

Clause embodied in Report No. 5 of the Planning and Transportation Committee, as adopted by the Council of the City of Toronto at its meeting held on May 30, 31 and June 1, 2001.

6

### **Graffiti Transformation Program: 2001 Recommendations**

*(City Council on May 30, 31 and June 1, 2001, amended this Clause by adding thereto the following:*

*“It is further recommended that the Commissioner of Urban Development Services be requested to submit a report to the Planning and Transportation Committee, prior to the 2002 Operating Budget process, on other areas across the City of Toronto where graffiti needs to be removed and vandalized surfaces transformed into murals.”)*

**The Planning and Transportation Committee recommends the adoption of the following report (April 13, 2001) from the Commissioner, Urban Development Services:**

Purpose:

To recommend grants to sixteen organizations for the removal of graffiti and the transformation of vandalized surfaces into murals. As a re-investment in both the liveability of urban neighbourhoods and the youth in those communities, agencies train and employ young people to carry out the work.

Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

Funds in the amount of \$307,100 for this grant program are available in the Consolidated Grants budget. There are no other financial implications. The Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer has reviewed this report and concurs with the financial impact statement.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

- (1) the Graffiti Transformation grants be allocated to the community groups as outlined in Appendix A of this report;
- (2) the Commissioner of Urban Development Services be authorized to complete discussions with the community groups in the Etobicoke and North York areas described in this report, and if feasible, to allocate the remaining funds of \$ 6,420 to one and/or both of these groups for work to begin this summer and if not feasible, to increase allocations to the existing groups as appropriate;

- (3) Council deem these Grants to be in the interest of the Municipality; and
- (4) the appropriate City Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

Background:

In 1996, the Council of the former City of Toronto established a program for the removal of graffiti and the transformation of the defaced sites into murals. The decision to initiate the Graffiti Transformation Program arose from a presentation by a community agency regarding the deterioration of communities caused in part by the proliferation of graffiti.

As developed, the program combined two of the Department's mandates: youth unemployment as well as neighbourhood planning, improvement and revitalization issues. A Community Economic Development (C.E.D.) model was designed involving the hiring of youth by local organizations to remove graffiti and resurface the walls with attractive murals. A description of C.E.D models is included in Appendix B.

The Graffiti Transformation Program allows participating agencies to create training and business experience for youth in the field of graffiti removal and outdoor art. In this way an opportunity is created to ameliorate neighbourhood deterioration and, since much of the graffiti is perpetrated by youth, to involve their peers in learning about the adverse effects on retail and residential neighbourhoods as a proactive intervention. In the process, valuable skills are learned in remediation methods, commercial art, business practice and community relations. This will be the 6<sup>th</sup> year of operation within the boundaries of the former City of Toronto and the third year in Etobicoke, York and Scarborough. North York entered the program for the first time in 2000.

Staff of Urban Development Services are responsible for reviewing proposals and recommending allocations. Parks and Recreation and Works and Emergency Services as well as the Toronto Arts Council offer assistance and advice as appropriate.

Comments:

A community suffers when areas previously enjoyed by everyone become the "property" of a group, making others uncomfortable about using the space. People will stay away when the "tagging" of an area becomes common. This can make an area feel even more unsafe, since there is none of the informal surveillance provided by those relaxing on park benches or moving through the laneway after parking their car. This in turn encourages more graffiti, creating a vicious cycle.

History Since Amalgamation and Program Results :

In 1998, in accordance with granting policy, the program budget and availability remained unchanged from pre-amalgamation guidelines. As a result, the same twelve groups participated.

In 1999, one of the original groups withdrew and three groups from outside the former City of Toronto were added, as a process of expanding availability (levelling up) began. Although budget restraints allowed only a very small increase to accommodate the additional groups, the results were impressive. Last year, the number of participating groups grew to 16, with the addition of one group in York and one in North York.

These sixteen organizations provided a range of training and employment opportunities for 154 youth. The youth removed 1124 individual tags, usually from street installations such as benches and newspaper boxes. In addition, 66 sites were cleaned and 54 murals created. When a whole wall receives this type of comprehensive treatment, the number of tags removed or covered is not counted. Finally, the groups leveraged a further \$111,000 from sales and donations, increasing the money available by one third.

Over the 5 year life of the program, over 3200 individual tags have been removed, 124 sites have been cleaned and 229 murals have been created. Along the way, over 650 youth have received paying work as well as training in the technical aspects of graffiti removal, outdoor art and business skills. Over \$540,000 has been raised from sales, donations and other funders.

Two groups have developed back lane identity programs, providing street numbers in laneways to assist emergency vehicles in locating addresses. More groups are finding a niche market in commissioned art, both indoors and out as the skill levels increase. Examples of this type of activity include, among other things, paintings, indoor murals, banners for street festivals, posters and panels for use on stage and in festival settings. Beyond the remediation of graffiti, it has always been a program objective to create possibilities in this field for the youth and the ingenuity of the participating organizations in pursuing and developing opportunities is commendable.

In addition to the interest demonstrated by donations and sales, the youth experienced many indications of approval from their respective communities - kind words, assistance, applause - as well as being drawn into the fabric of the community in a way many may not have previously experienced.

#### Program Recommendations for 2001

Proposals are assessed on the basis of the proponent's track record with youth, the training to be offered the number of youth to be employed and the anticipated impacts on neighbourhood enhancement. In addition, Council's instructions to make grant programs available in previously unserved areas of the City, (harmonization) is a factor.

Allocations have been determined with consideration given to factors such as: the proponent's experience and ability to raise other amounts; age of and disadvantages faced by the youth resulting in higher supervision requirements and requests too small to withstand cuts without resulting in an unrealistic proposal.

The groups are to be congratulated for their co-operation in anticipating the difficult budgeting constraints faced by Council and adjusting their requests accordingly. However, at the conclusion of the Budget debate, the allocation for the program remains unchanged from last year

Requests totalling \$300,556 were received from 16 groups. The approved budget is \$307,100. One group has decided not to participate this year, and in the continuing effort to make the program available in communities where it has not existed, a second group in Scarborough is recommended for inclusion. I am recommending that all groups be funded at last year's level with the exception of one group which has received significantly less money than the rest since the inception of the program. They are to be allocated \$10,000 this year

After these allocations are made, \$6,420 remains unallocated. Staff have received expressions of interest from two unserved areas, one in Etobicoke and one in North York. I propose to continue discussions see if pilot projects can be tested in those areas. I have recommended that I be authorized to make appropriate allocations in these areas should those discussions be successful, or to distribute the remaining funds among the operating groups if the pilot projects cannot be initiated this year.

Conclusions

In order to continue the Graffiti Transformation Program in 2001, grants should be awarded as described in Appendix A. Evaluation of this year's program will be reported on in conjunction with recommendations for 2002.

Contact:

Larry King, Planner  
 Phone No: 392-0622  
 Facsimile: 397-4080  
[lking@city.toronto.on.ca](mailto:lking@city.toronto.on.ca)

—————  
 Appendix A  
 Recommended Allocations: Graffiti Transformation Program

AGENCY	GRANT AMOUNT 1) 2000 2) REQUEST 3) 2001 RECOMMENDED
Cecil Community Centre And Harbourfront Community Centre. (joint project )	1) \$22,140 2) \$24,000 3) \$22,140
Christie Ossington Neighbourhood Centre "United Neighbourhood Artists"	1) \$23,140 2) \$24,299 3) \$23,140

AGENCY	GRANT AMOUNT 1) 2000 2) REQUEST 3) 2001 RECOMMENDED
Community Centre 55	1) \$21,140 2) \$19,950 3) \$21,140
Davenport Perth Neighbourhood Centre "Mural Express!"	1) \$22,140 2) \$22,000 3) \$22,140
Dixon Hall Neighbourhood Centre "Youth Opportunities:Graffiti Arts"	1) \$17,140 2) \$16,257 3) \$17,140
Pape Adolescent Resource Centre (PARC) ( With Eastview N.C.)	1) \$23,140 2) \$24,905 3) \$23,140
7 <sup>th</sup> Generation Image Makers Native Child & Family Services of Toronto	1) \$23,140 2) \$30,800 3) \$23,140
Homo Air Ectus"	1) \$23,140 2) \$31,850 3) \$23,140
St. Christopher House	1) \$15,840 2) \$10,000 3) \$15,840
Lakeshore Area Multi Service Project	1) \$23,140 2) \$20,000 3) \$23,140
West Scarborough Community Centre	1) \$23,140 2) \$22,000 3) \$23,140

AGENCY	GRANT AMOUNT 1) 2000 2) REQUEST 3) 2001 RECOMMENDED
Arts York	1) \$19,740 2) \$20,000 3) \$19,740
Scadding Court Community Centre, "Urban Artists"	1) \$6,140 2) \$6,000 3) \$10,000
Arts Starts	1) \$13,700 2) \$13,015 3) \$13,700
Mural Routes	1) NA 2) \$5,000 3) \$5,000
Jane Finch Family and Community Centre	1) \$15,000 2) \$10,480 3) \$15,000
Total 2000 Total Requests Total Recommended	\$307,100 \$300,556 \$300,680

**Appendix B**  
**Community Economic Development**

The establishment of local organizations to solve local problems has a long history in Toronto. Strategies that include economic components in community based endeavours often receive support from sources other than Municipal Governments allowing for additional investment to be directed at the problem. The City of Toronto first became involved in such efforts in 1980.

In Community Economic Development terms, there are two basic models that are used depending on the issue being addressed, the financial scenario and the outcomes that are sought. Community based training models generally address issues of preparation for the work force and use business opportunities as a vehicle for this effort. The employees generally work in the business until the required training occurs or their term (as determined by program guidelines) is complete.

Community Businesses operate on a model that emphasizes the provision of jobs in a more traditional sense. Although training occurs, the focus is on enabling the employee or member to perform well enough to stay with the business as opposed to finding employment elsewhere. Where particular employment barriers are evident, (for example, medical concerns, single parenthood, the need to continue formal education) accommodations are built into the operational model to mitigate the impact of the employment barrier while allowing the person to still earn money from productive employment.

Both types of organizations are incorporated as non-profits (corporations without share capital) enabling them to partner with both public and private organizations as well as voluntary and private sector foundations. There is frequently overlap in the models and few are purely training or business oriented. Similarly, the best and most durable have a diverse financial base usually including formal and informal arrangements with the public, private and voluntary sectors in addition to revenue from sales.

*(City Council on May 30, 31 and June 1, 2001, had before it, during consideration of the foregoing Clause, the following communication (May 22, 2001) from the City Clerk:*

*Attached, for consideration by City Council, is a revised Appendix A, titled “Recommended Allocation: Graffiti Transportation Program”, which is appended to the report (April 13, 2001) from the Commissioner of Urban Development Services contained in the above-noted Clause.*

*(Revised) Appendix A  
 Recommended Allocations - Graffiti Transformation Program*

<i>AGENCY</i>	<i>GRANT AMOUNT</i> 1) 2000 2) REQUEST 3) 2001 RECOMMENDED
<i>Cecil Community Centre And Harbourfront Community Centre. (joint project )</i>	1) \$22,140 2) \$24,000 3) \$22,140
<i>Christie Ossington Neighbourhood Centre “United Neighbourhood Artists”</i>	1) \$23,140 2) \$24,299 3) \$23,140
<i>Community Centre 55</i>	1) \$21,140 2) \$21,140 3) \$21,140
<i>Davenport Perth Neighbourhood Centre “Mural Express!”</i>	1) \$22,140 2) \$22,140 3) \$22,140

<i>AGENCY</i>	<i>GRANT AMOUNT</i> 1) 2000 2) <i>REQUEST</i> 3) <i>2001 RECOMMENDED</i>
<i>Dixon Hall Neighbourhood Centre "Youth Opportunities:Graffiti Arts"</i>	1) \$17,140 2) \$17,140 3) \$17,140
<i>Pape Adolescent Resource Centre (PARC)</i>  ( With Eastview N.C.)	1) \$23,140 2) \$24,905 3) \$23,140
<i>7<sup>th</sup> Generation Image Makers Native Child &amp; Family Services of Toronto</i>	1) \$23,140 2) \$30,800 3) \$23,140
<i>Homo Air Ectus"</i>	1) \$23,140 2) \$31,850 3) \$23,140
<i>St. Christopher House</i>	1) \$15,840 2) \$15,840 3) \$15,840
<i>Lakeshore Area Multi Service Project</i>	1) \$23,140 2) \$23,140 3) \$23,140
<i>West Scarborough Community Centre</i>	1) \$23,140 2) \$23,140 3) \$23,140
<i>Arts York</i>	1) \$19,740 2) \$20,000 3) \$19,740
<i>Scadding Court Community Centre, "Urban Artists"</i>	1) \$6,140 2) \$10,000 3) \$10,000

<i>AGENCY</i>	<i>GRANT AMOUNT</i> 1) 2000 2) REQUEST 3) 2001 RECOMMENDED
<i>Arts Starts</i>	1) \$13,700 2) \$13,700 3) \$13,700
<i>Mural Routes</i>	1) NA 2) \$5,000 3) \$5,000
<i>Jane Finch Family and Community Centre</i>	1) \$15,000 2) \$15,000 3) \$15,000
<i>Total 2000</i> <i>Total Requests</i> <i>Total Recommended</i>	\$307,100 \$300,556 \$300,680