re-opened for further consideration, which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.
- (b) Councillor Nunziata further moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 5 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed “City of Toronto 2000 Recommended Operating Budget”, adopted, as amended, by City Council at its Special Meeting held on April 26, 2000, be re-opened for further consideration, only insofar as it pertains to the number of Members proposed for the Task Force on User Fees.

Vote:

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Nunziata:

Yes - 31	
Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Bossons, Bussin, Cho, Chow, Duguid, Filion, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, King, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shiner, Silva, Sinclair, Tzekas, Walker
No - 12	
Councillors:	Brown, Chong, Davis, Disero, Flint, Giansante, Kelly, Kinahan, Layton, Li Preti, Ootes, Saundercook

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Motion:

- (c) Councillor Nunziata moved that the Clause be amended to provide that the Membership of the Recreation User Fee Task Force be increased to ten, and that the following Members of Council be appointed thereto:
- Councillor Bas Balkissoon, Scarborough Malvern;
 - Councillor Sandra Bussin, East Toronto;
 - Councillor Blake F. Kinahan, Lakeshore Queensway;
 - Councillor Chris Korwin-Kuczynski, High Park;
 - Councillor George Mammoliti, North York Humber;

- Councillor Pam McConnell, Don River;
- Councillor Ron Moeser, Scarborough Highland Creek;
- Councillor Frances Nunziata, York Humber;
- Councillor Jane Pitfield, East York; and
- Councillor David Shiner, Seneca Heights.

Votes:

Motion (c) by Councillor Nunziata carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.50 **Clause No. 18 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed “Health Impacts Resulting from the Fire at 75 Commissioners Street - Lease Provisions Respecting City-Owned Properties”.**

Motion:

Councillor Kinahan moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the City Solicitor be requested to submit a report to the Administration Committee on why the Standard Boiler Plate clause, namely that the tenant shall obey on municipal, provincial and federal laws, was not included in the lease.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Kinahan carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.51 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 3 of The Board of Health, headed “Venomous Snake”.**

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Filion moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that City Council adopt the following motion:

‘**WHEREAS** the City’s Animal Control By-law No. 28-1999 prohibits the keeping of poisonous and venomous animals by members of the general public; and

WHEREAS the continued existence of these animals in unregulated premises requires a comprehensive control strategy to protect the health and safety of the general public, City staff and other workers;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City Council endorse the development of an inter-agency response plan that includes public education, a voluntary compliance program, animal relocation and emergency preparedness;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Medical Officer of Health be requested to submit a report to the Board of Health on the implementation of this plan; in consultation with the appropriate City officials and stakeholders.’ ”

- (b) Councillor Chow, on behalf of Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski, moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that:

- (1) City Council request the federal government to ensure that, when dangerous exotic animals or reptiles are imported into Canada, antidotes, where available, accompany such animals or reptiles;
- (2) the Board of Health be requested to review the exotic animal listing currently embodied in the Animal Control By-law, in order to add or remove animals and/or reptiles from the by-law; and
- (3) the Medical Officer of Health be requested to:
 - (a) submit a report to the Board of Health, as soon as possible, on the implementation of an amnesty period whereby businesses and residents in the City of Toronto would be permitted to relinquish, to appropriate City officials, without penalization, any exotic animals and/or reptiles in their possession, such report to address how this amnesty period would be advertised and how educational material could be made available to businesses and residents outlining reasons why exotic animals and reptiles should not be owned; and
 - (b) strictly enforce all applicable legislation against any individuals involved in the selling of illegal exotic animals or reptiles.”

Vote Be Now Taken:

Councillor Johnston, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with subsection 37(e) of the Council Procedural By-law, the vote be now taken, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 17 Councillors:	Balkissoon, Davis, Feldman, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Kelly, Li Preti, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Palacio, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook
No - 14 Councillors:	Augimeri, Berger, Chow, Duguid, Filion, Holyday, Jones, Kinahan, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Miller, Moscoe, Ootes, Sinclair

Lost, less than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Votes:

Motion (a) by Councillor Filion carried.

Part (1) of motion (b) by Councillor Chow carried.

Adoption of balance of motion (b) by Councillor Chow:

Yes - 17 Councillors:	Altobello, Balkissoon, Chow, Davis, Gardner, Holyday, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, Pitfield, Prue, Saundercook, Silva, Walker
No - 21 Councillors:	Ashton, Augimeri, Cho, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Layton, Li Preti, McConnell, Mihevc, Ootes, Palacio, Rae, Sinclair

Lost by a majority of 4.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.52 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 5 of The Etobicoke Community Council, headed “Designation of 40 km/h Speed Limit - Prince Edward Drive, South of Bloor Street West and Edgevalley Drive/Edgehill Road”.**

Having regard that the Clause was submitted without recommendation:

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Giansante moved that Council adopt the following recommendations:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) Council approve the designation of Edgevalley Drive/Edgehill Road as 40 kilometre per hour speed limit streets;
- (2) Council adopt the criteria and procedures outlined in the report dated November 18, 1999, from the Director of Transportation Services, District 2, for the implementation of 40 kilometre per hour speed limits on residential roads;
- (3) Council approve the designation of the new Ward 4 community as a 40 kilometre per hour speed limit community, with the exception of arterial and collector roads and any other roads which do not meet at least two of the criteria which would be used by staff; and
- (4) the appropriate City officials be requested to take whatever action is necessary to give effect to the foregoing, including the introduction in Council of any Bills that may be required.”

- (b) Councillor Kinahan moved that Council adopt the following recommendations:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) Council approve the designation of the Prince Edward Drive south of Bloor Street West area as a 40 kilometre per hour speed limit area; and
- (2) the appropriate City officials be requested to take whatever action is necessary to give effect to the foregoing, including the introduction in Council of any Bills that may be required.”

- (c) Councillor King moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Etobicoke Community Council for further consideration.

Vote on Referral:

Adoption of motion (c) by Councillor King:

Yes - 17 Councillors:	Ashton, Cho, Chong, Davis, Duguid, Filion, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, King, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Moscoe, Ootes, Palacio, Pitfield
No - 17 Councillors:	Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Disero, Feldman, Giansante, Jakobek, Kinahan, Layton, Mammoliti, Nunziata, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair

Lost, there being an equal division of votes.

Motions:

(d) Councillor Sinclair moved that Part (1) of motion (b) by Councillor Kinahan be amended to provide that the area from south of Bloor Street West to Berry Road and from the Humber River to Mimico Creek be designated as a 40 kilometre per hour speed limit area.

(e) Councillor Bossons moved that Council adopt the following recommendation:

“It is recommended that all roads in the former City of Etobicoke area of the City of Toronto, with the exception of arterial roads, be designated as 40 kilometre per hour speed zones.”

Ruling by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the nature of motion (e) by Councillor Bossons, ruled such motion out of order.

Motions:

(f) Councillor Lindsay Luby moved that:

(1) Council adopt the following recommendation:

“It is recommended that the roads shown on Map 1 appended to the report dated November 18, 1999, from the Director, Transportation Services, District 2, be designated as 40 kilometre per hour speed zones.”; and

(2) Part (3) of motion (a) by Councillor Giansante be referred to the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, with a request that he submit a report thereon to the Etobicoke Community Council.

(g) Councillor Brown moved that Council adopt the following recommendations:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) Highway 27, from Belfield Road to Albion Road, be reduced to 60 kilometres per hour;
- (2) Westmore Drive, from Finch Avenue West to Humber College, be reduced to 40 kilometres per hour; and
- (3) Humber College Boulevard, from Highway 27 to Lynnmount Drive, be reduced to 40 kilometres per hour.”

Ruling by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the nature of motion (g) by Councillor Brown, ruled such motion out of order.

Motion:

(h) Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Etobicoke Community Council.

Ruling by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the decision of Council with respect to motion (c) by Councillor King, ruled motion (h) by Councillor Moscoe out of order.

Motion to Re-Open:

Councillor Mammoliti, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, the decision of Council with respect to the referral of this Clause back to the Etobicoke Community Council, be re-opened for further consideration, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 22 Councillors: Augimeri, Bossons, Chong, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, King, Layton, Li Preti, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Moscoe, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Soknacki
No - 11 Councillors: Balkissoon, Berger, Brown, Chow, Gardner, Giansante, Kinahan, Lindsay Luby, Rae, Saundercook, Sinclair

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Motion:

- (i) Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be struck out and referred back to the Etobicoke Community Council for further consideration.

Vote on Referral:

Adoption of motion (i) by Councillor Moscoe:

Yes - 24 Councillors:	Ashton, Berger, Bossons, Chong, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, King, Layton, Li Preti, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Soknacki
No - 12 Councillors:	Augimeri, Balkissoon, Brown, Chow, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Kinahan, Lindsay Luby, Rae, Saundercook, Sinclair

Carried by a majority of 12.

8.53 **Clause No. 9 of Report No. 12 of The Works Committee, headed “Enactment of By-law to Prohibit the Burning of Used Motor Oil”.**

Motion:

Councillor King moved that the Clause be amended by amending Recommendation No. (1) embodied in the report dated May 1, 2000, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, to read as follows:

- “(1) Council proceed with the enactment of the draft by-law to prohibit the burning of used motor oil, and that prior notice be given to affected parties for the purpose of deputations;”.

Votes:

The motion by Councillor King carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.54 **Clause No. 1 of Report No. 11 of The Works Committee, headed “Toronto Integrated Solid Waste Resource Management (‘TIRM’) Process - Request for Proposals for Disposal Services”.**

Motion:

Councillor King moved that the Clause be amended by deleting from the recommendation of the Works Committee, after the words “Emergency Services”, the words “a verifiable environmental”, and inserting in lieu thereof the words “an environmental”, and adding to such recommendation the words “verifiable to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services”, so that the recommendation of the Works Committee shall now read as follows:

“The Works Committee recommends that TIRM Respondents offering disposal services be required to have in place at the time of contract implementation, or an implementation schedule acceptable to the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, an environmental management system for their disposal, operations and applicable transportation systems, verifiable to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor King carried.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.55 **Clause No. 4 of Report No. 5 of The Planning and Transportation Committee, headed “Prepayment of Taxi Fares”.**

Motion:

Councillor Moscoe moved that consideration of the Clause be deferred to the next regular meeting of City Council scheduled to be held on July 4, 2000.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Moscoe carried.

8.56 **Clause No. 8 of Report No. 5 of The Planning and Transportation Committee, headed “Harmonization of the Division Fence By-law”.**

Motion:

Councillor Moscoe moved that consideration of the Clause be deferred to the next regular meeting of City Council scheduled to be held on July 4, 2000.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Moscoe carried.

8.57 Clause No. 17 of Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed "Procurement of Additional Subway Cars, Toronto Transit Commission".

Motions:

(a) Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be amended by amending the recommendation embodied in the report dated May 11, 2000, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, by:

- (1) deleting the word "not";
- (2) deleting the word "unless" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "if"; and
- (3) adding thereto the words "subject to the approval of the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, and Council",

so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

"It is recommended that Council approve the proposed advanced purchase of 80 T-1 subway cars if funds are contributed towards this purchase by the federal and/or provincial governments, subject to the approval of the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, and Council."

(b) Councillor Jakobek moved that consideration of this Clause be deferred to the next regular meeting of City Council scheduled to be held on July 4, 2000.

Vote on Deferral:

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Jakobek:

Yes - 27	
Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Gardner, Jakobek, Johnston, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki
No - 8	
Councillors:	Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Miller, Rae

Carried by a majority of 19.

8.58 Clause No. 8 of Report No. 6 of The York Community Council, headed “Rogers Road between Caledonia Road and Oakwood Avenue, Proposed Road Modifications with Reconstruction, Ward 28 - York Eglinton”.

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Mihevc moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the recommendations in the report dated May 19, 2000, from the Director, Transportation Services, District 1, be adopted, and that a copy of the Clause be forwarded to the residents of Rogers Road, including those homes that flank Rogers Road between Oakwood Avenue and Dufferin Street, for a poll to determine if there is majority support for the proposed road modifications.”

- (b) Councillor Moscoe moved that consideration of traffic calming measures on that portion of Rogers Road, between Caledonia Road and Oakwood Avenue, be deferred sine die, and that Council take no action with respect to the balance of the Clause.

Vote:

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Moscoe:

Yes - 26	
Councillors:	Adams, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Cho, Chong, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Prue, Rae, Sinclair, Soknacki
No - 9	
Councillors:	Altobello, Bussin, Chow, Jones, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Pitfield, Saundercook

Carried by a majority of 17.

8.59 **IN-CAMERA MEETING SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

June 7, 2000:

Motion:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, at 6:10 p.m., moved that Council resolve itself into Committee of the Whole in the Council Chamber and then recess to meet privately to consider Clause No. 16 of Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed “Acquisition of Municipal Electrical Utilities by Toronto Hydro Corporation”, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, having regard that such Clause contains information pertaining to the security of property interests of the municipality.

Vote:

The motion by Deputy Mayor Ootes carried.

Council resolved itself into Committee of the Whole.

Committee of the Whole recessed at 6:20 p.m., to meet privately in the Council Chamber to consider the above matter, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act.

Committee of the Whole rose, reconvened as Council at 7:28 p.m., and met in public session in the Council Chamber.

Deputy Mayor Ootes took the Chair and called the Members to order.

8.60 **Clause No. 16 of Report No. 7 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed “Acquisition of Municipal Electrical Utilities by Toronto Hydro Corporation”.**

Motions:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, reported that the following motions had been moved in Committee of the Whole for consideration by Council in conjunction with the Clause:

- (a) Councillor Moscoe moved that the Clause be amended by:
 - (1) inserting in Recommendation No. (3) embodied in the joint confidential report dated May 23, 2000, from the Chief Administrative Officer and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, after the words “Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer”, the words “and City Council, through the Administration Committee”, so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

“(3) Council authorize an amendment to the Shareholder Direction requiring Toronto Hydro to provide the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer and City Council, through the Administration Committee, with a quarterly update on its acquisition activity, indicating the bids that have been submitted, with commentary on the ones that have been successful, as well as those that have been unsuccessful along with the underlying reasons;”,

and amending the First Amendment to the Shareholder Direction Relating to Toronto Hydro Corporation (Draft 6/7/00) accordingly; and

(2) adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that Toronto Hydro be requested to provide City Council, through the Telecommunications Steering Committee, with an inventory of the full telecommunications assets of each successful acquisition, within two months of the date of such acquisition.”

(b) Councillor Kelly moved that the Clause be amended by adding thereto the following:

“It is further recommended that the First Amendment to the Shareholder Direction Relating to Toronto Hydro Corporation (Draft 6/7/00) be adopted.”

Votes:

Part (1) of motion (a) by Councillor Moscoe carried.

Part (2) of motion (a) by Councillor Moscoe carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Kelly, as amended, carried.

Adoption of Clause, as amended:

Yes - 35	
Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, McConnell, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Saundercook, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas
No - 1	
Councillor:	Walker

Carried by a majority of 34.

June 9, 2000:

Motion:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, at 3:41 p.m., moved that Council resolve itself into Committee of the Whole in the Council Chamber and then recess to meet privately to consider the following confidential matters on the Order Paper for this meeting of Council, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act:

- (a) Clause No. 3 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed “Conditions of Employment - Council Staff Members”, having regard that such Clause pertains to labour relations and employee negotiations;
- (b) Clause No. 4 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed “Council Office Support Staff”, having regard that such Clause pertains to employee negotiations; and
- (c) Clause No. 17 of Report No. 7 of The North York Community Council, headed “Ontario Municipal Board Decision and Legal Proceedings Respecting Official Plan Amendment 447”, having regard that such Clause pertains to litigation or potential litigation.

Vote:

The motion by Deputy Mayor Ootes carried.

Council resolved itself into Committee of the Whole.

Committee of the Whole recessed at 3:47 p.m., to meet privately in the Council Chamber to consider the above matters, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act.

Committee of the Whole rose, reconvened as Council at 4:25 p.m., and met in public session in the Council Chamber.

Deputy Mayor Ootes took the Chair and called the Members to order.

8.61 Clause No. 3 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed “Conditions of Employment - Council Staff Members”.

Motions:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, reported that the following motions had been moved in Committee of the Whole for consideration by Council in conjunction with the Clause:

Having regard that the Clause was submitted without recommendation:

- (a) Councillor Moscoe moved that Council adopt the following recommendation:

“It is recommended that the confidential report dated May 16, 2000, from the Executive Director of Human Resources, embodying the following recommendations, be adopted:

‘Consistent with the direction provided previously by the Administration Committee, as modified by the Policy and Finance Committee and Council, it is recommended that:

- (1) the recommended salary ranges, as proposed by the Hay Group, for the position of Executive Assistant to Councillor, be adopted at \$45,810.00 to \$60,560.00, effective January 1, 1998;
- (2) incumbent Executive Assistants below the minimum of \$45,810.00 be placed immediately at the level of \$45,810.00, effective January 1, 1998, or their date of hire, whichever is later;
- (3) incumbent Executive Assistants receive the benefit of up to a 3 percent performance increment for satisfactory performance in 1998 and up to a 3 percent increment for satisfactory performance in 1999; increases would be based on the annual anniversary date of the individual;
- (4) incumbent Executive Assistants who perform satisfactorily during 2000 be eligible for up to a 3 percent performance increment, based on the anniversary date of the individual;
- (5) future progression through the salary range for Executive Assistants be considered during 2000, consistent with forthcoming staff recommendations with respect to movement through the new salary ranges adopted by City Council for non-union staff;
- (6) this approach apply to all Executive Assistants currently on staff;
- (7) until the new Council deals with the appropriate mix and number of staff to be funded by the Council budget, a freeze be placed on the hiring of more than one Executive Assistant per office, with the current offices being grandparented;
- (8) those Constituency Assistants and exempt Administrative Assistants who are not at the maximum of their salary range be eligible to receive up to a 3 percent performance increase for 1998, 1999 and 2000, depending on their annual anniversary date;

- (9) future progression for Constituency Assistants and exempt Administrative Assistants be considered when City Council considers both the recommendations from the Hay Group on salary levels and staff recommendations with respect to the appropriate level of progression through the salary ranges;
 - (10) the proposed job description for exempt Administrative Assistants be placed before the Administration Committee, through the Personnel Sub-Committee, no later than June 2000;
 - (11) the recommendations on the appropriate salary levels for Constituency Assistants and exempt Administrative Assistants be placed before the Administration Committee, through the Personnel Sub-Committee, no later than August 2000; and
 - (12) recommendations regarding progression through the approved salary ranges be placed before the Administration Committee, through the Personnel Sub-Committee, no later than August 2000.’ ”
- (b) Councillor Adams moved that motion (a) by Councillor Moscoe be amended by adding thereto the following words:

“subject to individual Members of Council, in consultation with the Executive Director of Human Resources, being permitted to set the appropriate placement of their own Executive Assistants (for both continuing staff and new hires) on the new salary scale, commensurate with the skills and experience of the employee, and that for Executive Assistants, such placement may be effective from January 1, 2000.”

Votes:

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Adams:

Yes - 28	
Councillors:	Adams, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Walker
No - 9	
Councillors:	Altobello, Ashton, Feldman, Filion, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Minnan-Wong, Soknacki

Carried by a majority of 19.

Adoption of motion (a) by Councillor Moscoe, as amended:

Yes - 22 Councillors: Adams, Augimeri, Brown, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Fillion, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Ootes, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair
No - 15 Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bossons, Davis, Feldman, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Lindsay Luby, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, Pitfield, Soknacki, Walker

Carried by a majority of 17.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.62 Clause No. 4 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed “Council Office Support Staff”.

Motions:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, reported that the following motions had been moved in Committee of the Whole for consideration by Council in conjunction with the Clause:

Having regard that the Clause was submitted without recommendation:

(a) Councillor Soknacki moved that Council adopt the following recommendation:

“It is recommended that Council adopt the following policy with respect to Council office support staff:

- (1) no employment of relatives of Members of Council shall be permitted within Councillors’ offices and the Mayor’s offices;
- (2) relatives, for the purposes of this policy, shall be defined as:
 - (i) spouse, including common-law and same-sex spouse;
 - (ii) parent, including step-parent and legal guardian;
 - (iii) child, including step-child;
 - (iv) sibling; and
 - (v) any person who lives with the employee on a permanent basis;
- (3) implementation of this policy shall take effect with the new term of City Council, on December 1, 2000; and

- (4) a grandparenting clause be included in the policy in order to provide for the retention of existing staff.”
- (b) Councillor Duguid moved that Part (2) of motion (a) by Councillor Soknacki be amended to provide that siblings of Members of Council be exempt from the policy.
- (c) Councillor Chong moved that Council adopt the following recommendation:
- “It is recommended that there be no restrictions placed upon the employment of relatives of Council.”
- (d) Councillor Davis moved that Council adopt the following recommendation:
- “It is recommended that the Executive Director of Human Resources be requested to submit a report to the Administration Committee, during the next term of Council, on the implications of having a corporate-wide policy restricting the hiring of relatives.”

Ruling by the Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, having regard to the nature of motion (d) by Councillor Davis, ruled such motion out of order.

Motion:

- (e) Councillor Minnan-Wong moved that Part (3) of motion (a) by Councillor Soknacki be amended to provide that the policy come into force immediately.

Votes:

Adoption of motion (c) by Councillor Chong:

Yes - 5	
Councillors:	Augimeri, Bossons, Chong, Feldman, Moscoe
No - 32	
Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Berardinetti, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki, Walker

Lost by a majority of 27.

Adoption of motion (b) by Councillor Duguid:

Yes - 5 Councillors:	Adams, Augimeri, Bossons, Chong, Duguid
No - 32 Councillors:	Altobello, Berardinetti, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Disero, Feldman, Filion, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki, Walker

Lost by a majority of 27.

Adoption of motion (e) by Councillor Minnan-Wong:

Yes - 7 Councillors:	Augimeri, Duguid, Holyday, Kinahan, Layton, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata
No - 30 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Feldman, Filion, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki, Walker

Lost by a majority of 23.

Adoption of Part (4) of motion (a) by Councillor Soknacki:

Yes - 13 Councillors:	Adams, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Holyday, Miller, Ootes, Silva, Soknacki
No - 24 Councillors:	Altobello, Augimeri, Bussin, Davis, Feldman, Filion, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sinclair, Walker

Lost by a majority of 11.

Adoption of the balance of motion (a) by Councillor Soknacki, without amendment:

Yes - 33 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Berardinetti, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki, Walker
No - 4 Councillors:	Augimeri, Bossons, Chong, Feldman

Carried by a majority of 29.

The Clause, as amended, carried.

8.63 **Clause No. 17 of Report No. 7 of The North York Community Council, headed “Ontario Municipal Board Decision and Legal Proceedings Respecting Official Plan Amendment 447”.**

Motion:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act, reported that the following motion had been moved in Committee of the Whole for consideration by Council in conjunction with the Clause:

Moved by Councillor Filion:

“That the Clause be received, and that no further action be taken in this regard.”

Votes:

Adoption of motion by Councillor Filion:

Yes - 17 Councillors:	Adams, Augimeri, Chong, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Jakobek, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Sinclair
No - 18 Councillors:	Altobello, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Chow, Feldman, Giansante, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Soknacki, Walker

Lost by a majority of 1.

Adoption of Clause, without amendment:

Yes - 19 Councillors:	Altobello, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Feldman, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, Minnan-Wong, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Walker
No - 17 Councillors:	Adams, Augimeri, Chong, Chow, Davis, Duguid, Filion, Jakobek, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes

Carried by a majority of 2.

MOTIONS (NOTICE PREVIOUSLY GIVEN) AND NOTICES OF MOTION

8.64 Deputy Mayor Ootes called upon Motion F appearing on the Order Paper, as follows:

Moved by: Councillor Duguid

Seconded by: Councillor Davis

“WHEREAS City Council established the Task Force on Community Safety in January 1998, with a mandate to establish a blueprint for crime prevention; and

WHEREAS City Council, at its meeting held on March 2, 3 and 4, 1999, adopted, as amended, Clause No. 4 of Report No. 5 of The Strategic Policies and Priorities Committee, headed ‘Final Report of the Task Force on Community Safety’, and, in so doing, elected to re-create the Task Force on Community Safety to carry on its work; and

WHEREAS the 35 Recommendations of the Task Force on Community Safety are designed as the most comprehensive crime prevention and community safety strategy ever undertaken in the history of the City of Toronto; and

WHEREAS the Task Force, endeavouring to fulfill its mandate and report back to the current Council, has of necessity scheduled full day meetings of the Task Force, which is comprised of Members of Council and community representatives;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT authority be granted to amend quorum restrictions for the Task Force on Community Safety, from 8 out of 15 members, to 6 out of 15 members, to accommodate the full day meetings, and to allow for the possible temporary absence of private or Council members of the Task Force.”

Advice by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes advised the Council that the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law requiring the referral of Motion F to the Policy and Finance Committee would have to be waived in order to now consider such Motion.

Procedural Vote:

The vote to waive referral of Motion F to the Policy and Finance Committee carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Vote:

Motion F was adopted, without amendment.

8.65 Deputy Mayor Ootes called upon Motion I appearing on the Order Paper, as follows:

Moved by: Councillor Pitfield

Seconded by: Councillor Rae

“**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Commissioner of Urban Development Services be requested to submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee on the feasibility of requiring any developer proposing to demolish any heritage building(s) to conduct an international design competition with respect to the replacement structure.”

In accordance with the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law, Motion I was referred to the Planning and Transportation Committee.

- 8.66 Councillor Pitfield moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(1), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: **Councillor Pitfield**

Seconded by: **Councillor Prue**

“**WHEREAS** City Council, at its meeting held on May 9, 10 and 11, 2000, adopted, without amendment, Clause No. 7 of Report No. 4 of The East York Community Council, headed ‘Florida Restaurant Boulevard Café/Patio – 940 Pape Avenue, Extension of the Hours That Alcoholic Beverages Can Be Served on the Patio’, and, in so doing, among other things, approved the applicant’s request for an extension of the hours that alcoholic beverages may be served on the boulevard café/patio on the Westwood Avenue flank at 940 Pape Avenue, from 10:30 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.; and

WHEREAS the East York Community Council, at its meeting on May 2, 2000, requested the Commissioner of Urban Development Services to submit a report to the next meeting of the Community Council, scheduled to be held on May 23, 2000, with respect to the comparative restaurant/patio operating hours in this area that might warrant extending the hours of operation to 12:00 midnight on Fridays and Saturdays; and

WHEREAS the East York Community Council, at its meeting on May 23, 2000, in considering the aforementioned requested report dated May 11, 2000, from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services (copy attached), noted that, in the comparison study conducted relating to the operating hours of eight boulevard cafés/patios currently licensed in the area that flank onto residential streets, six have no restriction on the hours of operation, one has an Agreement that restricts the operating hours between 7:00 p.m. of one day to 11:00 a.m. on the following day, and one has an Agreement extending the hours of operation to 1:00 a.m., with a condition that Council would have the authority to limit the operating hours back to 10:30 p.m., provided that a 15-day notice is provided to the business operator; and

WHEREAS restricting the hours that alcoholic beverages may be served on the boulevard/patio on the Westwood Avenue flank at 940 Pape Avenue to 11:00 p.m., puts the operator of the Florida Restaurant at a commercial disadvantage;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 7 of Report No. 4 of The East York Community Council, headed ‘Florida Restaurant Boulevard Café/Patio – 940 Pape Avenue Extension of the Hours That Alcoholic Beverages

Can Be Served on the Patio', be re-opened for further consideration, only insofar as it pertains to the extension of the hours that alcoholic beverages may be served on the boulevard café/patio on the Westwood Avenue flank at 940 Pape Avenue;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT City Council amend Recommendation No. (1) embodied in Clause No. 7 of Report No. 4 of The East York Community Council, headed 'Florida Restaurant Boulevard Café/Patio – 940 Pape Avenue Extension of the Hours That Alcoholic Beverages Can Be Served on the Patio', by adding the words:

'on Sundays through Thursdays, and until 12:00 midnight on Fridays and Saturdays',

so that such recommendation shall now read as follows:

'Council approve the applicant's request for extension of the hours that alcoholic beverages may be served on the boulevard café/patio on the Westwood Avenue flank at 940 Pape Avenue, from 10:30 p.m. to 11:00 p.m. on Sundays through Thursdays, and until 12:00 midnight on Fridays and Saturdays.' "

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(1), a report dated May 11, 2000, from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, entitled "Florida Restaurant Boulevard Café/Patio". (See Attachment No. 1, Page 182.)

Votes:

The first Operative Paragraph embodied in Motion J(1) carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

The balance of Motion J(1) carried, without amendment.

8.67 Councillor Adams moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction of the following Notice of Motion J(2), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: **Councillor Adams**

Seconded by: **Councillor Augimeri**

“**WHEREAS** the Assessment and Tax Policy Task Force met on May 30, 2000, and considered the attached report dated May 17, 2000, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, respecting the 2001 Interim Tax Levy; and

WHEREAS the Assessment and Tax Policy Task Force recommends the adoption of the aforementioned report from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer; and

WHEREAS the Task Force reports to City Council, through the Policy and Finance Committee; and

WHEREAS the Policy and Finance Committee will not meet again prior to the meeting of City Council to be held on June 7, 8 and 9, 2000; and

WHEREAS the Assessment and Tax Policy Task Force directed its Chair and Vice-Chair to submit a Notice of Motion, in order that the report dated May 17, 2000, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, can be considered by City Council at its meeting held on June 7, 8 and 9, 2000; and

WHEREAS the Task Force concurs with the opinion of the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer that this matter is best considered at the same meeting of City Council as a related report dealing with other requests to the provincial government for statutory and regulatory changes regarding the next version of Current Value Assessment;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council give consideration to the report dated May 17, 2000, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, respecting the 2001 Interim Tax Levy, and that such report be adopted.”

Advice by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes advised the Council that the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law requiring the referral of Motion J(2) to the Policy and Finance Committee would have to be waived in order to now consider such Motion.

Procedural Vote:

The vote to waive referral of Motion J(2) to the Policy and Finance Committee carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(2), a report dated May 17, 2000, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, entitled “2001 Interim Tax Levy”. (See Attachment No. 2, Page 185.)

Vote:

Motion J(2) was adopted, without amendment, and, in so doing, Council adopted, without amendment, the report dated May 17, 2000, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, embodying the following recommendations:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) the Province of Ontario be requested to amend provincial legislation for the 2001 and future year interim levies for all property classes, including residential, to be billed on an amount no more than 50 percent the prior year’s total levy; and
- (2) the appropriate civic officials be authorized and directed to take any necessary action to give effect to the foregoing.”

8.68 Councillor Jones moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(3), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Jones

Seconded by: Councillor Filion

“**WHEREAS** City Council, at its Special meeting held on April 26, 2000, adopted, as amended, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 5 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed ‘City of Toronto 2000 Recommended Operating Budget’; and

WHEREAS Council adopted the recommendation of the Policy and Finance Committee that the joint report dated February 17, 2000, from the Medical Officer of Health, the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services and the Chief Administrative Officer, respecting the purchase of service contract for animal sheltering services with the Toronto Humane Society, be received; and

WHEREAS the aforementioned report included recommendations respecting the need to extend the City’s purchase of service contract for animal sheltering services with the Toronto Humane Society; and

WHEREAS the current purchase of service contract with the Toronto Humane Society for animal sheltering services expires June 30, 2000; and

WHEREAS in the 2000 budget process, it was recognized by the Budget Advisory Committee that the negotiations for a new purchase of service contract for animal sheltering services with the Toronto Humane Society are expected to extend beyond June 30, 2000; and

WHEREAS it was an oversight that an extension of the purchase of service contract for animal sheltering services with the Toronto Humane Society was not adopted by Council;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 5 of

The Policy and Finance Committee, headed 'City of Toronto 2000 Recommended Operating Budget', be re-opened for further consideration, only insofar as it pertains to the extension of the existing purchase of service agreement for animal sheltering services with the Toronto Humane Society;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council approve the extension of the current contract with the Toronto Humane Society to December 31, 2000, under the existing terms and conditions for funding and service levels, as previously recommended by the Medical Officer of Health, the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services and the Chief Administrative Officer.”

Vote:

The first Operative Paragraph embodied in Motion J(3) carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Motion:

Councillor Jakobek moved that the balance of Motion J(3) be adopted, subject to amending the last Operative Paragraph by deleting the date “December 31, 2000”, and inserting in lieu thereof the date “April 1, 2001”, so that such Operative Paragraph shall now read as follows:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council approve the extension of the current contract with the Toronto Humane Society to April 1, 2001, under the existing terms and conditions for funding and service levels, as previously recommended by the Medical Officer of Health, the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services and the Chief Administrative Officer.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Jakobek carried.

The balance of Motion J(3) carried, as amended.

- 8.69 Councillor Berardinetti moved that, in accordance with the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law, leave be granted to introduce and debate the following Notice of Motion J(4), which carried:

Moved by: Councillor Berardinetti

Seconded by: Councillor Ootes

“WHEREAS City Council, at its meeting held on May 9, 10 and 11, 2000, considered a Motion, moved by Councillor Moscoe, seconded by Councillor Soknacki, regarding the access to personal information by Members of Council; and

WHEREAS in adopting the Motion, as amended, Council requested the City Clerk to consult with Members of Council and submit a report to the next regular meeting of Council scheduled to be held on June 7, 2000, on how the Members of Council can be provided with the information they require to properly fulfill their obligations of office within the parameters of the present legislation; and

WHEREAS the City Clerk has prepared the attached report dated May 28, 2000, as directed by Council;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council give consideration to the aforementioned report dated May 28, 2000, from the City Clerk, and that such report be received for information.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(4), the following:

- (i) report dated May 28, 2000, from the City Clerk, entitled “Councillors’ Access to Personal Information” (See Attachment No. 3, Page 187.); and
- (ii) confidential communication dated June 7, 2000, from Mr. George H. Rust-D’Eye, Weir and Foulds, Barristers and Solicitors, such communication now public in its entirety, a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Motion:

Councillor Moscoe moved that Motion J(4) be adopted, subject to adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT:

- (1) the appeal of the Assistant Privacy Commissioner authorized by Council at its last meeting proceed as soon as possible;
- (2) Council seek an interim order to permit Councillors to at least have access to on-line assessment and property tax data; and
- (3) Council seek a statutory amendment to permit Councillors sufficient data to be able to fulfil their obligations to their constituents.”; and

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Moscoe carried.

Motion J(4), as amended, carried.

Motion to Re-Open:

Councillor Moscoe, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Motion I, moved by Councillor Moscoe, seconded by Councillor Soknacki, regarding the access to personal information by Members of Council, which was adopted, as amended, by City Council on May 9, 10 and 11, 2000, be re-opened for further consideration, which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Motion:

Councillor Moscoe moved that Council also adopt the following recommendation:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council direct the Chair of the Administration Committee to seek a meeting with the Attorney General of Ontario to request an amending regulation that would ensure the Council Members have sufficient access to data to properly do their jobs.”

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Moscoe carried.

- 8.70 Councillor Augimeri moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of MotionJ(5), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Augimeri

Seconded by: Councillor Pantalone

“WHEREAS the City of Toronto recognizes the contribution that CFMT-TV, also known as Channel 47, has made to the community in the past 20 years; and

WHEREAS CFMT represents the multicultural mosaic that constitutes the very fabric of this City; and

WHEREAS CFMT reaches our City’s many ethnocultural communities and helps newcomers understand and adjust to life in a new country; and

WHEREAS CFMT-TV is Canada’s first multilingual/multicultural television system and the first such broadcaster to be named ‘Television Station of the Year’ in 1999, by the Ontario Association of Broadcasters; its ongoing commitment to the reflecting and evolving needs of its diverse audience is evidenced by a regular production schedule that sees more than 22 hours of original multilingual

programming produced each week in Toronto, including three daily language newscasts in Italian, Portuguese and Chinese; and CFMT also produces many other current affairs and magazine programs; and

WHEREAS CFMT has applied for a broadcasting licence renewal; and

WHEREAS the CRTC will be considering this licence renewal at its July 4, 2000 meeting in Toronto;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, for all the above-mentioned reasons, the City of Toronto support CFMT's broadcast licence renewal application, as we believe that this would be in the best interest of all the citizens of Toronto;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City Clerk be directed to indicate Council's support to the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission for its hearing to take place on July 4, 2000."

Vote:

Motion J(5) was adopted unanimously.

- 8.71 Councillor Bossons moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(6), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: **Councillor Bossons**

Seconded by: **Councillor Adams**

“WHEREAS there was no access to the Yorkville commercial area or to Bay Street for any of the 20,000 southbound vehicles on Avenue Road, except through tiny Cumberland Street, which was forced to serve as a quasi-collector/arterial road; and

WHEREAS the Works and Emergency Services staff recommendation to undertake a pilot project during April, May and June, 2000, to rescind the 35-year old southbound left-turn prohibition at Avenue Road and Davenport Road, and Avenue Road and Bloor Street West, was recommended by Toronto Community Council in Clause No. 1 of Report No. 4 of The Toronto Community Council, headed 'Proposed Rescission of the Southbound Left-Turn Prohibitions on a Trial Basis – Avenue Road, at Intersections with Davenport Road and Bloor Street West (Midtown, Downtown)', and was adopted, without amendment, by City Council at its meeting held on February 29, March 1 and 2, 2000; and

WHEREAS the Annex Community and the Bloor-Yorkville BIA has, since the early 1970s, requested that these southbound left-turn prohibitions be rescinded; and

WHEREAS to ease the impact to the Avenue Road traffic flow, of these vehicles making the new left-turns as part of this pilot project, a southbound advanced green signal was installed temporarily; and

WHEREAS, except for a sign stating 'NEW', on a pole north of the Avenue Road/Davenport Road intersection, the ability to make these left-turns was not well advertised; and

WHEREAS the 'NEW' sign disappeared some time ago, causing the community apprehension that drivers are not sufficiently aware that left-turns may now be made - hence the likelihood that motorists may not take these left-turn opportunities, therefore, no true, full-impact assessment can be made; and

WHEREAS, the BIA, in particular, is very anxious that this project be given enough time to be utilized fully by drivers and thus evaluated fully by Works and Emergency Services' staff; and

WHEREAS the pilot project is scheduled to end on June 30, 2000, and the full impact of motorists utilizing these new left-turns opportunities will not have been able to be assessed;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 4 of The Toronto Community Council, headed 'Proposed Rescission of the Southbound Left-Turn Prohibitions on a Trial Basis – Avenue Road, at Intersections with Davenport Road and Bloor Street West (Midtown, Downtown)', adopted by City Council at its meeting on February 29, March 1 and 2, 2000, be re-opened for further consideration, only insofar as it pertains to the trial period for this pilot project;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT an extension of the pilot project permitting left turns from southbound Avenue Road to Davenport Road eastbound, and Bloor Street West eastbound, for a minimum of three months, until at least September 30, 2000, including the southbound advanced green signal, be approved;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Works and Emergency Services' staff be requested to post sufficient notices/signs, for the duration of the pilot project, to ensure that all motorists are aware of these left-turn opportunities."

Votes:

The first Operative Paragraph embodied in Motion J(6) carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

The balance of Motion J(6) carried, without amendment.

- 8.72 Councillor Kelly moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction of the following Notice of Motion J(7):

Moved by: Councillor Kelly

Seconded by: Councillor Duguid

“**WHEREAS** Olifas Marketing Group (OMG) is under contract to supply waste receptacles to most parts of all Community Council areas except Scarborough; and

WHEREAS the City of Toronto currently receives \$10.00 per month for each OMG receptacle that is installed in Toronto, and this amount will increase to \$15.00, as of October 15, 2003, and then to \$20.00, as of October 15, 2005; and

WHEREAS the City of Toronto receives 10 percent of all revenue that is generated from the sale of advertising on the OMG receptacles; and

WHEREAS OMG pays for the cost of cleaning, repairing and replacing its waste receptacles, thus resulting in considerable savings for the City; and

WHEREAS projections show that the City of Toronto would have gained a total net revenue and savings of \$1.9 million over ten years, had the Community Council area of Scarborough been included in the OMG program; and

WHEREAS OMG receptacles are of high quality, and are aesthetically pleasing; and

WHEREAS OMG waste receptacles contain compartments for recyclable containers and newspapers, as well as for garbage;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 13 of Report No. 6 of The Scarborough Community Council, headed ‘Provision of Litter Bins with Advertising’, be re-opened for further consideration, only insofar as it pertains to the issue of OMG waste receptacles in the Community Council area of Scarborough;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, within the next 30 days, the City of Toronto offer to amend its contract with OMG to include the Community Council area of Scarborough, so long as OMG is willing to provide its waste receptacles to the Community Council area of Scarborough for the same prices and under the same conditions as it does for the other Community Council areas;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, if OMG accepts the City of Toronto's offer to amend the contract to include the Community Council area of Scarborough, the City will act on this, as soon as possible, by amending its contract with OMG to include the Community Council area of Scarborough.”,

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 40	
Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Fillion, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Nunziata, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki, Valenti, Walker
No - 11	
Councillors:	Ashton, Berger, Kelly, Mahood, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Moscoe, O'Brien, Shiner, Tzekas

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Vote:

Adoption of first Operative Paragraph:

Yes - 40	
Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Brown, Chong, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Fillion, Flint, Gardner, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Mihevc, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki, Valenti, Walker
No - 10	
Councillors:	Ashton, Berger, Davis, Mahood, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, O'Brien, Shiner, Tzekas

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Advice by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes advised the Council that the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law requiring the referral of the balance of Motion J(7) to the Scarborough Community Council would have to be waived in order to now consider the balance of such Motion.

Motion:

Councillor Kelly moved that the balance of Motion J(7) be referred to the Scarborough Community Council, with a request that the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services submit a report to the Scarborough Community Council, for consideration therewith, on the implications of the second Operative Paragraph embodied therein, viz.:

“**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT**, within the next 30 days, the City of Toronto offer to amend its contract with OMG to include the Community Council area of Scarborough, so long as OMG is willing to provide its waste receptacles to the Community Council area of Scarborough for the same prices and under the same conditions as it does for the other Community Council areas;”.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Kelly carried.

- 8.73 Councillor Disero moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(8), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Disero

Seconded by: Councillor Palacio

“**WHEREAS** at its meeting held on December 14, 15 and 16, 1999, City Council, by its adoption of Motion J(14), adopted a report from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services recommending that expropriation proceedings be commenced for the remaining lands required for the construction of a public lane at the rear of 357 to 399 Bartlett Avenue North and 448 to 492 Salem Avenue North; and

WHEREAS Notice of Application to Expropriate the said lands has been published and served on the required parties; and

WHEREAS Facilities and Real Estate staff have determined that additional rights-of-way; a temporary easement and a fee simple interest need to be expropriated to prevent an adverse effect that the proposed expropriation will

otherwise have on two of the property owners from whom land is to be expropriated, for which significant compensation would have to be paid; and

WHEREAS the expropriation of the land required for the lane has already been initiated, it is necessary to expedite the process to obtain approval to initiate expropriation proceedings for the additional interests in land that are required, so that the potential adverse effect of the lane expropriation can be prevented; and

WHEREAS the Commissioner of Corporate Services has submitted the attached report dated June 5, 2000, recommending that expropriation proceedings be commenced for the acquisition of the above-noted interests;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City Council consider the aforementioned report dated June 5, 2000, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, entitled ‘Application for Approval to Expropriate Interest in Land - Part of 373 and 375 Bartlett Avenue North and 460 and 462 Salem Avenue North, Toronto, Ward 21, Davenport’, and that the recommendations contained in such report be adopted.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(8), a report dated June 5, 2000, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, entitled “Application for Approval to Expropriate Interest in Land - Part of 373 and 375 Bartlett Avenue North and 460 and 462 Salem Avenue North, Toronto, Ward 21. Davenport”. (See Attachment No. 4, Page 194.)

Vote:

Motion J(8) was adopted, without amendment, and, in so doing, Council adopted the report dated June 5, 2000, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, embodying the following recommendations:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) authority be granted to initiate expropriation proceedings for the acquisition, from the owners of No. 375 Bartlett Avenue North, of their existing right-of-way over a portion of the property at No. 373 Bartlett Avenue North, in order to extinguish the right-of-way;
- (2) authority be granted to initiate expropriation proceedings for the acquisition, from the owners of No. 460 Salem Avenue North, of their existing right-of-way over a portion of the property at No. 462 Salem Avenue North in order to extinguish the right-of-way;
- (3) authority be granted to initiate expropriation proceedings for the acquisition, from the owner of No. 462 Salem Avenue North, of a fee

simple interest consisting approximately of the westerly 2.5 metres from the centre line of the double garage across the full width of the lands;

- (4) authority be granted to initiate expropriation proceedings for a temporary working easement (for a three-month period) over a portion of No. 375 Bartlett Avenue North consisting approximately of the westerly 5.0 metres from the centre wall of the double car garage across the full width of the lands, to the extent necessary to undertake any work, including the removal of any structures that is required to facilitate the construction of the public lane;
- (5) authority be granted to serve and publish a Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate the above-noted property interests, to forward to the Chief Inquiry Officer any requests for hearings that are received and to report the Inquiry Officer's recommendations to Council for its consideration; and
- (6) authority be granted for the appropriate City Officials to take whatever action is necessary to give effect thereto, including the introduction in City Council of any bills that might be necessary."

8.74 Councillor Adams moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(9), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Adams

Seconded by: Councillor Miller

“WHEREAS Toronto City Council has acknowledged the importance of the Oak Ridges Moraine to Toronto and the impact of development of the Moraine on wetlands and watercourses, aquifers, surface and ground water and Lake Ontario; and

WHEREAS at its meeting of October 26 and 27, 1999, Toronto City Council directed the City to participate at Ontario Municipal Board Hearings in Richmond Hill; and

WHEREAS at its meeting December 14, 15 and 16, 1999, Council directed that the City seek party status at the Richmond Hill Ontario Municipal Board Hearings; and

WHEREAS at its meeting of February 29, and March 1 and 2, 2000, Council directed the City Solicitor to take all such steps as may be necessary to secure full party status at the Ontario Municipal Board Hearing in Richmond Hill; and

WHEREAS the City of Toronto was denied party status at the Richmond Hill Ontario Municipal Board Hearing on April 12, 2000, and in Divisional Court on May 23, 2000; and

WHEREAS the twelve-week Richmond Hill OMB hearing commenced on Monday, May 29, 2000, and the first two phases of the hearing concluded on June 5, 2000;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council consider the attached report dated June 7, 2000, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, entitled ‘Oak Ridges Moraine – Richmond Hill Ontario Municipal Board Hearing’, and that such report be adopted.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(9), a report dated June 7, 2000, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, entitled “Oak Ridges Moraine – Richmond Hill Ontario Municipal Board Hearing”. (See Attachment No. 5, Page 198.)

Motions:

- (a) Councillor Adams moved that Motion J(9) be adopted, subject to adding to the Operative Paragraph, the following words:

“subject to:

- (1) amending Recommendation No. (2) embodied therein to read as follows:
 - ‘(2) that a grant of up to \$300,000.00 be given to the Save the Rouge Valley System Inc. (SVRS) to assist in presenting its case at the Richmond Hill Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Hearing, subject to SVRS entering into an agreement with the City which protects the City’s interests and in form and content satisfactory to the City Solicitor, and the SVRS be requested to use its best efforts to work collaboratively with the Jefferson Forest Residents Association at the OMB Hearing;’; and
- (2) inserting the following new recommendations and re-numbering the remaining recommendation accordingly:
 - ‘(6) that the Commissioners of Urban Development Services and Works and Emergency Services undertake a study on regional strategies for managing development patterns, protecting valuable countryside such as the Oak Ridges Moraine, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution;

- (7) that, in order to expedite the completion of the above study, the key appropriate consultants hired as part of the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing be retained, and that \$200,000.00 from the Oak Ridges Preservation Account be allocated towards internal staff costs and consultants working towards this purpose and that the Oak Ridges Moraine Steering Committee be authorized to approve the terms of reference; and',

so that the recommendations embodied in such report shall now read as follows:

'The Oak Ridges Moraine Steering Committee recommends that Council endorse the following:

- (1) that staff maintain a watching brief at the Richmond Hill Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Hearing which is currently underway;
- (2) that a grant of up to \$300,000.00 be given to the Save the Rouge Valley System Inc. (SVRS) to assist in presenting its case at the Richmond Hill Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Hearing, subject to SVRS entering into an agreement with the City which protects the City's interests and in form and content satisfactory to the City Solicitor, and the SVRS be requested to use its best efforts to work collaboratively with the Jefferson Forest Residents Association at the OMB Hearing;
- (3) that a grant of \$220,000.00 be given to the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) to assist them in presenting their case at the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing;
- (4) that the grants are deemed to be in the interest of the City of Toronto;
- (5) that \$200,000.00 from the Oak Ridges Preservation Account (\$800,000.00) be made available to the Oak Ridges Moraine Steering Committee for allocation at their discretion;
- (6) that the Commissioners of Urban Development Services and Works and Emergency Services undertake a study on regional strategies for managing development patterns, protecting valuable countryside such as the Oak Ridges Moraine, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution;
- (7) that, in order to expedite the completion of the above study, the key appropriate consultants hired as part of the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing be retained, and that \$200,000.00 from the Oak Ridges Preservation Account be allocated towards internal staff

costs and consultants working towards this purpose and that the Oak Ridges Moraine Steering Committee be authorized to approve the terms of reference; and

- (8) that the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.’ ”

Vote Be Now Taken:

At this point in the proceedings, Councillor Duguid, with the permission of Council, moved that, in accordance with subsection 37(e) of the Council Procedural By-law, the vote be now taken, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 24	
Councillors:	Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Kelly, Mammoliti, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki
No - 17	
Councillors:	Adams, Ashton, Bossons, Chow, Filion, Holyday, Johnston, Kinahan, King, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Moeser, Moscoe, Ootes, Walker

Lost, less than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Motions:

- (b) Councillor Ashton moved that Motion J(9) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Chief Administrative Officer, in consultation with the City Solicitor, be requested to submit a report to the Policy and Finance Committee on a mechanism to review and evaluate the program and deliverables of those agencies or groups receiving grant monies;”.

- (c) Councillor Shiner moved that Motion J(9) be amended by adding thereto the following new Operative Paragraph:

“AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer be requested to submit a report to the next meeting of the Policy and Finance Committee scheduled to be held on June 22, 2000, on the appropriate financial controls and detailed reporting regarding all expenditures.”

Votes:

Motion (a) by Councillor Adams carried.

Motion (b) by Councillor Ashton carried.

Motion (c) by Councillor Shiner carried.

Adoption of Motion J(9), as amended:

Yes - 41 Councillors:	Adams, Ashton, Balkissoon, Berardinetti, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chow, Davis, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas, Walker
No - 5 Councillors:	Bossons, Disero, Holyday, Jakobek, Minnan-Wong

Carried by a majority of 36.

- 8.75 Councillor Moscoe moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(10), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Moscoe

Seconded by: Councillor Feldman

“**WHEREAS** City Council on September 28 and 29, 1999, adopted, as amended, Clause No. 16 of Report No. 8 of The North York Community Council, headed ‘Zoning Amendment Application UDOZ-97-41 – Costco Canada Limited – South Side of Wilson Avenue, West of Allen Road – North York Spadina’; and

WHEREAS in approving the development of Block H (UDOZ-97-41) on Wilson Avenue, one of the conditions of approval was the phasing of the development to measure the impact of traffic on the local community; and

WHEREAS the phasing of the project will have an effect of lengthening the construction period and creating an enhanced inconvenience for the community; and

WHEREAS as an alternative, the developer has offered to provide a Letter of Credit to pay for traffic modification requirements in an amount sufficient to ameliorate any possible impact on traffic conditions; and

WHEREAS, through the settlement of an appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board, the applicant will pay \$250,000.00 to the Toronto Transit Commission for transit signal priority on Wilson Avenue;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 16 of Report No. 8 of The North York Community Council, headed 'Zoning Amendment Application UDOZ-97-41 – Costco Canada Limited – South Side of Wilson Avenue, West of Allen Road – North York Spadina', be re-opened for further consideration, only insofar as it pertains to the conditions of approval;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the development conditions Re:UDOZ-97-41 be modified so that requirement two of the conditions of approval be amended to read:

- '(d)(iii) To accommodate neighbourhood protection the applicant shall provide to the City a Letter of Credit in the amount of \$50,000.00 and the traffic monitoring shall continue for one year after the stores have been in operation.

- (iv) The Letter of Credit shall be returned only after the traffic infiltration studies have indicated that local traffic infiltration measures attributable to the development have been adopted by the City in consultation with the local Councillor(s) at the expense of the applicant and if Council does not decide to implement mitigation measures within two (2) years of receipt of the traffic infiltration study, the Letter of Credit shall thereupon be returned.' "

Votes:

The first Operative Paragraph embodied in Motion J(10) carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

The balance of Motion J(10) carried, without amendment.

- 8.76 Councillor Soknacki moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By law be waived to permit introduction of the following Notice of Motion J(11), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Soknacki

Seconded by: Councillor Moeser

“**WHEREAS** the residents of David Drive, in Scarborough Highland Creek, abut Highway 401 and have no protection from the visual, noise and atmospheric pollution from the highway; and

WHEREAS the recent expansion of the highway to 16 lanes has made the visual, noise and atmospheric pollution unbearable to the residents of David Drive; and

WHEREAS the noise and air pollution have aggravated respiratory and other health concerns among the David Drive children and elderly residents, in particular; and

WHEREAS the Province of Ontario, in spite of repeated requests, has not taken effective action to ameliorate these conditions; and

WHEREAS Toronto City Council needs to take action today to respond to the health problems of the residents of David Drive created by the increased noise and air pollution; and

WHEREAS the vast majority of residential homes abutting Highway 401 have some protection from the highway; and

WHEREAS the planting of a number of suitable trees along approximately 150 metres of City property abutting Highway 401 has the support of residents and will go a long way towards resolving the problem;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Commissioners of Works and Emergency Services and Economic Development, Culture and Tourism be requested to bring forward a report to the June 19, 2000 meeting of the Economic Development and Parks Committee on the planting of a number of suitable trees along the City’s property between Highway 401 and the residents of David Drive, such report to include a detailed implementation plan and estimated costs.”

In accordance with the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law, Motion J(11) was referred to the Economic Development and Parks Committee.

- 8.77 Councillor Gardner moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(12), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Gardner

Seconded by: Councillor Filion

“**WHEREAS** City Council, at its meeting of April 11, 12 and 13, 2000, adopted Clause No. 21 of Report No. 5 of The North York Community Council, headed ‘Temporary Road Closure - Willowdale Avenue - North York Centre’, to temporarily close a portion of Willowdale Avenue on May 28, 2000, to accommodate the 2nd Annual Willowdale Avenue Street Party, sponsored by the North York Chamber of Commerce; and

WHEREAS the North York Chamber of Commerce has requested that the date of this community festival be rescheduled to June 11, 2000, and that the boundaries of this event be expanded to include the portion of Willowdale Avenue, between Alfred Avenue and Sheppard Avenue East;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 21 of Report No. 5 of The North York Community Council, headed ‘Temporary Road Closure - Willowdale Avenue - North York Centre’, be re-opened for further consideration, only insofar as it pertains to the date and the boundaries for the event;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT City Council grant approval for the 2nd Annual Willowdale Avenue Street Party to take place on June 11, 2000, and permit the temporary closure of Willowdale Avenue, from Alfred Avenue to Sheppard Avenue East, for this community festival.”

Votes:

The first Operative Paragraph embodied in Motion J(12) carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

The balance of Motion J(12) carried, without amendment.

- 8.78 Councillor Ashton moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(13), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Ashton

Seconded by: Councillor Davis

“**WHEREAS** Toronto Hydro has applied to the Ontario Energy Board for a 6 percent rate increase to take effect July 1, 2000; and

WHEREAS the rate increase means \$60.00 on a homeowner’s typical electricity bill of \$1,000.00 annually; and

WHEREAS the impact of this increase will be detrimental to Toronto businesses; and

WHEREAS provincial deregulation permits utilities like Toronto Hydro to earn a profit of up to 9.88 percent; and

WHEREAS the City of Toronto is the sole shareholder of Toronto Hydro; and

WHEREAS Toronto Hydro has stated publicly that the proposed rate increase will generate \$90.0 million in profit to the City of Toronto;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City of Toronto Council request Toronto Hydro to defer implementing a rate increase, pending a review by the City of Toronto of Toronto Hydro’s submission to the Ontario Energy Board and justification for a rate increase, far in excess of inflation.”

Motion:

Councillor Layton moved that Motion J(13) be referred to the Chief Administrative Officer with a request that he submit a report to the Policy and Finance Committee on the Minister of Energy’s announcement pertaining to the Toronto Hydro rate increase.

Vote:

The motion by Councillor Layton carried.

- 8.79 Councillor Feldman moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(14), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Feldman

Seconded by: Councillor Lindsay Luby

“**WHEREAS** the Annual General Meeting of the Toronto Housing Company Inc. is being held on June 19, 2000, and the Auditor’s Report and Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 1999, are required for the Annual Report; and

WHEREAS Auditor’s Report and Financial Statements for the Toronto Housing Company Inc. would normally be submitted to City Council, through the Policy and Finance Committee; and

WHEREAS the next regular meeting of the Policy and Finance Committee is scheduled to be held on June 22, 2000, which would not provide an opportunity for the Toronto Housing Company to submit the Auditor’s Report and Financial Statements to the Committee and Council, prior to the Annual General Meeting of the Toronto Housing Company; and

WHEREAS the Board of Directors of the Toronto Housing Company Inc., on May 29, 2000, approved a report dated May 25, 2000, from the Chief Executive Officer, respecting the Auditor’s Report and Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 1999, and directed that such report be forwarded to City Council for approval;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the attached communication dated June 1, 2000, from the Chief Executive Officer of the Toronto Housing Company Inc., forwarding the Auditor’s Report and Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 1999, for the Toronto Housing Company Inc., be considered by City Council at its meeting scheduled to be held on June 7, 2000, and that the Auditor’s Report and Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 1999, for the Toronto Housing Company Inc. be received by City Council as Shareholder of the Toronto Housing Company Inc.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(14), a communication dated June 1, 2000, from the Chief Executive Officer of the Toronto Housing Company Inc., forwarding the Auditor’s Report and Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 1999, for the Toronto Housing Company Inc. (See Attachment No. 6, Page 203.)

Vote:

Motion J(14) was adopted, without amendment.

- 8.80 Councillor Bossons moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(15), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Bossons

Seconded by: Councillor Adams

“WHEREAS City Council at its meeting held on April 11, 12 and 13, 2000, adopted, without amendment, Clause No. 60 of Report No. 5 of The Toronto Community Council, headed ‘Tree Removal - 261 Inglewood Drive (Midtown)’, and, in so doing, refused the removal of the subject tree; and

WHEREAS a further investigation by an Arborist has uncovered a structural weakness in the subject tree; and

WHEREAS City staff concurs with the results of the Arborist’s report;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 60 of Report No. 5 of The Toronto Community Council, headed ‘Tree Removal - 261 Inglewood Drive (Midtown)’, be re-opened for further consideration;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council rescind the previous decision in this regard and adopt the attached report dated May 31, 2000, from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(15), a report dated May 31, 2000, from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, entitled “261 Inglewood Drive - Removal of Private Tree”. (See Attachment No. 7, Page 207.)

Votes:

The first Operative Paragraph embodied in Motion J(15) carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

The balance of Motion J(15) carried, without amendment, and, in so doing, Council adopted, without amendment, the report dated May 31, 2000, from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, embodying the following recommendation:

“It is recommended that City Council rescind its decision of April 11, 12 and 13, 2000, to refuse a permit for tree removal at 261 Inglewood Drive, conditional on the applicant planting a 80 millimetre caliper red oak tree as replacement.”

- 8.81 Councillor Moscoe moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(16), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: **Councillor Moscoe**

Seconded by: **Councillor Feldman**

“**WHEREAS** Deal Makers of Canada Inc. applied to the Committee of Adjustment North District office for consent to sever lands at 1000 Finch Avenue West and 4580 Dufferin Street; and

WHEREAS the Committee of Adjustment on March 9, 2000, adjourned the hearing, sine die, at the request of the local Councillor(s) to discuss the application; and

WHEREAS the applicant has launched an appeal against a deferral of the application to the Ontario Municipal Board;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City Solicitor be directed to attend the Ontario Municipal Board to oppose the application from Deal Makers of Canada Inc.”

Vote:

Motion J(16) was adopted, without amendment.

- 8.82 Councillor Rae, with the permission of Council, withdrew the following Notice of Motion J(17):

Moved by: **Councillor Rae**

Seconded by: **Councillor Chow**

“**WHEREAS** City Council, during its consideration of the 1999 Operating Budget (Recommendation No. 181), determined that the cost of policing the Lesbian and Gay Pride Day, the Santa Claus Parade, Caribana and the Beaches Jazz Festival would be borne by the Toronto Police Service; and

WHEREAS Council determined that figure to be approximately \$350,000.00; and

WHEREAS the Committees organizing these festivals, and Councillors, were told, in 1999, that this Council decision would clarify for the future the source of funds for policing these major community festivals; and

WHEREAS the April 2000 variance report of the Toronto Police Service demonstrates there is a \$0.3 Million Operating Budget surplus;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Toronto Police Services Board adhere to the 1999 Operating Budget recommendations concerning policing of designated community events and provide officers, as required, at no cost to these organizing committees, and that this directive be the operating standard in the future.”

- 8.83 Councillor Duguid moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(18), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillors Davis and Duguid

Seconded by: Councillors Chow, Korwin-Kuczynski, McConnell, Nunziata and Sinclair

“**WHEREAS** during the past two and one-half years, the City has released various recommendations on youth violence, such as The Mayor’s Task Force on Young Offenders (January ’99); Action Plan on Youth Violence in Schools from the Mayor’s Task Force on Youth Violence (February 1999); Community Safety Task Force (February 1999); and Youth and Police Action Committee, through the Police Services Board (March 2000); and

WHEREAS at this time, aside from the Task Force on Community Safety, there are various committees working on youth violence, including the Youth Cabinet; the Youth Committee (from the City); Police and Youth Action Committee, and the Task Force on Youth Violent Crimes (from the Police Services Board and the Chief of Police); a staff working group who meets regularly on issues of youth violence and who organized a very successful conference highlighting the best practices of various City departments, Public Health, Police and School Boards; and

WHEREAS it is essential that all of these initiatives be integrated and co-ordinated; and

WHEREAS the Community Safety Task Force will not be formally reporting to Council (through the Policy and Finance Committee) until August; and

WHEREAS City staff are eager to implement, as soon as possible, the various recommendations aimed at fostering youth safety (and clarification of the reporting structure is required); and

WHEREAS the Task Force appointed Councillors Pam McConnell, Chris Korwin-Kuczynski and Bruce Sinclair, and Member Marg Stanowski, to be members of the Youth Safety Sub-Committee; and

WHEREAS the Task Force requested that the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services report directly to Council on June 7, 2000, with respect to the proposed Youth Safety Sub-Committee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the report dated May 29, 2000, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, be considered by Toronto City Council at its meeting commencing on June 7, 2000, and that such report be adopted;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a Youth Sub-Committee (as part of the Task Force on Community Safety) be formed with a mandate to co-ordinate, integrate and oversee the implementation of all recommendations, present and future, in dealing with youth violence prevention;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Task Force on Community Safety designate a lead Councillor, or Councillors, to work on this sub-committee, and seek other interested Councillors, community members and staff to join.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(18), a report dated May 29, 2000, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, entitled “Establishment of a Youth Safety Sub-Committee of the Task Force on Community Safety”. (See Attachment No. 8, Page 209.)

Vote:

Motion J(18) was adopted, without amendment, and, in so doing, Council also adopted, without amendment, the report dated May 29, 2000, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, embodying the following recommendations:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) a Youth Safety Sub-Committee of the Task Force on Community Safety be established with a mandate to co-ordinate, integrate and oversee the implementation of all recommendations dealing with youth violence prevention;

- (2) the Community Safety Task Force designate a lead Councillor to work on the Sub-Committee with the Children and Youth Advocate, and seek other interested Toronto City Councillors, community members and staff to participate; and
- (3) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.”

8.84 Councillor Chow moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(19), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Chow

Seconded by: Councillor Pantalone

“**WHEREAS** Councillor Olivia Chow, as a Member of the Board of Directors of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), is unable to attend the AMO Annual Conference on August 13 to 16, 2000, in Ottawa;

WHEREAS is preferable for the City of Toronto to have full representation on the Board of Directors for the Board meetings to be held the last Friday in June and immediately prior to the Annual Meeting in August; and

WHEREAS there are no financial impacts associated with this Motion;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the resignation of Olivia Chow as a member of the Board of Directors of AMO as a member of the Toronto Caucus, be accepted;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Councillor Joe Pantalone be appointed to the Board of Directors of AMO as a member of the Toronto Caucus, for a term to expire at the Annual Meeting of AMO in August, 2000.”

Motion:

Councillor Pantalone moved that Motion J(19) be adopted, subject to amending the second Operative Paragraph to read as follows:

“**AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** Councillor Joe Pantalone be appointed to the Board of Directors of AMO as a member of the Toronto Caucus, for a term to expire on November 30, 2000.”

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Pantalone carried.

Motion J(19), as amended, carried.

- 8.85 Councillor Chow moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(20), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Chow

Seconded by: Councillor Shaw

“**WHEREAS** the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) requires Council to provide a list of City Councillors approved as the City’s representatives to FCM no later than June 18, 2000;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT interested City Councillors (see proposed names attached) be approved as the City’s representatives and forwarded by the Chief Administrative Officer to the FCM no later than June 18, 2000;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Chief Administrative Officer, in consultation with Council’s FCM representatives, be requested to report to the Policy and Finance Committee on a strategy that ensures Toronto takes maximum advantage of funding from FCM initiatives developed over the past year, that could increase City revenues from between \$108.0 million to \$123.0 million per year;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT interested Councillors and the Chief Administrative Officer meet with the Executive Director of FCM regarding appropriate levels of representation of large urban centres on the FCM;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Chief Administrative Officer consider sending staff to all FCM Board meetings.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(20), a communication dated June 6, 2000, addressed to Mayor Lastman, from Councillors Olivia Chow, Howard Moscoe, Sherene Shaw, Bas Balkissoon, Pam McConnell, Anne Johnston and Jack Layton, entitled “Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) 63rd Annual Conference and Municipal Expo, June 2-5, London Convention Centre”. (See Attachment No. 9, Page 218.)

Motion:

Councillor Johnston moved that Motion J(20) be adopted, subject to amending the first Operative Paragraph by adding thereto the words “subject to amending the listing entitled ‘Proposed List of City Councillors to be Approved as the City’s Representatives to the FCM’, to provide that Councillor Anne Johnston be included as a member of the Future Role of Municipal Government Committee’, so that such Operative Paragraph shall now read as follows:

“NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT interested City Councillors (see proposed names attached) be approved as the City’s representatives and forwarded by the Chief Administrative Officer to the FCM no later than June 18, 2000, subject to amending the listing entitled ‘Proposed List of City Councillors to be Approved as the City’s Representatives to the FCM’, to provide that Councillor Anne Johnston be included as a member of the Future Role of Municipal Government Committee;”.

Votes:

The motion by Councillor Johnston carried.

Motion J(20), as amended, carried.

- 8.86 Councillor Prue moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(21), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Prue

Seconded by: Councillor Pitfield

“WHEREAS the severe thunderstorm on May 12, 2000, caused severe flooding and damage within the Don Valley River System at Taylor Bush Park; and

WHEREAS two pedestrian bridges were washed away and a third severely damaged as a result of flood waters; and

WHEREAS these are the only trans-river crossings at this Park for cyclists, pedestrians, dog walkers and joggers, and these people are now at risk making unsafe fordings; and

WHEREAS staff have determined that the tendering process will add six to eight weeks to the time frame before these bridges can be replaced; and

WHEREAS the actual cost of each bridge is in the range of \$20,000.00 to \$25,000.00;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council waive the requirement to tender these projects and that staff be instructed to begin construction as soon as insurance claims are finalized.”

Vote:

Motion J(21) was adopted, without amendment.

- 8.87 Councillor Mihevc moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(22), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: **Councillor Mihevc**

Seconded by: **Councillor Rae**

“**WHEREAS** the Government of Ontario, through its Ministry of Citizenship which has responsibility for access, equity and immigrant settlement issues, while maintaining all its Provincial District Offices has closed down its Toronto District Office; and

WHEREAS residents of Toronto seeking the services of that Ministry now need to go to Hamilton; and

WHEREAS City Council has reiterated its commitment on many occasions to the continuation of access and equity values, policies and programs; and

WHEREAS Toronto prides itself on its diversity and the tremendous benefits that it brings the City; and

WHEREAS Toronto is the primary destination of immigrants and refugees to Ontario;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City Council communicate its concerns to the Province of Ontario regarding this apparent slight to the residents of Toronto and urge that the Government of Ontario re-establish a Toronto District Office of the Ministry of Citizenship to ensure equitable access and to those particular services that a large proportion of Toronto residents require.”

Vote:

Motion J(22) was adopted, without amendment.

- 8.88 Councillor Jakobek moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(23), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: **Councillor Jakobek**

Seconded by: **Councillor Berardinetti**

“**WHEREAS** the City will once again be celebrating our Nation’s birthday on July 1, 2000; and

WHEREAS there are a number of events being planned for the residents of this City and also to attract tourism; and

WHEREAS the 'Friends of Fort York' have organized a Tall Ship and Re-enactment for July 1 and 2, 2000; and

WHEREAS this event is significant and will attract thousands of visitors from outside the City; and

WHEREAS the Planning Committee has raised significant funds of approximately \$200,000.00 to hold this event; and

WHEREAS there is a shortfall of \$20,000.00; and

WHEREAS there is insufficient time to process a 'one time grant' towards this event;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City Council approve a one-time grant of \$20,000.00 to the 'Friends of Fort York' to assist in the Canada Tall Ship and Re-enactment event, such funds to be provided from the Corporate Contingency Account."

Vote:

Motion J(23) was adopted, without amendment.

- 8.89 Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(24), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski

Seconded by: Councillor Miller

WHEREAS 40 Wabash Avenue has been acquired for a Municipal Recreation Facility; and

WHEREAS this land is being designated to start with construction of a recreational facility in the year 2002; and

WHEREAS the Wabash Community Recreational Centre Working Group has been established; and

WHEREAS members of the Wabash Community Recreational Centre Working Group intend to fundraise for the purpose of building a recreational facility; and

WHEREAS the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer concurs with the fundraising project but advises that, technically, Council approval is needed; and

WHEREAS any further delay prejudices the success of this project;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City acknowledge 40 Wabash Avenue as an approved project for the purposes of fundraising by the members of the Wabash Community Recreational Centre Working Group and the issuing by the City of charitable receipts.”

Vote:

Motion J(24) was adopted, without amendment.

- 8.90 Councillor Li Preti moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction of the following Notice of Motion J(25), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: **Councillor Li Preti**

Seconded by: **Councillor Moscoe**

“**WHEREAS** the City of Vaughan established the Spadina Subway - Corporate Centre Transportation Committee; and

WHEREAS the City of Toronto’s Transportation Planning Group is currently working on the development of the transportation component of the City’s new Official Plan, and has produced a vision statement that defines the basic principles intended to guide the development of that Plan; and

WHEREAS the vision statement also provides some examples of possible rapid transit priorities to be considered in further detail, among which, extension of the Spadina subway to York University has already been identified for being highly consistent with the general thrust of the Official Plan itself; and

WHEREAS Transportation staff are positioning themselves to advise Council on short-term rapid transit priorities in the event of infrastructure money, should it become available from either the provincial or federal governments; and

WHEREAS the first project being analyzed by staff is the subway extension to York University, identified as having potential for reducing automobile dependence and increasing transit use both above and below Steeles Avenue; and

WHEREAS the City of Toronto would greatly benefit from an extended transportation corridor into York Region; and

WHEREAS representatives from York University and York Region area are also involved in discussions; and

WHEREAS the City of Toronto would greatly benefit from participation on this Committee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City of Toronto Council appoint Councillor Peter Li Preti and Councillor Howard Moscoe as City of Toronto representatives on the Spadina Subway - Corporate Centre Transportation Committee.”

In accordance with the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law, Motion J(25) was referred to the Striking Committee.

- 8.91 Councillor Jakobek moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(26), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Jakobek

Seconded by: Councillor Rae

“**WHEREAS** City Council at its meeting held on May 9, 10 and 11, 2000, in adopting Notice of Motion J(2) regarding the 2000 Education Tax levy and the 2000 BIA levy approved the levy and collection of special charges in respect of certain Business Improvement Areas for the year 2000 and adopted By-law No. 252-2000 in regard thereto; and

WHEREAS, by inadvertence, gross expenditures were used as the basis of calculating the special charge rate set out in By-law No. 252-2000 for certain of the Business Improvement Areas, rather than net expenditures, resulting in an incorrect special charge for those Business Improvement Areas; and

WHEREAS it is necessary to amend By-law No. 252-2000 so that the total special charge reflects a calculation on the basis of net expenditures rather than gross expenditures for certain of the Business Improvement Areas set out in By-law No. 252-2000;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Notice of Motion J(2) regarding the 2000 Education Tax levy and the 2000 BIA levy be re-opened for further consideration, in order to amend By-law No. 252-2000 to correct the special charge rate and the special charge levied in respect of certain Business Improvement Areas as set out above;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City Solicitor be authorized to introduce the necessary bill in Council to amend By-law No. 252-2000.”

Votes:

The first Operative Paragraph embodied in Motion J(26) carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

The balance of Motion J(26) carried, without amendment.

- 8.92 Councillor Berardinetti moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(27), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: **Councillor Berardinetti**

Seconded by: **Councillor Jakobek**

“**WHEREAS** City Council, at its meeting held on January 27, 2000, adopted, as amended, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 1 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed ‘2000-2004 Capital Budget and Five Year Capital Program’; and

WHEREAS City Council at its meeting held on May 9, 10 and 11, 2000, adopted, as amended, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 10 of The Administration Committee headed, ‘Green Roofs Infrastructure – Demonstration Project’, and, in so doing, approved a green roof on the Eastview Neighbourhood Community Centre, and struck out and referred that portion of the recommendation of the Administration Committee pertaining to the green roof demonstration project for the City Hall podium roof, back to the Administration Committee for further consideration; and

WHEREAS the City of Toronto is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 20 percent and to reducing smog precursors and to promoting environmentally-sustainable development; and

WHEREAS a Green Roof project provides for many public and private benefits, such as energy efficiency, stormwater management, improving roof membrane

durability, air and water quality improvements, increased public amenity space, reduction in the urban heat island effect and reduced greenhouse gas emissions; and

WHEREAS the City of Toronto has, by far, the largest market potential in Canada for green roofs infrastructure and a City-sponsored pilot project will increase the visibility of this technology; and

WHEREAS staff from the Facilities and Real Estate Division, the Parks and Recreation Division, the Chief Administrative Officer's office, the Energy Efficiency Office, Urban Development Services and the Toronto Public Health Division have developed, and the Administration Committee has approved, a 6,000 square foot project to demonstrate green roof infrastructure technology on the City Hall podium roof; and

WHEREAS the replacement of the City Hall podium roof has already been approved in the 2004 Capital Budget and the incremental cost of the green roof pilot approved by the Administration Committee is \$130,000.00; and

WHEREAS the Green Roofs for Healthy Cities Coalition is prepared to donate \$70,000.00 towards the project and an application has been made to the Toronto Atmospheric Fund for the remaining \$60,000.00 of the project; and

WHEREAS it is necessary to move forward with the City Hall podium green roof, in order to ensure plant survival over the winter;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 1 of The Policy and Finance Committee, headed '2000-2004 Capital Budget and Five Year Capital Program', and Clause No. 1 of Report No. 10 of The Administration Committee headed, 'Green Roofs Infrastructure – Demonstration Project', be re-opened for further consideration, insofar as they pertain to the green roof demonstration project on the City Hall podium roof;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT City Council amend the 2000-2004 budget to provide \$165,000.00 in funding to repair a portion of the City Hall podium roof in 2000 rather than 2004 as approved in the Capital Budget;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the City Hall podium green roof project be approved, conditional on \$130,000.00 being received from the Green Roofs for Healthy Cities Coalition, the Toronto Atmospheric Fund or other sources.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(27), a concept drawing for the proposed City Hall Green Roof Infrastructure Demonstration Site, a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Votes:

The first Operative Paragraph embodied in Motion J(27) carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

The balance of Motion J(27) carried, without amendment.

- 8.93 Councillor Saundercook moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(28), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Saundercook

Seconded by: Councillor Chong

“**WHEREAS** City Council, at its meeting held on May 9, 10 and 11, 2000, by its adoption of Clause No. 3 of Report No. 7 of The Toronto Community Council, headed ‘Installation of Speed Humps – Windermere Avenue, from Bloor Street West to Annette Street (High Park)’, approved the installation of speed humps on Windermere Avenue; and

WHEREAS at this same meeting of Council, petitions signed by hundreds of local residents were before Council, requesting that the humps not be installed until a full review;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 3 of Report No. 7 of The Toronto Community Council, headed ‘Installation of Speed Humps – Windermere Avenue, from Bloor Street West to Annette Street (High Park)’, be re-opened for further consideration;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council’s previous action be rescinded and the Clause be referred to the Works Committee for further consideration in conjunction with the overall traffic calming policy.”

Vote:

Adoption of the first Operative Paragraph embodied in Motion J(28):

Yes - 14 Councillors:	Balkissoon, Bussin, Disero, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, King, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Moeser, O'Brien, Ootes, Saundercook, Soknacki
No - 29 Councillors:	Adams, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Brown, Chow, Duguid, Filion, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, Korwin Kuczynski, Layton, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, Palacio, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shaw, Shiner, Silva, Walker

Lost, less than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Having regard to the foregoing decision, Council did not re-open Clause No. 3 of Report No. 7 of The Toronto Community Council, headed "Installation of Speed Humps - Windermere Avenue, from Bloor Street West to Annette Street (High Park)", for further consideration.

- 8.94 Councillor Pantalone moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(29), which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Pantalone

Seconded by: Councillor Silva

“WHEREAS the owner of 667 King Street West has permission to operate a licensed boulevard café on the Bathurst Street flankage; and

WHEREAS the owner recently began resurfacing the boulevard area without the proper permit; and

WHEREAS there is a stop work order in place; and

WHEREAS the existing plans submitted are acceptable but require permission to allow the area to remain elevated and constructed of wood; and

WHEREAS there are other elevated wooden decks on other City boulevards;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT City Council adopt Recommendation No. (2) embodied in the attached report dated June 6, 2000,

from the District Manager, Municipal Licensing and Standards, to allow for the plans submitted to be approved, provided that there no objections from the circulated utilities.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(29), a report dated June 6, 2000, from the District Manager, Municipal Licensing and Standards, entitled “The Wheat Sheaf - Appeal of an Application for a Boulevard Café Deck - 667 King Street West, Bathurst Street Flank (Trinity-Niagara)”. (See Attachment No. 10, Page 223.)

Vote:

Motion J(29) was adopted, without amendment, and, in so doing, Council adopted Recommendation No. (2) embodied in the report dated June 6, 2000, from the District Manager, Municipal Licensing and Standards, viz.:

“It is recommend that:

- (2) City Council approve the applicant’s request for the construction and maintenance of a boulevard café deck at 667 King Street West, Bathurst Street flank, subject to the café operator confining the deck and café fence to the licensed café area and notwithstanding the Deck Criteria of Municipal Code 313, Streets and Sidewalks of the former City of Toronto Municipal Code and only on approval from all relevant utility companies.”

8.95 Councillor Walker moved that, in accordance with the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law, leave be granted to introduce and debate the following Notice of Motion J(30), which carried:

Moved by: Councillor Walker

Seconded by: Councillor Prue

“**WHEREAS** the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine is designated in the Official Plan for the former City of Toronto as a ‘Natural Area’; and

WHEREAS it is the policy of Council ‘to protect, preserve and maintain and, where possible, enhance Natural Areas of the City in perpetuity’; and

WHEREAS the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine received its designation pursuant to Section 2 of the City of Toronto Act on May 21, 1981; and

WHEREAS the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, in the attached report dated June 8, 2000, has recommended Interim Control for these Ravine Lands;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council adopt the attached report dated June 8, 2000, from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, regarding an Interim Control By-law for these Ravine Lands;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the necessary Bill be introduced to give effect thereto.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(30), a report dated June 8, 2000, from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, entitled “Interim Control By-law Respecting the Properties Abutting the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine (North Toronto)”. (See Attachment No. 11, Page 227.)

Vote:

Motion J(30) was adopted, without amendment, and, in so doing, Council adopted the report dated June 8, 2000, from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, embodying the following recommendations:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, in consultation with the Commissioners of Works and Emergency Services, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism and other City departments, be directed, pursuant to Section 38 of the Planning Act, to undertake a review of the land use policies appropriate for the lands within and abutting the boundary of the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine;
- (2) in connection with the review of the land use policies recommended above, Council pass an Interim Control By-law for lands within the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine and for portions of lands adjacent to the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine to prohibit the erection of buildings or structures in the ravine and within 10 metres of the limit of the ravine shown on the attached map, and that this By-law be in force for a period of one year; and
- (3) authority be granted for the introduction of the necessary Bill in Council to implement Recommendation No. (2), above.”

- 8.96 Councillor Silva moved that the necessary provisions of the Council Procedural By-law be waived to permit introduction and debate of the following Notice of Motion J(31), moved by Councillor Silva, seconded by Councillor Pantalone, and, in the absence of Councillor Pantalone, seconded by Councillor Berardinetti, which carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative:

Moved by: Councillor Silva

Seconded by: Councillor Berardinetti

“**WHEREAS** the Molson Indy Toronto race event is being held over July 14, 15 and 16, 2000, at the Canadian National Exhibition Grounds in Toronto; and

WHEREAS Molson Indy Toronto has had a special permit to serve liquor in the tiered seating areas at the event, for the years 1996 to 1999, inclusive; and

WHEREAS Molson Indy Toronto has changed its caterer for the 2000 year event and requires a Resolution from the City of Toronto that it is an Event of Municipal Significance, in order to obtain a special permit to serve liquor in the tiered seating areas;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City of Toronto declare the Molson Indy Toronto race an Event of Municipal Significance for the purposes of obtaining a special permit to serve liquor in the tiered seating areas, and the Alcohol and Gaming Commission be advised accordingly.”

Council also had before it, during consideration of Motion J(31), a communication dated June 9, 2000, from Mr. Robert Singleton, General Manager, Molson Indy Racing, a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk.

Vote:

Motion J(31) was adopted, without amendment.

- 8.97 Councillor Davis gave Notice of the following Motion to permit consideration at the next regular meeting of City Council scheduled to be held on July 4, 5 and 6, 2000:

Moved by: Councillor Davis

Seconded by: Councillor Adams

“**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** the Executive Director of Human Resources be requested to submit a report to the Administration Committee, during the next term of Council, on the implications of having a corporate-wide policy restricting the hiring of relatives.”

- 8.98 Councillor Moscoe gave Notice of the following Motion to permit consideration at the next regular meeting of City Council scheduled to be held on July 4, 5 and 6, 2000:

Moved by: Councillor Moscoe

Seconded by: Councillor Adams

“**WHEREAS** every employee of the City of Toronto, including unionized, non-unionized, management staff, Councillors’ staff and the Chief Administrative Officer, have had their salaries increased for 1998, 1999 and 2000, except Members of Council; and

WHEREAS it seems unlikely that, on the eve of an election, Council will be able to seek the same increases for themselves; and

WHEREAS Council Members have not had an increase for nine years; and

WHEREAS the provincial government is presently reviewing the salaries of Members of the Legislature; and

WHEREAS City Council, at its meeting held on February 29, March 1 and 2, 2000, in adopting, as amended, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 6 of The Administration Committee, headed, ‘Collective Bargaining With the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local 79’, requested the Executive Director of Human Resources to develop a process to determine remuneration for Members of Council, such remuneration to take effect for the new term of Council, and report thereon to the Administration Committee;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, Clause No. 1 of Report No. 6 of The Administration Committee, headed, ‘Collective Bargaining With the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local 79’, be reopened for further consideration, insofar as it pertains to salaries of Members of Council;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Council peg the salaries of Toronto Council to those of the Members of the Ontario Legislature and Toronto Council salaries be automatically adjusted proportionally to those of the Ontario Legislature whenever they are adjusted retroactively to the effective dates of any adjustments to the salaries of MPPs.”

BILLS AND BY-LAWS

- 8.99 On June 7, 2000, at 5:57 p.m., Councillor Mihevc, seconded by Councillor Filion, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bill, and that this Bill, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as a By-law:

Bill No. 363 By-law No. 316-2000 To Regulate Election Signs,

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 36	
Councillors:	Adams, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Chow, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mihevc, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shaw, Shiner, Soknacki, Valenti
No - 9	
Councillors:	Altobello, Balkissoon, Bussin, Flint, McConnell, Miller, Saundercook, Silva, Walker

Carried by a majority of 27.

- 8.100 On June 7, 2000, at 5:58 p.m., Councillor Mihevc, seconded by Councillor Filion, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bill, and that this Bill, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as a By-law, which carried:

Bill No. 390 By-law No. 317-2000 To confirm the proceedings of the Council at its meeting held on the 7th day of June, 2000.

- 8.101 On June 7, 2000, at 7:30 p.m., Councillor Pitfield, seconded by Councillor Prue, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bill, and that this Bill, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as a By-law:

Bill No. 391 By-law No. 318-2000 To confirm the proceedings of the Council at its meeting held on the 7th day of June, 2000,

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 34 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Brown, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Johnston, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, McConnell, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Saundercook, Silva, Soknacki, Tzekas
No - 1 Councillor:	Walker

Carried by a majority of 33.

- 8.102 On June 8, 2000, at 7:07 p.m., Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Pantalone, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bill, and that this Bill, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as a By-law:

Bill No. 388	By-law No. 319-2000	To effect interim control on certain lands within and abutting the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine,
--------------	---------------------	---

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 34 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Walker
No - 0	

Carried, without dissent.

- 8.103 On June 8, 2000, at 7:08 p.m., Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Pantalone, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bills, and that these Bills, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as By-laws:

Bill No. 313	By-law No. 320-2000	To expropriate certain interests in land from Properties referred to in Column 1 of the Schedule attached in the vicinity of Bayview Avenue
--------------	---------------------	---

		and Sheppard Avenue East for the widening of Sheppard Avenue East.
Bill No. 314	By-law No. 321-2000	To expropriate certain interests in land from 333 Sheppard Avenue East for the widening of Sheppard Avenue East.
Bill No. 315	By-law No. 322-2000	To expropriate certain interests in land from 337 Sheppard Avenue East for the widening of Sheppard Avenue East.
Bill No. 316	By-law No. 323-2000	To designate the property at 1107 Avenue Road (Eglinton Hunt Club) as being of architectural and historical value or interest.
Bill No. 317	By-law No. 324-2000	To adopt Amendment No. 1051 of the Official Plan for the former City of Scarborough.
Bill No. 318	By-law No. 325-2000	To adopt Amendment No. 1037 of the Official Plan for the former City of Scarborough.
Bill No. 319	By-law No. 326-2000	To amend the Employment Districts Zoning By-law No. 24982 (Rouge).
Bill No. 320	By-law No. 327-2000	To designate certain lands as the Queen - Broadview Community Improvement Project Area.
Bill No. 322	By-law No. 328-2000	To amend further By-law No. 23503 of the former City of Scarborough, respecting the regulation of traffic on Toronto Roads.
Bill No. 323	By-law No. 329-2000	To amend further By-law No. 23506 of the former City of Scarborough, respecting pedestrian crossovers.

Bill No. 324	By-law No. 330-2000	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being “A By-law to authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations”, respecting the alteration of Balmoral Avenue from Avenue Road to Yonge Street and Farnham Avenue from Avenue Road to Yonge Street by the installation of speed humps.
Bill No. 325	By-law No. 331-2000	To exempt certain lands on Mare Crescent, Stallion Place and Triple Crown Ave., being certain lots within Plan of Subdivision 66M-2338 (formerly City of Etobicoke), from the provisions of subsection 50(5) of the <u>Planning Act</u> which relate to part-lot control.
Bill No. 326	By-law No. 332-2000	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being “A By-law to authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations”, respecting the alteration of Concord Avenue from Hallam Street to Northumberland Street by the installation of speed humps.
Bill No. 327	By-law No. 333-2000	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being “A By-law to authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations”, respecting the alteration of Delaware Avenue from Hallam Street to Northumberland Street by the installation of speed humps.

Bill No. 328	By-law No. 334-2000	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being “A By-law to authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations”, respecting the alteration of Elm Grove Avenue from King Street West to Queen Street West, Wilson Park Road from King Street West to Queen Street West, Dunn Avenue from King Street West to Springhurst Avenue and Spencer Avenue from King Street West to Springhurst Avenue by the installation of speed humps.
Bill No. 329	By-law No. 335-2000	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being “A By-law to authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations”, respecting the alteration of Highfield Road from Dundas Street East to Gerrard Street East by the installation of speed humps.
Bill No. 330	By-law No. 336-2000	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being “A By-law to authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations”, respecting the alteration of Kimberley Avenue from Lyall Avenue to Swanwick Avenue by the installation of speed humps.
Bill No. 331	By-law No. 337-2000	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being “A By-law to authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various

		locations”, respecting the alteration of Millwood Road from Yonge Street to Acacia Road by the installation of speed humps.
Bill No. 332	By-law No. 338-2000	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being “A By-law to authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations”, respecting the alteration of Poulett Street north of Shuter Street by narrowing the pavement.
Bill No. 333	By-law No. 339-2000	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being “A By-law to authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations”, respecting the alteration of St. Clements Avenue from Avenue Road to Castlewood Road and St. Clements Avenue from Castlewood Road to Caldow Road by the installation of speed humps.
Bill No. 334	By-law No. 340-2000	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being “A By-law to authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations”, respecting the alteration of Euclid Avenue from Dundas Street West to College Street by the installation of speed humps.
Bill No. 335	By-law No. 341-2000	To authorize the alteration of Morningside Avenue between Lawrence Avenue East and Kingston Road by the installation of a pedestrian refuge island.

Bill No. 336	By-law No. 342-2000	To authorize the alteration of Little Avenue from Lawrence Avenue West to Weston Road by the installation of speed humps.
Bill No. 337	By-law No. 343-2000	To amend further Metropolitan By-law No. 32-92, respecting the regulation of traffic on former Metropolitan Roads.
Bill No. 338	By-law No. 344-2000	To amend further By-law No. 34-93, a By-law "To provide for disabled person parking permit holders", being a by-law of the former Borough of East York.
Bill No. 339	By-law No. 345-2000	To amend further By-law No. 92-93, a By-law "To regulate traffic on roads in the Borough of East York", being a by-law of the former Borough of East York.
Bill No. 340	By-law No. 346-2000	To amend further Metropolitan By-law No. 32-92, respecting the regulation of traffic on former Metropolitan Roads.
Bill No. 341	By-law No. 347-2000	To amend the Municipal Code of the former City of Etobicoke with respect to Traffic - Chapter 240, Article I.
Bill No. 342	By-law No. 348-2000	To amend former City of York Municipal Code Ch. 997, School Bus Loading Zone, respecting Brookside Avenue and St. Mark's Road.
Bill No. 343	By-law No. 349-2000	To amend the Municipal Code of the former City of Etobicoke with respect to Traffic - Chapter 240, Article I.
Bill No. 344	By-law No. 350-2000	To amend By-law No. 31001 of the former City of North York, as amended.

Bill No. 345	By-law No. 351-2000	To amend former City of York By-law No. 2958-94, being a By-law "To regulate traffic on City of York Roads".
Bill No. 346	By-law No. 352-2000	To amend former City of York By-law No. 196-84, being a By-law "To regulate traffic on City of York Roads".
Bill No. 347	By-law No. 353-2000	To amend the Municipal Code of the former City of Etobicoke with respect to Traffic - Chapter 240, Article I.
Bill No. 348	By-law No. 354-2000	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, respecting East Avenue.
Bill No. 349	By-law No. 355-2000	A by-law pursuant to the provisions of section 50(7.5) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, to repeal By-law No. 143-97.
Bill No. 350	By-law No. 356-2000	To amend further Metropolitan Toronto By-law No. 32-92, respecting the regulation of traffic on former Metropolitan Roads.
Bill No. 351	By-law No. 357-2000	To adopt an amendment to the Official Plan for the former City of Toronto respecting lands known as Nos. 195 and 253 Merton Street.
Bill No. 352	By-law No. 358-2000	To amend the General Zoning By-law No. 438-86 of the former City of Toronto with respect to lands known as Nos. 195 and 253 Merton Street.
Bill No. 353	By-law No. 359-2000	To amend Article I, Conveyance of Land for Park Purposes of the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 165, to provide for an exemption

		in respect of Nos. 195 and 253 Merton Street.
Bill No. 354	By-law No. 360-2000	To adopt Amendment No. 77-2000 to the Official Plan of the Etobicoke Planning Area in order to implement a site-specific amendment affecting the lands located on the south side of The Queensway, west of Kipling Avenue.
Bill No. 357	By-law No. 361-2000	To adopt Amendment Number 152 to the Official Plan of the former City of York with respect to lands known municipally as 1202 Jane Street.
Bill No. 358	By-law No. 362-2000	To amend former City of York By-law No. 1-83 with respect to the lands known municipally as 1202 Jane Street.
Bill No. 359	By-law No. 363-2000	To amend By-law No. 2696, being "A By-law to establish schedules of retention for records of local boards of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto" to establish immediate destruction dates for certain records of The Board of Governors of Exhibition Place.
Bill No. 360	By-law No. 364-2000	To amend current City of Toronto By-laws No. 30742 (North York), No. 22614 (Scarborough), No. 107 86 (Metro), No. 197 (East York), No. 1645-89 (York), and Municipal Code Chapters 400 (Toronto), 982 (York) and 187 (Etobicoke) respecting the use of parking meters to establish new regulations for the parking of motorcycles in metered spaces.

Bill No. 361	By-law No. 365-2000	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being “A By-law to authorize the construction, widening, narrowing, alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations”, respecting the alteration of Gainsborough Road by the installation of speed humps from Gerrard Street East to Eastwood Road.
Bill No. 362	By-law No. 366-2000	To layout and dedicate certain land west of Jonesville Crescent for public highway purposes to form part of the public highway Eglinton Avenue East.
Bill No. 364	By-law No. 367-2000	To amend further Metropolitan By-law No. 32-92, respecting the regulation of traffic on former Metropolitan Roads.
Bill No. 365	By-law No. 368-2000	To layout and dedicate certain land west of Keele Street for public highway purposes to form part of the public highway St. Clair Avenue West.
Bill No. 366	By-law No. 369-2000	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, respecting Garnock Avenue, Lambertlodge Avenue, Park Road, Pearson Avenue, Rennie Terrace, Silver Avenue, Victoria Street, Waller Avenue.
Bill No. 367	By-law No. 370-2000	To layout and dedicate certain land north-east of Acorn Avenue for public highway purposes to form part of the public highway Dundas Street West.

Bill No. 368	By-law No. 371-2000	To layout and dedicate certain land for public highway purposes to form part of the public highway Bloor Street West.
Bill No. 369	By-law No. 372-2000	To layout and dedicate certain land east of Jane Street for public highway purposes to form part of the public highway Lawrence Avenue West.
Bill No. 370	By-law No. 373-2000	To layout and dedicate certain land for public lane purposes to form part of the public lane south of Lappin Avenue extending between Lansdowne Avenue and Ward Street.
Bill No. 371	By-law No. 374-2000	To layout and dedicate certain land for public lane purposes to form part of the public lane north of College Street extending between Montrose Avenue and Crawford Street.
Bill No. 372	By-law No. 375-2000	To layout and dedicate certain land to form part of the public lane east of Brock Avenue extending southerly from Earnbridge Street.
Bill No. 373	By-law No. 376-2000	To layout and dedicate for public lane purposes certain land to form part of the public lane east of Sherbourne Street extending between Gerrard Street East and Dundas Street East
Bill No. 374	By-law No. 377-2000	To layout and dedicate for public lane purposes certain land to form part of the public lane south of Eglinton Avenue West extending easterly from Warren Road.
Bill No. 375	By-law No. 378-2000	To further amend former City of Toronto By-law No. 602-89, being "A By-law to authorize the construction, widening, narrowing,

		alteration and repair of sidewalks, pavements and curbs at various locations”, respecting the alteration of Windermere Avenue from Bloor Street West to Annette Street by the installation of speed humps.
Bill No. 376	By-law No. 379-2000	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, respecting Fairlawn Avenue, Hallam Street, Margueretta Street, Moutray Street, Riverside Drive, Wyndham Street, Wright Avenue.
Bill No. 377	By-law No. 380-2000	To name the public lane extending northerly from Eastern Avenue to Queen Street East between Woodfield Road and Woodward Avenue as “Cam Fella Lane”.
Bill No. 378	By-law No. 381-2000	To dedicate certain lands for public lane purposes and to name certain lands forming the public lane system within the block bounded by Wellesley Avenue, Wellesley Street East, Parkview Avenue and the St. James Cemetery as “St. James Court”.
Bill No. 379	By-law No. 382-2000	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, respecting Bathurst Street, Fleet Street, Queens Quay West to establish public transit reserve lanes.
Bill No. 380	By-law No. 383-2000	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Chapter 194, Footpaths, Bicycle Lanes and Pedestrian Ways to relocate the bicycle lanes on Queens Quay West between Lower Portland Avenue and Lower Bathurst Street.

Bill No. 381	By-law No. 384-2000	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, with respect to speed control zones.
Bill No. 382	By-law No. 385-2000	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, respecting Orchard Park Boulevard.
Bill No. 383	By-law No. 386-2000	To amend Chapter 400 of the Toronto Municipal Code, the Traffic and Parking Code, a by-law of the former City of Toronto, respecting the designation of private roadways at 66 Pacific Avenue, 255 Glenlake Avenue, 111 Pacific Avenue and 66 Oakmount Avenue as fire routes and to repeal By-Law No. 163-2000.
Bill No. 384	By-law No. 387-2000	To amend By-law No. 252-2000, being a by-law "To provide for the levy and collection of special charges for the year 2000 in respect of certain Business Improvement Areas".
Bill No. 385	By-law No. 388-2000	To regulate planting, care, maintenance, and protection of trees on City Highways/Roads or Street Allowances and to ensure the sustainability of the urban forest.
Bill No. 386	By-law No. 389-2000	To appoint members to the Board of Directors of the Toronto Atmospheric Fund and to establish quorum.
Bill No. 387	By-law No. 390-2000	To amend the former City of Toronto Municipal Code Ch. 400, Traffic and Parking, respecting Ravina Crescent,

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 35 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Walker
No - 0

Carried, without dissent.

- 8.104 On June 8, 2000, at 7:09 p.m., Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Pantalone, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bill, and that this Bill, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as a By-law:

Bill No. 392	By-law No. 391-2000	To confirm the proceedings of the Council at its meeting held on the 7th, and 8th days of June, 2000,
--------------	---------------------	---

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 36 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Ashton, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Bossons, Brown, Bussin, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, Kelly, Kinahan, King, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moeser, Nunziata, Ootes, Pantalone, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Soknacki, Tzekas, Walker
No - 0

Carried, without dissent.

- 8.105 On June 9, 2000, at 5:11 p.m., Councillor Augimeri, seconded by Councillor McConnell, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bills; that Bills Nos. 355 and 356 which were inadvertently introduced on June 8, 2000, be withdrawn; that leave now be granted to introduce Bill No. 355, as amended, and that these Bills, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as By-laws:

Bill No. 321	By-law No. 392-2000	To amend further Metropolitan Toronto By-law No. 20-85, a By-law "Respecting the licensing, regulating
--------------	---------------------	--

and governing of trades, callings, businesses and occupations in the Metropolitan Area”, a by-law of the former Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, respecting taxicab safety devices.

Bill No. 389	By-law No. 393-2000	To amend further Metropolitan Toronto By-law No. 20-85, a By-law “Respecting the licensing, regulating and governing of trades, callings, businesses and occupations in the Metropolitan Area”, a by-law of the former Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, respecting Accessible taxicabs.
Bill No. 355	By-law No. 394-2000	To prescribe the height and description of fences on private property and to require owners of privately owned outdoor swimming pools to erect and maintain fences and gates around the swimming pools (as amended),

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 35 Councillors: Adams, Altobello, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Fillion, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki, Walker
No - 1 Councillor: Bossons

Carried by a majority of 34.

- 8.106 On June 9, 2000, at 5:13 p.m., Councillor Augimeri, seconded by Councillor Adams, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bill, and that this Bill, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as a By-law:

Bill No. 393 By-law No. 395-2000 To confirm the proceedings of the Council at its meeting held on the 7th, 8th and 9th days of June, 2000,

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 35 Councillors:	Altobello, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Brown, Bussin, Chong, Chow, Davis, Duguid, Feldman, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki, Walker
No - 1 Councillor:	Bossons

Carried by a majority of 34.

- 8.107 On June 9, 2000, at 5:44 p.m., Councillor Holyday, seconded by Councillor Soknacki, moved that leave be granted to introduce the following Bill, and that this Bill, prepared for this meeting of Council, be passed and hereby declared as a By-law:

Bill No. 394 By-law No. 396-2000 To confirm the proceedings of the Council at its meeting held on the 7th, 8th and 9th days of June, 2000,

the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 35 Councillors:	Adams, Altobello, Augimeri, Berardinetti, Brown, Bussin, Cho, Chong, Chow, Davis, Disero, Duguid, Filion, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Kinahan, Layton, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Minnan-Wong, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Sinclair, Soknacki
No - 1 Councillor:	Bossons

Carried by a majority of 34.

The following Bill which appeared on the Final Bills Index was not adopted at this meeting:

Bill No. 356 For determining how the cost of division fences shall be apportioned, and for providing that any amount so apportioned shall be recoverable under the Provincial Offences Act.

OFFICIAL RECOGNITIONS:

8.108 Condolence Motion:

June 7, 2000:

Councillor Sinclair, seconded by Councillor Chow, moved that:

“**WHEREAS** the Members of City of Toronto Council are saddened to learn of the passing of Dr. Paul Steinhauer, on Saturday, May 27, 2000; and

WHEREAS Dr. Steinhauer was a renowned advocate for children’s rights in Canada, and was a consultant to several children’s aid organizations; and

WHEREAS Dr. Steinhauer, a child psychiatrist for 38 years, cared deeply for the well-being of children, particularly those facing obstacles, such as poverty; and

WHEREAS Dr. Steinhauer was honoured many times during his career, most recently by the Ontario Medical Association, in recognition for his service to the community;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the City Clerk be directed to convey, on behalf of members of City Council, our sincere sympathy to Dr. Steinhauer’s wife Estelle, and their family.”

Leave to introduce the Motion was granted and the Motion was adopted unanimously.

Council rose and observed a moment of silence in memory of the late Dr. Steinhauer.

8.109 Presentations/Introductions/Announcements:

June 7, 2000:

Councillor Layton, during the morning session of the meeting, with the permission of Council, introduced Ms. Lillian Thomas, Deputy Mayor of Winnipeg, present at the meeting.

Councillor Johnston, during the morning session of the meeting, with the permission of Council, advised the Council that Councillor Jack Layton, Don River, had been elected as the first Vice-President of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities.

Councillor Layton, during the morning session of the meeting, with the permission of Council, advised the Council that the Minister of the Environment had agreed to participate in the "Smog Busting Summit" being held at Metro Hall on June 21, 2000, to which the Greater Toronto Mayors and Chairs and the relevant Commissioners had also been invited.

Mayor Lastman, during the morning session of the meeting, advised the Council that at 11:00 a.m. today, in the Great Hall of Union Station, he, together with Federal Minister of Transport, David Collenette, would be officially announcing the City of Toronto's \$80 million purchase of Union Station from the Toronto Terminal Railway Company (TTR), and that copies of the press release in this regard would be distributed to all Members of Council.

Deputy Mayor Ootes, during the morning session of the meeting, introduced the Grade 5 students of Thorncliffe Park Public School, present at the meeting.

Deputy Mayor Ootes, during the morning session of the meeting, introduced nine out-of-province graduates who will be assisting Elections staff with the preparations for the upcoming Municipal election, present at the meeting.

Mayor Lastman, during the afternoon session of the meeting, with the permission of Council, invited Councillor Anne Johnston, Seniors Advocate, to the podium to address the Council and to officially launch the book, entitled "Then and Now", which has been produced by the City of Toronto's Homes for the Aged Division and which contains over 100 years of the personal reminiscences of 40 seniors who have lived or volunteered in the City's Homes for the Aged. Councillor Johnston addressed the Council and presented the Mayor with a copy of the book to mark the occasion.

Deputy Mayor Ootes, during the afternoon session of the meeting, introduced the students of Vaughan Road Co-op Nursery, present at the meeting.

Councillor Jakobek, during the afternoon session of the meeting, with the permission of Council, addressed the Council in regard to problems experienced with the official elevator to the Council Chamber and the delays associated therewith; and requested the Deputy Mayor to consult with the appropriate City staff, in order to solve this ongoing problem.

Deputy Mayor Ootes, during the afternoon session of the meeting, introduced Councillor Nick Volkow, of Burnaby, British Columbia, present at the meeting.

Councillor Moscoe, during the afternoon session of the meeting, with the permission of Council, introduced Ms. Gail Nyberg, Chair, Toronto District School Board, present at the meeting.

Deputy Mayor Ootes, during the afternoon session of the meeting, introduced a Tour Group from the United Kingdom, present at the meeting.

Councillor Layton, during the afternoon session of the meeting, with the permission of Council, introduced the video presentation for the 2000 White Ribbon Campaign; and invited all Members of Council to participate in the two-minute walk past City Hall with the children from the Hester Howe Day Care Centre, on Thursday, June 8, 2000, at 1:50 p.m., to promote the White Ribbon Campaign 'Dad Walk' being held on Sunday, June 11, 2000.

June 8, 2000:

Mayor Lastman, during the morning session of the meeting, invited Councillor Mihevc to the podium to address the Council in regard to the Task Force on Community Access and Equity. Councillor Mihevc addressed the Council, outlined the achievements of the Task Force, expressed, on behalf of Council, the appreciation of Council, to the members of Task Force and, in particular, to Ms. Ceta Ramkhalawansingh and Ms. Bernita Lee of the Access and Equity Centre of the Chief Administrator's Office; and invited Members of Council and the Members of the Task Force to a small reception in the Members' Lounge.

Deputy Mayor Ootes, during the morning session of the meeting, introduced the Grade 5 students of Thorncliffe Park Public School, present at the meeting.

Mayor Lastman, during the morning session of the meeting, invited Councillor Layton to the podium to address the Council in regard to the presentation that will be made in Nathan Phillips Square at 1:00 p.m., today, to the 21 schools who have won grants from the Toronto Atmospheric Fund (TAF) for their involvement in programs ranging from climate change to conservation. Councillor Layton addressed the Council and introduced the representatives of the schools, present at the meeting, who would be receiving \$2,500.00 from TAF during the ceremony on the Square.

Mayor Lastman, during the afternoon session of the meeting, invited Councillor Pantalone, Tree Advocate, to the podium to launch the City of Toronto Tree Advocacy Program's corporate sponsorship and fundraising initiative to raise private funds for the planting of 60,000 trees across the City of Toronto, including 30,000 trees at 28 designated sites in each of the existing 28 wards. Councillor Pantalone addressed the Council and invited the following representatives of corporate sponsors and strong supporters of the Program to the podium, to accept a memento to mark the launch of the Tree Advocacy Program:

- Mr. Tony DiGiovanni, Executive Director, Landscape Ontario;
- Mr. Matthew Stainton, Manager of Business Development, and Mr. Peter Olive, Manager of Business Development, Toronto Construction Association;
- Mr. Paul Schmalz, Vice President, P.C.L. Constructors Canada Inc.;
- Ms. Helen Howes, Director of Environmental Affairs, Ontario Power Generation Corporation; and
- Mr. Phil Jessup, Executive Director, Toronto Atmospheric Fund.

Councillor Pantalone further advised the Council that the Globe and Mail was also a sponsor of the program; introduced the representatives of other supporting organizations, namely, the Toronto Real Estate Board and the Film Industry Liaison Committee, present at the meeting; invited Members of Council to take home and plant the seedlings which had been left on each Member's desk in the Chamber; and encouraged Members to spread the tree planting message.

Deputy Mayor Ootes, during the afternoon session of the meeting, introduced his brother, Mr. Jake Ootes, Minister of Education, Culture and Employment and Minister Responsible for the Northwest Territories Power Corporation, accompanied by Ms. Jane Groenewegen, Deputy Premier, Northwest Territories, present at the meeting.

Deputy Mayor Ootes, during the afternoon session of the meeting, introduced the representatives of the Massey Centre for Women, present at the meeting.

June 9, 2000:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, during the morning session of the meeting, introduced the students of Thorncliffe Park Public School, present at the meeting.

Councillor Tzekas, during the morning session of the meeting, with the permission of Council, advised the Council that, from June 5, 2000, to June 15, 2000, the City of Toronto is being visited by a Hellenic Theatrical Troupe, bringing with them a Photographic Exhibition from the historic City of Kastoria, Greece; and introduced the following delegates present at the meeting:

- Mr. Achilleas Mirkopoulos, City Councillor of Kastoria and Chairman of Economic Development of the City and Region;
- Mrs. Christina Papoulidou, the wife of the Mayor of Kastoria and the representative of the Mayor;
- Mrs. Voula Kokkaloniou, Public Relations Attaché and Principal Secretary to the Mayor and Council of Kastoria; and
- Mrs. Helen Botteas, an executive member of the Kastorian Society in Toronto.

Councillor Tzekas also read the following preamble about the City of Kastoria:

“The City of Kastoria is located in the northwest corner of Greece, 2,100 feet above sea level, nestled among rolling mountains, lush valleys and the ample rivers of the Province of Macedonia.

Kastoria has flourished for over 3,000 years as a centre for trade, politics and culture for the entire Balkan region. It was particularly the City’s trade and industry that brought its citizens to every corner of the world and back, making Kastoria one of the world’s first truly cosmopolitan cities.

The United Nations (UN) has named Kastoria as the Historical Capital of Europe for Byzantine history and, through UNESCO, the UN has assisted in the preservation of many of the City’s historical treasures. Such treasures include the frescoes and icons of the City’s 72 churches, many of which date back to both before and after Christ.”

8.110 MOTIONS TO VARY PROCEDURE

Vary the order of the proceedings of Council:

June 7, 2000:

Motions:

Councillor Mihevc, during the morning session of the meeting, moved that Council vary the order of its proceedings to consider Clause No. 1 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed “Proposed Election Sign By-law”, as the first item of business.

Councillor Davis moved that the motion by Councillor Mihevc be amended to provide that Council vary the order of its proceedings to consider such Clause at 2:00 p.m. on June 8, 2000.

Votes:

Adoption of motion by Councillor Davis:

Yes - 14 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Augimeri, Berger, Davis, Holyday, Kinahan, King, Lindsay Luby, McConnell, Minnan-Wong, Nunziata, Palacio, Soknacki, Valenti
No - 29 Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Bossons, Bussin, Cho, Chow, Duguid, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Mihevc, Moeser, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Shiner, Silva, Sinclair

Lost by a majority of 15.

Adoption of motion by Councillor Mihevc, without amendment:

Yes - 26 Mayor: Lastman Councillors: Augimeri, Cho, Chow, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Jakobek, Johnston, Jones, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Mihevc, Miller, Moeser, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Palacio, Pitfield, Prue, Sinclair
No - 19 Councillors: Altobello, Ashton, Berardinetti, Berger, Bossons, Bussin, Davis, Duguid, Giansante, Holyday, Kinahan, King, Minnan-Wong, Pantalone, Rae, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Valenti

Carried by a majority of 7.

Motion and Vote:

Councillor Johnston, during the morning session of the meeting, moved that Council vary the order of its proceedings to consider Clause No. 13 of Report No. 5 of The Community Services Committee, headed "Implementation of the Toronto Seniors Task Force Report and the Establishment of the Toronto Seniors Assembly", after 2:00 p.m., today, which carried.

Motions:

Councillor Gardner, during the morning session of the meeting, moved that Council vary the order of its proceedings to consider Clause No. 1 of Report No. 12 of The Administration Committee, headed "Future Use of the Dempsey Store (Ward 10 - North York Centre)", as the first item of business on June 8, 2000.

Councillor Filion moved that Council vary the order of its proceedings to consider Clause No. 1 of Report No. 12 of The Administration Committee, headed "Future Use of the Dempsey Store (Ward 10 - North York Centre)", at 2:00 p.m. on June 8, 2000.

Votes:

Adoption of motion by Councillor Gardner:

Yes - 28	
Councillors:	Augimeri, Berardinetti, Berger, Chow, Disero, Filion, Flint, Gardner, Giansante, Holyday, Kinahan, King, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, Moeser, Moscoe, Nunziata, O'Brien, Ootes, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Shiner, Silva, Soknacki, Valenti
No - 11	
Mayor:	Lastman
Councillors:	Altobello, Ashton, Bossons, Bussin, Davis, Duguid, Jakobek, Jones, Korwin-Kuczynski, Palacio

Carried by a majority of 17.

Having regard to the foregoing decision of Council, the motion by Councillor Filion was not put to a vote.

Proposal by Deputy Mayor:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, during the morning session of the meeting, proposed that Council vary the order of its proceedings to first consider those matters on the Order Paper for this meeting which were 'time critical'.

Council concurred in the proposal by the Deputy Mayor.

Motion and Vote:

Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski, during the morning session of the meeting, moved that Council vary the order of its proceedings to consider Clause No. 8 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Rehabilitation and Redevelopment of the Canada Malting Complex, Metronome Canada Incorporated (Ward 24 - Downtown)", at

3:00 p.m. on June 8, 2000, subject to the completion of the 'time critical' items by that time, which carried.

Motion and Vote:

Councillor Moscoe, during the morning session of the meeting, moved that Council vary the order of its proceedings to consider Clause No. 3 of Report No. 5 of The Planning and Transportation Committee, headed "Accessible Taxicab Class of Licence", as the last item of business, which carried.

June 8, 2000:

Councillor Korwin-Kuczynski, at 5:11 p.m., moved that, in accordance with Section 46 of the Council Procedural By-law, the previous decision of Council to consider Clause No. 8 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed "Rehabilitation and Redevelopment of the Canada Malting Complex, Metronome Canada Incorporated (Ward 24 - Downtown)", following the completion of the 'time critical' items, be re-opened for further consideration, and that Council now give consideration to such Clause, the vote upon which was taken as follows:

Yes - 34	
Councillors:	Adams, Ashton, Augimeri, Balkissoon, Bossons, Chong, Disero, Duguid, Feldman, Flint, Giansante, Holyday, Jones, King, Korwin-Kuczynski, Layton, Li Preti, Lindsay Luby, Mammoliti, McConnell, Moscoe, Nunziata, Ootes, Palacio, Pantalone, Pitfield, Prue, Rae, Saundercook, Shiner, Silva, Sinclair, Soknacki, Walker
No - 6	
Councillors:	Altobello, Berardinetti, Chow, Kelly, Minnan-Wong, Tzekas

Carried, more than two-thirds of Members present having voted in the affirmative.

Waive the provisions of the Council Procedural By-law related to meeting times:

June 7, 2000:

Councillor Moscoe, during the in-camera portion of the meeting, moved that, in accordance with subsection 11(8) of the Council Procedural By-law, Council waive the requirement of the 7:30 p.m. recess, in order to provide sufficient time to meet in public session and confirm the proceedings of this portion of the meeting, which carried, without dissent.

June 9, 2000:

Deputy Mayor Ootes, at 12:25 p.m., proposed that Council now recess and reconvene at 2:00 p.m.

Council concurred in the proposal by the Deputy Mayor.

8.111 ATTENDANCE

June 7, 2000	9:40 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.*	Roll Call 11:15 a.m.	Roll Call 2:10 p.m.	2:10 p.m. to 6:10 p.m.*
Lastman	x	-	-	x
Adams	x	-	-	x
Altobello	x	x	x	x
Ashton	x	x	x	x
Augimeri	x	-	-	-
Balkissoon	x	-	x	x
Berardinetti	x	-	x	x
Berger	x	x	x	x
Bossons	x	x	-	x
Brown	x	x	x	x
Bussin	x	x	-	x
Cho	x	-	x	x
Chong	x	x	-	x
Chow	x	x	x	x
Davis	x	x	-	x
Disero	x	x	x	x
Duguid	x	-	-	x
Feldman	-	-	x	x
Filion	x	x	x	x
Flint	x	x	x	x
Gardner	x	-	-	x
Giansante	x	x	x	x

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 7, 2000	9:40 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.*	Roll Call 11:15 a.m.	Roll Call 2:10 p.m.	2:10 p.m. to 6:10 p.m.*
Holyday	x	x	x	x
Jakobek	x	x	-	x
Johnston	x	x	x	x
Jones	x	x	x	x
Kelly	x	x	x	x
Kinahan	x	x	x	x
King	x	x	x	x
Korwin-Kuczynski	x	-	x	x
Layton	x	-	-	x
Lindsay Luby	x	x	x	x
Li Preti	x	x	-	x
Mahood	x	-	-	x
Mammoliti	x	x	-	x
McConnell	x	-	-	x
Mihevc	x	x	x	x
Miller	x	-	x	x
Minnan-Wong	x	x	x	x
Moeser	x	x	-	x
Moscoe	x	x	-	x
Nunziata	x	-	-	x
O'Brien	x	x	-	x
Ootes	x	x	x	x
Palacio	x	-	x	x
Pantalone	x	-	x	x
Pitfield	x	x	x	x
Prue	x	x	-	x
Rae	x	x	x	x
Saundercook	x	x	x	x
Shaw	x	-	-	x

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 7, 2000	9:40 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.*	Roll Call 11:15 a.m.	Roll Call 2:10 p.m.	2:10 p.m. to 6:10 p.m.*
Shiner	x	x	-	x
Silva	x	-	x	x
Sinclair	x	-	-	-
Soknacki	x	x	x	x
Tzekas	x	x	-	x
Valenti	x	-	x	x
Walker	x	-	-	x
Total	57	36	33	56

* Members were present for some or all of the time period indicated.

June 7, 2000	Roll Call 4:41 p.m.	Roll Call 5:09 p.m.	Ctte. of the Whole in-Camera 6:20 p.m.*	7:29 p.m. to 7:32 p.m.*
Lastman	x	-	x	-
Adams	x	x	x	x
Altobello	-	x	x	x
Ashton	-	x	x	x
Augimeri	-	-	-	-
Balkissoon	x	x	-	-
Berardinetti	-	x	x	x
Berger	-	-	x	x
Bossons	-	-	-	-
Brown	x	x	x	x
Bussin	-	-	-	-
Cho	-	-	-	-
Chong	-	x	-	-
Chow	x	x	x	x
Davis	-	-	-	-
Disero	x	x	x	x

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 7, 2000	Roll Call 4:41 p.m.	Roll Call 5:09 p.m.	Ctte. of the Whole in-Camera 6:20 p.m.*	7:29 p.m. to 7:32 p.m.*
Duguid	x	x	x	x
Feldman	x	-	x	x
Filion	x	x	-	-
Flint	x	x	x	x
Gardner	x	x	x	-
Giansante	x	x	x	x
Holyday	-	x	x	x
Jakobek	-	-	-	-
Johnston	-	-	x	x
Jones	-	-	x	x
Kelly	x	x	x	-
Kinahan	x	x	x	x
King	x	x	x	x
Korwin-Kuczynski	x	x	-	x
Layton	x	x	x	x
Lindsay Luby	x	x	-	-
Li Preti	-	x	-	-
Mahood	x	-	-	-
Mammoliti	-	-	-	-
McConnell	-	-	x	x
Mihevc	x	x	-	-
Miller	-	-	-	-
Minnan-Wong	-	x	x	x
Moeser	x	-	x	x
Moscoe	x	x	x	x
Nunziata	x	-	x	x
O'Brien	x	x	x	x
Ootes	x	x	x	x
Palacio	x	x	x	-

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 7, 2000	Roll Call 4:41 p.m.	Roll Call 5:09 p.m.	Ctte. of the Whole in-Camera 6:20 p.m.*	7:29 p.m. to 7:32 p.m.*
Pantalone	x	-	x	x
Pitfield	x	x	x	x
Prue	-	x	x	x
Rae	-	x	-	-
Saundercook	x	x	x	x
Shaw	x	x	x	-
Shiner	x	x	-	-
Silva	-	-	-	x
Sinclair	-	-	-	-
Soknacki	x	x	x	x
Tzekas	x	-	x	x
Valenti	x	x	-	-
Walker	-	x	x	x
Total	34	37	37	34

* Members were present for some or all of the time period indicated.

June 8, 2000	Roll Call 9:40 a.m.	9:40 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.*	Roll Call 2:10 p.m.	2:10 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.*
Lastman	-	x	-	x
Adams	-	-	x	x
Altobello	x	x	x	x
Ashton	-	-	x	x
Augimeri	x	x	x	x
Balkissoon	-	x	-	x
Berardinetti	-	x	x	x
Berger	-	x	-	x
Bossons	-	x	-	x
Brown	x	x	x	x

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 8, 2000	Roll Call 9:40 a.m.	9:40 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.*	Roll Call 2:10 p.m.	2:10 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.*
Bussin	-	x	-	x
Cho	-	-	-	-
Chong	-	x	-	x
Chow	x	x	-	x
Davis	x	x	x	x
Disero	x	x	x	x
Duguid	x	x	x	x
Feldman	-	x	x	x
Filion	-	x	-	x
Flint	x	x	-	x
Gardner	x	x	-	x
Giansante	-	x	x	x
Holyday	x	x	x	x
Jakobek	-	x	x	x
Johnston	-	-	-	-
Jones	x	x	x	x
Kelly	x	x	x	x
Kinahan	x	x	x	x
King	x	x	x	x
Korwin-Kuczynski	-	x	x	x
Layton	x	x	-	x
Lindsay Luby	x	x	x	x
Li Preti	-	x	x	x
Mahood	x	x	x	x
Mammoliti	-	x	x	x
McConnell	-	x	-	x
Mihevc	x	x	-	x
Miller	-	x	-	x
Minnan-Wong	-	x	-	x

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 8, 2000	Roll Call 9:40 a.m.	9:40 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.*	Roll Call 2:10 p.m.	2:10 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.*
Moeser	x	x	x	x
Moscoe	-	x	-	x
Nunziata	-	x	x	x
O'Brien	x	x	x	x
Ootes	x	x	x	x
Palacio	-	x	-	x
Pantalone	x	x	x	x
Pitfield	x	x	x	x
Prue	x	x	-	x
Rae	x	x	x	x
Saundercook	x	x	x	x
Shaw	-	x	-	x
Shiner	x	x	x	x
Silva	x	x	-	x
Sinclair	-	x	x	x
Soknacki	-	x	x	x
Tzekas	-	x	x	x
Valenti	x	x	-	x
Walker	x	x	x	x
Total	30	54	35	56

* Members were present for some or all of the time period indicated.

June 8, 2000	Roll Call 4:10 p.m.	Roll Call 6:13 p.m.	Roll Call 6:58 p.m.
Lastman	-	-	-
Adams	x	x	x
Altobello	-	x	-
Ashton	x	x	-
Augimeri	-	x	-

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 8, 2000	Roll Call 4:10 p.m.	Roll Call 6:13 p.m.	Roll Call 6:58 p.m.
Balkissoon	-	-	-
Berardinetti	-	x	-
Berger	-	x	-
Bossons	x	x	x
Brown	x	x	x
Bussin	x	x	x
Cho	-	-	-
Chong	x	-	-
Chow	x	x	-
Davis	-	x	x
Disero	x	x	x
Duguid	x	x	x
Feldman	x	x	x
Filion	-	-	-
Flint	-	x	x
Gardner	x	-	-
Giansante	-	x	x
Holyday	x	x	x
Jakobek	-	-	-
Johnston	-	-	-
Jones	x	-	x
Kelly	x	-	x
Kinahan	x	x	x
King	x	-	x
Korwin-Kuczynski	x	x	-
Layton	x	x	x
Lindsay Luby	x	x	x
Li Preti	-	x	x
Mahood	-	-	-

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 8, 2000	Roll Call 4:10 p.m.	Roll Call 6:13 p.m.	Roll Call 6:58 p.m.
Mammoliti	-	-	-
McConnell	x	-	x
Mihevc	x	-	-
Miller	-	x	x
Minnan-Wong	-	x	x
Moeser	x	x	x
Moscoe	x	-	-
Nunziata	-	x	x
O'Brien	-	x	-
Ootes	x	-	x
Palacio	x	-	-
Pantalone	-	x	x
Pitfield	-	x	-
Prue	x	x	x
Rae	-	x	x
Saundercook	x	x	x
Shaw	-	-	-
Shiner	x	x	x
Silva	-	-	-
Sinclair	x	-	-
Soknacki	x	x	x
Tzekas	-	x	x
Valenti	x	x	-
Walker	-	x	x
Total	31	37	32

* Members were present for some or all of the time period indicated.

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 9, 2000	Roll Call 9:44 a.m.	9:44 a.m. to 12:25 p.m.*	Roll Call 10:59 a.m.	Roll Call 2:11 p.m.	2:11 p.m. to 3:40 p.m.*
Lastman	-	-	-	-	-
Adams	-	x	-	-	-
Altobello	-	x	-	x	x
Ashton	x	x	-	x	x
Augimeri	-	x	-	x	x
Balkissoon	x	x	-	-	x
Berardinetti	x	x	-	x	x
Berger	-	-	-	x	x
Bossons	-	x	x	-	x
Brown	-	x	x	-	x
Bussin	x	x	x	-	-
Cho	-	x	-	x	x
Chong	-	x	x	-	-
Chow	x	x	x	-	x
Davis	x	x	x	x	x
Disero	x	x	x	x	x
Duguid	x	x	x	x	x
Feldman	x	x	x	x	x
Filion	x	x	x	x	x
Flint	x	x	x	-	-
Gardner	x	x	x	-	x
Giansante	x	x	-	x	x
Holyday	x	x	x	x	x
Jakobek	x	x	-	x	x
Johnston	-	x	x	x	x
Jones	-	x	x	x	x
Kelly	x	x	x	x	x

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 9, 2000	Roll Call 9:44 a.m.	9:44 a.m. to 12:25 p.m.*	Roll Call 10:59 a.m.	Roll Call 2:11 p.m.	2:11 p.m. to 3:40 p.m.*
Kinahan	x	x	x	x	x
King	x	x	-	x	x
Korwin-Kuczynski	-	-	-	-	-
Layton	x	x	-	x	x
Lindsay Luby	x	x	x	x	x
Li Preti	-	x	x	x	x
Mahood	-	-	-	-	-
Mammoliti	x	x	x	x	x
McConnell	x	x	x	-	x
Mihevc	-	x	x	x	x
Miller	x	x	x	x	x
Minnan-Wong	x	x	x	-	x
Moeser	x	x	-	-	-
Moscoe	x	x	x	x	x
Nunziata	x	x	x	-	x
O'Brien	-	-	-	-	-
Ootes	x	x	x	x	x
Palacio	x	x	x	x	x
Pantalone	x	x	-	-	-
Pitfield	x	x	x	x	x
Prue	x	x	-	-	x
Rae	x	x	-	x	x
Saundercook	x	x	x	x	x
Shaw	-	-	-	-	-
Shiner	x	x	x	-	-
Silva	x	x	x	x	x
Sinclair	x	x	x	x	x
Soknacki	x	x	x	x	x
Tzekas	-	x	x	-	-

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 9, 2000	Roll Call 9:44 a.m.	9:44 a.m. to 12:25 p.m.*	Roll Call 10:59 a.m.	Roll Call 2:11 p.m.	2:11 p.m. to 3:40 p.m.*
Valenti	-	-	-	-	-
Walker	x	x	x	-	x
Total	39	51	36	34	44

* Members were present for some or all of the time period indicated.

June 9, 2000	Roll Call 3:20 p.m.	Ctte. of the Whole in-Camera 3:47 p.m.*	4:25 p.m. to 5:44 p.m.*	Roll Call 5:25 p.m.
Lastman	-	-	-	-
Adams	-	x	x	x
Altobello	-	x	x	x
Ashton	-	x	x	-
Augimeri	x	x	x	x
Balkissoon	x	-	-	-
Berardinetti	-	x	x	x
Berger	x	x	-	-
Bossons	x	x	x	x
Brown	x	x	x	x
Bussin	-	-	x	x
Cho	-	-	-	-
Chong	x	x	x	x
Chow	-	-	x	x
Davis	x	x	x	x
Disero	x	x	x	x
Duguid	x	x	x	x
Feldman	x	x	x	x
Filion	x	x	x	x
Flint	-	-	-	-
Gardner	-	-	-	x
Giansante	x	x	x	x

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 9, 2000	Roll Call 3:20 p.m.	Ctte. of the Whole in-Camera 3:47 p.m.*	4:25 p.m. to 5:44 p.m.*	Roll Call 5:25 p.m.
Holyday	x	x	x	x
Jakobek	x	x	x	x
Johnston	x	x	x	-
Jones	x	x	x	x
Kelly	-	-	-	-
Kinahan	x	-	x	x
King	x	x	-	-
Korwin-Kuczynski	-	-	-	-
Layton	-	x	x	x
Lindsay Luby	x	x	x	x
Li Preti	x	x	-	-
Mahood	-	-	-	-
Mammoliti	x	x	-	-
McConnell	x	x	x	x
Miheve	x	x	x	x
Miller	x	x	x	x
Minnan-Wong	-	x	x	-
Moeser	-	-	-	-
Moscoe	x	-	x	x
Nunziata	-	x	x	x
O'Brien	-	-	-	-
Ootes	x	x	x	x
Palacio	-	-	-	-
Pantalone	-	-	-	-
Pitfield	-	x	x	x
Prue	-	x	x	x
Rae	x	x	x	x
Saundercook	x	x	x	x
Shaw	-	-	-	-

Minutes of the Council of the City of Toronto
June 7, 8 and 9, 2000

June 9, 2000	Roll Call 3:20 p.m.	Ctte. of the Whole in-Camera 3:47 p.m.*	4:25 p.m. to 5:44 p.m.*	Roll Call 5:25 p.m.
Shiner	-	-	-	-
Silva	x	x	x	-
Sinclair	x	-	x	x
Soknacki	x	x	x	-
Tzekas	-	-	-	-
Valenti	-	-	-	-
Walker	-	x	x	-
Total	31	37	38	33

* Members were present for some or all of the time period indicated.

MEL LASTMAN,
Mayor

NOVINA WONG,
City Clerk

ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Report dated May 11, 2000, from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, entitled "Florida Restaurant Boulevard Café/Patio". (See Minute No. 8.66, Page 102.):

Purpose:

To further report on the extension of the hours that alcoholic beverages can be served on the patio of 940 Pape Avenue, and to provide a comparison of the operating hours of boulevard patios in the area that flank onto a residential street.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

Nil.

Recommendation:

The East York Community Council must decide whether or not to recommend that City Council grant the extension of the hours for the service of alcoholic beverages, for the boulevard patio on the Westwood Avenue flank of 940 Pape Avenue.

Background:

The Florida Restaurant currently occupies a portion of the boulevard for the purpose of a boulevard café/patio under an agreement enacted January 19, 1984. Section 8 of their agreement requires the owners to cease service of alcoholic beverages on the patio at 10:30 p.m.

The present owner of the Florida Restaurant (Mr. Costa Baklais), who has run the restaurant for the past six years, has made a request to have this restriction extended to midnight or 2:00 a.m.

The East York Community Council recommended to City Council for its meeting held on May 9, 2000 that:

- (1) Council approve the applicant's request for an extension of the hours that alcoholic beverages may be served on the boulevard café/patio on the Westwood Avenue flank of 940 Pape Avenue, from 10:30 p.m. to 11:00 p.m.;
- (2) approval be granted, subject to the applicant complying with the criteria set out in By-law No. 16-97, of the former Borough of East York;
- (3) the applicant enter into an agreement with the City of Toronto which reflects the change in hours; and

- (4) staff be requested to report back to East York Community Council on the operation of the café under the extended hours, after the 2000 café season.

Comments:

Occupation of the boulevard for the purposes of operating a boulevard café is governed by the criteria set out in the former Borough of East York By-law No. 16-97. One of the provisions of this By-law, Section 7, subsection (j), indicates, “the frequency, length and duration of the hours of use of the boulevard shall be subject to the approval of the Borough”.

As requested by East York Community Council, staff have conducted a comparison study relating to the operating hours of boulevard cafés in the area that flank onto residential streets. The following eight boulevard cafés are currently licensed in the area:

- (1) 995/997 Broadview Avenue, “Whistlers Restaurant”, agreement enacted July 8, 1981, with no restriction on the hours of operation;
- (2) 466 Cosburn Avenue, “Wee Jaggy Nettle Bar”, agreement enacted September 19, 1988, with no restriction on the hours of operation;
- (3) 399 Dawes Road, “Duffy’s Drive Inn”, agreement enacted November 13, 1997, with no restriction on the hours of operation;
- (4) 420 Dawes Road, “Upstairs Restaurant”, agreement enacted November 8, 1993; paragraph 5 of the agreement restricts the operating hours between 7:00 p.m. of one day to 11:00 a.m. on the following day;
- (5) 914 Pape Avenue, “California Restaurant”, agreement enacted June 29, 1983, with operating hours restricted to 10:30 p.m.; Agreement revised April 21, 1992, (as approved by Council, Report No. 8, Item 4) extending the hours of operation to 1:00 a.m., with a condition of a trial period to September 27, 1992, and that Council would have the authority to limit the operating hours back to 10:30 p.m., provided that a 15-day notice is provided to the business operator;
- (6) 925 Pape Avenue, “Delectables Donuts and Sandwiches”, agreement enacted May 10, 1999, with no restriction on the hours of operation;
- (7) 300/302 O’Connor Drive, “JR Beans Tavern”, original agreement dated May 9, 1988, with no restriction on the hours of operation; and
- (8) 2636 St. Clair Avenue East, “Venice Pizza”, agreement enacted June 14, 1999, with no restriction on the hours of operation.

The former City of Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 313 Streets and Sidewalks, Section 313-36 establishes the criteria that govern boulevard cafés in the former municipality of Toronto. One of the provisions of Section 313-36, subsection (f)(2a), is the regulation of boulevard cafés that flank onto residential streets. Subsection (f)(2a) states the owner or occupant shall:

“ensure the boulevard café is closed and cleared by 11:00 p.m. or, where Council has authorized extended hours of operation, the closing time as authorized by Council.”

Conclusion:

The East York Community Council must decide whether or not to recommend that City Council grant the extension of the hours for the service of alcoholic beverages, for the boulevard patio on the Westwood Avenue flank of 940 Pape Avenue.

Contact:

Gus Michaels
East District Supervisor
Municipal Licensing and Standards
Urban Development Services
(416) 397-4481
(416) 397-4582, Fax Number
gmichaels@city.toronto.on.ca

ATTACHMENT NO. 2

Report dated May 17, 2000, from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, entitled "2001 Interim Tax Levy". (See Minute No. 8.67, Page 103.):

Purpose:

This report addresses the need to amend provincial legislation to allow the 2001 and future year interim billings for all property classes to be no more than 50 percent of the total taxes levied in 2000 on a property basis.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications associated with this report.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) the Province of Ontario be requested to amend provincial legislation for the 2001 and future year interim levies for all property classes, including residential, to be billed on an amount no more than 50 percent the prior year's total levy; and
- (2) the appropriate civic officials be authorized and directed to take any necessary action to give effect to the foregoing.

Background:

Prior to 2000, the interim tax billing for all property classes in Ontario was based on 50 percent of the prior year's tax rate. The rate would be applied to each property's current year assessment, to determine the interim billing for the year. Interim billing revenues generally produced sufficient tax revenues for municipal purposes, until the final year's tax rates were struck which was done after the approval of the Operating Budget.

The amendment requested for the year 2000 by the City of Toronto permitted municipalities to bill the 2000 interim levy for capped classes (commercial, industrial and multi-residential) based on 50 percent of their prior year's full levy, on a property basis. The residential class was still based on 50 percent of the prior year's rate. The rationale for the change in approach related to Current Value Assessment (CVA) and the complications associated with the capping process and the Frozen Assessment Listing adjustments. This rationale was contained in Clause No. 21 of Report No. 11 of The Policy and Finance Committee which dealt with the 2000 levy and was adopted by Council at its meeting held on December 14, 15 and 16, 1999.

Comments:

In 2001, the CVA base will change from a 1996 base year to a 1999 base year. This may result in large shifts in assessment, since real estate market values have changed dramatically during this time. If the legislation for interim billing is unchanged for 2001, properties may face sizeable increases in their interim tax bills. Any significant increases in CVA values between 1996 and 1999 will be reflected on the assessment roll for the 2001 interim billing, causing increases to the taxpayer's interim bill, which will be unexpected.

To alleviate any confusion or complication with tax billing, it is recommended that Council request from the Province legislation to allow in 2001 the interim billing of all property classes, including residential, to be no more than 50 percent of the final billing of 2000.

Section 370 of the Municipal Act requires that the interim levy for the residential class be based on a rate that applies to the whole property class, rather than the amount levied against an individual property. It is recommended that this section of the Act be amended such that interim levies can be based on an amount of no more than 50 percent of the prior year's levy on a property basis. For the capped classes, a regulation change is required.

Conclusion:

Due to the change in the base year from 1996 to 1999 for the 2001 re-assessment, it is likely changes, perhaps significant, will occur. Without a change in provincial legislation for the interim billing, 2001 interim bills could also increase significantly. To reduce confusion for taxpayers and municipalities, it is recommended that the Province amend legislation such that for 2001 and future interim bills be based on no more than 50 percent of the prior year's levy on a property basis.

Contact Names:

Giuliana Carbone, 392-8065
Paul Wealleans, 397-4208
Mark D'Souza, 395-6739

ATTACHMENT NO. 3

Report dated May 28, 2000, from the City Clerk, entitled "Councillors' Access to Personal Information". (See Minute No. 8.69, Page 106.):

Purpose:

To advise City Council with respect to disclosure of personal information in a manner consistent with the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement :

There are no immediate cost implications.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that this report be received for information.

Background:

City Council, at its meeting of May 9, 10 and 11, 2000, adopted the Motion moved by Councillor Moscoe and seconded by Councillor Soknacki, as amended, requesting the City Clerk to submit a report to the next regular meeting of Council on how Members of Council can be provided with the information they require to properly fulfill their obligations of office, within the parameters of the present legislation, and requesting that consultations be held with Councillor Moscoe and Councillor Soknacki and any other interested Members of Council.

A memorandum was sent to all Councillors requesting their views as to the personal information they require in order to carry out their duties as Councillors. Four Councillors responded, including Councillor Moscoe and Councillor Soknacki. This report addresses the types of information identified by the responding Councillors and those which have been previously identified by Councillors or Executive Assistants acting on the respective Councillors' behalf.

Comments:

In 1988, the Province of Ontario enacted the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act covering all provincial government institutions and, in 1991, this was followed by the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (the Act) to which all municipal institutions were made subject.

Implementation of access and privacy legislation required fundamental changes in collecting, using and disclosing personal information. The legislation positioned government institutions as being custodians of personal information but not the owners of this information. It also placed significant control over personal information in the hands of the individual to whom the information relates.

Municipal corporations were required to restrict access to personal information within the corporation, to use the information only for the purposes collected or for a consistent purpose and to disclose personal information only in specific limited circumstances as provided for in the Act. I am advised that briefing sessions were held in the former municipalities outlining the implications of the new legislation for the Corporations, elected officials and the public.

The Act established a set of mandatory obligations relating to protecting the privacy of individuals whose personal information is in the custody or control of municipal institutions. Personal information is broadly defined in the Act and includes recorded information about an identifiable individual including the following: address, telephone number, financial transactions, education, employment history (résumés) and the individual's name where it appears with other personal information about the individual. The definition of personal information in the Act is not exhaustive and "other personal information about the individual" has been further defined through the Orders and Findings of the Information & Privacy Commissioner/Ontario, since 1989.

The legislation permits disclosure of personal information, when the disclosure falls within one of the specific exemptions prescribed in Section 32 of the Act. Section 32 permits disclosure of personal information "if the person to whom the information relates has identified that information in particular and consented to its disclosure". Consistent with this provision, the Corporation is permitted to disclose to a Councillor any personal information which the respective individual identifies specifically and provides the relevant consent.

In 1989, the first Orders and investigation Findings made clear that personal information could only be disclosed in accordance with relevant provisions of the Act. All subsequent decisions of the succeeding Information & Privacy Commissioners/Ontario have remained consistent with that view.

Access and privacy legislation, federally, provincially and municipally does not accord elected officials any special rights to personal information. These pieces of legislation only permit disclosure within the provisions of the applicable legislation. There is no provision in the Act which permits consideration of the good intentions of the requester.

Community Information Meetings

In accordance with the requirement for an individual to identify the information which may be disclosed, Community Information Meeting sign-in sheets have been amended to provide the specific consent required. The names and addresses, together with any comments of all individuals who provide consent, may then be disclosed to their respective ward Councillors. Consent is not required to disclose the comments to Councillors, providing the personal identifiers are severed.

The mandatory obligation to protect privacy does not permit situations of reverse onus. Reverse onus exists where the individual must take steps to preserve privacy i.e. provide a written request that privacy be protected. The Act places the onus on the institution to protect privacy and not on the respective individual to require privacy protection.

Notices of Violation, Orders to Comply

Councillors wish to receive copies of Notices of Violation and Orders to Comply related to properties in their respective wards. The unlawful condition of a property constitutes personal information of the respective homeowner and the name and address of the property owner is not permitted to be disclosed under the Act. However, the municipal address where a violation occurs is not personal information and the Notice or Order may, therefore, be disclosed providing the name and the address of the property owner is severed. The municipal address and the details of the Notice or Order would remain on the Notice and be disclosed accordingly. In circumstances where the Notice or Order is against a commercial or business entity, the record may be disclosed without severing the name of the business.

Signage Changes, Stop Signs

During the consultation process, a concern was expressed that members of the public may not receive sufficient notice of various changes in the municipal landscape, such as a new neighbourhood stop sign or similar matter. For this reason, Councillors wish to be provided with the names and addresses of individuals living in areas adjacent to such changes. As a municipal address alone is not personal information, Councillors may be provided municipal address information for any series of streets. There is also the option of Council or Committee directing staff to provide any required notices as part of a communication process and to include the names, addresses and telephone numbers of the respective ward Councillors.

Names and Addresses

Councillors have requested access to the names and addresses of individuals in their wards, including mailing lists/labels. Names and addresses constitute personal information of the respective individuals and may only be disclosed as set out in Section 32 of the Act. Accordingly, it would be necessary to obtain consent to disclose. Municipal addresses within wards are not personal information and lists or labels for the wards or identified streets may be provided to Councillors.

Taxation Information

Councillors have asked to be advised of the names and addresses of individuals who have received an increase in their assessment/property taxes. The amount of taxes owing on individuals' properties has been requested.

Names and addresses of individuals who have received increases is personal information. Similarly, the amount of taxes owing or payable on an individual's property constitutes personal and financial information of the owner. With respect to an increase in property taxes, the municipal address alone constitutes personal information, as the property owner is responsible for taxes and may be identified through the municipal address. In the absence of consent, disclosure is considered an unjustified invasion of privacy. This is a matter which may be addressed as a communication issue by Council or Committee.

As determined necessary, Council or Committee could direct staff to include a notice to those who receive an increase. The notice could provide information to assist the individual, together with a reference to contacting their respective ward Councillors for further assistance. Names, addresses and telephone numbers of Councillors would be included to facilitate such contact.

Additional Computer

A suggestion was made that a second computer for Councillors' offices be obtained which is not attached to the network. The purpose was for the Councillor to load whatever information he/she feels appropriate. I am of the view that this is not necessary. As individuals, Councillors may load any information on their office computers they feel appropriate. Under the legislation, Councillors are not officers, employees or directors of the Corporation and are viewed as members of the public. There is a clear division between corporate records and Councillors' constituency records and a separate computer is not required in order to maintain records relevant to constituency work.

The Corporate Access & Privacy Office has maintained the position that individual Councillors function as private citizens in conducting constituency work and their constituency records are not accessible under or subject to the Act. In circumstances where this position has been challenged before the Information & Privacy Commissioner/Ontario, the accuracy of this application of the legislation has been found to be correct.

The issue of contravention of privacy legislation would arise if the personal information was disclosed from corporation records and loaded on Councillors' computers. It also would arise if the Corporation provided online access to municipal databases containing personal information, and if the personal information was downloaded to Councillors' computers.

Assessment Information

Members of Council have also expressed interest in obtaining direct on-line access to an electronic copy of the Assessment Roll. There remains an interest in using assessment information to create mailing lists and labels containing names and addresses. Responsibility for the Assessment Roll and assessment information has been devolved to the Ontario Property Assessment Corporation (OPAC).

Under the authority of the Assessment Act, OPAC provides assessment information to the corporation for the purpose of issuing tax bills and for various planning matters. The City Clerk is also provided with a hard copy of the Assessment Roll. The City Clerk is required to maintain and make a copy of the Assessment Roll available for public inspection during regular office hours and has no authority over the Roll beyond fulfilling this responsibility.

Annually, the Corporation is required to enter into a licensing agreement with OPAC which provides for protecting the privacy, confidentiality and security of the assessment information. The Corporation may only use the information for the purpose for which it was provided, i.e. issuing tax notices and for planning purposes. The City Clerk is permitted only to make a copy of the Assessment Roll available for public inspection in the office of the Clerk during regular office hours. The confidentiality provisions of the Assessment Act, privacy legislation and the licensing agreement preclude secondary uses such as creation of mailing lists and labels and on-line access.

As a convenience to the public, an electronic copy of the Assessment Roll is made available for inspection, to relieve the burden of looking through the massive hard copy record. OPAC does license access to a CD-ROM of the Assessment Roll, in limited circumstances, such as to real estate law firms. Approved licensees are required to verify that the information will only be used for the purpose of real estate transactions. Licensees must warrant that the assessment information will not be used for any secondary purposes. This is consistent with the restrictions on assessment information to which the Corporation is subject.

Property Databases, Real Estate Data

Councillors continue to express an interest in receiving information relating to property transactions obtained from Moore Data. This information, over the years, has been identified as "TEELA", "Moore Data" or "real estate data". In the former cities, some Councillors were provided access to property databases which contained information provided by the Ministry of Finance (now OPAC), real estate and property related information. This included, among other things, individuals' names and addresses, assessment and taxation information, together with financial information such as purchase price and down payment. In other cases, hard copy listings of "TEELA" information were generated for Councillors which included names and addresses of individuals who moved into various areas of the City.

For purposes of the Act, the name and address of an individual alone or with other information relating to the individual constitutes personal information of the affected individual. The purchase price, the amount of down payment and any mortgages against the property constitute personal information of the individual property owners. The taxation information is provided in confidence by OPAC, under the terms of a licensing agreement as noted in the section on taxation information above. In determining whether or not certain information constitutes personal information, the form or medium in which it is held, i.e. "TEELA" listings or property databases, are not factors which affect the determination. Once the Corporation becomes the custodian of the personal information, it may only be disclosed in accordance with the Act.

The above noted information was the subject of a Finding of contravention of the Act by the Information & Privacy Commissioner/Ontario. Council has directed the City Solicitor to use whatever action may be necessary to overturn the Finding (MC-980018-1). Until such time as that occurs, the names and addresses of individuals who move into their wards may not be provided to ward Councillors and access to property databases may not be provided.

Any Councillors who may still have on-line access to municipal databases containing personal information, such as the property registry or assessment database, should notify the Executive Director of Information & Technology. In order to comply with privacy legislation, the Assessment Act and the terms of the licensing agreement with OPAC, the connection will be severed pending a court decision on overturning the Finding in Investigation MC-980018-1.

Seniors Tax Deferral Program, Assistance Programs

Access has been requested to the names and addresses of seniors who applied for the seniors tax deferral program and to those who have applied for other types of assistance programs. Medical information has been requested on a case specific basis, rather than requesting routine access.

The above noted types of information all fall within the definition of personal information in the Act. The fact that an individual has applied for the seniors tax deferral program or any other type of assistance program is considered highly sensitive personal information. Similarly, medical information is considered to be highly sensitive.

Conclusion:

As instructed by Council, this report summarizes the types of information requested by Members of Council. It outlines the statutory restrictions of privacy legislation, together with actions which have been taken and those which may be helpful in meeting these information requirements within the parameters of the legislation.

The Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act permits disclosure of Community Information Meeting sign-in sheets to ward Councillors, where consent of the respective individuals has been obtained. The sign-in sheets have been amended to provide an opportunity for consent to be given. The Act permits disclosure of Notices of Violation and Orders to Comply against municipal addresses, providing the name and address of the property owner is severed. The municipal address of the Violation or Order to Comply may then be disclosed to Councillors. Copies of Notices of Violation or Orders against a commercial or business entity may be disclosed without severing the business name or address. In circumstances where the individual to whom the information relates identifies the information in particular and consents to disclosure, the respective Councillor may be provided any personal information so identified. Councillors may also be provided the municipal addresses of any or all streets in the City of Toronto.

Contact Name:

Rita Reynolds
Director of Corporate Access & Privacy
392-9683

ATTACHMENT NO. 4

Report dated June 5, 2000, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, entitled "Application for Approval to Expropriate Interest in Land, Part of 373 and 375 Bartlett Avenue North and 460 and 462 Salem Avenue North, Toronto (Ward 21 – Davenport)". (See Minute No. 8.73, Page 113.):

Purpose:

To authorize the initiation of expropriation proceedings, in order to extinguish right-of-ways, acquire a temporary working easement and acquire a fee simple interest to facilitate the construction of a north-south public lane extending between Bartlett Avenue North and Salem Avenue North.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

A further report identifying the funds required to cover the compensation to be offered to the affected parties will be submitted, together with the report seeking final approval of the expropriation. The land acquisition costs will be back-charged in their entirety to the benefitting property owners.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) authority be granted to initiate expropriation proceedings for the acquisition from the owners of No. 375 Bartlett Avenue North of their existing right-of-way over a portion of the property at No. 373 Bartlett Avenue North, in order to extinguish the right-of-way;
- (2) authority be granted to initiate expropriation proceedings for the acquisition from the owners of No. 460 Salem Avenue North of their existing right-of-way over a portion of the property at No. 462 Salem Avenue North, in order to extinguish the right-of-way;
- (3) authority be granted to initiate expropriation proceedings for the acquisition from the owner of No. 462 Salem Avenue North of a fee simple interest consisting approximately of the westerly 2.5 metres from the centre line of the double garage across the full width of the lands;
- (4) authority be granted to initiate expropriation proceedings for a temporary working easement (for a three-month period) over a portion of No. 375 Bartlett Avenue North consisting approximately of the westerly 5.0 metres from the centre wall of the double car garage across the full width of the lands, to the extent necessary to undertake any work, including the removal of any structures that is required to facilitate the construction of the public lane;

- (5) authority be granted to serve and publish a Notice of Application for Approval to Expropriate the above-noted property interests, to forward to the Chief Inquiry Officer any requests for hearings that are received and to report the Inquiry Officer's recommendations to Council for its consideration; and
- (6) authority be granted for the appropriate City Officials to take whatever action is necessary to give effect thereto, including the introduction in City Council of any bills that might be necessary.

Background:

In order to proceed with the construction of a public lane at the rear of 357 to 399 Bartlett Avenue North and 448 to 492 Salem Avenue North the City needed to acquire 35 individual parcels of privately owned property. The City acquired 22 of these parcels of land through negotiations with the owners. Agreement was reached with an additional six (6) property owners, but the required legal documents have not yet been fully executed. Council, at its meeting on December 14, 15 and 16, 1999, adopted a report from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services recommending that expropriation proceedings be commenced for the remaining lands required.

Notices of intent to expropriate have been issued to the owners and advertised in the newspaper. The deadline for receipt of requests for a hearing of necessity is June 11, 2000, and it is now known that at least one request for a hearing has been received by the City. It is, therefore, anticipated that a hearing officer will be appointed subsequent to June 11, 2000, and it is anticipated that possession of the subject lands will occur within 8 to 10 months. This report seeks authority to initiate expropriation proceedings for certain additional interests to ensure all owners will have access to the laneway and to limit the City's financial exposure.

Comments:

No. 373 Bartlett Avenue North has a side driveway leading to the backyard with a shared double garage at the rear of No. 375 Bartlett Avenue North. No. 375 Bartlett Avenue North has a benefitting right-of-way over the side drive and the entire rear yard of No. 373 Bartlett Avenue North, to provide access to the double garage. As part of the laneway project, the City has initiated expropriation proceedings to acquire the lands (shown as Parts 28 and 29 on the attached portion of Plan 66R-17213) at the rear of 373 and 375 Bartlett Avenue North, which includes half of the existing double car garage (the easterly half of the garage is situate on land owned by the owners of No. 373 Bartlett Avenue North). If the lane project proceeds to completion, the owners of No. 373 Bartlett Avenue North will lose their existing parking and garage and, given the existence of the right-of-way over their entire rear yard, will be unable to build a new garage or park at the rear of their property. As the laneway will provide access to the rear of No. 375 Bartlett Avenue North, Real Estate staff has been negotiating with the owners of this property for:

- (1) the release of their right-of-way over the side driveway and rear yard of No. 373 Bartlett Avenue North; and
- (2) the demolition by the City of No. 375 Bartlett Avenue North's garage in conjunction with the lane construction.

While the owners of 373 and 375 Bartlett Avenue North had a verbal understanding to give effect to the above, negotiations have recently broken down between the two parties. Real Estate staff are of the view that, in light of the fact that expropriation proceedings have already commenced on the laneway, the City should apply to expropriate not only the temporary working easement required to remove the garage from the rear of 375 Bartlett Avenue North, but also the above-noted right-of-way interest, in order to release the property at 373 Bartlett Avenue North from this encumbrance and allow that owner to create a parking space or rebuild the garage in the rear yard of 373 Bartlett Avenue North. It is recommended that these interests be expropriated, in order to enable both property owners to access the rear of their properties via the new lane and have parking facilities.

In relation to another part of the laneway project, the City has initiated expropriation proceedings to acquire the lands at the rear of 460 and 462 Salem Avenue North (shown as Parts 17 & 18 of Plan 66R-17213), which includes half of the existing double car garage/shed (the westerly half of the garage is situated on Part 18 and on land still owned by the owners of 462 Salem Avenue North). No. 460 Salem Avenue North has a right-of-way over the side drive and a portion of the rear yard of No. 462 Salem Avenue North, to provide access to their garage which is attached to and east of the garage belonging to the owners of 462 Salem Avenue North. Again, when the lane project proceeds to completion, the owners of No. 462 Salem Avenue North will lose their existing parking and garage and, given the existence of the right-of-way, will be unable to build a new garage or park at the rear of their property. Also, in order to provide access for 460 Salem Avenue North, it is necessary to expropriate the fee simple interest in the lands owned by the owner of 462 Salem Avenue North and shown cross hatched on Schedule "B". In staff's view, negotiations have come to an impasse and it is recommended that these interests be expropriated, in order to enable both property owners to park and build replacement garages at the rear of their properties, with access to the rear of their properties via the new lane.

Conclusion:

As expropriation proceedings have been commenced to acquire the lands required for the lane itself, it is also prudent and necessary to commence expropriation proceedings to acquire the above-noted interests. Otherwise, if the lane project proceeds and the arrangements between the owners of Nos. 373 and 375 Bartlett Avenue North and 460 and 462 Salem Avenue North have not been finalized, the

owners of No. 373 Bartlett Avenue North and 462 Salem Avenue North will suffer an undue adverse effect, for which the City will be required to compensate them.

Staff of Legal Services and Works and Emergency Services have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

Contact:

Kathie Capizzano, 392-4825 - Fax – 392-1880,
E-mail - kcapizzano@city.toronto.on.ca (Tc0-066)

List of Attachments:

Schedule A – Site Sketch – Bartlett Avenue

Schedule B – Site Sketch – Salem Avenue

Schedule C – Location Map

(Copies of the attachments referred in the foregoing report are on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

ATTACHMENT NO. 5

Report dated June 7, 2000, from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, entitled "Oak Ridges Moraine – Richmond Hill Ontario Municipal Board Hearing". (See Minute No. 8.74, Page 115.):

Purpose:

To report on the status of the City's position on the Richmond Hill Oak Ridges Moraine Ontario Municipal Board Hearing and recommendations from the Council appointed Oak Ridges Moraine Steering Committee.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

Council has already approved funding as follows:

- (a) \$1,037,000.00 for the Richmond Hill Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Hearing, of which approximately \$490,000.00 has been spent or committed. (Funding was provided from the Corporate Contingency Account in 1999.) This report recommends a further commitment of up to \$300,000.00 from the 1999 funding, to bring the total to \$790,000.00 that will be spent;
- (b) \$220,000.00 to partner with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) in conjunction with the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing. This report recommends allocating the full amount to the TRCA, to assist them in presenting their case at the Hearing, as we are not able to partner with them. The funding was provided from the 1999 Corporate Contingency Account;
- (c) \$800,000.00 to be allocated to the Oak Ridges Preservation Account from the Water and Wastewater Capital Budget. The Steering Committee was to recommend use of the funds. To date, Council has delegated authority to the ORM Steering Committee for \$120,000.00 of the \$800,000.00, of which \$68,000.00 has been allocated. This report recommends a further delegation of \$200,000.00 to the ORM Steering Committee, for distribution at their discretion.

The total commitment of funding, with approval of this report, would thus be \$1,330,000.00, of the total \$2,057,000.00 already approved.

The Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer has reviewed this report and concurs with the financial impact statement.

Recommendations:

The Oak Ridges Moraine Steering Committee recommends that Council endorse the following:

- (1) that staff maintain a watching brief at the Richmond Hill Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) Hearing which is currently underway;
- (2) that a grant of up to \$300,000.00 be given jointly to Save the Rouge Valley System Inc. (SRVS) and Jefferson Forest Residents Association (JFRA), to assist these groups in presenting their case at the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing;
- (3) that a grant of \$220,000.00 be given to the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) to assist them in presenting their case at the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing;
- (4) that the grants are deemed to be in the interest of the City of Toronto;
- (5) that \$200,000.00 from the Oak Ridges Preservation Account (\$800,000.00) be made available to the Oak Ridges Moraine Steering Committee for allocation at their discretion; and
- (6) that the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

Background:

At its meeting of December 14, 15 and 16, 1999 (Clause No. 26 of Report No. 11 of The Policy and Finance Committee), Council directed City staff to seek party status at the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing regarding urban development on the Oak Ridges Moraine (ORM). At the in-camera portion of its meeting on February 1, 2, and 3, 2000, Council directed staff to take the necessary actions to ensure continued party status at the OMB Hearing in Richmond Hill in opposition to development on the Oak Ridges Moraine. During February and March 2000, City staff retained witnesses, identified in the chart below, to prepare evidence in respect of the City's application for intervention and its anticipated participation at the OMB Hearing.

Comments:

As recommended by the ORM Steering Committee, the following chart identifies the types of witnesses retained by the City for the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing and their current status now that the City will not be a party to the Hearing:

Area of Evidence	Current Status of Former City Witnesses*
<u>Environmental:</u>	
Case Management and environmental law	Uncommitted
Conservation biology/fragmentation ecology	Approached by TRCA and the Province
Terrestrial ecology/natural heritage/impact assessment of approved development	Approached by TRCA
Fisheries and aquatic biology	Uncommitted
Geology and geomorphology	Committed to the Province
Hydrogeology	Approached by SRVS
<u>Planning/Urban Sprawl/Growth:</u>	
General planning / green space and countryside	May assist the Councillors with deputations at public deputation sessions.
Development of cumulative effects framework and environmental impact analysis	Uncommitted
Traffic impact analysis	Uncommitted
Historical planning	Uncommitted

Originally City staff envisioned that the City's OMB case would proceed supported by a broader perspective that recognized the GTA/Regional planning and environmental concerns. The broader perspective emphasizes compact urban development within existing urban areas, no further expansion of existing or approved urban areas and a recognition of the environmental impacts of ongoing and continued urban sprawl, which includes greenhouse gas emissions, air pollution and impacts on soil and water quality. City staff identified the need to protect the Oak Ridges Moraine as an environmentally significant feature integral to defining the GTA bioregion.

The City's motion for party status at the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing was denied on April 12, 2000. The City then sought leave to appeal the OMB's decision respecting party status to the Divisional Court and this application was denied on May 23, 2000. As a result of these decisions, the City's participation in the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing is now limited to a monitoring capacity and public deputation. The ORM Steering Committee met on May 30, 2000, to consider further actions by the City.

The Hearing will proceed to consider the following evidence in phases:

- Phase A: Growth Management and Traffic (completed)
- Phase B: OPA 138 (completed)
- Phase C: Environmental (begins June 20, 2000)
- Phase D: Planning
- Phase E: Subdivision/Zoning

Other parties at the Hearing (TRCA, the Region of York, the Town of Richmond Hill and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing) are taking the position that the specific development applications before the OMB should be refused, yet they are not presenting a case that opposes development on the moraine and seeks

provincial action to protect the moraine as a significant natural feature and water resource within the Greater Toronto bioregion.

In the OMB's decision to deny the City of Toronto party status at the Richmond Hill Hearing, it stated that "there may be a role for the City to play by still participating with one of the other parties, whether it's TRCA or, in fact, bringing the groups such as STORM, Save the Rouge and so on together and helping them fund or whatever legal and witness help". The efforts of SRVS and JFRA are clearly consistent with the broader City approach, therefore, it is appropriate for the City to fund other parties to assist them at the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing.

At the ORM Steering Committee Meeting on May 30, 2000, SRVS and JFRA requested funding from the City to help them present a case in opposition to development on the ORM at the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing. Both of these groups have party status at the OMB hearing, yet do not have sufficient funds to retain legal counsel and expert witnesses for the duration of the twelve week Hearing, which began May 29, 2000.

SRVS and JFRA, working in partnership, are expected to oppose all development on the ORM and to argue that the moraine should be protected as a significant natural feature over the long term. This position is consistent with the case that the City would have brought forward, should party status have been granted. Funds of up to \$300,000.00 would assist these groups to obtain legal counsel over the full course of the Hearing and to retain expert witnesses to provide evidence in support of their position. According to the presentation made by SRVS and JFRA to the ORM Steering Committee on May 30, 2000, the bulk of the budget will be spent on legal fees. Such expenditure would be payable upon submission of invoices to be verified and approved by City staff.

At its meeting of December 14, 15 and 16, 1999, Council allocated \$220,000.00 from the Corporate Contingency Account to partner with the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). The TRCA presented a report to its Executive Committee on May 26, 2000, which recommended that their staff oppose the development applications in Richmond Hill before the OMB because they do not implement the intent of the Provincial, Regional and Authority policies regarding the Oak Ridges Moraine. A letter to the City from the TRCA requesting assistance with the OMB Hearing was considered by the Oak Ridges Moraine Steering Committee on May 30, 2000. Given the request from the TRCA, and that the funds for this purpose have already been approved by Council, it is appropriate to use these funds to assist the TRCA in presenting their case at the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing. The ORM Steering Committee recommended that the full amount be granted up front to the TRCA.

At its meeting of February 29, March 1 and 2, 2000, Council directed that the City Solicitor be authorized to assist in the preparation of materials in support of an application to the provincial Environmental Commissioner pursuant to s. 61(2) of

the Environmental Bill of Rights (1993). The purpose of the application was to seek a review of the need for a new provincial policy applicable to development on the Oak Ridges Moraine. On May 29, 2000, a joint response was received from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Natural Resources indicating that a review of the existing policies designed to protect the Oak Ridges Moraine was not warranted as “the guidelines, policy and legislation comprising the current land use planning system in Ontario provides [sufficient environmental] protection”.

Conclusions:

The City is now only permitted to monitor the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing, and, as a result, is not able to call evidence regarding the long-term protection of the ORM. The City can, however, participate in the public Hearings, where a (limited) statement of the City’s interests can be established. SRVS and the JFRA are parties to the Hearing and are expected to oppose all development on the ORM and to argue that the moraine should be protected as a significant natural feature over the long term. Funding from the City will assist them in effectively presenting their case at the Richmond Hill OMB Hearing. Similarly, funding for the TRCA, which is consistent with previous Council direction, will assist this party to present their evidence at the OMB Hearing.

Contact:

Vicky McGrath, Policy and Research Analyst
Environmental Impact Assessment and Policy Development
Technical Services, Works and Emergency Services
Phone: 392-8856
Fax: 392-9317
e-mail: vmcgrat@city.toronto.on.ca

ATTACHMENT NO. 6

Communication dated June 1, 2000, from the Chief Executive Officer, Toronto Housing Company Inc., entitled "Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Toronto Housing Company Inc. - Item (1)(iv) - Auditor's Report and Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 1999" (See Minute No. 8.79, Page 124.):

At its meeting of May 29, 2000, the Board of Directors of the Toronto Housing Company Inc., had before it a report (May 25, 2000) from the Chief Executive Officer respecting the Auditor's Report and Financial Statements of the Toronto Housing Company Inc., for the Year Ended December 31, 1999; recommending that:

- (1) the Board of Directors approve the Financial Statements of the Toronto Housing Company Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1999, and that two Directors be authorized to sign the Balance Sheet on behalf of the Board;
- (2) the Auditor's Report and Financial Statements be forwarded to the City Clerk for submission to the Annual Meeting of the Shareholder to be held at the next convenient meeting of the City of Toronto Council; and
- (3) the appropriate Housing Company officials be authorize to take the necessary action to give effect to Recommendations Nos. (1) and (2).

The Board of Directors:

- (i) approved the recommendations of the Finance/Audit Committee and adopted, without amendment, the aforementioned report; and
 - (ii) authorized Dr. John Metson and Councillor Michael Feldman to sign said statements on behalf of the Company.
-

Report dated May 25, 2000, from Chief Executive Officer, Toronto Housing Company Inc., entitled "Auditor's Report and Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 1999 (THC:200056), addressed to the Board of Directors of the Toronto Housing Company Inc.:

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) the Board of Directors approve the Financial Statements of the Toronto Housing Company Inc. for the year ended December 1999, and that two Directors be authorized to sign the Balance Sheet on behalf of the Board;
- (2) the Auditor's Report and Financial Statements be forwarded to the City Clerk for submission to the Annual Meeting of the Shareholder to be held at the next convenient meeting of the City of Toronto Council; and
- (3) the appropriate Housing Company officials be authorized to take the necessary action to give effect to Recommendations Nos. (1) and (2).

Background:

At its meeting of May 25, 2000, the Finance/Audit Committee received the Auditor's Report and Financial Statements for the Year Ended December 31, 1999, and recommended that it be forwarded to the Board of Directors for approval.

The Auditor's Report and Financial Statements of the Toronto Housing Company Inc. for the year ended December 31, 1999 are attached. In accordance with the Business Corporations Act, the Auditor's Report and Financial Statements should be referred to the 1999 Annual Meeting of the Shareholder, which will be held at the next convenient meeting of the City of Toronto Council.

Financial Statements Analysis:

The Toronto Housing Company recorded an \$8.6 million excess revenue over expenses for the year 1999.

Revenues:

Revenues from residential rents rose to \$124.3 million, a 2.4 percent increase over previous year. This is related to rent increases (increased income for RGI units and increased rents for market units) and acquisition of two (2) new housing projects. Revenues from commercial rents increased to \$4.0 million, a 2.8 percent increase due to increase in commercial activities. Federal interest reduction grant decreased to \$10.1 million, a 18.7 percent reduction due to corresponding

decrease in mortgage interest. Revenue from cable television, parking, laundry and other sources were close to the level in the previous year at \$12.5 million.

Expenditure:

Mortgage payments (principal and interest) decreased to \$100.3 million, a 3.1 percent reduction due to lower interest rates on mortgage renewals. Municipal taxes reduced to \$48.0 million, a 0.9 percent decrease due to the implementation of Current Value Assessment (CVA) by the tax authorities. Administration expenses decreased substantially to \$19.0 million, a 13.2 percent reduction due to the restructuring of administrative functions and consolidation of offices. Operating and Maintenance expenses reduced to \$80.6 million, a 1.7 percent decrease due to other restructuring activities, despite increases in purchased goods and utilities. The Toronto Housing Company embarked on its 5 year Business Plan in 1999, by initiating restructuring activities to reduce its manageable operating costs and subsidies.

Subsidies:

Subsidies decreased to \$105.7 million, a 3.8 percent reduction due to increase in revenue and decrease in expenses. The subsidies were received from the City of Toronto/ Greater Toronto Area pooling and Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, based on various funding program guidelines and allocations.

1999 Budget Savings:

1999 budget was prepared incorporating the first year's subsidy savings of \$1.7 million based on the Toronto Housing Company's 5 year Business Plan. Further, the Shareholder, the City of Toronto authorized any additional budget savings achieved by implementing the Business Plan be transferred to a reserve for capital improvements. Such budget savings (\$ millions) for 1999 are:

	<u>Budget</u>	<u>Actual</u>	<u>Savings</u>
<u>Manageable costs</u>			
Bad debts and insurance	1.8	2.0	(0.2)
Corporate administration/district and property management	21.4	18.9	2.5
Utilities	25.2	25.1	0.1
Maintenance/front line services	<u>32.3</u>	<u>33.7</u>	<u>(1.4)</u>
	80.7	79.7	1.0
Other revenue	<u>(9.0)</u>	<u>(9.5)</u>	<u>(0.5)</u>
Manageable costs deficit subsidized	<u>71.7</u>	<u>70.2</u>	<u>1.5</u>

The Toronto Housing Company further reduced the 'manageable costs deficit subsidized' to \$70.2 million from the budgeted amount of \$71.7 million. Therefore, the additional budget savings are \$1.5 million.

Surplus Contribution to Special Funds:

Operating surpluses for \$6.3 million generated from various housing programs based on funding guidelines, and the above budget savings of \$1.5 million are transferred to the Building Rehabilitation, Development and Contingencies Fund. The funds accumulated in this Building Rehabilitation, Development and Contingencies Fund will be available to be transferred to the Capital Reserve Fund and Amalgamation/ Transition Fund, as and when funds are required, and after receiving specific approval from the Board. The operating surplus generated from the cable television activity for \$0.7 million is transferred to the Cable Television Reserve Fund until the decision is made how the surplus funds are to be utilized, as per Board direction.

Assets and Liabilities:

A new housing project for \$27.6 million was acquired during the year. \$16.3 million from various sources was contributed to the Special Funds and \$12.6 million was withdrawn to meet specific expenditures. In addition, \$6.7 million from the Social Housing Reserve Fund was paid to the City of Toronto's Capital Revolving Fund for Affordable Housing, in accordance with the City Council decision.

Conclusion:

At the end of year 1999, the first year of existence of the Toronto Housing Company Inc., the Company is in a strong financial position to meet its future challenges.

Contact:

Rajini Masilamany,
Manager, Financial Control,
392-6065

(A copy of the Auditor's Report and Financial Statements of the Toronto Housing Company Inc. for the Year Ended December 31, 1999, is on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

ATTACHMENT NO. 7

Report dated May 31, 2000, from the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, entitled "261 Inglewood Drive – Removal of Private Tree Midtown". (See Minute No. 8.80, Page 125.):

Purpose:

To provide City Council with further information regarding the removal of a private tree at 261 Inglewood Drive. City Council at its meeting of April 11, 12 and 13, 2000 approved Clause No. 60 of Report No. 5 of The Toronto Community Council, refusing the removal of a private tree located at 261 Inglewood Drive. The property owners have appealed Council's decision to the Ontario Municipal Board and, based on the information in the new Arborist report, the department staff are of the opinion that the tree removal should be approved.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement :

There are no financial implications resulting from the adoption of this report.

Recommendations :

It is recommended that City Council rescind its decision of April 11, 12 and 13, 2000, to refuse a permit for tree removal at 261 Inglewood Drive, conditional on the applicant planting a 80 millimetre caliper red oak tree as replacement.

Background :

An application was received from the owners of 261 Inglewood Drive, Mr. and Mrs. Bush, 261 Inglewood Drive, Toronto, M4T 1J2, requesting permission to remove a privately-owned elm tree, to allow for the installation of a swimming pool. At its meeting held on April 11, 12 and 13, 2000, City Council gave consideration to Clause No. 60 contained in Report No. 5 of The Toronto Community Council. Council adopted the Clause, without amendment, and, by so doing, refused to issue a permit for tree removal at 261 Inglewood Drive. A new Arborist report was submitted by the property owner to Forestry Services staff on May 3, 2000, providing a more detailed analysis on the condition of the elm tree. The property owners have appealed Council's decision to the Ontario Municipal Board and, based on the information in the new Arborist report, staff are of the opinion that tree removal should be approved.

Comments:

The new Arborist report provided information on the extent of decay in the elm tree, as assessed by a private Arborist climbing the tree. This information did not

accompany the original application for permission to remove the tree. The new Arborist report states that the elm has a large crack at the main union of its two stems, and that the crack has healed on the exterior of the tree but that the climber heard cracking at the main union when located at this position in the tree. The report states that the interior crack has not healed. Details on the amount of internal decay, at the site of a cavity in the stem of the tree, were provided in the new Arborist report. The report states that the elm has a diameter of 28 inches at the location of the cavity. The climber indicated that the cavity has a depth of 20 inches and that it extends 20 inches up from the entrance and 6 inches down from the cavity entrance. The report states that there is not much holding wood remaining at this location.

The combination of decayed wood and the crack in the main union render the structural integrity of this tree as suspect. Based on the new Arborist report and the more detailed analysis of the elm tree that was undertaken by climbing the tree, the owner of the property should now be permitted to remove this tree.

Conclusions:

The original application did not include any evidence that would suggest that the elm tree was structurally unsound. The additional information provided indicates that there is a significant amount of decay in the tree's main stem. If this information were provided to staff originally, the tree would have met the criteria for an exemption under Article III, Chapter 331, of the former City of Toronto Municipal Code, and the Department would have been permitted to authorize the owner to proceed with removal. The applicant should now be permitted to remove the elm tree, conditional on the planting of an 80 millimetre caliper red oak tree as replacement.

This report has been done in consultation with the staff in the Legal Division.

Contact:

Andrew Pickett
Urban Forestry Planner
Tel: 392-6644
apickett@city.toronto.on.ca

Jasmine Stein
Solicitor
Tel: 392-7226
jstein@city.toronto.on.ca

ATTACHMENT NO. 8

Report dated May 29, 2000, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, entitled "Establishment of a Youth Safety Sub-Committee of the Task Force on Community Safety". (See Minute No. 8.83, Page 127.):

Purpose:

This report identifies a number of youth anti-violence initiatives and recommends a co-ordinated approach to addressing youth violence through the establishment of a Youth Safety Sub-Committee of the Task Force on Community Safety.

Funding Sources, Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

There are no financial implications identified in the establishment of a Youth Safety Sub-Committee.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) a Youth Safety Sub-Committee of the Task Force on Community Safety be established with a mandate to co-ordinate, integrate and oversee the implementation of all recommendations dealing with youth violence prevention;
- (2) the Community Safety Task Force designate a lead Councillor to work on the Sub-Committee with the Children and Youth Advocate, and seek other interested Toronto City Councillors, community members and staff to participate; and
- (3) appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

Background:

At the May 29, 2000 meeting of the Task Force on Community Safety, the City's Children and Youth Advocate addressed the Task Force members regarding youth anti-violence initiatives. This report identifies a number of youth anti-violence initiatives and recommends a co-ordinated approach to addressing youth violence, through the establishment of a Youth Safety Sub-Committee of the Task Force on Community Safety.

Comments:

A number of initiatives related to youth violence and crime prevention are currently underway within the City. These include the work of the Youth Cabinet of the Children and Youth Action Committee, the Chief of Police and the Toronto Police Services Board's Police and Youth Action Committee and Task Force on

Youth Violent Crimes, and a staff working group that continues to meet and review best practices in preventing youth violence. In addition, past initiatives, such as the Mayor's Task Force on Young Offenders, the Mayor's Task Force on Youth Violence and the original Community Safety Task Force, had made a number of recommendations related to youth anti-violence actions. These are highlighted in Appendix 1.

The level of interest within Toronto Council, the community, and among youth themselves, in youth anti-violence is clearly visible in the establishment of these City Task Forces or Committees. The challenge lies in ensuring an integrated and co-ordinated approach is undertaken to address this very important issue. Upon consideration of the matter, the Task Force on Community Safety agreed that a Youth Safety Sub-Committee of the Task Force should be established, with a mandate to co-ordinate, integrate and oversee the implementation of all recommendations dealing with youth violence prevention.

The Task Force has identified several members of the Task Force to participate on the Youth Safety Sub-Committee, in addition to the Children and Youth Advocate. These include Toronto Councillors Pam McConnell, Chris Korwin-Kuczynski and Bruce Sinclair, and Marg Stanowski from Operation Springboard. Staff will consult with the Children and Youth Advocate and the Task Force on Community Safety for other possible suggestions on community membership.

No financial implications have been identified in the establishment of the Youth Safety Sub-Committee. Lead staff support will be provided from the Social Development and Administration Division of Community and Neighbourhood Services, with the involvement of appropriate City staff engaged in youth support initiatives.

Conclusion:

Through the establishment of a Youth Safety Sub-Committee, the Community Safety Task Force can ensure that youth-related community safety issues can be addressed through the focused support of Sub-Committee and staff members. This will ensure the development of integrated responses and co-ordinated implementation of recommended actions.

Contact:

Lydia Fitchko
Policy Development Officer
Phone: 392-5397
Fax: 392-8492

List of Attachments:

Appendix 1: Summary of Task Force Recommendations on Youth Violence

Appendix No. 1

Summary of Task Force Recommendations on Youth Violence

Mayor's Task Force on Young Offenders
January 1999

In addition to the many recommendations of the public regarding the proposed amendments to the Young Offenders Act, the federal government is encouraged to consider five additional recommendations from the Mayor's Task Force:

It is recommended that:

- (1) the federal government formally recognize the link between youth crime and youth unemployment and establish a body or protocol to co-ordinate the resources of the Department of Justice and the Department of Human Resources Development;
- (2) the federal government further recognize the importance of working directly with municipalities to develop programs that reflect the individual needs of municipalities in dealing with juvenile justice issues;
- (3) the federal government recognize, support and fund already existing and successful Toronto programs that help young people and their families before new programs are created;
- (4) the federal government work directly with school boards, educators, social service providers and businesses to develop meaningful diversion and rehabilitation programs for young people; and
- (5) the federal government consider the City of Toronto as a pilot site for a Community Justice Council initiative.

Action Plan on Youth Violence in Schools
February 1999

- (1) It is recommended that the Children and Youth Advocate and the Youth Cabinet convene a Summit on Youth Violence in Schools. The Youth Cabinet of the Children and Youth Action Committee should assist in bringing together a diverse and representative group of youth from across the City; particular attention should be paid to reaching out to youth who have been involved in gangs or violence in schools. The purpose of the Summit is to discuss the issue of youth violence in schools and the actions proposed in this report, with the aim of developing an action plan endorsed by youth. This meeting should be convened for May 1999;
- (2) In order to respond to specific incidents of violence in schools, the City encourage the Boards of Education and the Police Department to complete

the preparation of the Protocol on Police Involvement in Schools and requests the Boards of Education and Police to implement this protocol at the beginning of the fall 1999 school year.

- (3) It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service, the Boards of Education and the Public Health Department immediately begin working on a Violence Prevention Partnership Strategy focusing on involvement in elementary and high schools, that would be implemented this fall. The strategy must identify the respective roles and responsibilities of the partners, and demonstrate a commitment to providing the necessary resources to ensure that violence prevention and police awareness programs in schools are better co-ordinated and more equitably distributed across the City.
- (4) It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service and School Boards immediately identify three (3) priority areas across the City that would benefit from increased police presence in schools, and pilot violence prevention programs. This would include providing the adequate police resources to be involved in the program and a commitment from the Boards of Education to allow curriculum time and teaching support for this initiative. It is proposed that the pilots run for one year with the evaluation to include the cost implications of extending the program beyond the pilot phase, and an assessment of the effectiveness of the program in responding to youth violence issues. These pilots would be one component of the Violence Prevention Partnership Strategy identified above.
- (5) It is recommended that the Mayor endorse the Raptors' Slam Dunk Youth Violence initiative as one positive example of a multi-sectoral partnership with a major sports organization to respond to the issue of youth violence.
- (6) It is recommended that the City, the Police Department and the Province, under the leadership of the TDSB, endorse and support the Anti-Gang Awareness Campaign. Specifically, each of the partners should contribute \$6,000.00 toward this initiative. The City should also participate in the distribution of the poster and pamphlet through Parks and Recreation centres, and other City sites frequented by youth and their families.
- (7) It is recommended that a full audit of existing City-funded community-based programs and City Parks and Recreation programs for youth and youth at risk be undertaken as part of the Youth Profile initiative of the Children and Youth Action Committee.
- (8) It is recommended that access to recreation programs for youth at risk, and developing appropriate programs for youth at risk be a priority for the

Parks and Recreation Department; To that end, it is recommended that the Department propose a feasible strategy for improving access and services for youth at risk, to be implemented in the fall programming schedule. This will require that funding implications be identified during the 1999 budget process. It is critical that this strategy also include a process for involving youth in identifying, designing and evaluating programs.

- (9) It is recommended that an annual monitoring report on youth safety in schools be developed by the Boards of Education and the Police. A questionnaire would be administered to high school students each fall, beginning in 1999.
- (10) It is recommended that the City encourage the Ministry of Education and Training and the Boards of Education to bring forward and implement anti-violence policies in schools as quickly as possible. These policies must make it clear that violence, weapons, and gang activity will be met with immediate and substantive consequences, but also recognize that meaningful strategies and alternative programs must be available to support youth and respond effectively to meet their needs.
- (11) It is recommended that staff awareness and training be a key component of implementing Board policies related to safe schools, with an emphasis on ensuring that staff are equipped to deal effectively with violent incidents as they arise.
- (12) The Province, led by the Ministry of the Attorney General, in partnership with the City of Toronto and the Boards of Education should evaluate existing initiatives, identify opportunities for expanding alternative sentencing options, and establish a protocol on the respective roles and responsibilities of the community-based agencies, and the schools involved in these initiatives.
- (13) It is recommended that the Federal Minister of Justice act quickly to make changes to the Young Offenders Act, and that she consider the comments and suggestions identified in the Report of the Mayor's Task Force on Young Offenders in amending the Act.

Community Safety Task Force
February 1999

B. Investing in Children, Youth, and Families

- (13) Co-ordination of Child and Youth Violence Prevention Across the City

The City of Toronto should assist in the co-ordination of school boards, community agencies, police, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of

Community and Social Services, the Ministry of the Solicitor General, City staff and other partners to promote comprehensive and co-ordinated prevention resources to children, youth, and families at risk of becoming victims or perpetrators of abuse and crime. These prevention resources should be aimed at children and their caregivers from pregnancy through the end of secondary school. The City should also take leadership by ensuring that all city-funded programs for children, youth and families (childcare centres, parent-child drop-in centres, community recreation centres, libraries) include anti violence program elements. The City should ensure that information about these resources is available to all parents and caregivers, by assisting in the development of school board wide and City-wide information networks.

Furthermore, the City should assist in the development of a Case Management Referral Protocol between childcare centres, schools, police, courts, and community agencies, that allows better co-ordination of services to children who are offenders and/or victims of crime. This protocol would include when it is necessary and appropriate to inform Police when a crime has occurred or is suspected to have occurred.

(14) Co-ordination of Substance Abuse Policies in Schools

Public Health should work with other community partners to assist in reviewing and revising current school substance abuse policies to include: education, prevention, early identification, support for users, and training and support for school, Public Health, and community agency staff.

(15) Improving Parenting Supports

The City of Toronto should assist in the co-ordination of supports to parents, and promote the expansion of parenting skills education to sites as varied as libraries, schools, and workplaces, with an emphasis on high-risk families.

(16) Youth Mentoring

The City of Toronto should expand its "One on One" school-based mentoring program that involves City staff in developing supportive personal relationships with children. Other sources of funding should be solicited to expand this successful program into the private sector.

(17) Provision of Quality Recreation to Children, Youth and Families at Risk

City Council should recognize the provision of high-quality accessible recreation for children, youth and families at risk of being victims and/or

offenders as the top priority for programming at recreation centres. Parks and Recreation should work with community agencies, school boards, libraries, housing, police and the TTC, to develop an inventory of where pre-school, after school and evening programs for youth, late night drop in programs, recreation leagues and community recreation agencies are presently provided, along with a needs assessment of where these services are most needed, and an analysis of possible sources of funding, including professional sports organizations as part of the Youth Profile initiative of the Children and Youth Action Committee. Furthermore, Parks and Recreation should report to City Council on ways to improve access to programs for high risk youth, and that this strategy involve youth in identifying and evaluating programs.

(18) Self-Defence Classes

City Council should recognize the importance of self-defence classes in providing necessary skills for those most at risk for violence, including children, women and girls, seniors, people with disabilities, gay and lesbian people, and high-risk youth, by maintaining and expanding the number and range of self-defence classes provided in community recreation centres. Self-defence courses should be appropriate for the specific group, taught by instructors with a demonstrated sensitivity to the safety issues of the specific group, and should be regularly evaluated by their appropriateness and effectiveness.

(19) Youth Employment/ Job Skills and Community Safety

The City of Toronto should continue to support and expand youth employment initiatives that combine job readiness/employment creation with community safety enhancement, such as the Graffiti Transformation, Drug Ambassador and Job Corps Programs.

Furthermore, the City of Toronto should investigate co-funding possibilities for expanded programs that would employ at-risk youth to provide activities, maintenance and other improvements to neighbourhood business areas, and other public places in areas.

(20) Co-ordination of Community Safety, Children's Rights, and Youth Employment

The City should forward these recommendations to the Children and Youth Action Committee, the Mayor's Youth Employment Strategy, and the Economic Development Strategy for inclusion in these respective strategies.

Youth and Police Action Committee
March 2000

- (1) The Toronto Police Service (TPS) course, "Policing and Diversity," should:
 - (a) continue in conjunction with the Toronto District School Board (TDSB);
 - (b) include youth in preparation and delivery;
 - (c) address racism;
 - (d) expand its reach, staffing and resources; and
 - (e) include in its youth component Parks and Recreation (community centres), youth detention facilities as well as youth courts.
- (2) The Students with a Target (SWAT) program, now run in 33 Division, should be expanded to every division in the TPS.
- (3) The Safety Centre model run by 55 Division should be expanded throughout the City.
- (4) The role and responsibilities of school liaison officers should be delineated and consistently applied.
- (5) The TPS, in partnership with the TDSB and Parks and Recreation should create youth liaison committees within each division.
 - (a) each division should organize an annual community event that involves young people; and
 - (b) each division should host annual focus groups between officers and young people.
- (6) TPS officers should "adopt" elementary school classes and conduct regular correspondence with them.
- (7) The TPS should provide co-operative learning opportunities for young people identified by street youth services across Toronto.
- (8) A Toronto Police Services Board (TPSB) Sub-Committee should be established to oversee all matters related to youth and police relations in the City. The Sub-Committee should:
 - (a) identify important issues;
 - (b) establish policies and mechanisms to ensure that specific projects are allocated to appropriate divisions;

- (c) oversee a long-term strategy to improve youth-police relations;
 - (d) encourage youth participation in projects designed to improve youth-police relations; and
 - (e) serve as a reporting mechanism to the TPSB.
- (9) A mechanism should be implemented into the promotional process to provide ongoing recognition of officers positively to the lives of Toronto youth.
- (10) A regular review of school liaison officers should be held to ensure that the needs of schools are being met.
- (11) The annual performance review should include criteria that take into account the adherence to policies and service directives regarding youth programs provided by the TPSB.
- (12) TPS officers should be paired with Toronto youth in mentoring relationships.
- (13) Parks and Recreation should design long-term drop-in programs for youth to be run and monitored by the officers in the TPS. Officers should serve as tutors, sports coaches and mentors.
- (14) Unit commanders in each division, in co-ordination with the City of Toronto Youth Committee, invite community groups to participate and facilitate some of the on going training sessions.
- (15) The TPS should produce a training program to provide youth with insight and education on policing issues—specifically those regarding the rights of a young person. The program can be produced and delivered in partnership with the TDSB, Parks and Recreation and youth-serving agencies.
- (16) In partnership with the TDSB, the TPS should organize regular field trips to all divisions.
- (17) A television series designed for children aged 8 to 12 should be produced that highlights a “day in the life” of a Toronto police officer.

ATTACHMENT NO. 9

Report dated June 6, 2000, from Councillor Chow, with input from Councillors Howard Moscoe, Sherene Shaw, Bas Balkissoon, Pam McConnell, Anne Johnston and Jack Layton, entitled "Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) 63rd Annual Conference and Municipal Expo, June 2-5, London Convention Centre". (See Minute No. 8.85, Page 130.):

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) interested City Councillors (see proposed names attached) be approved as the City's representatives and forwarded by the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) to the FCM no later than June 18, 2000;
- (2) the CAO, in consultation with the Council's FCM representatives, report to the Policy and Finance Committee on a strategy that ensures Toronto takes maximum advantage of funding from FCM initiatives developed over the past year, that could increase City revenues from between \$108 million to \$123 million per year;
- (3) interested Councillors and the CAO meet with the Executive Director of FCM regarding appropriate levels of representation of large urban centres on the FCM; and
- (4) the CAO consider sending staff to all FCM Board meetings.

Background:

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities now has over 1,000 members, representing 82 percent of the population of Canada. This high percentage of representation is a result of a year-long membership drive, chaired by Councillor Layton, which increased membership by over 42 percent in one year.

Thanks to the hard work of the FCM Board members, the FCM has now emerged as the most important municipal voice on the Canadian national scene.

The four-day conference featured workshops, seminars and important speeches from Cabinet Ministers including:

- The Right Honourable Prime Minister Jean Chretien;
- Finance Minister Paul Martin;
- Minister of Environment David Anderson;
- Minister of Transportation David Collenette;

- Minister of Public Works and CMHC Alfonso Gagliano;
- Secretary of State on Rural Development Andy Mitchell, and
- Minister of Labour also responsible for homelessness, Claudette Bradshaw.

In his speech, the Prime Minister acknowledged the influence and contribution of the FCM towards the federal government decision-making process, specifically in the federal budget which highlighted the FCM's theme of the Quality of Life.

Finance Minister Paul Martin, taking the lead from Toronto's Environmental Task Force report, spoke repeatedly about the importance of environmentally sustainable communities as a way to ensure enduring quality of life and economic prosperity of cities.

Members of our delegation had the opportunity to meet face-to-face and extensively with the Prime Minister, the Finance Minister, the Minister of Environment, the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Public Works and the CMHC.

Direct results of FCM's intensive lobbying efforts this year include the multi-year, multi-billion dollar infrastructure program, the \$125 million Green Fund, and the \$75 million homelessness initiative funds. In fact, the Green Fund is modelled after the very successful Toronto Atmosphere Fund (TAF) and will be administered by the FCM.

The FCM work this year will benefit municipalities throughout the country. For the City of Toronto, the benefits include:

- (1) new payment-in-lieu of taxes legislation which will be worth several million dollars;
- (2) the Green Municipal Enabling Fund is expected to provide 50 percent of the cost of feasibility studies for environmental initiatives over the three years of the fund. It would be reasonable to expect \$2 million to \$2.5 million to the City from this source;
- (3) the Green Municipal Investment Fund will enhance the Toronto Atmospheric Fund's activities and other energy efficiency projects and will pay back from 5 to 10 years on a very low interest rate basis; Toronto could be expected to access up to \$10 million of this fund this year;
- (4) the Infrastructure Program will make available \$100 million this year, rising to \$500 million per year in year three; Toronto could be expected to receive in the range of \$10 million this year, rising to \$30 million annually; these funds will need to be matched by an equal payment from the province; the City's share would be one third, but may take a variety of forms which are still under negotiation; and the funds can be used for

public transit, affordable housing, environmental infrastructure, tourism, cultural and recreational projects;

- (5) rights-of-way efforts in the FCM will assist our telecommunications group to achieve millions of dollars in revenue;
- (6) reduced GST in new rental construction should help with the housing crunch, may help reduce some shelter costs, and will eventually produce additional property tax revenue;
- (7) additional RRAP funding will provide several million dollars for affordable housing initiatives; and
- (8) homelessness funds under the “supporting community partnerships initiatives” will provide \$17 million per year to the city of Toronto for qualifying projects.

The total financial benefit to the City of Toronto ranges from \$108 million to \$123 million per year.

Conference Highlights:

FCM Elections:

A member of Council, Jack Layton, was nominated by the Board of Directors for first Vice President. He faced a challenge from Michael Power and an enthusiastic campaign ensued (see attached flyer). Councillor Layton was elected with strong support from across the country.

With a member of Toronto Council very likely to become the president of FCM at the convention in Banff, the City of Toronto may want to consider sending a large delegation of Councillors to attend the Banff conference. All those interested should notify the CAO as soon as possible.

Municipal Rights-of-Way:

Councillor Howard Moscoe led a seminar regarding what steps should be taken to protect and enforce municipal rights-of-way from telecommunications companies, natural gas and electricity.

Youth and Children:

There were various seminars regarding the importance in investing in children and youth (recreation and culture), leading up to the adoption of a resolution

urging the federal government to implement early childhood development programs through the National Children's Agenda.

Municipal governance:

The new FCM president signalled in her speech that municipal governance and financing is a top priority. A Task Force to deal with municipal governance has been charged with organizing the National Symposium on the Future Role of Municipal government.

The objectives of this Task Force include:

- (a) assisting municipal governments to achieve formal recognition as an order of government; and
- (b) pushing the provinces to enhance the status of municipal governments through provincial legislation and constitutional authority.

There will be a one-day meeting at the beginning of each FCM March meeting to share results and experience of Municipal Act reform.

Study Tours:

Toronto Councillors found various Study Tours extremely instructional and useful. These tours included the Integrated Manufacturing Technologies Institute, the Agricultural Tour, and the Race Relations Seminar on the Underground Railroad that brought hundreds of American slaves to safety and freedom in Canada.

Another very useful seminar on Connecting Council and Management gave practical, useful and realistic advice on the relationship between Councillors and city staff. In the Municipal Finance Forum there was an excellent discussion on new means of raising municipal capital.

Conclusion:

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) 63rd Annual Conference and Municipal Expo at the London Convention Centre was a highly successful conference, thanks to the combination of meetings, study tours and keynote addresses. The 1,200 delegates also celebrated an extremely successful year for the FCM which led to the Federal Government committing over \$3.3 billion in new money for municipalities. The City of Toronto stands to benefit financially - revenue increases could be between \$108 million to \$123 million per year.

Proposed List of City Councillors to be approved as the City's Representatives to the FCM:

Councillors	FCM Committees and Task Forces
Jack Layton	First Vice President
Sherene Shaw	Board of Director from Ontario International programs Race relations
Pam McConnell	Race Relations Municipal-Aboriginal Relations Social Infrastructure
Anne Johnston	Economic Development International programs
Howard Moscoe	Future role of municipal government Telecommunications: Access to Rights-of-Way
Bas Balkissoon	Telecommunications: Access to Rights-of-Way
Olivia Chow	Social Infrastructure Community Safety and Crime Prevention

(A copy of the attachment referred to in the foregoing report is on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

ATTACHMENT NO. 10

Report dated June 6, 2000, from the District Manager, Municipal Licensing and Standards, entitled “The Wheat Sheaf – Appeal of an Application for a Boulevard Café Deck, 667 King Street West, Bathurst Street Flank (Trinity - Niagara)”. (See Minute No. 8.94, Page 139.):

Purpose:

To report on the business owner’s appeal of staff’s denial of an application for a boulevard café deck at 667 King Street West, Bathurst Street Flank. As this is a request for an exception from Chapter 313, Streets and Sidewalks, of the former City of Toronto Municipal Code, it is scheduled as a deputation item.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement :

Not applicable.

Recommendations :

It is recommend that:

(1) City Council deny the applicant’s request for a boulevard café deck at 667 King Street West, Bathurst Street flank;

OR

(2) City Council approve the applicant’s request for the construction and maintenance of a boulevard café deck at 667 King Street West, Bathurst Street flank, subject to the café operator confining the deck and café fence to the licensed café area and notwithstanding the Deck Criteria of Municipal Code 313, Streets and Sidewalks, of the former City of Toronto Municipal Code and only on approval from all relevant utility companies.

Background :

Councillor Jakobek has requested us to report on the denial of an application for a boulevard café deck at 667 King Street West, Bathurst Street flank.

Comments:

Mr. Danny Tsakiris, owner of The Wheat Sheaf, 667 King Street West, Toronto, Ontario M5V 1M9, submitted an application on April 12, 2000, requesting an extension of his licence for a boulevard café on the Bathurst Street flank of 667 King Street West. Site inspection on May 23, 2000, determined that an illegal deck was being constructed without a construction permit for which a Notice of Advice to Stop Work was issued.

On June 1, 2000, we requested sets of Engineered Certified Utility Drawings, with plans showing views, elevations and loads, along with plans showing wheelchair accessibility. The plans were submitted June 6, 2000, and are presently being circulated to the appropriate City Departments and relevant utility companies.

Boulevard cafés provide a significant contribution to animating street activity. Given the proliferation of requests from café operators for removable decks, and to ensure that the physical connection between the café and the adjacent pedestrian is maintained, Municipal Code Chapter 313, Streets and Sidewalks, of the former City of Toronto Municipal Code, provides specific criteria for the construction of decks within the road allowance as follows:

- (a) boulevard café decks only be permitted on sidewalks or boulevards that exceed a slope of 5 percent and over;
- (b) the deck should be no higher than what is required to accommodate a level area and the deck framing members (which should be the minimum depth required);
- (c) where the distance between grade and the top of the deck is greater than the total thickness of the deck and framing member, a skirt or screen should be provided;
- (d) when wood is used for the decking, skirt, uprights or railing, it should be treated, painted or stained;
- (e) when wood is used for uprights, post widths should not exceed 0.10 metres x 0.10 metres (4 x 4 inches), top and bottom railings should not exceed 0.06 metres x 0.09 metres (2.5 x 3.5 inches), and pickets or balusters should not exceed 0.04 metres x 0.04 metres (1.5 x 1.5 inches); the spacing between the pickets or balusters should not exceed 0.10 metres (4 inches);
- (f) a minimum width of 1.03 metre (3.3 foot) break in the railing must be provided at the high side of the slope, to provide wheelchair access;
- (g) boulevard café decks are not to be constructed over existing underground services (i.e. hydro vaults, chambers, maintenance holes, etc.), unless written approval is given by the public utility;
- (h) should future installation of services within the boulevard area be required, the boulevard café owner, upon receipt of a 30-day notice, shall be required to remove the boulevard cafe deck;

- (i) the boulevard café deck be removed at the end of the café season; and
- (j) the boulevard café owner shall be required to enter into an agreement with the City of Toronto.

This criteria was adopted by City Council at its meeting of October 28, 29 and 30, 1998. Previous to this, it was the Department's policy to accept applications for construction of removable decks, where there was a substantial slope in the sidewalk abutting the establishment which could result in a potential safety hazard for patrons. Applications of this nature were reviewed on their own merits and were reported to the Toronto Community Council (formerly the City Services Committee) for recommendation to City Council.

In the past couple of years, we have received a number of requests from café operators, for permission for elevated café structures in the public right-of-way. The majority of these requests were not for operational reasons (i.e. substantial slope, etc.), but rather to increase visibility of the café. As these boulevard café decks are another physical obstruction to the street allowance and pose various problems with respect to access for wheelchairs and the disabled, specific criteria on the construction of boulevard café decks was established.

A licence was issued to Mr. Tsakiris, owner of The Wheat Sheaf, in October 1996, for a boulevard café on the Bathurst Street flank of 667 King Street West, for an area of approximately 36.4 square metres, as shown on the attached sketch (Attachment No. 1). The operator has requested a deck over the licensed boulevard café area. It can accommodate approximately 34 chairs and 8 tables.

In addition, Mr. Tsakiris has applied to extend the café area, but has not requested a deck to cover the proposed boulevard café extension. This application was made on April 12, 2000, and is presently being processed.

Our review of the 667 King Street West, Bathurst Street flank, has determined that the location does not meet the physical criteria for boulevard café decks, as noted above, given that the sidewalk fronting the location is relatively flat, less than 5 percent slope. It is unknown if the deck has been constructed over utility services; utility drawings are presently being circulated and approval has not been received.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Tsakiris was advised to stop work on the deck, as was conveyed to him in a Notice of Advice to Stop Work dated May 23, 2000.

Conclusions:

The criteria set out in Chapter 313 of the former City of Toronto Municipal Code allows business owners an opportunity to modify the abutting landscape by

installing a removable deck within licensed café areas, in cases where the existing grade of sidewalk is substantial to operate a boulevard café safely.

In this particular case, the slope of the sidewalk on the Bathurst Street flank of 667 King Street West is minimal and does not pose a hazard for patrons.

On hearing the depositions, the Toronto Community Council must decide whether or not to recommend that City Council grant the appeal to permit a café deck on the Bathurst Street flank of 667 King Street West.

Contact Name and Telephone Number:

Curtis Sealock,
District Manager,
South District,
Municipal Licensing and Standards.
Telephone: 392-7616
Fax: 392-0677
E-mail: csealock@city.toronto.on.ca

List of Attachments:

Attachment No. 1 - Sketch

(A copy of the attachment referred to in the foregoing report is on file in the Office of the City Clerk.)

ATTACHMENT NO. 11

Report dated June 8, 2000, from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, entitled "Interim Control By-law respecting the properties abutting the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine (North Toronto)". (See Minute No. 8.95, Page 140.):

Purpose:

This report recommends that the Commissioner of Urban Development Services undertake a study of policies appropriate for the lands within and abutting the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine, pursuant to Section 38 of the Planning Act. The report also recommends that Council approve an Interim Control By-law for lands within the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine and within 10 metres of the limit of the ravine, as shown on the attached map, and that this By-law be in force for a period of one year.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

If outside consultants are required to assist staff of this Department, a further report would outline the funds needed.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) the Commissioner of Urban Development Services, in consultation with the Commissioners of Works and Emergency Services, Economic Development, Culture and Tourism, and other City departments, be directed, pursuant to Section 38 of the Planning Act, to undertake a review of the land use policies appropriate for the lands within and abutting the boundary of the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine;
- (2) in connection with the review of the land use policies recommended above, Council pass an Interim Control By-law for lands within the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine and for portions of lands adjacent to the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine, to prohibit the erection of buildings or structures in the ravine and within 10 metres of the limit of the ravine shown on the attached map, and that this By-law be in force for a period of one year; and
- (3) authority be granted for the introduction of the necessary Bill in Council to implement Recommendation No. (2) above.

Background:

In accordance with the recommendations of Clause No. 7 of Report No. 10 of the Land Use Committee, adopted by the former City of Toronto Council on July 14, 1997, in respect to the Final Report on Interim Control By-law No. 1997-0073, respecting 119R Glen Road, 107 Glen Road, 15 Beaumont Road and 12 May Street,

I was requested to report back on a process and timetable for developing "Ravine Impact Boundaries" for ravine areas.

I am proposing to continue this requested study by recommending the imposition of an Interim Control By-law on the first 10 metres of lands abutting the limits of the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine. Given the constraints of staff resources, i.e. the possible requirement for expert consultants, it may be necessary to have outside assistance for this study.

The Kimbark Coldstream Ravine was designated by By-law No. 332-81 on May 21, 1981, pursuant to Section 2 of the City of Toronto Act, 1983, as identified on the attached map.

The Kimbark Coldstream Ravine is designated in the Official Plan for the former City of Toronto as a "Natural Area". It is the policy of Council "to protect, preserve and maintain and where possible enhance 'Natural Areas' of the City in perpetuity". Council policy (S.2.37) is to encourage owners of lands not owned by the City "to maintain them in their natural state". In addition, the Official Plan policy (S.2.4) provides for the acquisition, from time to time, of privately-owned ravines, when opportunities arise to enlarge the open space system or "to protect an endangered 'Natural Area' or 'Ravine' environment". In 1977, the former City of Toronto acquired the rear portion of 37 Kimbark Boulevard, within the designated Ravine, and now known as 65 Coldstream Avenue.

The lots within and immediately adjacent to the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine are zoned R1Z0.35 which permits low density residential uses.

Council should be aware that an Application for Consent under Chapter 276, Article I, of the former City of Toronto Municipal Code and a Site Plan Application have been submitted for lands municipally known as 33 Kimbark Boulevard (two parcels) for a single family dwelling. These applications have been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board.

Comments:

I am recommending that an Interim Control By-law, applying to the lands within the first 10 metres abutting the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine and within the Kimbark Coldstream Ravine, be enacted for a period of one year, to prohibit all uses of the lands during this period.

Contact Name: Ted Cymbaly, Planner
Community Planning, North Section
Tel: 416-392-7740
Fax: 416-392-1330

Attachment: Key Map

(A copy of the attachment referred to in the foregoing report is on file in the Office of the City Clerk.)