

THE CITY OF TORONTO

City Clerk's Division

Minutes of the Administration Committee

Meeting No. 11

Tuesday, December 12, 2002.

The Administration Committee met on Tuesday, December 12, 2002, in Committee Room 1, 2nd Floor, City Hall, Toronto, commencing at 9:38 a.m.

Attendance

Members were present for some or all of the time periods indicated.

	9:38 a.m. to 12:28 p.m.	2:07 p.m. to 3:45 p.m.	In-Camera 3:45 p.m. to 5:04 p.m.	5:05 p.m. to 6:55 p.m.
Councillor Brian Ashton	X	X	X	X
Councillor Rob Ford	X	X	X	X
Councillor Doug Holyday, Chair	X	X	X	X
Councillor Anne Johnston	X	X		
Councillor David Miller	X	X	X	X
Councillor Frances Nunziata Vice-Chair	X	X	X	X
Councillor Paul Sutherland	X	X	X	X
Councillor David Soknacki	X	X	X	X

Confirmation of Minutes.

On motion by Councillor Ford, the Administration Committee confirmed the Minutes of its meeting held on November 15, 2002.

11.1 2003 Operating and Capital Budget Review.

Staff presentation respecting the 2003 Capital and Operating Budgets pertaining to:

Corporate Services:

- City Clerk's;
- Corporate Communications;
- Court Services;

Administration Committee Minutes
Tuesday, December 12, 2002

- Facilities and Real Estate;
- Fleet Management Services;
- Human Resources;
- Information and Technology;
- Legal; and
- Service Integration and Support.

Finance

Other:

- CAO's Office;
- Council; and
- Mayor's Office.

The following members of staff gave an overview of their departmental budgets:

- Commissioner of Corporate Services;
- Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer;
- Chief Administrative Officer;
- Director of Council Support Services; and
- Chief of Staff, Mayor's Office.

Councillor David Shiner, Chair, Budget Committee, appeared before the Administration Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.

The Administration Committee received presentations from the following members of staff pertaining to their 2003 Operating and Capital Budgets who also filed a copy of their presentation material in regard thereto (See January 10 and 17, 2003, meeting file, Minute No. 1.1 for Budget/Presentation material):

- Commissioner of Corporate Services;
- Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer;
- Chief Administrative Officer; and
- Director of Council and Support Services.

(Clause No. 19(a) – Report No. 1)

11.2 Technology Acquisition and Asset Management.

The Administration Committee had before it a communication (November 5, 2002) from the City Clerk, Administration Committee, advising that the Administration Committee on November 5, 2002, during its consideration of a joint report (September 30, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, entitled “Technology Acquisition and Asset Management”, amongst other things:

- (I) deferred consideration of the following Recommendation No. (6) contained in the aforementioned joint report (September 30, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer until its meeting scheduled to be held on December 12, 2002:
 - “(6) staff be authorized to sole source future purchases of computer hardware and software from Dell, if necessary, beyond the maximum sole source limit of \$500,000 due to Dell's direct marketing model, and that Council concur with staff actions to date for emergency sole source purchases of computers from Dell in the amount of \$695,617.71, excluding taxes;” and
- (II) requested the Commissioner of Corporate Services to submit a report to the meeting of the Administration Committee scheduled to be held on December 12, 2002, on why Dell Computers is being treated as a sole source supplier when there are other computer suppliers that the City could make purchases from by making comparisons.

On motion by Councillor Johnston, the Administration Committee deferred consideration of the foregoing communication and the material submitted by Dell Canada until the meeting of the Committee scheduled to be held on January 10, 2003.

(Administration Committee; Commissioner of Corporate Services; Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer; Executive Director, Information and Technology; Director, Purchasing and Materials Management Division; Mr. Paul Cooper, Dell Canada – December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 19(b) – Report No. 1)

**11.3 Tenant Outreach Program
2000 Municipal Election.**

The Administration Committee had before it the following reports:

- (1) (August 27, 2002) from the City Clerk, describing the tenant outreach program undertaken by the City of Toronto during the 2000 Municipal Election; advising that there are no financial implications arising from this report; that this report has outlined a number of options for the tenant outreach program; that staff will continue to evaluate these options and look at implementing a plan that maintains the same level of service and is the most cost effective; and recommending that this report be received for information; and
- (2) (November 21, 2002) from the City Clerk, reporting, as requested by the Administration Committee on October 8, 2002, on the cost and feasibility of conducting a tenant information program as part of the 2003 Municipal Election; advising that there are no funds in the City Clerk's proposed 2003 election budget to cover the costs of a tenant information program as part of the 2003 Municipal Election; that the estimated costs of the options outlined in this report range from \$26,440 to \$82,245; that should Council wish the City Clerk to implement such a program, the necessary funds and staffing resources for the selected program would need to be provided to the 2003 election budget; and recommending that this report be received for information.

On motion by Councillor Miller, the Administration Committee deferred consideration of the foregoing reports until its next meeting scheduled to be held on January 10, 2003.

(City Clerk – December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 19(c) – Report No. 1)

**11.4 Use of Communications Services and
Resources During an Election Year.**

The Administration Committee had before it a report (October 17, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, recommending that:

- (1) Members of Council may not use the services of any staff in the City of Toronto to assist in any communication activity related to the preparation or distribution of campaign related materials or events;

- (2) no photographic or video materials created by City staff may be used in any campaign materials; and
- (3) consistent with the recommendations adopted by the Administration Committee in the report entitled, *Use of Corporate Resources for Election Purposes Especially during a Municipal Election Year*, commencing August 1 and ending December 31st in a municipal election year:
 - (a) Councillors will not distribute media releases using the City of Toronto media relations or departmental communications networks or distribution systems unless such a release is considered to be part of a response to a City emergency.;
 - (b) announcements concerning City of Toronto events where Councillors or the Mayor will be present will not contain the name of the Councillor or Mayor;
 - (c) no advertising paid for by the City of Toronto will contain the name of a Councillor or the Mayor. Advertising during an emergency may contain such information if required;
 - (d) the City logo will not be used in any campaign related materials; and
 - (e) the City of Toronto media clippings package will not include items related to municipal election campaigns.

Councillor Howard Moscoe, Eglinton-Lawrence, appeared before the Administration Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.

On motion by Councillor Sutherland, on behalf of Councillor Moscoe, the Administration Committee recommended to Council the adoption of the foregoing report (October 17, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services subject to amending Recommendation No. (3) (e) to read as follows:

“(3)(e) the City of Toronto media clippings package will be made available to the general public by providing copies for viewing at the central library and at the counter of all civic centres.”

so that the Recommendations contained in the aforementioned report now reads as follows:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) Members of Council may not use the services of any staff in the City of Toronto to assist in any communication activity related to the preparation or distribution of campaign related materials or events;
- (2) no photographic or video materials created by City staff may be used in any campaign materials; and
- (3) consistent with the recommendations adopted by the Administration Committee in the report entitled, *Use of Corporate Resources for Election Purposes Especially during a Municipal Election Year*, commencing August 1 and ending December 31st in a municipal election year:
 - (a) Councillors will not distribute media releases using the City of Toronto media relations or departmental communications networks or distribution systems unless such a release is considered to be part of a response to a City emergency;
 - (b) announcements concerning City of Toronto events where Councillors or the Mayor will be present will not contain the name of the Councillor or Mayor;
 - (c) no advertising paid for by the City of Toronto will contain the name of a Councillor or the Mayor. Advertising during an emergency may contain such information if required;
 - (d) the City logo will not be used in any campaign related materials; and

- (e) the City of Toronto media clippings package will be made available to the general public by providing copies for viewing at the central library and at the counter of all civic centres.”

The following motion was voted on and lost:

Moved by Councillor Sutherland, on behalf of Councillor Moscoe:

“That the Administration Committee recommend to Council that:

- (1) no photographic or video materials may be created by City staff for use in any campaign materials;
- (2) consistent with the recommendations adopted by the Administration Committee in the report entitled, *Use of Corporate Resources for Election Purposes Especially during a Municipal Election Year*, commencing September 1 and ending December 31st in a municipal election year: **(Lost on a tie vote)**
 - (a) Councillors will not distribute media releases using the City of Toronto media relations or departmental communications networks or distribution systems unless such a release is considered to be consistent with their duties;
 - (b) deletion of this recommendation;
 - (c) no advertising paid for by the City of Toronto will contain the name of a Councillor or the Mayor unless consistent with their duties as an elected official; and
 - (d) the City of Toronto media clippings package will be made available to the general public by providing copies for viewing at the central library and at the counter of all civic centres.

(Clause No. 1 – Report No. 1)

**11.5 Use of Corporate Resources for Election Purposes
Especially During a Municipal Election Year.**

The Administration Committee had before it the following communication and reports:

- (1) (December 2, 2002) from the City Clerk, advising that City Council City Council, at its regular meeting held on November 26, 27 and 28, 2002, re-opened Clause No. 2 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, headed “Use of Corporate Resources for Election Purposes Especially during a Municipal Election Year”, for further consideration, and adopted the balance of the following Motion, without amendment:

Moved by: Councillor Moscoe

Seconded by: Councillor Bussin

“**WHEREAS** City Council at its meeting held October 29, 30 and 31, 2002, adopted, as amended, Administration Committee Report No. 13, Clause No. 2, headed ‘Use of Corporate Resources for Election Purposes Especially during a Municipal Election Year’; and

WHEREAS such Clause established severe limitations on Councillors, effective August 1st of an election year; and

WHEREAS during the previous election these restrictions came into effect October 13th, a full two and a half months later; and

WHEREAS these restrictions severely impact on a Councillor’s ability to fulfill the functions expected of them from the electorate they represent; and

WHEREAS the policy attempts to nullify incumbency;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in accordance with §27-49 of Chapter 27 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code, Administration Committee Report No. 13, Clause No. 2, headed ‘Use of Corporate Resources for Election Purposes Especially during a Municipal Election Year’, be re-opened for further consideration;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT this matter be referred back to the Administration Committee;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT Members of Council be invited to recommend changes to this policy.”

and further advising that in so doing, Council referred Clause No. 2 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee headed "Use of Corporate Resources for Election Purposes Especially during a Municipal Election Year", back to the Administration Committee and invited Members of Council to recommend changes to this policy;

- (2) (November 21, 2002) from the City Clerk, responding to a request from City Council to report to the Administration Committee on a process for allowing Members of Council to communicate with their constituents in the event emergency situations arise between August 1, 2002, and Election Day; advising that there are no financial implications arising from this report; that there are five options by which Members of Council can ensure emergency issues or events are brought to their constituent's attention; and recommending that this report be received for information; and
- (3) (December 9, 2002) from the City Clerk and the City Solicitor, providing further information to the Committee as part of its reconsideration of Clause No. 2 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, entitled "Use of Corporate Resources for Election Purposes Especially During a Municipal Election Year"; advising that there are no financial implications involved in the adoption of this report; that however, should an individual launch a legal challenge, claiming that the City has contributed to a candidate's campaign by allowing the continued use of a Member's global office budget for communications purposes during the election period, the offence provisions of the *Municipal Elections Act, 1996* provide for a fine of up to \$5,000 for a Member and up to \$25,000 for the City with respect to each conviction; that there would also be costs of defending against any actions; and recommending that the recommendations as contained in Clause No. 2 of Report No. 13 of the Administration Committee be re-adopted.

Councillor Howard Moscoe, Eglinton-Lawrence, appeared before the Administration Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.

On motion by Councillor Soknacki, the Administration Committee recommended to Council the adoption of the report (September 20, 2002) from the City Clerk, embodied in Clause No. 2 of Report No. 13 of The Administration Committee, subject to amending Recommendation No. (7) to read as follows:

"(7)(b) profile (name or photograph), or reference the fact, in any material paid by City funds, that an individual is registered as a candidate in any election;"

The following motion was voted on and lost:

Moved by Councillor Sutherland:

“That the Administration Committee recommend to Council the adoption of the foregoing report (September 20, 2002) from the City Clerk subject to deleting Recommendation No. (5) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“(5) Members of Council be permitted to print and distribute flyers using City funds up to and including September 25, 2003, the third day after the last meeting of Council, if the flyer:

- (a) relates to a single issue specific to the individual Member’s existing City ward, within the street or neighbourhood;
- (b) does not contain any photograph of the Member, save and except if it is now part, and has been part of the Member’s letterhead, and also, save and except if the flyer has been printed prior to the adoption of this recommendation;
- (c) is not election-related;
- (d) is confined to no more than one (1) page in length and no larger than 8½ x 14 double sided; and
- (e) is distributed within the individual Member’s existing City ward only.”

(Clause No. 2 – Report No. 1)

11.6 Number of Voters in Federal, Provincial and Municipal Elections.

The Administration Committee had before it a report (November 12, 2002) from the City Clerk, reporting on the number of voters in Federal, Provincial and Municipal elections; advising that there are no financial implications resulting from this report; that traditionally voter turnout has been expressed by percentages; that the federal election

attracted the highest number of voters in 8 of the 22 ridings with the provincial election having the highest number in the remaining 14 ridings; and recommending that this report be received for information.

On motion by Councillor Ashton, the Administration Committee received the foregoing report.

(Clause No. 19(d) – Report No. 1)

11.7 Policy on Political Activities for Grant Recipients.

The Administration Committee had before it a communication (November 18, 2002) from the City Clerk, Grants Sub-Committee, advising that the Grants Sub-Committee at its meeting held on November 18, 2002 had before it the following:

- (I) (November 5, 2002) report, from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, recommending that:
 - (1) the Policy on Political Activities, Appendix A, be approved and applied to all City grant programs, and
 - (2) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto; and
- (II) (April 26, 2002) communication, from the City Clerk, forwarding Clause No. 2 contained in Report No. 3 of The Administration Committee, headed “Policy Statement and Guidelines for Political Activities of City Grant Recipients”, which was adopted, as amended, by the Council of the City of Toronto at its meeting held on April 16, 17 and 18, 2002; and advising that Council directed that the request for a policy statement and guidelines be referred to the Grants Sub-Committee for inclusion in its current review of the City of Toronto Grants Policy, being reported out in mid-2002, and that such policy and guidelines be developed in consultation with stakeholders;

and advising that the Grants Sub-Committee directed that a copy of the aforementioned report be forwarded to the Administration Committee, for information purposes.

On motion by Councillor Soknacki, the Administration Committee recommended to the Policy and Finance Committee and Council:

- (1) the adoption of the Recommendations of the Grants Sub-Committee embodied in the foregoing communication (November 18, 2002) from the City

Clerk, subject to amending the last paragraph in Appendix "A", entitled "Policy on Political Activities", appended to the report (November 5, 2002) from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, by deleting the following words "take place in the context of an election campaign, or", so that the paragraph now reads as follows:

"However, none of the above activities may be carried out in a manner, which may reasonably be construed as supporting a particular candidate, elected official or particular party."; and

- (2) that the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services be requested to submit a report to the Administration Committee within a year on the impact of this policy, having first consulted with stakeholders.

(Policy and Finance Committee – December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 19(e) – Report No. 1)

**11.8 Re-Establishment of Works
Best Practices Work Group.**

The Administration Committee had before it a communication (October 22, 2002) from the City Clerk, advising that The Personnel Sub-Committee at its meeting held on October 22, 2002:

- (1) forwarded the communication (June 25, 2002) from the City Clerk, Works Committee, respecting the re-establishment of the Works Best Practices Program Work Group, to the Administration Committee for information; and
- (2) requested the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services to submit a report to the Administration Committee for its meeting scheduled to be held on November 5, 2002, such report to include:
 - (a) the concerns raised regarding Items 3, 4 and 9 embodied in the Terms of Reference for the Works Best Practices Program Work Group;

- (b) a review of the Mandate of the Works Best Practices Program Work Group to explicitly address the effectiveness of the Work Group and a response to staff transitional issues; and
- (c) a review of the outstanding issues from March 1999 and December 1999 addressed by CUPE Local 416, with respect to redeployment, training and apprenticeship programs for inclusion as issues in the Mandate.

The Administration Committee also had before it a report (December 11, 2002) from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, reporting on issues raised by the Personnel Sub-Committee on October 22, 2002, pertaining to the Re-establishment of the Works Best Practices Work Group.

On motion by Councillor Sutherland, the Administration Committee:

- (1) recommended to Council the adoption of the Terms of Reference for the Works Best Practices Program Work Group appended to the report (June 17, 2002) from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, noting that the Works Committee on June 25, 2002, appointed Councillor Frank DiGiorgio as its representative on the Works Best Practices Work Group; and
- (2) received the report (December 11, 2002) from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services.

(Clause No. 7 – Report No. 1)

11.9 Tax Adjustment Municipal Act Section 442 and 443.

The Administration Committee had before it the following communications and report:

- (1) (November 7, 2002) from the City Clerk, advising that Council on October 29, 30 and 31, 2002, adopted, as amended, Clause 31 of Report No. 13 of the Administration Committee, headed “Tax Adjustment – Municipal Act Section 442 and 443”; and amended the Clause by striking out and referring Recommendation No. (2) of the Administration Committee, together with the following motion by Councillor Holyday, back to the Administration Committee for further consideration:

Moved by Councillor Holyday:

“**WHEREAS** the Administration Committee at its meeting held on October 8, 2002, considered 212 appeal applications for the reduction and/or cancellation of property taxes pursuant to the provisions of section 442 and 443 of the Municipal Act; and

WHEREAS 90 of these 212 appeal applications relate to section 442(1)(c) of the Municipal Act; and

WHEREAS the Administration Committee approved tax reductions for 89 of the 90 applications before it, based on staff’s recommendations, calculated on an assessment value pertaining to the damaged area of the building (as determined by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation) and the appropriate tax rates as levied by City Council, being the methodology applied to all similar section 442 applications since 1998 (and consistently applied by the six former municipalities for many years prior to amalgamation), and being the method employed by municipalities across the Province of Ontario; and

WHEREAS the Administration Committee approved a reduction for the property located at 206 Shaughnessy Boulevard (regarding Application No. 20020104) based on a different formula that grants a full cancellation in taxes (for both the building and the land value) for the period of time that the property was not being lived in; and

WHEREAS the use of the term ‘building’ in section 442(1)(c) of the Municipal Act suggests that only the ‘building’ portion of the taxes should be considered for a tax reduction; and

WHEREAS the motion adopted by Administration Committee at its meeting held on October 8, 2002, with respect to 206 Shaughnessy Boulevard, is unfair to the 3,000 taxpayers that have applied for and been granted tax reductions under section 442(1)(c) of the Municipal Act since 1998 based on the methodology consistently employed by City staff and other municipalities across the province; and

WHEREAS granting a tax reduction for 206 Shaughnessy Boulevard based on a different formula sets a precedent for the calculation of future tax reductions on a go forward basis, and if Council continued to use this alternate methodology, it is estimated that an additional \$2.5 million per year would be required to cover the City’s portion of annual tax reductions resulting from section 442(1)(c) tax appeals;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT a tax reduction of \$300.75, as recommended by the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer in his report dated September 23, 2002, be approved for the property located at 206 Shaughnessy Boulevard (regarding Application No. 20020104), and that Recommendation No. (2) of the Administration Committee be deleted; and

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer be requested to submit a report to the Administration Committee, on the methodology used by staff since 1998 (and by the six former area municipalities prior to 1998) to calculate tax reductions as a result of a section 442(1)(c) tax appeal.”

Recommendation No. (2) of the Administration Committee:

“(2) that the taxes for the property located at 206 Shaughnessy Boulevard (Appeal No. 20020104 – Tax Year 2002 – Roll Number 19 08 11-2-570-02200) be reduced in the amount of \$1,214.00; and that the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer be requested to review the insurance claim of the appellant.”;

- (2) (December 5, 2002) from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, recommending that:
- (1) a tax reduction of \$300.75 (excluding any adjustment for phase-in and capping) for the period May 25, 2002 to December 31, 2002 be approved for the property located at 206 Shaughnessy Boulevard (re: Section 442 Application No. 20020104, Roll No. 19 08 11-2-570-02200); and
 - (2) the staff procedures for processing and calculating recommendations for section 442 and 443 tax appeal applications, as outlined in Appendices A and B of this report, be approved; and
- (3) (December 1, 2002) from Mr. Timothy R. Singh, writing to restate his position that the municipality’s recommendation to adjust the tax levy by \$300.75 pertaining to 206 Shaughnessy Boulevard is inequitable; and requesting the Administration Committee to consider his request for a more equitable tax adjustment as the Committee recommended at its meeting held on October 8, 2002.

Mr. Timothy Singh appeared before the Administration Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.

The Administration Committee:

- (1) recommended to Council the adoption of the following Recommendation No. (1) embodied in the report (December 5, 2002) from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer:

“(1) a tax reduction of \$300.75 (excluding any adjustment for phase-in and capping) for the period May 25, 2002 to December 31, 2002, be approved for the property located at 206 Shaughnessy Boulevard (re: Section 442 Application No. 20020104, Roll No. 19 08 11-2-570-02200);”;
- (2) deferred consideration of the following Recommendation No. (2) embodied in the report (December 5, 2002) from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, and the appeal respecting 206 Shaughnessy Boulevard, until its meeting scheduled to be held on March 25, 2003:

“(2) the staff procedures for processing and calculating recommendations for section 442 and 443 tax appeal applications, as outlined in Appendices A and B of this report, be approved.”;
- (3) requested the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, in consultation with the City Solicitor, to revise the policy for owner occupied single family homes generally in accordance with the deputants request, if legally permissible, and submit a report thereon to the Administration Committee, such report to also address the impact of the insurance coverage on the tax adjustment; and
- (4) requested the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer to consider the impact of a change in policy for all classes of taxes and also provide options that would be available to the Committee pertaining thereto and report thereon to the Administration Committee.

(Administration Committee; Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer; City Solicitor; Mr. Timothy Singh; Administrator, Administration Committee – December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 5 – Report No. 1)

**11.10 Hearing - Apportionment of Taxes
Section 413 of the Municipal Act
Roll No. 1908-101-480-00110-0000
1100 Eglinton Avenue East,
Toronto (North York), Inn on the Park Hotel.**

The Administration Committee had before it the following communications and report:

- (1) (November 5, 2002) from the City Clerk, advising that The Administration Committee at its meeting held on November 5, 2002, amongst other things, deferred consideration of the communication (October 10, 2002) from the City Clerk pertaining to Apportionment of 2001 Taxes for Roll No. 1908-101-480-00110-0000, 1100 Eglinton Avenue East, Toronto (North York), Inn on the Park Hotel”, until its meeting scheduled to be held on December 12, 2002;
- (2) (December 5, 2002) from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, providing an update on the status of the apportionment application for the above referenced property and to recommend approval as per Appendix A of this report; advising that there are no financial implications resulting from this report; that all parties have been properly advised of the tax calculations arising from this apportionment application; that it is therefore recommended that the Administration Committee approve the apportionment application as per Appendix A attached; and
- (3) (December 6, 2002) from Mr. David V. Hutchison, Barrister and Solicitor, recommending that the Administration Committee not recommend approval of the 2001 apportionment of taxes pertaining to 1100 Eglinton Avenue West; and advising that the applicant FRC Properties Partnership may then exercise its right to appeal to the Assessment Review Board pursuant to Section 414 of the Municipal Act, where all issues may be appropriately considered.

On motion by Councillor Sutherland, the Administration Committee deferred consideration of the foregoing communications and report until its meeting scheduled to be held on January 10, 2003.

(Clause No. 19(f) – Report No. 1)

**11.11 Response to Incident
Outside City Hall.**

The Administration Committee had before it a report (November 13, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, reporting, as requested by the Administration Committee on November 5, 2002, respecting security improvements to the exterior of Toronto City Hall; and recommending that:

- (1) Security staff re-distribute resources to obtain a better balance between patrolling inside and outside City Hall;
- (2) the 2002 Capital Emergency funds be utilized to install additional lighting, security cameras and intercoms outside Toronto City Hall in an amount not to exceed \$195,000.00; and
- (3) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

On motion by Councillor Ashton, the Administration Committee recommended to Council the adoption of the foregoing report (November 13, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services.

(Clause No. 18 – Report No. 1)

**11.12 Expected Use of Force for Security Officers
at Toronto City Hall.**

The Administration Committee had before it a report (November 2, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, reporting, as requested by the Administration Committee on October 8, 2002, on the expected “use of force” options for the Security Officers at Toronto City Hall if granted Special Constable status; advising that there are no funding implications contained in this status report; that this report advises that when Security Officers at City Hall are granted Special Constable status there are no plans to upgrade or change “use of force” options currently available to Security Officers at Toronto City Hall; and recommending that this report be received for information only.

On motion by Councillor Ashton, the Administration Committee:

- (1) received the foregoing report; and

- (2) requested the Commissioner of Corporate Services to report annually to the Administration Committee, on any incidents and “use of force”, if any.

(Commissioner of Corporate Services – December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 19(g) – Report No. 1)

11.13 Discussions With the Province on the Future of the ICON Computer System.

The Administration Committee had before it a report (November 19, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, providing information requested by the Administration Committee on September 10, 2002, on what plans the Province has respecting the future of the ICON computer system which administers the Provincial Offences Act payment, court scheduling and administration activities; advising that there are no financial implications associated with this report; that Provincial staff have indicated that in light of the recently announced change in direction made by the Provincial government respecting the Integrated Justice Project, the future plans respecting ICON are uncertain at this time; that staff from Court Services and the Information and Technology Divisions are working together to develop a project strategy and migration plan that will allow the City to manage its own information in order that services can be provided more efficiently and effectively; and recommending that this report be received for information.

On motion by Councillor Soknacki, the Administration Committee received the foregoing report.

(Clause No. 19(h) – Report No. 1)

**11.14 Declaration of Surplus Property
North Side of Bergamot Avenue,
West of Islington Avenue
(Ward 2 – Etobicoke North).**

The Administration Committee had before it the following reports and communication:

- (I) joint report (October 21, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, recommending that:

- (1) the Property be declared surplus to the City's requirements, with the intended method of disposal to be by way of a long-term lease to Young Women's Christian Association of Metropolitan Toronto ("YWCA"), or to another person, corporation or entity associated with and controlled by it and acceptable to the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services to facilitate the development and provision of affordable rental housing;
 - (2) all steps necessary to comply with Chapter 213 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code, be taken;
 - (3) authority be granted to the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, to negotiate the long-term lease described in Recommendation No. (1) and any mortgages/charges or other agreements, deemed appropriate by the Commissioner and the City Solicitor to facilitate the development and provision of affordable rental housing on the Property, generally in accordance with the terms and provisions outlined in this report and to protect the City's interests, all such terms and conditions as are satisfactory to the Commissioner, in his discretion, and in form acceptable to the City Solicitor, and to report back on the results of such negotiations; and
 - (4) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto;
- (II) report (December 9, 2002) from the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services reporting on the results of a community meeting held on December 5, 2002, as directed by the Administration Committee at its meeting of November 5, 2002, respecting the Bergamot Avenue West Property; and recommending that:
- (1) the recommendations contained in the report dated October 21, 2002, and entitled "Declaration of Surplus - North Side of Bergamot Avenue, West of Islington Avenue" be adopted, which was before the Administration Committee on November 5, 2002; and
 - (2) a community working group be formed to work with the YWCA and city staff in relation to the proposed affordable housing and childcare centre initiative on the Bergamot Avenue property; and
 - (3) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto; and

(III) communications from the following pertaining to the proposed development:

- (1) (December 9, 2002) from Mr. Dave Ellins, writing in opposition to the proposal to use the property located on the North Side of Bergamot Avenue West of Islington Avenue for affordable housing;
- (2) (December 10, 2002) from Mr. and Mrs. Shirley and Aubrey Gott, writing in opposition to the proposal to use the property located on the North Side of Bergamot Avenue West of Islington Avenue for affordable housing.
- (3) (December 8, 2002) from Mr. Dave Ellins, advising of his opposition regarding the proposed development;
- (4) (December 10, 2002) from Mr. and Mrs. Aubrey Gott, and on behalf of two other residents in this area, advising of their opposition regarding the proposed development;
- (5) (Undated) from Mrs. Constance Peters and Mrs. E. Dolman, advising of their opposition regarding the proposed development;
- (6) (December 9, 2002) from Mr. and Mrs. R. Richards, advising of their opposition regarding the proposed development;
- (7) (December 11, 2002) from Mr. Oliver, advising of his support regarding the proposed development;
- (8) (December 10, 2002) from Mr. Sam Wall, advising of his opposition regarding the proposed development;
- (9) (Undated) from D. Milligan, in opposition to the proposed development;
- (10) (December 2, 2002) from Mr. and Mrs. M. Ciupa, in opposition to the proposed development;
- (11) (December 9, 2002) from Anto Perisa, in opposition to the proposed development;
- (12) (December 9, 2002) from Mr. and Mrs. M. Kupchanko, in opposition to the proposed development;
- (13) (December 11, 2002) from Mrs. Hicks, in opposition to the proposed development;
- (14) (December 9, 2002) from Mr. and Mrs. T. Graham, in opposition to the proposed development;

Administration Committee Minutes
Tuesday, December 12, 2002

- (15) (December 11, 2002) from Mr. and Mrs. D. Capogna, in opposition to the proposed development;
- (16) (December 11, 2002) from Ms. Lynne Gott and Mr. Brian Spurr, in opposition to the proposed development;
- (17) (December 11, 2002) from Mr. Ed Gabryl, in opposition to the proposed development;
- (18) (December 11, 2002) from Ms. Louise Bird, in opposition to the proposed development;
- (19) (December 11, 2002) from Ms. Anne Punnett, in opposition to the proposed development;
- (20) (December 12, 2002) from Ms. Carol Reilly and Ms. Deirdre Johnston, in opposition to the proposed development;
- (21) (December 12, 2002) from Ms. Rose Damico, in opposition to the proposed development;
- (22) (December 10, 2002) from Mr. Lloyd Hillier, in opposition to the proposed development and providing comments thereon; and
- (23) a number of communications and a petition with approximately 361 signatures, in opposition to the proposed development, submitted by Councillor Rob Ford, Etobicoke North.

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

- Ms. Judy Goldie;
- Ms. Heather McGregor, and filed a written submission with respect thereto;
- Ms. Ann Sado;
- Ms. Sarah Hayden;
- Mr. John Cartwright, Toronto and York Region Labour Council.
- Mr. Martin Schulmeister;
- Ms. Leila Monib, Rexdale Community Health Centre;

Administration Committee Minutes
Tuesday, December 12, 2002

- Mr. Tony Kastelic, and filed a written submission with respect thereto;
- Mr. Malcolm Frazer, on behalf of Rexdale Presbyterian Senior Citizens Organization, and filed a document entitled “Proposal Submission for the Development of Affordable Rental Housing, City of Toronto, RFP No. 9155-02-7275”;
- Mr. Bill Rodrigues, Development Consultant;
- Mr. Matkin;
- Ms. Ella Jackson, representing Knights of Columbus; Pelletier Home and Youth; and Learning Enrichment Foundation;
- Mr. Bob Barnett, Architect;
- Mr. Drago Konjevic;
- Mr. Bruce Melanson; and
- Mr. K. Birkic.

The Administration Committee recommended to Council:

- (1) the adoption of the foregoing joint report (October 21, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services subject to:
 - (I) amending Recommendation No. (1) to read as follows:
 - “(1) the property be declared surplus to the City’s requirements with the intended method of disposal to be by way of long term lease for affordable housing, to the successful proponent as determined by Council”; and
 - (II) amending Recommendation No. (3) by deleting the following words:

“generally in accordance with the terms and provisions outlined in this report”; **(Motion by Councillor Ashton, which carried on the following recorded vote:**

FOR: Ashton; Ford; Holyday; Miller; Nunziata; Soknacki; and Sutherland

AGAINST: Nil)

so that the Recommendations embodied in the aforementioned report now reads as follows:

“It is recommended that:

- (1) the property be declared surplus to the City’s requirements with the intended method of disposal to be by way of long term lease for affordable housing, to the successful proponent as determined by Council”; and
- (2) all steps necessary to comply with Chapter 213 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code, be taken;
- (3) authority be granted to the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, to negotiate the long-term lease described in Recommendation No. (1) and any mortgages/charges or other agreements, deemed appropriate by the Commissioner and the City Solicitor to facilitate the development and provision of affordable rental housing on the Property, and to protect the City’s interests, all such terms and conditions as are satisfactory to the Commissioner, in his discretion, and in form acceptable to the City Solicitor, and to report back on the results of such negotiations; and
- (4) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.”

The following motions were ruled out of order or voted on and lost:

Moved by Councillor Ford:

“That the Administration Committee recommend to Council the adoption of the foregoing joint report (October 21, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services subject to amending Recommendation No. (1) to read as follows:

“(1) the Property be declared surplus to the City’s requirements, with the intended method of disposal to be by way of a long-term lease to Rexdale Seniors Corporation for seniors and families housing acceptable to the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services.” **(Ruled Out of Order having regard that the issue of the successful proponent has already been considered and determined by the Community Services Committee.)**

Moved by Councillor Ford:

“That the Administration Committee recommend to Council:

- (1) that the foregoing joint report (October 21, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services, be received; and
- (2) that the property on the north side of Bergamot Avenue, west of Islington Avenue, not be declared surplus. **(Lost on the following recorded vote:**

FOR: Ford, Holyday

**AGAINST: Ashton, Miller, Nunziata, Soknacki,
Sutherland.)**

(Clause No. 9 – Report No. 1)

**11.15 Declaration as Surplus
75 Lee Avenue
(Ward 32 – Beaches-East York).**

The Administration Committee had before it a report (November 20, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, recommending that:

- (1) property municipally known as 75 Lee Avenue, being Part of Block A on Plan 254E, be declared surplus to the City’s requirements and be listed for sale on

the open market, and all steps necessary to comply with Chapter 213 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code be taken; and

- (2) appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

On motion by Councillor Miller, the Administration Committee recommended to Council the adoption of the foregoing report (November 20, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services.

(Clause No. 10 – Report No. 1)

**11.16 Declaration as Surplus
Two Parcels of Vacant Land,
Rear of Nos. 53 and 57 Thicket Road
(Ward 3 - Etobicoke Centre).**

The Administration Committee had before it a report (November 21, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, recommending that:

- (1) two (2) parcels of vacant land, located at the rear of Nos. 53 and 57 Thicket Road respectively, be declared surplus to the City's requirements, and the Commissioner of Corporate Services be authorized to invite offers to purchase from the abutting property owners as outlined in the body of this report, and all steps necessary to comply with Chapter 213 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code be taken; and
- (2) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

On motion by Councillor Miller, the Administration Committee recommended to Council the adoption of the foregoing report (November 21, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services.

(Clause No. 11 – Report No. 1)

**11.17 Declaration as Surplus
Parcel of Vacant Land
Located on the West Side of Byng,
Between Nos. 32 and 36 Byng Avenue
(Ward 35 - Scarborough Southwest).**

The Administration Committee had before it a report (November 21, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, recommending that:

- (1) the parcel of vacant land located on the west side of Byng Avenue, between Nos. 32 and 36 Byng Avenue, described as Lot 49 on Registered Plan 2238, be declared surplus to the City's requirements and the property be listed for sale on the open market, and all steps necessary to comply with Chapter 213 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code be taken; and
- (2) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

On motion by Councillor Soknacki, the Administration Committee withdrew the foregoing report at the request of the Commissioner of Corporate Services who advised the Committee that this matter will be reported back to the Administration Committee in January 2003.

(Clause No. 19(i) – Report No. 1)

**11.18 Declaration as Surplus
Parcel of Vacant Land
at the Rear of 209 Forest Hill Road
(Ward 22 - St. Paul's).**

The Administration Committee had before it a report (November 20, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, recommending that:

- (1) the parcel of vacant land located at the rear of 209 Forest Hill Road, described as Part of Block C on Plan 645E, and shown as Part 1 on Sketch No. PS-2002-076, be declared surplus to the City's requirements and the Commissioner of Corporate Services be authorized to invite an offer to purchase from the abutting property owner at 209 Forest Hill Road, subject to the retention of a permanent easement over entire site, and all steps necessary to comply with Chapter 213 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code be taken;

- (2) City Council approve, as the approving authority under the provisions of the *Expropriations Act*, the disposal of the site without giving the original owners from whom the lands were expropriated the first chance to repurchase the lands; and
- (3) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

On motion by Councillor Nunziata, the Administration Committee recommended to Council the adoption of the foregoing report (November 20, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services.

(Clause No. 12 – Report No. 1)

11.19 Corporate Occupational Health and Safety Policy and Program.

The Administration Committee had before it a communication (November 19, 2002) from the City Clerk, Personnel Sub-Committee, advising that the Personnel Sub-Committee on November 19, 2002, recommended to the Administration Committee the adoption of the joint report (October 23, 2002) from the Chief Administrative Officer and the Commissioner of Corporate Services, entitled “Corporate Occupational Health and Safety Policy and Program”, wherein it is recommended that the updated Corporate Occupational Health and Safety Policy be endorsed by City Council.

On motion by Councillor Miller, the Administration Committee recommended to Council the adoption of the recommendation of the Personnel Sub-Committee embodied in the foregoing communication (November 19, 2002) from the City Clerk, Personnel Sub-Committee.

(Clause No. 6 – Report No. 1)

11.20 Work Force Reduction Costs in 2002.

The Administration Committee had before it a communication (November 19, 2002) from the City Clerk, Personnel Sub-Committee, advising that the Personnel Sub-Committee on November 19, 2002, recommended to the Administration Committee the adoption of the joint report (November 13, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer wherein it is recommended that:

Administration Committee Minutes
Tuesday, December 12, 2002

- (1) the Reserve Fund preliminary estimate be revised to reflect a reduction in the estimate for 2002 staff exits from \$5,251,000 to \$3,574,676.00. This amount represents the actual and revised anticipated charges to the Reserve for 2002;
- (2) the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer and the Commissioner of Corporate Services report to the Personnel Sub-Committee the final charges to the Reserve Fund once the actual 2002 workforce reduction costs have been finalized in early 2003; and
- (3) the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer and the Commissioner of Corporate Services report to the Personnel Sub-Committee and Budget Advisory Committee on the workforce reduction reserve funds required for the year 2003 once the budget process for 2003 has been finalized.

On motion by Councillor Miller, the Administration Committee recommended to the Policy and Finance Committee and Council the adoption of the recommendation of the Personnel Sub-Committee embodied in the foregoing communication.

(Policy and Finance Committee – December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 19(j) – Report No. 1)

11.21 Performance Pay: Increment Progression Rate – Non-Union.

The Administration Committee had before it the following communication and report:

- (1) (November 19, 2002) from the City Clerk, Personnel Sub-Committee, advising that The Personnel Sub-Committee on November 19, 2002:
 - (A) recommended to the Administration Committee:
 - (1) the adoption of the report (November 15, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services respecting Performance Pay, Increment Progression Rate – Non-union; and
 - (2) that the Commissioner of Corporate Services be requested, in one years' time after the implementation of the performance pay program, to submit a report back to the Personnel Sub-Committee, providing a further review on this program; and

- (B) requested the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer to submit a report directly to the Administration Committee for its meeting scheduled to be held on December 12, 2002, on the funding of the performance pay program; and
- (2) (December 9, 2002) from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, reporting, as requested by the Personnel Sub-Committee on November 19, 2002, on the funding of the Performance Pay Program; advising that as indicated in the November 15, report from the Commissioner of Corporate Services to the Personnel Sub-Committee, performance pay adjustments will continue to be budgeted through the normal operating budget process; that part year funding in 2003 will be absorbed within the 2003 program salary budgets; and recommending that this report be received for information.

Mr. Richard Majkot, Executive Director, COTAPSAI, appeared before the Administration Committee in connection with the foregoing matter and filed a written submission with respect thereto.

The Administration Committee:

(I) recommended to Council:

- (1) the adoption of the recommendations of the Personnel Sub-Committee embodied in the communication (November 19, 2002) from the City Clerk; and **(Motion by Councillor Soknacki)**
- (2) that since performance pay is intended to reward exceptional performance, staff be requested to establish a maximum number or percentage of qualifying employees, and include this information in the first status report on performance pay; **(Motion by Councillor Soknacki which carried on the following recorded vote:**

FOR: Holyday; Miller; Soknacki

AGAINST: Ford; Sutherland)

(II) received the report (December 9, 2002) from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer; **(Motion by Councillor Soknacki)** and

(III) referred the communication (Undated) from Mr. Richard Majkot, Executive Director, COTAPSAI (City of Toronto Administrative, Professional, Supervisory Association, Incorporated) to the Commissioner of Corporate Services for consideration in the implementation of this program. **(Motion by Councillor Miller which carried on the following recorded vote:**

**FOR: Holyday; Miller; Soknacki;
Sutherland.**

AGAINST: Ford)

The following motion **lost on the following recorded vote:**

FOR: Sutherland

AGAINST: Holyday; Ford; Miller; Soknacki)

Moved by Councillor Sutherland:

“That the Administration Committee recommend to Council:

- (1) that the report be adopted in principle; and
- (2) that staff be requested to conduct a pilot study respecting the implementation of the performance pay increment progression rate in one department and submit a report thereon to the Administration Committee, through the Personnel Sub-Committee.

(Clause No. 4 – Report No. 1)

11.22 Securing Additional Parking Spaces at 630 and 650 Mount Pleasant Road (Ward 22 - St. Paul's).

The Administration Committee had before it a report (November 27, 2002) from the President, Toronto Parking Authority, recommending that:

- (1) City Council approve the expansion of the public underground parking garage in the proposed development at 630 and 650 Mount Pleasant Road;

- (2) the cost of the expansion of the public underground parking garage be deducted from the net closing proceeds on the sale of the development rights; and
- (3) the appropriate City officials be authorized to take the actions necessary to give effect thereto.

On motion by Councillor Miller, the Administration Committee recommended to Council the adoption of the foregoing report (November 27, 2002) from the President, Toronto Parking Authority.

(Clause No. 14 – Report No. 1)

**11.23 Staff Response to Commission Inquiry,
Review of All Business Computing Licenses.**

The Administration Committee had before it a report (October 29, 2002) from the General Secretary, Toronto Transit Commission, advising that the Toronto Transit Commission at its meeting on Wednesday, October 23, 2002, had before it a memorandum dated October 23, 2002 from Mr. Richard C. Ducharme, Chief General Manager, Toronto Transit Commission entitled, “Staff Response to Commission Inquiry - Review of All Business Computing Licenses”, that the Commission received the memorandum and requested that a copy be forwarded to the City Administration Committee for information.

On motion by Councillor Soknacki, the Administration Committee received the foregoing report.

(General Secretary, Toronto Transit Commission –
December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 19(k) – Report No. 1)

11.24 External Human Rights Investigation.

The Administration Committee had before it the following confidential reports:

- (1) (November 1, 2002) from the Executive Director of Human Resources, respecting an External Human Rights Investigation, such report to be considered in-camera having regard that the subject matter relates to personal matters about identifiable individuals, including municipal or local board employees; and

- (2) (December 6, 2002) from the Executive Director of Human Resources, providing additional information as requested by the Administration Committee at its meeting on November 5, 2002, pertaining to an External Human Rights Investigation, such information to be considered in-camera having regard that the subject relates to personal matters about identifiable individuals, including municipal or local board employees.

Ms. Barbara Humphreys, Consultant, appeared before the Administration Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.

Councillor Mammoliti also appeared before the Administration Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.

On motion by Councillor Sutherland, the Administration Committee submitted to Council the confidential communication (December 12, 2002) from the City Clerk pertaining to an External Human Rights Investigation which was forwarded to Members of Council under confidential cover; and recommends that in accordance with the Municipal Act, discussions pertaining thereto be held in-camera having that the subject matter relates to personal information for the purposes of the *Municipal of Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (MFIPPA).

(City Council; Deputy Mayor Case Ootes; Councillor George Mammoliti; Commissioner of Corporate Services; Executive Director of Human Resources; Councillor Rob Ford – December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 16 – Report No. 1)

11.25 Legal Proceedings to Recover Rental Arrears from Rhineland Heating Ltd. C.O.B. as West End Heating.

The Administration Committee had before it a confidential report (November 27, 2002) from the City Solicitor, respecting legal proceedings to recover rental arrears from Rhineland Heating Ltd. C.O.B. as West End Heating, such report to be considered in-camera having regard that the subject relates to litigation or potential litigation matters.

On motion by Councillor Sutherland, the Administration Committee recommended to Council the adoption of the confidential report (November 27, 2002) from the City

Solicitor, respecting Legal Proceedings to Recover Rental Arrears from Rhineland Heating Ltd., c.o.b. as West End Heating, which was forwarded to Members of Council under confidential cover; and further that in accordance with the Municipal Act, discussions pertaining thereto be held in-camera having regard that the subject matter relates to potential litigation affecting the municipality.

(Clause No. 17 – Report No. 1)

**11.26 Accounts Receivable
Largest Debtors with Tax Arrears
Greater than \$500,000.00.**

The Administration Committee had before it a report (December 5, 2002) from the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, providing information on property tax accounts with outstanding receivables of \$500,000 or more as at September 30, 2002; advising that there are no financial implications resulting from this report; that outstanding taxes receivable continue to be monitored and acted upon in a timely manner; that the largest debtor accounts greater than \$500,000 continue to be a priority for collection action, and now with the December 1, 2002 coming into force of much of the *Brownfields Statute Law Amendment Act, 2001*, the City shall also be proceeding with tax sale collection process in respect of contaminated tax arrears properties; and recommending that this report be received for information.

On motion by Councillor Ashton, the Administration Committee received the foregoing report.

(Clause No. 19(l) – Report No. 1)

**11.27 Request to Increase the Purchase Order Amount
for Additional Engineering Services to
Morrison Hershfield Ltd., Purchase Order No. 47004276
Scarborough Civic Centre Parking Garage Rehabilitation
Ward 38 – Scarborough Centre.**

The Administration Committee had before it a report (November 5, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, recommending that Purchase Order No. 47004276 be extended by \$47,125.00 to \$83,655.00 to cover the costs associated with providing additional engineering field review services between the months of March 2001 and January 2002.

On motion by Councillor Ashton, the Administration Committee approved the amendment to Purchase Order No. 47004276 outlined in the foregoing report in accordance with City of Toronto Municipal Code Subsection 71-9 B (2) of the Financial Control By-law.

(Commissioner of Corporate Services; Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer; Director, Purchasing and Materials Management – December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 19(m) – Report No. 1)

**11.28 Results of Request for Proposal 9103-02-7176
Provision of Recruitment Advertising Services.**

The Administration Committee had before it a joint report (December 5, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer, recommending that:

- (1) the City of Toronto enter into a one year contract with RecruitAd, the highest overall scoring Proponent for the provision of Recruitment Advertising products and services as described in the City's Request for Proposal, at a cost not to exceed \$600,000 for the period November 1, 2002 – October 31, 2003, with an option to renew for an additional year;
- (2) the option to renew for a second year to be exercised for the period November 1, 2003, to October 31, 2004, at a cost not to exceed \$600,000 under the same terms and conditions and is to be reviewed by the Commissioner of Corporate Services in co-operation with the Purchasing Agent, provided the first term of the contract was performed satisfactorily, to ensure it is feasible to extend the contract; and
- (3) provided that there is a favourable review, in accordance with Recommendation No. (2), the Commissioner of Corporate Services be delegated the authority to exercise the options on the terms and conditions set out above and be authorized to instruct the Purchasing Agent to process the necessary contract.

On motion by Councillor Miller, the Administration Committee recommended to Council the adoption of the foregoing joint report (December 5, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and the Chief Financial Officer and Treasurer; subject to funds being available in subsequent years.

(Clause No. 15 – Report No. 1)

11.29 Energy Management Program (EMP) for City Facilities.

The Administration Committee had before it a report (December 6, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, recommending that:

- (1) the five year Energy Management Program (EMP) for City Facilities (Attachment 1) to this report be approved;
- (2) the Energy and Waste Management Office (EWMO) within the Business and Strategic Innovation Section of the Facilities and Real Estate Division of the Corporate Services Department be recognized as having responsibility for the management of the City's energy purchases, for the implementation of the City's energy efficiency/retrofit programs and for the tracking and monitoring of energy usage in the City to support the purchasing and energy efficiency program;
- (3) the EWMO submit an annual report to Council regarding the status of the EMP; and
- (4) the appropriate City officials be authorized to take any action necessary to give effect thereto.

On motion by Councillor Soknacki, the Administration Committee deferred consideration of the foregoing report and the staff presentation until its meeting scheduled to be held on January 10, 2003.

(Commissioner of Corporate Services – December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 19(n) – Report No. 1)

11.30 West District Study – A Process Framework.

The Administration Committee had before it a report (December 6, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, updating Council on the status of the West District Study; proposing next steps to be undertaken to facilitate the development of a new West District Service Centre and disposal of certain West District lands (the "West District Project"); advising that there are no financial implications arising from the adoption of this report; and recommending that:

- (1) City Council approve in principle the concept of a new West District Service Centre that is optimally located with respect to the Bloor-Danforth Subway Line;

- (2) the Commissioner of Corporate Services, in consultation with the relevant City Departments, commence the process to develop the new West District Service Centre and the disposal of certain West District lands by exploring the possibilities of a public/private partnership as well as other more traditional transaction structures including design/build, ground leases, etc., with due consideration to public input from the citizens residing within the boundaries of the Etobicoke and Humber York Community Councils, and report back to Administration Committee in the Spring of 2003 on the feasibility of such undertakings;
- (3) the Council Reference Group-West District Study, in consultation with the Etobicoke and Humber York Community Councils, develop options and solicit public input on, among other things, the form, mass and design of the new West District Service Centre, and that this public input be duly considered by the Commissioner of Corporate Services when reporting back to the Administration Committee on the feasibility of a public/private partnership to develop the new West District Service Centre, and
- (4) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

The following Members of Council appeared before the Administration Committee in connection with the foregoing matter:

- Councillor Peter Milczyn, Etobicoke-Lakeshore; and
- Councillor Howard Moscoe, Eglinton-Lawrence.

On motion by Councillor Soknacki, the Administration Committee recommended to Council the adoption of the foregoing report (December 6, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services.

(Clause No. 3 – Report No. 1)

11.31 Donation of Community Waterplay Area at Fennimore Park (Ward 7 - York West)

The Administration Committee had before it a report (December 10, 2002) from the Commissioner of Economic Development Culture and Tourism, reporting as requested by City Council with respect to the process used in selecting P. Gabriele and Sons to construct a community waterplay and other improvements at Fennimore Park; advising that there are no financial implications resulting from the adoption of this report; and recommending that this report be received for information.

On motion by Councillor Ford, the Administration Committee:

- (1) deferred consideration of the foregoing report until its meeting scheduled to be held on January 10, 2003; and tabled the following motion for consideration at the aforementioned meeting:

Moved by Councillor Soknacki:

“That the Chief Administrative Officer be requested to report to the Administration Committee prior to April 1, 2003, on a protocol with respect to encouraging donations (including cash and services in-kind) while ensuring value, transparency and adherence to City policies and service standards.”

(Administration Committee – December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 19(o) – Report No. 1)

11.32 70 Birmingham Street - Purchase of Land for the Toronto Police Service Firearms/Defensive Tactics and Applicant Testing Facility (Ward 6 - Etobicoke Lakeshore).

The Administration Committee had before it a confidential report (December 9, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, respecting the purchase of land for the Toronto Police Service Firearms/Defensive Tactics and Applicant Testing Facility, such report to be considered in-camera having regard that the subject matter relates to the acquisition of property.

On motion by Councillor Ashton, the Administration Committee:

- (1) recommended to Council the adoption of the confidential report (December 9, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, respecting 70 Birmingham Street, Purchase of Land for the Toronto Police Service Firearms/Defensive Tactics and Applicant Testing Facility, (Ward 6 – Etobicoke Lakeshore) which was forwarded to Members of Council under confidential cover; and further that in accordance with the Municipal Act,

discussions pertaining thereto be held in-camera having regard that the subject matter relates to the acquisition of property for municipal purposes; and

- (2) requested the Commissioner of Corporate Services to submit a report to the Administration Committee on the disposal of the C.O.BICK Police College.

(Commissioner of Corporate Services – December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 13 – Report No. 1)

11.33 Toronto Olympic Plebiscite.

The Administration Committee had before it a communication (December 9, 2002) from the City Clerk, advising that City Council at its regular meeting on November 26, 27 and 28, 2002, referred the following Motion to the Administration Committee:

Moved by: Councillor Walker

Seconded by: Councillor Miller

“WHEREAS gathering public opinion via plebiscite furthers open and transparent government; and

WHEREAS the cost of a plebiscite can be minimized when conducted simultaneously with a scheduled election; and

WHEREAS Toronto has a scheduled election in November 2003; and

WHEREAS Bern, Switzerland recently held a plebiscite on public consent for its multi-million dollar bid for the 2010 Winter Olympics, the result being nearly 4 to 1 against; and

WHEREAS Bern, Switzerland had already spent considerable millions of public dollars prior to this plebiscite; and

WHEREAS the Cities of Sydney (2000) and Montreal (1976), among others, were left with billions of dollars of debt after their respective Olympics and are still struggling with this debt; and

WHEREAS there are other international events, such as a World’s Fair, that generate positive outcomes with fewer negative possibilities that may be more appropriate in Toronto; and

WHEREAS the City's infrastructure is in dire need of maintenance and upgrade, greater in scope than the funding accompanying an Olympic Games could provide; and

WHEREAS the City's official bid for the 2008 Olympics cost 128 percent more than budgeted, ballooning from \$21 million to \$46 million; and

WHEREAS taxpayers in Toronto will be directly affected by any future Olympic bid through the spending of their tax dollars; and

WHEREAS all residents in Toronto will be directly affected as a result of the hosting of an Olympic Games;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Toronto City Council commit to the holding of a City-wide plebiscite on the support for an Olympic Games bid, prior to formalizing any such bid for the 2012 Olympics;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT a plebiscite question seeking public input on this question be included on the November 2003 municipal election ballot;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the appropriate City officials be requested to take any action necessary to give effect to the foregoing, including the introduction in Council of any Bills that may be required."

On motion by Councillor Ashton, the Administration Committee deferred consideration of the foregoing communication until the meeting of the Administration Committee scheduled to be held on January 10, 2003.

(Clause No. 19(p) – Report No. 1)

11.34 Audio-Visual Linkage Between East York Civic Centre and City Hall.

The Administration Committee had before it a report (December 11, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services, recommending that:

- (1) the Administration Committee direct the Commissioner of Corporate Services to proceed with the installation of an audio-visual link between East York Civic Centre and City Hall and to report out to Council on the project at the February 4, 5, and 6, 2003 meeting;

- (2) approval be given to proceed with a sole source procurement of goods and services with Adcom Videoconferencing to install the audio-visual link between East York Civic Centre and City Hall;
- (3) the project be funded through the Master Accommodation Capital Fund (CCA902) at a cost not to exceed \$12,098; and
- (4) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto.

Councillor Holyday appointed Councillor Soknacki Acting Chair and vacated the Chair.

On motion by Councillor Holyday, the Administration Committee:

- (I) concurred with the recommendations embodied in the foregoing report (December 11, 2002) from the Commissioner of Corporate Services wherein it is recommended that:
 - (1) the Administration Committee direct the Commissioner of Corporate Services to proceed with the installation of an audio-visual link between East York Civic Centre and City Hall and to report out to Council on the project at the February 4, 5, and 6, 2003 meeting;
 - (2) approval be given to proceed with a sole source procurement of goods and services with Adcom Videoconferencing to install the audio-visual link between East York Civic Centre and City Hall;
 - (3) the project be funded through the Master Accommodation Capital Fund (CCA902) at a cost not to exceed \$12,098; and
 - (4) the appropriate City officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give effect thereto; and

- (II) requested the Chair of the Administration Committee, in consultation with the Commissioner of Corporate Services, to formally request Rogers Cable TV to deliver some or all of the audio-visual link between East York Civic Centre and City Hall.

Councillor Holyday resumed the Chair.

(Chair, Administration Committee; Commissioner of Corporate Services – December 12, 2002)

(Clause No. 8 – Report No. 16)

The Administration Committee adjourned its meeting at 6:55 p.m.

Chair.