

---

## Executive Committee

**Meeting No.** 11  
**Meeting Date** Tuesday, September 4, 2007  
**Start Time** 9:30 AM  
**Location** Committee Room 1, City Hall

**Contact** Patsy Morris, Committee Administrator  
**Phone** 416-392-9151  
**E-mail** pmorris@toronto.ca

---

EX11.1	Information			Ward: All
--------	-------------	--	--	-----------

### **Water Supply Agreement with Region of York (Deferred from June 25, 2007 meeting - 2007.EX10.38)**

(June 13, 2007) Report from the General Manager, Toronto Water

#### **Financial Impact**

There are no financial implications from the adoption of this report. Toronto Water's approved Operating Budget and Capital Budget has provided for the infrastructure requirements and capital cost-sharing contributions from the Region of York. The formula used to determine York Region's water rates continues to ensure full operating cost recovery, a fair return on investment and continued rate and reserve fund stability. The Agreement also has provisions for calculating the capital cost share, on a proportionate use basis, for future expansion to the drinking water system to service both the needs of Toronto and the Region of York.

The Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer has reviewed this report and agrees with the financial impact information.

#### **Summary**

The purpose of this report is to provide the Executive Committee with information pertaining to the City of Toronto's Water Supply Agreement with the Regional Municipality of York. The Water Supply Agreement limits the amount of water supplied to York Region while at the same time ensuring there is sufficient capacity to meet the needs of the City of Toronto.

#### **Background Information**

Water Supply Agreement with Region of York  
(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-5244.pdf>)

EX11.2	ACTION			Ward: All
--------	--------	--	--	-----------

## **Strategic Plan for Toronto's Screen-based Industry**

(August 10, 2007) Report from the Acting Film Commissioner

### **Recommendation**

The Film Commissioner recommends that Council endorse the Strategic Plan for Toronto's Screen-based Industry and direct staff and the Toronto Film Board to develop and implement a plan to advance the recommendations contained in the Strategy.

### **Financial Impact**

There are no financial implications as a result of the recommendation in this report. It is anticipated that implementation for most elements of the Strategic Plan can be accomplished within the approved budget. Should specific tactics require additional funding, staff will report through the 2008 Operating Budget process for Council approval.

### **Summary**

Over the past 40 years, Toronto has developed a fully-integrated screen-based entertainment industry which is recognized as having among the world's best crews, and a full spectrum of producers, companies, actors, directors and infrastructure. It became Canada's English-language Centre of Excellence in film and television. The combined domestic and foreign service industry employs tens of thousands, brings Toronto to the world and, until recently contributed more than a billion dollars annually to Toronto's economy.

However, Toronto, the other orders of government, national and local agencies and the industry itself has not kept pace with changing market realities nor has it responded effectively to increasing global competition. In the last five years, major production spending in Toronto has declined by 35% and the industry is facing a crisis. Government, agencies and local industry must take action together, strategically and quickly, to re-establish Toronto's position as a Centre of Excellence, to create the enabling environment required for the industry to succeed and thrive, and to leverage the strength of our new media sector to propel Toronto forward as an innovative and creative industry leader. If we do it right, Toronto – not New York, Los Angeles or London – will be the leading centre of the digital age.

### **Background Information**

Strategic Plan for Toronto's Screen-based Industry

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6146.pdf>

EX11.3	ACTION			Ward: All
--------	--------	--	--	-----------

## **Complaint Pursuant to Section 20 of the Development Charges Act, 1997 – 200 Lonsdale Road**

(August 20, 2007) Report from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer Deputy City Manager Richard Butts

### **Recommendation**

The Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer, and Deputy City Manager Richard Butts recommend that:

1. Council dismiss the complaint filed pursuant to Section 20 of the *Development Charges Act, 1997*, and the request for a refund of the development charges paid in the amount of \$370,623.07 not be approved.

### **Financial Impact**

Staff recommends that the complaint be dismissed for the reasons contained in this report. A decision to recognize the complaint would have consequential negative precedent-setting implications. Such a decision would lead to a loss of revenue of \$370,623.07 in the present case, and also development charges already collected from other private schools (over \$150,000). In addition, all future building permit applications of private schools and other similar institutions that provide a service to a paying public would seek to be exempted from the City's Development Charges By-law (the "by-law"), leading to further loss of revenue.

### **Summary**

The purpose of this report is to provide staff recommendations in response to a complaint filed pursuant to Section 20 of the Development Charges Act, 1997 (the "Act").

Staff is of the opinion that the development charges by-law was properly applied to this development and accordingly it is recommended that the complaint be dismissed.

### **Background Information**

Complaint Pursuant to Section 20 of the Development Charges Act, 1997 - 200 Lonsdale Road (<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6152.pdf>)  
Attach 1 - DC Complaint Letter dated July 17, 2007, from Fraser Milner Casgrain LLP, counsel to Upper Canada College (<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6153.pdf>)

EX11.4	ACTION			Ward: 5
--------	--------	--	--	---------

## Status of Capital Funding and Implementation Progress Kipling/Islington Redevelopment Initiative

(August 17, 2007) Report from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer

### Recommendations

The Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer recommends that:

1. City Council approve additional capital funding of \$5,400,000 for the Kipling/Islington Redevelopment Initiative (K/I Initiative) from the Golden Horseshoe Transit Investment Partnerships (GTIP) grant funds received in 2007;
2. applications for the Islington project from the Building Canada Fund or any other appropriate Federal infrastructure programs be filed as soon as the criteria of these programs are finalized; and
3. the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary actions to give effect thereto

### Financial Impact

It is currently estimated that the K/I Initiative will have a total capital cost of \$58,400,000, as summarized below:

<u>Projects</u>	<u>Islington</u>	<u>Kipling</u>	<u>Total</u>
Inter-regional bus terminal		\$10.5 M	
East Entrance		\$ 5.8 M	
New TTC bus terminal, PPUDO, entrances	\$18.5 M	\$ 6.5 M	
Replacement Commuter Parking	\$ 4.4 M	\$10.7 M	
Property Acquisition		\$ 2.0 M	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$22.9 M</b>	<b>\$35.5 M</b>	<b>\$58.4 M</b>

In February, City Council approved a capital allocation to the K/I Initiative of \$17,500,000 from the Land Acquisition Reserve Fund (LARF) subject to confirmation of cost-sharing from the other stakeholders. Based on the funding commitments received from the Province and MT, the total capital costs of the Kipling improvements, \$35,500,000 are secured. For the Islington portion of the project, with a capital cost of \$22,900,000, no additional stakeholder funding has been provided. Consequently, an additional \$5,400,000 in capital funding is required, which is approximately 10% of the total projected cost of the K/I Initiative.

It is recommended that \$5,400,000 be allocated from the GTIP funding grant received from the Province in March 2007, of which about \$8,000,000 will be available after the application to

other GTIP projects, to complete the financing of the new Islington terminal. It is also recommended that the potential for a Federal contribution in 2008 continue to be pursued to offset as much as possible of the City's financing of the K/I Initiative. The LARF is to be reimbursed through any proceeds that are realized from the sale of the Bloor/Islington lands achieved through the relocation of the Islington bus terminal and redevelopment of these lands and the sale of Westwood lands.

The following table sets out the proposed source of funding of the K/I Initiative over the term of the project based on the funding commitments received.

	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
Total Gross Expenditure	8.5M	30.7M	14.5M	4.7M	58.4M
Source of Funding					
City/ LARF	8.5M	3.6M	0.7M	4.7M	17.5M
GTIP Funds		5.4M			5.4M
Other Stakeholders		21.7M	13.8M		35.5M
Total Source of Funding	8.5M	30.7M	14.5M	4.7M	58.4M

## Summary

In February, 2007, City Council approved the Kipling/Islington Redevelopment Initiative (K/I Initiative) and the allocation of capital funding of \$17,500,000 for this project, subject to confirmation of funding commitments from Mississauga Transit (MT), GO Transit (GO), the Province of Ontario, the Greater Toronto Transportation Authority (GTTA) and the Federal Government.

This report summarizes the status of the cost-sharing arrangements with MT, GO, GTTA, the Province and the Federal Government, to date. Full funding commitments of \$35,500,000 for the Kipling project have been received, but additional capital funding is required for the Islington project. Additional capital funding is available from the funds remaining under the Golden Horseshoe Transit Investment Partnerships (GTIP) initiative grant to the City in 2007, to address the current estimated shortfall of \$5,400,000 for the Islington project.

## Background Information

Status of Capital Funding and Implementation Progress Kipling/Islington Redevelopment Initiative

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6156.pdf>)

Attach 1 - Letter from Lawrence Cannon, Federal Minister of Transportation Infrastructure and Communities

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6157.pdf>)

Attach 2 - Letter from Donna Cansfield, Provincial Minister of Transportation

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6158.pdf>)

Attach 3 - Letter from City of Mississauga Clerk

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6159.pdf>)

Attach 4 - Islington Station Area Improvements

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6160.pdf>)

Attach 5 - Kipling Station Area Improvements

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6161.pdf>)

EX11.5	ACTION			Ward: 11, 16, 18, 20, 26, 27, 32
--------	--------	--	--	-------------------------------------

## Relationship Framework for City Board-Operated Arenas

(August 8, 2007) Report from the City Manager

### Recommendations

The City Manager recommends that:

1. City Council adopt the Relationship Framework, attached as Appendix A, for the eight City Arenas Boards, developed in compliance with the City of Toronto Act, 2006;
2. the General Manager of Parks, Recreation and Forestry be designated the City's operational liaison for arena boards and provide support to the Boards to ensure they bring their operations into compliance with the Relationship Framework; and
3. the City Solicitor bring forward to the Executive Committee a by-law to add a new chapter to the Municipal Code replacing Chapter 25 of the former City of Toronto Municipal Code to implement the Relationship Framework.

### Financial Impact

There is no financial impact.

The Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer has reviewed this report and agrees with the financial impact information

### Summary

This report recommends adoption of the Relationship Framework for City board-operated arenas including:

1. George Bell Arena (215 Ryding Ave., established 1961);
  2. Larry Grossman Forest Hill Memorial Arena (340 Chaplin Cres., established 1970);
  3. Leaside Memorial Community Gardens Arena (1073 Millwood Ave., established 1963);
- and
4. McCormick Playground Arena (179 Brock Ave., established 1971);
  5. Moss Park Arena (140 Sherbourne St., established 1974);
  6. North Toronto Memorial Arena (174 Orchard View Blvd., established 1965);
  7. Ted Reeve Community Arena (175 Main St., established 1954); and

## 8. William H. Bolton Arena (40 Rossmore Rd., established 1971).

The relationship framework attached as Appendix A defines the roles and responsibilities of the Board and the City, clarifying accountabilities, expectations and requirements.

Through discussions with the members of these eight City Boards, the Managers of the arenas and with appropriate City staff from Parks, Forestry and Recreation, Financial Planning, and Legal Services a relationship framework was developed and it is attached as Appendix A.

### Background Information

Relationship Framework for City Board-Operated Arenas

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6165.pdf>)

Appendix A - Relationship Framework for Boards of Management of Arenas

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6166.pdf>)

EX11.6	Information			Ward: All
--------	-------------	--	--	-----------

### 2006 Statement of Development Charge Reserve Funds

(August 20, 2007) Report from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer

#### Financial Impact

There are no financial implications arising from this report. Development charge revenue during the year amounted to \$33.7 million, while project funding of \$40.6 million was extended from the development charge reserve funds. Total development charge reserve funds as at the end of 2006 amounted to \$194.4 million.

#### Summary

The purpose of this report is to provide a statement of development charge reserve funds for the year ended December 31, 2006, as required by the Development Charges Act, 1997.

### Background Information

2006 Statement of Development Charge Reserve Funds

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6182.pdf>)

Appendix 1: Schedule A: Statement of Development Charge Reserve Funds for the year ended December 31, 2006

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6183.pdf>)

Appendix 2 - Schedule B

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-7349.pdf>)

EX11.7	Information			Ward: All
--------	-------------	--	--	-----------

## Development Charges Act – Proposed Amendments

(August 20, 2007) Report from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer

### Financial Impact

The 2004 Development Charge Background Study, prepared in accordance with the provisions and requirements of the *Development Charges Act, 1997*, calculated the maximum permissible rates that could have been charged by type of development.

However, Council elected to reduce the residential charge, maintain the exemption for non-residential development, and introduced the calculated charge for retail uses. This resulted in a reduction of almost \$20 million in estimated annual development charge revenues as compared to at the rates calculated in the background study. It is currently not possible to estimate the increase in development charge revenues resulting from the inclusion of all services. However, the elimination of the historical cap and the statutory 10 percent reduction would have led to at least an additional \$25 million in estimated annual development charge revenues at Council-adopted rates.

### Summary

This report responds to Council's direction for a report pertaining to a motion seeking amendments to the Development Charges Act, 1997 (the "Act"), to permit full recovery of growth-related capital costs through development charges. The motion sought the removal of the following constraints currently imposed by the Act:

1. use of historical service level averages to estimate increase in need;
2. statutory 10 percent reduction of capital costs; and
3. exclusion of specified municipal services from development charge calculations.

The cap imposed by the use of historical service levels on eligible growth-related capital costs, used in the 2004 Development Charge Background Study, had a significant negative impact on the amount recoverable through development charges. The effect of the statutory reduction of 10% of the capital costs is relatively minor. It is currently not possible to quantify the effect of the exclusion of specified services from the development charge calculation; however, staff expects that the impact could be significant.

The City, along with other members of the Association of Municipalities of Ontario, is assisting the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing to develop a range of options on reform of the Act.

### Background Information

Development Charges Act - Proposed Amendments

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6185.pdf>



EX11.8	ACTION			Ward: All
--------	--------	--	--	-----------

## **Appointment of the City of Toronto Representatives to the CTC Source Protection Committee**

(August 23, 2007) Report from the General Manager, Toronto Water

### **Recommendations**

The General Manager of Toronto Water recommends that:

1. the Deputy City Manager responsible for Toronto Water, in consultation with the General Manager of Toronto Water, designate Toronto's two representatives on the CTC Source Protection Committee; and
2. the City Clerk forward the names of the two City of Toronto representatives to the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority prior to November 3, 2007.

### **Financial Impact**

The recommendations contained in this report will have no financial impact.

### **Summary**

The Clean Water Act, directed at protecting the natural sources of Ontario's drinking water, was passed on October 18, 2006. The purpose of the Act is to protect existing and future sources of drinking water. The Act establishes Source Water Protection Regions in Ontario; delegates Conservation Authorities as Source Protection Authorities and requires them to create Source Protection Committees which will prepare and submit a Terms of Reference, an Assessment Report and finally, a Source Water Protection Plan (SWPP) for their region. The City of Toronto is within the CTC Source Protection Region and has been allocated two positions on its Source Protection Committee.

The appointment of the City's representatives is addressed in this report.

### **Background Information**

Appointment of the City of Toronto Representative to the CTC Source Protection Committee (<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6186.pdf>)

EX11.9	ACTION			Ward: All
--------	--------	--	--	-----------

## **2007 - 2008 Status Report and Update of the City of Toronto Accessibility Plan**

(August 14, 2007) Report from the City Manager

### **Recommendations**

The City Manager recommends that:

1. this Status Report and update on new initiatives be approved and submitted to the Ontario Accessibility Directorate as the 2007 - 2008 City of Toronto Accessibility Plan;
2. City Council request the Government of Ontario give consideration to providing funding as more accessibility standards and regulations are established; and
3. this Status Report be forwarded to the City's Disability Issues Committee for information.

### **Financial Impact**

There is no direct financial impact as a result of the recommendations in this report.

### **Summary**

This Status Report provides an update on the City's 2007 – 2008 Accessibility Plan, a requirement of the Ontarians with Disabilities Act (ODA, 2001). It recommends that the 2007 – 2008 Status Report and Update on the City's Accessibility Plan be filed with the Ontario Accessibility Directorate and be forwarded to the City's Disability Issues Committee for information.

The Accessibility Plan supports and strengthens the City's commitment to respond to the needs of people with disabilities in its multiple roles as employer, service provider, grants provider, and purchaser of goods and services.

The Plan commits the City to review, identify and remove barriers to access in services, policies and programs with the goal of achieving equality of access, opportunities and outcomes for all members of Toronto's diverse communities. The barriers cited in the Plan include those which are found in the environment – physical and architectural, communication and technological barriers, as well as those which are attitudinal and systemic in nature.

The City has continued to make steady progress in making city facilities, programs, information and services more accessible and in providing a more accessible workplace. Divisions have laid the groundwork for future accessibility enhancements as outlined in the ODA and also to meet the accessibility targets of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA), 2005.

## Background Information

2007-2008 Status Report and Update of the City of Toronto Accessibility Plan

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6162.pdf>)

Appendix 1 - City of Toronto Divisional Accessibility Plans

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6163.pdf>)

EX11.10	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

## 2007 Additional Best Start Funding and New Funding for Aboriginal Child Care

(July 31, 2007) Report from the General Manager, Children's Services

### Recommendations

The General Manager of Children's Services recommends that:

1. the Children's Services' 2007 Approved Operating Budget be amended to include the following:
  - a. an additional \$12,612.2 thousand in Provincial Best Start revenues offset by a reduction in withdrawals from the Child Care Expansion Reserve Fund of \$12,612.2 thousand; and
  - b. an increase of \$4,744.9 thousand gross and revenues for wage improvement for child care practitioners.
2. wage improvement funds be dispersed to child care operators with fee subsidy contracts on the basis of a sliding scale and in accordance with the principles attached in Appendix A;
3. subject to Provincial funding and approval of Aboriginal child care projects, the General Manager of Children's Services be delegated authority to negotiate and execute agreements on behalf of the City with provincially approved organizations to fund the construction and /or renovation costs associated with the creation of new Aboriginal child care sites, in an amount determined in accordance with the provincial infrastructure guidelines, which amount shall not exceed an average cost of \$10,000 per child care space, such agreement to be on terms that are satisfactory to the General Manager and be in a form acceptable to the City Solicitor;
4. through variance reporting, Children's Services' 2007 Approved Operating Budget be further increased to reflect the City's allocation for provincially approved Aboriginal Child Care projects; and
5. the General Manager of Children's Services report to the Community Development and Recreation Committee and Budget Committee in late 2007 on the projected service impacts in 2008.

**Financial Impact**

	Additional Provincial Best Start Funding						
	2007			2008 (Annualized)			
	Gross	Provincial Revenue	Child Care Expansion RF	Net	Gross	Provincial Revenue	Net
Child Care Spaces		12,612.2	(12,612.2)	-	-	16,816.3	-
Wage Improvement	4,744.9	4,744.9		-	6,326.5	6,326.5	-
Total	4,744.9	17,357.1	(12,612.2)	-	6,326.5	23,142.8	-

Prior to this announcement, Children’s Services’ 2007 Approved Operating Budget included a draw from the Child Care Expansion Reserve Fund (CCERF) of \$15.9 million to fund base pressures. This additional provincial funding will result in a substantial reduction to the budgeted draw from the CCERF to \$3.2 million in 2007 and approximately \$7 million in 2008. Based on current service levels it is expected that the Reserve will not be exhausted until 2010.

The Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer has reviewed this report and agrees with the financial impact information.

**Summary**

This report seeks approval to amend the Children’s Services’ 2007 Approved Operating Budget to reflect additional Best Start funding. Details of additional funding were provided by Minister Chambers, Minister of Children and Youth Services (MCYS), in a letter to Mayor Miller dated June 28, 2007 and announced publicly on July 5, 2007. This announcement includes \$17,357.1 thousand additional funding in 2007, annualized to \$23,142.8 thousand in 2008 for Toronto to support child care spaces and improve wages to child care practitioners.

The Ministry has also announced an Expression of Interest process to create off-reserve culturally appropriate child care programs for Aboriginal children. Toronto is one of the 14 communities selected for the development of the child care spaces. This report also provides information on the new funding and seeks authority to enter into agreements with Aboriginal children’s services providers in Toronto that are successful in the Expression of Interest.

**Background Information**

2007 Additional Best Start Funding and New Funding for Aboriginal Child Care  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6164.pdf>

EX11.11	ACTION			Ward: 32
---------	--------	--	--	----------

## **Board Composition and Recruitment Process for Ted Reeve Arena**

(August 13, 2007) Report from the City Manager

### **Recommendations**

The City Manager recommends that:

1. City Council adopt a new board structure for Ted Reeve Arena consisting of:
  - a. the Ward 32 Councillor;
  - b. 8 community members;
  - c. 2 non-voting staff members from the local Police Services Division and Parks, Forestry and Recreation Division;
  - d. 1 non-voting representative of the Sports Centre Design and Management Limited; and
  - e. from among the voting members, the Chair and Treasurer will be elected by the Board at its inaugural meeting;
2. Council approve the qualifications for the 8 community members as follows:
  - a. an interest and commitment to volunteering and community development;
  - b. a range of skills or experience such as fundraising, financial management, sports facility operation, event planning, amateur and children's sports development in the community, managing in the non-profit sector, law, or marketing;
  - c. a majority of members residing in the area bounded by Danforth Avenue, Victoria Park, Broadview Avenue and Lake Ontario;
  - d. experience playing, organizing or coaching minor hockey among at least 3 members, including at least 1 member with experience in women's hockey;
  - e. at least 1 member with experience playing, organizing or coaching minor lacrosse in; and
  - f. at least 1 youth member;
3. Council approve an open and transparent advertised recruitment process in accordance with the Advertised Process in the Public Appointments Policy with:
  - a. emphasis on local community advertising;
  - b. a selection panel comprised of the Ward 32 Councillor and one other member of the Toronto East York Community Council;
  - c. appointment by the Toronto East York Community Council;
4. Council authorize the City Manager to amend the Public Appointments Policy for Arena Boards to reflect the recommended changes for Ted Reeve Arena and direct the City Manager to work with other arena boards to revise their recruitment processes using the Ted Reeve process as a model;

5. the City Manager initiate the recruitment process with the objective of appointing the new board before the end of the year; and
6. the City Solicitor give notice to the Toronto East Arena Gardens Incorporated of termination of the 1954 agreement with the City of Toronto and thank the membership for their long service and dedication to the arena.

### Financial Impact

The advertising costs for Board recruitment will be sourced from Ted Reeve Arena revenues.

### Summary

This report recommends a revised composition for the board of Ted Reeve Arena and an open and transparent recruitment process that enhances engagement of the local community.

### Background Information

Board Composition and Recruitment Process for Ted Reeve Arena  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6167.pdf>

EX11.12	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

### Recipients - 2007 Access Equity and Human Rights Awards

(August 1, 2007) Report from the City Manager

### Recommendations

The City Manager recommends that:

1. City Council extend congratulations to the following persons and organizations who have been selected as recipients of the City of Toronto Access Equity and Human Rights Awards:

Aboriginal Affairs Award:

Vern Harper

Access Award:

Parkdale Activity and Recreation Centre (PARC)

Pride Award:

Central Toronto Youth Services – The Pride and Prejudice Program

Deb Parent

Rupert Raj

William P. Hubbard Award:

Afua Cooper  
Anne Gloger  
Kevin Lee

**Financial Impact**

There are no financial impacts arising from the recommendations in this report.

**Summary**

This report advises Council of the result of the nomination process for the City of Toronto Access, Equity and Human Rights Awards. These Awards are the Aboriginal Affairs Award, the Access Award on Disability Issues, the Constance E. Hamilton Award on the Status of Women, the Pride Award for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Transsexual and Two Spirited Issues and the William P. Hubbard Race Relations Award.

Recipients of the Constance E. Hamilton Award are selected by the Women Members of Council and will be reported separately to City Council

**Background Information**

Recipients - 2007 Access Equity and Human Rights Awards  
(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6169.pdf>)

EX11.13	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

**2007 Heads and Beds Levy on Institutions**

(August 20, 2007) Report from the Treasurer

**Recommendations**

The Treasurer recommends that:

1. Council authorize the levy and collection of taxes for the 2007 taxation year on hospitals, colleges and universities and correctional facilities as authorized by Section 285 of the *City of Toronto Act, 2006*;
2. the maximum prescribed amount of \$75 be applied per provincially rated hospital bed, full time student, or resident place;
3. authority be granted for the introduction of the necessary bills in Council to levy taxes for the 2007 taxation year on hospitals, colleges and universities and correctional facilities; and,
4. the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

**Financial Impact**

Revenue of approximately \$14.0 million will be raised through the 2007 levy on the institutions outlined in this report as outlined in Table 1, below.

Table 1: 2007 Heads and Beds Levy on Institutions

Institutions	Capacity Figures	Prescribed Amount	2007 Levy
Universities and Colleges	169,497	\$75	\$12,712,275
Public Hospitals	14,835	\$75	\$1,112,625
Correctional Facilities	1,750	\$75	\$131,250
Total	186,082		\$13,956,150

The Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer has reviewed this report and agrees with the financial impact information.

**Summary**

To obtain Council’s authority for the adoption of by-laws for the levying and collection of taxes for the 2007 taxation year for public hospitals, universities and colleges, and correctional facilities (the “institutions”), totalling approximately \$14.0 million.

**Background Information**

2007 Heads and Beds Levy on Institutions  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6170.pdf>

<b>EX11.14</b>	ACTION			Ward: 42
----------------	--------	--	--	----------

**Markham By-pass – Morningside Avenue: Individual Environmental Assessment**

(June 27, 2007) Report from the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee

**Recommendation**

The Public Works and Infrastructure Committee, in accordance with the City of Toronto Municipal Code, Chapter 27, Council Procedures, requested the Executive Committee to refer the Markham By-pass-Morningside Avenue: Individual Environmental Assessment matter to Scarborough Community Council for consideration and report back to the Public Works and Infrastructure Committee.



## Summary

A report (June 12, 2007) from the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning Division respecting the Markham By-pass – Morningside Avenue: Individual Environmental Assessment.

## Background Information

Markham By-pass-Morningside Avenue: Individual Environmental Assessment

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6177.pdf>)

Staff Report - Markham By-pass - Morningside Avenue: Individual Environmental Assessment

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6178.pdf>)

EX11.15	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

## Capital Variance Report (for the Four Months Ended April 30, 2007)

(June 22, 2007) Report from the Budget Committee

## Recommendations

The Budget Committee recommended to the Executive Committee that Council:

1. approve a reduction to the 2007 Approved Cash Flow totalling \$11.511 million in order to adjust/correct overstated 2006 carry forward funding as detailed in Appendix 2 attached;
2. approve the technical adjustments detailed in Appendix 2 attached, in order to reallocate funds between projects with no incremental budget impact, and to increase the Toronto Public Library 2007 Capital Budget by \$17,000 (funded by development charges) to cover the unanticipated increased cost of construction materials for the Jane/Sheppard Neighbourhood Relocation project;
3. approve closure of completed projects with total project cost of \$90.221 million and actual expenditures of \$77.298 million as detailed in Appendix 3, and, in accordance with the Financial Control By-law, direct that after fully funding overspent projects, any remaining unspent funds be returned to the original funding sources; and
4. authorize and direct the appropriate staff to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

## Financial Impact

As summarized in Table 1 below, for the four months ended April 30, 2007, actual expenditures for Tax Supported Programs totalled \$420.982 million or 20.8% of their 2007 Approved Cash Flow of \$2.026 billion. By comparison, these programs spent 14.8% of their

2006 Approved Cash Flow during the same period in 2006. Tax Supported Programs project a spending rate of 89.8% or \$1.819 billion at the end of 2007.

Table 1 Corporate Capital Variance Summary For the Four Months Ended April 30, 2007 (\$000s)					
	2007 Approved Budget	January to April 2007		Total Year	
		\$	%	Projected Actuals to Year-End \$	% of Plan
<b>Tax Supported Programs:</b>					
Citizen Centred Services – “A”	182,065	12,508	6.9%	150,130	82.5%
Citizen Centred Services – “B” (See Note)	700,784	232,847	33.2%	615,168	87.8%
Internal Services	165,211	13,638	8.3%	130,867	79.2%
Other City Programs	33,930	1,280	3.8%	31,437	92.7%
Agencies, Boards & Commissions	944,293	160,709	17.0%	891,707	94.4%
<b>Total – Tax Supported</b>	<b>2,026,282</b>	<b>420,982</b>	<b>20.8%</b>	<b>1,819,309</b>	<b>89.8%</b>
<b>Rate Supported Programs:</b>					
Toronto Parking Authority	27,506	1,561	5.7%	27,506	100.0%
Toronto Water	410,001	26,712	6.5%	327,842	80.0%
<b>Total Rate Supported</b>	<b>437,507</b>	<b>28,273</b>	<b>6.5%</b>	<b>355,348</b>	<b>81.2%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,463,789</b>	<b>449,255</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>2,174,657</b>	<b>88.3%</b>
Note: Includes Greenlane Landfill					

Rate Supported programs spent \$28.273 million or 6.5% of their 2007 Approved Cash Flow of \$437.507 million. It is estimated that by year-end, expenditures will approximate \$355.348 million or 81.2% of the 2007 Approved Cash Flow.

## Summary

The Budget Committee considered the following reports:

1. (June 22, 2007) from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer advising that the Capital Variance Report for the Four Months ended April 30, 2007 will be on the Supplementary Agenda for the Budget Committee meeting of July 10, 2007; and
2. (July 5, 2007) from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer providing the Capital Variance Report for the four months ended April 30, 2007, and requesting Council approval for additional 2006 carry forward funding adjustments, budget and technical adjustments, and closure of completed capital projects is to advise that the

Capital Variance Report for the Four Months Ended April 30, 2007 will be on the Supplementary Agenda for the Budget Committee meeting of July 10, 2007.

### Background Information

Capital Variance Report (for the Four Months Ended April 30, 2007)

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6200.pdf>)

Report (June 22, 2007) Capital Variance Report for the Four Months Ended April 30, 2007

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6201.pdf>)

Report (July 5, 2007) Capital Variance Report For the Four Months Ended April 30, 2007

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6193.pdf>)

EX11.16	ACTION			
---------	--------	--	--	--

### Green Roof Feasibility Report Roofing Rehabilitation Program

(July 10, 2007) Report from the Budget Committee

### Recommendations

The Budget Committee recommended to the Executive Committee that Council:

1. approve the staff recommendation to implement a green roof pilot project at the existing Victoria Park Subway Station, new Victoria Park Canopy, and the existing Wilson Carhouse (cool roof).
2. authorize staff to seek approval of additional funds of \$3,200,000.00 (\$2,700,000.00 for Project 3.1 Finishes, Roofing Rehabilitation Program and \$500,000.00 for Project 3.9 Buildings and Structures Projects, Victoria Park Bus Terminal Replacement) in order to implement the green roof pilot project at the above locations as part of the 2008-2012 Capital Program, subject to City approval of the project and additional funding.
3. consider funding the project through the Green Municipal Funding Program.

### Summary

The Budget Committee considered a communication (June 14, 2007) from the General Secretary, Toronto Transit Commission forwarding the report, entitled “Green Roof Feasibility Report Roofing Rehabilitation Program”, approved by the Commission on June 13, 2007.

### Background Information

Green Roof Feasibility Report Roofing Rehabilitation Program

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6190.pdf>)

Communication from Toronto Transit Commission

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6191.pdf>)

Attach - Toronto Transit Committee Report 1

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6192.pdf>)

EX11.17	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

## Toronto Public Health 2007 Operating Budget Adjustments

(July 10, 2007) Report from the Budget Committee

### Recommendations

The Budget Committee recommended to the Executive Committee that Council:

1. approve the following adjustments to the Toronto Public Health's 2007 Operating Budget:
  - a. an increase of \$1,443.3 thousand gross and \$0.0 thousand net and a staff increase of 11 temporary positions, to reflect confirmed funding from various provincial ministries (see Attachment 1 – Table 1); and
  - b. an increase of \$556.1 thousand gross and \$0.0 net to reflect recovery costs of external secondments (see Attachment 1 – Table 2).

### Financial Impact

Table 1 (see Attachment 1) reflects the budget adjustments required resulting from the confirmation of 2007 funds from various provincial ministries.

Table 2 (see also Attachment 1) reflects cost recoveries for staff seconded to various provincial ministries and related agencies.

The Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer has reviewed this report and agrees with the financial impact information.

### Summary

The Budget Committee on July 10, 2007, considered a communication (June 12, 2007) from the Board of Health forwarding the recommendations of the Board of Health on June 12, 2007.

### Background Information

Toronto Public Health 2007 Operating Budget Adjustments

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6194.pdf>

Attachment - Staff report

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6195.pdf>

EX11.18	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

## **City Council Endorse Provincial Bill 199: To Permit the Sale of VQA Wine and Ontario Microbrewery Beer at Convenience Stores**

(July 25, 2007) Member Motion from Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Jenkins

### **Recommendations**

1. that City Council endorse provincial Bill 199.
2. that City Council direct the Clerk to immediately convey City Council's endorsement of Bill 199 to the Province of Ontario.
3. that City Council direct the appropriate officials to give effect to the foregoing.

### **Summary**

The sale of liquor and wine in Ontario is regulated by the Liquor Control Board of Ontario (LCBO) and is restricted to LCBO stores and LCBO Agency stores. LCBO Agency stores are local vendors licensed to sell alcohol in small communities that do not have LCBO stores. The LCBO Agency store program has been in effect since 1962.

To spread the success of the LCBO Agency store program, convenience stores and small grocery stores should be allowed to sell alcohol. The sale of alcohol would bring added income to these small business owners and would boost the local economy in Toronto and its neighbourhoods. Also, with the impending ban on cigarette "power-wall" advertising behind the cash-register at convenience stores, allowing the limited sale of alcohol at convenience stores could provide some relief for the small business owner from their loss of the "power-wall" revenue.

The provinces of Quebec, British Columbia and Alberta all allow the sale of alcohol in stores licensed and regulated by the Province.

On April 3, 2007, Queen's Park passed the first reading of a Private Member's Bill (Liberal MPP, Kim Craitor - Niagara Falls) that proposes to amend the Liquor Control Act to allow the sale of VQA wine and Ontario microbrewery beer at convenience stores. In addition to the Liquor Control Board of Ontario (LCBO), this bill would allow licensed convenience store owners to sell limited stock of local wine and beer only. The bill proposes to regulate the qualified, trained (by the Hospitality Industry Training Organization of Ontario) and licensed vendors.

### **Background Information**

City Council Endorse Provincial Bill 199: To Permit the Sale of VQA Wine and Ontario Microbrewery Beer at Convenience Stores

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6202.pdf>

EX11.19	ACTION			
---------	--------	--	--	--

## **City Council Petition to the Province of Ontario to Remove the City of Toronto from the Jurisdiction of the Ontario Municipal Board**

(June 26, 2007) Member Motion from Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Jenkins

### **Recommendation**

1. City Council immediately and aggressively petition the Province of Ontario to remove the City of Toronto from the jurisdiction of the Ontario Municipal Board, thereby allowing appeals of City of Toronto planning decisions only through the Divisional Court or the Provincial Cabinet.

### **Financial Impact**

Council also considered a Financial Impact Statement (June 20, 2007) from the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer.

### **Summary**

There is no government agency so consistently reviled by residents of the City of Toronto as is the un-elected Ontario Municipal Board (OMB). Every neighbourhood in this City has been affected by an OMB decision made against the City's wishes. From Committee of Adjustment minor variance appeals to major Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments, the OMB is increasingly dictating how our City is planned and is adversely affecting our residents throughout the process. The City of Toronto ought to be free of the OMB.

The OMB is ruling against the City more than it ever has before. The magnitude and frequency of the amendments to Zoning By-laws and the Official Plan is increasing (though under the new Official Plan the need for amendments is inherently reduced by the vague malleability of the document). This is not only due to the Provincial Policy Statement and Places to Grow Act's push of 'Intensification' (the requirement that our City must aggressively build to accommodate a million more residents in twenty years time) – it's the Ontario Municipal Board. The City of Toronto could adhere to that Provincial Policy Statement adequately without the OMB, if Council only had the autonomy to tell applicants (developers) when and where they can develop, and by staying principled and consistent to our Official Plan and Zoning By-laws while ensuring adequate infrastructure planning able to accommodate this growth.

The OMB ought to be abolished for at least Toronto which has a large and sophisticated multi million dollar Planning Division administration supporting it. By comparison, the second guessing OMB has only a few staff members to support its decisions.

The existence of the OMB reduces Planning decisions to a bargaining exercise between what a developer proposes and what City Council feels is appropriate for development. Provincial planning documents are used to justify almost any size of development, almost anywhere. Speculation on properties is on the rise because there is a pattern of developing to double or triple what the Zoning By-law allow. It adds up to a loss of control over the growth, stability

and the health of our neighbourhoods. To stop this pattern, accountability for planning decisions must rest solely with elected officials.

Residents feel the impact of these new developments incrementally diminishing their quality of life. Residents want Council's planning decisions to matter and be final. Residents know that planning decisions must not be made ad hoc or in isolation from the existing context of the development site's neighbourhood. The accumulated effect of developments on our quality of life and our infrastructure over time must be paramount. Residents know that our infrastructure (transit, schools, roads, water system) built years ago cannot sustain us today, let alone the in future.

Furthermore, residents' have spent millions of after-tax dollars on unsuccessful OMB appeals in the last ten years. Unlike the developer applicant who incorporates the cost of an appeal into the project cost, residents must fund-raise in the neighbourhood to support an appeal at the OMB. This is the most glaring example of the uneven playing field at the OMB. A Residents' group should not have to spend \$100,000.00 to essentially defend the City's position at the OMB.

The Ontario Municipal Board drains the City's resources by occupying our Planning (OMB appeals occupied nearly 2000 staff hours/280 staff days in 2006) and Legal Divisions and City Council debate, not to mention our residents and ratepayers' resources. The OMB puts our focus toward hopeless legal battles over a building that will have a part in shaping our City for the next 50-100 years. In 2005, the City won only 34% of appeal cases at the OMB.

The City of Toronto needs to make this a major issue in this upcoming Provincial election on October 10, 2007.

### **Background Information**

City Council Petition to the Province of Ontario to Remove the City of Toronto from the Jurisdiction of the Ontario Municipal Board  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6203.pdf>

EX11.20	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

### **Composition of the Board of Health**

(July 25, 2007) Member Motion from Councillor Del Grande, seconded by Councillor Nunziata

### **Recommendations**

That the Executive Committee review the composition of the Toronto Board of Health and consider the following proposals:

- a. reduce the number of City Councillors from six (6) members to five (5) members and increase the number of School Board representatives from 1 (one) to two (2) members, so that both the TDSB and TCDSB have a representative on the Board of Health;

OR

- b. rotate the School Board Representative between the TDSB and the TCDSB each term; and
- c. amend the Public Appointments Policy to reflect the revised composition of the Board of Health so that the new composition takes effect with the 2010 term of Council.

### Summary

The Toronto Board of Health is composed of 13 members (its maximum composition): six (6) City Councillors, six (6) members of the public and one (1) School Board representative. The appointment of a School Board representative provides a vital link between the School Boards and the City of Toronto.

There are two large publicly-funded School Boards within the City of Toronto consisting of the Toronto District School Board (TDSB) and the Toronto Catholic District School Board (TCDSB).

For the 2003 to 2006 term and the 2006 to 2010 term, the School Board representative on the Toronto Board of Health has been from the TDSB: Sheila Cary-Meagher from 2003 to 2006, and Soo Wong for the 2006 to 2010 term. As a result, the TCDSB will not have had a representative on the Board of Health for seven years, when the current term ends in 2010.

### Background Information

Composition of the Board of Health

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6205.pdf>

EX11.21	ACTION			
---------	--------	--	--	--

### Council Office Space at Civic Centres and Budget Transparency

(June 26, 2007) Member Motion from Councillor Moscoe, seconded by Councillor Filion

### Recommendation

- 1. Members of Council who so require, be provided with currently vacant space at Civic Centres for use as satellite offices at no cost to their office budgets and Members currently using this kind of space be relieved of the responsibility for paying rent for such space on a go forward basis.

### Summary

City Council at its meeting held on May 23, 24 and 25, 2007, considered Item EX8.2, headed “Remuneration and Expenses of Members of Council and of Council Appointees to Local Boards and Other Special Purpose Bodies for the year ended December 31, 2006 (Ward: All)”, which is an exercise designed to hold some Councillors accountable, by requiring them to pay



rent for office space at the Etobicoke Civic Centre. During that debate, it became apparent that the City policy that requires Councillors to pay rent for office space at Civic Centres is a factor that has induced some Councillors to take measures to secure this space without paying for it. It makes no sense whatsoever to force Councillors to vacate offices in order to leave them empty. That has been the case for several years at all of the suburban Civic Centres. Councillors have been economically evicted from their offices which have remained empty for several years when that space could, and should, have been available to service constituents close to home. It is in that respect that an urgent policy change is required. In view of the debate that is taking place surrounding the “Etobicoke Civic Centre Controversy”, it is important that, in order to make Council’s intentions clear, this policy change needs to take place at this meeting of Council.

### Background Information

Council Office space at Civic Centres and Budget Transparency  
<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6207.pdf>

EX11.22	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

### Municipal Election 2006 - Review of Financial Filings by Members of City of Toronto Council

(June 26, 2007) Member Motion from Councillor Holyday, seconded by Councillor Del Grande

### Recommendations

City Council adopt the following recommendations contained in the attached report dated June 14, 2007 from the Auditor General:

The Auditor General recommends that:

1. Members of Toronto City Council, in preparing their financial statements, utilize the City’s Electronic Financial Filing System. Any errors identified during this process be corrected prior to filing financial statements with the City Clerk.
2. City Council request the Province to amend the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* to provide that all candidates seeking election to Toronto City Council be required to use the City’s Electronic Financial Filing System to file their financial statements.
3. City Council request the Province to amend the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* to allow candidates the opportunity, within certain criteria, to correct errors or omissions in financial statements which have been filed with the City Clerk.
4. City Council request the Province to amend the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* pertaining to the nomination filing fee, to clarify the manner in which the fee is to be accounted for in the candidate’s financial statement.

## Financial Impact

There are no financial implications resulting from this report.

## Summary

City Council at its meeting of September 28, 29, 30 and October 1, 2004, considered the recommendations of the Toronto Election Finance Review Task Force. As a result of these deliberations, Council recommended the following:

“That should the Province fail to enact the appropriate changes to the Municipal Elections Act, 1996 prior to the 2006 election, the Auditor General, as part of his 2006/2007 work plan, review the financial statements filed by Members of Council after the 2006 election and report to Council, through the Audit Committee, on any other irregularities or inconsistencies contained therein.”

In accordance with Council’s directive, this review was included in the Auditor General’s 2007 work plan. Although the directive stated that the report should be directed to Council through the Audit Committee, one of the possible outcomes of the results of the review is that a compliance audit of a candidate’s financial filing could be requested. The deadline for requesting a compliance audit is July 2, 2007. It was not possible to complete the review, submit the report to the Audit Committee and have it before Council to meet this deadline, therefore, we are submitting the Auditor General’s report through this Motion Without Notice.

## Background Information

Municipal Election 2006 - Review of Financial Filings by Members of Council of Toronto Council

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6213.pdf>

Attach 1 - Staff Report from the Auditor General

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6214.pdf>

Attach 3 - Summary of Findings

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6215.pdf>

EX11.23	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

## Report Request - Feasibility of a Municipal Casino

(July 25, 2007) Member Motion from Councillor Palacio, seconded by Councillor Mammoliti

## Recommendations

1. that the City Manager and City Solicitor report to an upcoming meeting of the Executive Committee on the legal feasibility of establishing a municipally-owned and operated Casino in the City of Toronto.

2. that this report discuss the possibility of the Province of Ontario partnering with the City of Toronto in this venture.
3. that this report discuss the potential economic and social impacts of this proposal.

### Summary

Several major North American Cities, including Canadian ones such as Winnipeg, have established Casinos within their City limits. A municipally owned and operated casino within the City of Toronto has the potential to create a tremendous amount of revenue for the City to fund major City building initiatives.

The revenue from such a venture could be dedicated specifically to transit, social infrastructure or to directly address the City's financial crisis.

At the moment, many options are already available to City of Toronto residents for gaming, such as the City's numerous Bingo Halls, facilities like Woodbine Racetrack and temporary casinos such as the CNE. Casino Niagara in Niagara Falls and Casino Rama in Orillia already offer free transportation to and from the Casino to Toronto residents. New Casinos on the U.S. side of the border at Niagara Falls are benefiting from a windfall of Toronto gaming enthusiasts. Toronto should explore the possibility of a municipally-owned and operated Casino, as a means of generating revenue and economic growth within the City of Toronto.

### Background Information

Report Request - Feasibility of a Municipal Casino

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6216.pdf>

Letter - Fairness of Woodbine Racetrack Slot Machine and Gaming Revenue Sharing

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6223.pdf>

Motion - Revenue Sharing Fairness of Woodbine Racetrack Slot Machine and Gaming Revenues

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6224.pdf>

### Communications

(July 19, 2007) letter from Councillor Cesar Palacio (EX.Main)

## **23a** Fairness of Woodbine Racetrack Slot Machine and Gaming Revenue Sharing

### Summary

Memo (July 19, 2007) from Councillor Cesar Palacio, requesting that the attached Notice of Motion regarding revenue sharing of Woodbine Racetrack gaming revenue be added to the Executive Committee agenda and be considered concurrently with my Notice of Motion M90 "Report Request - Feasibility of Municipal Casino" which was referred to the Executive Committee by City Council.

## Communications

(July 19, 2007) e-mail from Councillor Cesar Palacio (EX.Main)  
(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/comm/communicationfile-3209.pdf>)

EX11.24	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

### **Report Request - New Property Tax Class for Big Box Stores and Potential New Revenues for the City of Toronto**

(July 25, 2007) Member Motion from Councillor Palacio, seconded by Councillor Jenkins

#### **Recommendations**

1. that the City Manager include in upcoming discussions with the Province, regarding the Ontario Act, the feasibility of permitting the City to establish a new commercial tax class for big box stores.
2. that, depending upon the results of Recommendation 1, consideration be given to creating a new tax class for parking lots in the City of Toronto.

#### **Summary**

Big box retail stores threaten neighbourhood small business strips and encourage a car culture that is counterproductive to many of Council's priorities. These big box stores are currently taxed at the same rate as their small business competitors.

Big box retailers also often have on-site parking not available to many small businesses. The parking advantage enjoyed by big box retailers is also not taxed at the proper rate and encourages applicants to expand parking as much as physically possible, with no incentive to create more landscaping or use the site efficiently, which gives them a further untaxed advantage over small business.

The City of Toronto should have the option to tax big box stores at a different rate to account for these factors.

The pending two year review of the City of Toronto Act provides the opportunity to request the Province to make changes to the Act to provide more flexibility to the City in the area of property tax policy.

#### **Background Information**

Report Request - New Property Tax Class for Big Box Stores and Potential new Revenues for the City of Toronto  
(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6204.pdf>)

EX11.25	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

## **Report Request - New Property Tax Class for Gas Stations and Potential New Revenues for the City of Toronto**

(July 25, 2007) Member Motion from Councillor Palacio, seconded by Councillor Jenkins

### **Recommendation**

1. that the City Manager include in upcoming discussions with the Province regarding the City of Toronto Act, a request that the City be provided with the authority to establish a special commercial tax class for gas stations in the City of Toronto.

### **Summary**

Gouging by the gas station industry is rampant in Toronto and is taking place without the significant intervention of any level of government. Gas stations are, in general, obnoxious uses that do not fit well in local neighbourhoods. There is often a substantial cost to the City, in terms of mitigating the negative impacts of these uses on the surrounding communities, and lost tax revenue opportunities because of the low tax rate that this land use enjoys.

The gas station industry flourishes, at the same time as this land use contributes to costing the City hundreds of millions of dollars a year in terms of maintenance and making accommodations for automobiles through the City. The proliferation of gas stations in the City of Toronto also makes it easy for drivers to choose traveling by car over transit, cycling or walking.

Furthermore, gas stations, after they cease being gas stations, very often have to be remediated at an extremely slow rate that means lost revenue for the City for decades, as the land remains vacant. The City of Toronto should have the option to tax gas stations at a different rate to account for these factors.

The pending two year review of the City of Toronto Act provides the opportunity to request the Province to make changes to the Act to provide more flexibility to the City in the area of property tax policy.

### **Background Information**

Report Request - New Property Tax Class for Gas Stations and Potential New Revenues for the City of Toronto

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6206.pdf>

<b>EX11.26</b>	<b>ACTION</b>			Ward: All
----------------	---------------	--	--	-----------

## **Request for GST and PST Exemption on Bicycle Purchases**

(July 25, 2007) Member Motion from Councilor Walker, seconded by Councillor Cho

### **Recommendations**

1. that the City of Toronto request the Provincial government to create a Provincial Sales Tax (PST) exemption for bicycle purchases, including electric bicycles, thus eliminating the PST on these items.
2. that the City of Toronto request the Federal government to create a Goods and Services Tax (GST) exemption for bicycle purchases, including electric bicycles, thus eliminating the GST on these items.

### **Summary**

Promoting bicycle use is essential to the City of Toronto's environmental, transportation, public health and recreation objectives. In July 2001, City Council affirmed this position by adopting the Toronto Bike Plan, a comprehensive strategy to increase bicycle use in the City.

Each time an individual chooses to cycle rather than drive a car, the quality of life of all Torontonians is enhanced. The Toronto Bike Plan describes the following benefits that accrue from bicycle use:

- air quality is improved and green house gasses are reduced; - regular physical activity causes health care costs to decline; and - traffic congestion is eased, with fewer cars using the roads.

Each of these benefits is a public good for all Torontonians and also for other Ontarians who share our environment, transportation infrastructure and the cost of our provincial health care system.

To realize the public good that bicycle use generates, the City has worked consistently to encourage cycling. The Toronto Bike Plan sets, as a primary goal, doubling the number of bicycle trips made in the City, as a percentage of total trips, by 2011.

To reach this objective, the City undertakes numerous programs, services and improvements. Foremost, the City continues to expand its bicycle network by building trails, bike lanes and bike parking facilities. Additionally, the City celebrates Bike Week annually, presents the Bicycle Friendly Business Awards and supports Bicycle User Groups.

These measures do much to promote cycling in Toronto, but there is substantial room for growth in bicycle use. In 1999, the City's Cycling Survey (prepared by Decima Research Inc.) revealed that 38 percent of Toronto households do not own a bicycle and that 52 percent of adults in Toronto do not use a bicycle at all.

The survey also revealed that those with lower incomes are significantly less likely to be cyclists than those with higher incomes, suggesting that cost continues to present a barrier to bicycle use for many Torontonians.

Reducing the cost of purchasing a bike would increase bicycle ownership and use in Toronto. Such a cost reduction could be achieved if the Provincial and Federal governments exempted bicycle purchases from the Provincial Sales Tax (PST) and the Federal Goods and Services Tax (GST), respectively.

With a sales tax exemption, those who do not own a bicycle would be given an incentive to purchase one. For households which already own a bicycle, a tax exemption would create an incentive to purchase higher performance models, making cycling a more attractive alternative to driving.

Additionally, electric bicycles are an emerging environmentally friendly and comfortable mode of transportation. They are capable of traveling at speeds of up to 30 kilometers per hour, are silent and produce no emissions. Electric bicycles range in cost from the \$600.00 to \$1500.00, price levels which are prohibitive for many consumers. A sales tax exemption for electric bicycles would stimulate demand for these environmentally desirable vehicles.

All levels of government have a clear responsibility to promote the public good that results from bicycle use: clean air, good health and efficient transportation infrastructure. The City of Toronto is striving to increase bicycle use and needs the strong partnership of the Provincial and Federal governments to achieve this objective.

The PST and GST are significant barriers to bicycle use. It is in the best interests of Torontonians, Ontarians and Canadians that bicycle purchases be exempted from these taxes.

### **Background Information**

Request for GST and PST Exemption on Bicycle Purchases  
(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6208.pdf>)

EX11.27	ACTION			
---------	--------	--	--	--

### **Section 37 Funds – Interest Bearing Account**

(July 17, 2007) Letter from Councillor Adrian Heaps

### **Recommendation**

That the City Manager, assign all Section 37 funds allocated from ward-development agreements be immediately subject to an interest bearing account and that this interest be accrued and allocated to the intended ward project to be funded by these section 37 funds.

### Summary

Section 37 funds are currently earmarked for capital community projects such as community centres, park improvements or other similar ventures. Normally, much or all of these monies are paid at the time of application or shortly thereafter. Because the intended projects are usually years away from completion, Section 37 funds should be deposited into an account where they would be earning interest that should in turn be accrued to the project in question. By not having funds earning interest, these resources lose their initial value and therefore their spending power is diminished significantly in the completion of the project.

### Background Information

Section 37 Funds - Interest Bearing Account  
(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6209.pdf>)

EX11.28	ACTION			
---------	--------	--	--	--

### Naming Rights on Existing and Future City Buildings

(July 9, 2007) Letter from Councillor Adrian Heaps

### Recommendation

That the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer be requested to report to the Executive Committee for submission to City Council on October 22, 2007 on a process and criteria for the naming and renaming of existing and future City owned buildings or properties, and that staff also identify potential revenues for such naming rights on these properties.

### Summary

A letter (July 17, 2007) from Councillor Adrian Heaps advising that the City of Toronto owns several buildings where naming rights could be sold realizing millions of dollars in potential revenues. However, several concerns have been raised including the aesthetic value and honouring heritage sites. And advising that there is no formal policy to guide Council when we debate the renaming of any building and having a having this formal policy will speed up discussions and act as a firm reference for the final decision.

### Background Information

Naming Rights on Existing and Future City Buildings  
(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6210.pdf>)



EX11.29	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

## **A Mission Statement for the City of Toronto**

(July 9, 2007) Letter from Councillor Adrian Heaps

### **Recommendation**

That the City Manager undertake the process to create a mission statement for the City of Toronto, and that this mission statement be displayed in all city buildings with public access where it can be viewed by all citizens entering these buildings.

### **Summary**

Toronto is a multi-billion dollar corporation and yet it does not have an all encompassing statement. For any corporation the mission statement defines the objectives and goals of the organization in one succinct statement that defines itself to the public, the employees and all that are governed by that statement.

Toronto has guidelines, rules and regulations, policies and bylaws which govern all aspects of almost every facet of the City's operation. However, these rules and regulations govern the individual operations of each division. The City is bigger than these divisions. It is the reflection of its citizens and the prism through which those hopes and needs are collected and finally focused through the services we deliver.

Although our city accomplishes so much, especially when compared to other like-minded municipalities around the world, we are poor communicators when it comes to trumpeting our own successes. When people enter the doors of Toronto City Hall, I would hope that everyone in this building can point to an all defining statement that defines the corporation's identity as much as it speaks to the work being achieved within these walls.

The City of Toronto needs to tell its story to the public, to its employees and to everyone who enters its doors. We need to let the world know, especially Torontonians, that we are a great city with great accomplishments to its credit. A mission statement is the starting block to start this communication process.

### **Background Information**

A Mission Statement for the City of Toronto

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6211.pdf>

EX11.30	Information			
---------	-------------	--	--	--

### Identifying Fibre Assets in the City of Toronto

(September 4, 2007) Letter from Councillor Suzan Hall

#### Recommendation

Recommending that City staff investigate all City-owned (including ABCs) fibre assets as well as stranded fibre assets. Stranded fibre assets are located within City-owned tunnels, ducts, sewers and were laid by companies which have closed down or relocated. Those unused cables may be of use to Toronto.

#### Summary

Letter (September 4, 2007) from Councillor Suzan Hall, advising that she held a discussion with Police Chief Bill Blair on which they agreed that there was merit that municipal bodies utilize and share their existing network assets with each other to maximize cost and service efficiencies provided that that security and information integrity was not compromised.

#### Background Information

Identifying Fibre Assets in the City of Toronto  
(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6212.pdf>)

EX11.31	ACTION			Ward: All
---------	--------	--	--	-----------

### Transitional City Funding for the Toronto Economic Development Corporation (TEDCO)

#### Confidential - The security of the property of the municipality or local board

(August 28, 2007) Report from the City Manager and Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer

#### Recommendations

The City Manager and the Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer recommend that:

1. TEDCO's existing responsibility for funding the \$3 million annual operating payment to the Toronto Port Authority be transferred to the City beginning in 2008.
2. TEDCO be directed not to undertake any initiatives other than those presented on its existing 5-year plan until after the City Manager has reported to Council on the governance review of the City's economic development activities

**Financial Impact**

The means by which City will fund the \$3 million annual operating payment to the TPA will be addressed through the 2008 Budget process.

It is anticipated that the necessary financing of the payment amounts can be replenished through future revenues received from TEDCO as compensation for the City surplus lands provided to TEDCO.

**Summary**

The purpose of this report is to provide Executive Committee and Council with staff's assessment of TEDCO's financial status and to report on the need for the City to provide TEDCO with transitional funding.

Following discussions with senior TEDCO management and the review of financial statements and pro-formas provided by TEDCO, City Finance staff have determined that TEDCO will require transitional financial support from the City. Staff are recommending that this support be provided by transferring to the City TEDCO's current responsibility for funding the annual \$3 million operating payment to the Toronto Port Authority (TPA) beginning in 2008.

**Background Information**

Transitional City Funding for the Toronto Economic Development Corporation (TEDCO)  
(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2007/ex/bgrd/backgroundfile-6284.pdf>)