

Ice Allocation Practices in City Arenas Operated by Arena Boards of Management

Date:	January 22, 2010
To:	Community Development and Recreation Committee
From:	Brenda Patterson, General Manager Parks, Forestry and Recreation
Wards:	All
Reference Number:	

SUMMARY

This report reviews the ice allocation practices of Arena Boards of Management (also referred to as “Boards” or “Arena Boards”) and makes recommendations to ensure that ice allocation policies and practices of the Boards are consistent with those used to administrate all other City of Toronto operated arenas.

Concern about equitable allocations of available ice at City-owned arenas operated by Arena Boards of Management has resulted in a comprehensive review of the process. This report outlines the current allocation practices, reviews the practices against the City’s Ice Allocation Policy, and recommends that future applications for ice allocation for all City-owned arenas be managed by the City in a single, centralized application process to ensure that ice is allocated equitably and transparently.

The process for allocation of ice must ensure that new and emerging groups that require ice time receive their fair portion based on participant numbers. Groups requesting ice time at any City-owned facility, including those operated by a Board of Management, should have a reasonable expectation that they will be accommodated in a fair manner. The City’s Ice Allocation Policy provides a framework for allocation of ice that is based on a priority ranking system. Development of a single application/allocation process for all City-owned arenas, including the eight Board-managed facilities, is the only option to successfully implement this policy in the eight Board-managed arenas. With implementation of a centralized system, there will be no loss of ice time for community use. The change to a centralized system will result, however, in increased capacity to accommodate new and emerging groups by effectively utilizing all of the City’s ice surfaces – both Board-operated and City-operated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The General Manager, Parks, Forestry and Recreation recommends that:

1. Prior to implementation of the 2010/2011 ice allocations, all Arena Boards of Management must receive approval by the General Manager, Parks, Forestry and Recreation; such approval to be given when, subject to sufficient applications, the allocation conforms with the priorities for ice allocation outlined in the Ice Allocation Policy, attached as Appendix A;
2. Applications for all ice at both City-operated and Arena Boards of Management operated arenas for the 2011/2012 season, and from this time forward, be submitted to and allocated by the City;
3. The General Manager of Parks, Forestry and Recreation consult with the Arena Boards of Management, and user groups, existing, new and emerging, with respect to a centralized application process and report back in May 2010 on the implementation plan for a City-wide application process;
4. The Arena Boards of Management receive the approval of the General Manager, Parks, Forestry and Recreation prior to implementing any new Board-operated programs, including house leagues or learn to play programs, for the 2010/2011 season, and thereafter, prior to being initiated; and
5. Staff continue negotiations and develop a business plan with the Leaside Board of Management on the ‘twinning’ of the existing ice pad which includes financial impact and community benefits of the project; and if suitable terms can be reached, staff will report on the business requirements and necessary approvals for the 2011 Capital Budget.

Financial Impact

There are no immediate financial impacts related to this report. However, adoption of the recommendations may result in some of the Arena Boards not meeting budgeted revenue expectations for the last quarter of 2010, as their 2010 Operating Budgets will be based on the current allocation mix. Increased net budget support from the City may be required in 2011 and future years. Although rate schedules could be reviewed and revised, the break-even financial targets of the Arena Boards are based on the marketing of ice time at each location. Discontinuance of this activity in favour of a fully centralized application process may also impact revenues. Financial outcomes will be monitored through the variance reporting process as changes cannot be estimated at this time.

The Leaside Arena Twinning Proposal ice rental revenue forecast, based on rental revenue forecasts under the current rental process, was used to determine the recoverable debt which the City could advance to the project. This estimate of \$7 million will be reviewed in light of the changes recommended in this report as the staff team continues work on the business plan for the project. Currently the Leaside Board's Business Plan outlines a project cost of \$11.7 million, including improvements to current facilities as well as the construction of the twin pad. Staff estimates the cost of the pad alone to be \$6 million. This project is under consideration for inclusion in the Division's 2011 Capital Budget submission.

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

DECISION HISTORY

City Council at its November 30, December 1, 2, 4 and 7, 2009 meeting directed the Arena Boards of Management to submit their ice allocation plan for 2010/2011 to the General Manager of Parks, Forestry and Recreation for approval prior to implementation and further requested that the General Manager, Parks, Forestry and Recreation report on the progress to date and any further recommendations to ensure that Board practices are consistent with the City's Ice Allocation Policy.

<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2009/cc/decisions/2009-11-30-cc42-dd.htm>

ISSUE BACKGROUND

The City of Toronto through its Parks, Forestry and Recreation (PFR) Division directly operates 40 arenas with 48 ice pads. There are an additional eight City-owned arenas with 10 ice pads that are operated by Arena Boards of Management. Governance of these board-operated arena facilities is through a relationship framework, approved by Council in 2007.

At City-operated arenas, ice is allocated equitably and consistently through a Council-approved allocation policy, attached as Appendix A. Historically, applications for City-operated arenas were made in June. All applications are considered at the same time and reviewed based on the City's policy. For the 2010/2011 season, the Division has expedited the application process to assist teams with planning for their ice needs. The City's Ice Allocation Policy sets out the following allocation targets, in priority order:

- 60% to Community Youth (not-for-profit 90% resident children and youth)
- 25% to Competitive Youth (not-for-profit non-resident children and youth)
- 1% to Competitive Junior Hockey
- 13% to Community Adult (not-for-profit resident adult and older adult); and
- 1% to Commercial (private/commercial).

Application of the policy at City-operated arenas has ensured that at City-operated arenas community youth programs for children and youth have very close to their proportionate share of ice based on current participation levels. While the policy does not differentiate by gender, the proportionate allocation principle ensures that both genders are treated equitably regardless of whether the activity is a girls', boys' or co-ed league or activity. In addition, because all applications for ice are evaluated yearly the policy ensures that new and emerging groups have opportunity to secure ice time.

Each of the eight board-operated arenas functions independently at arms-length from the City. Boards follow their own policies and procedures, develop their own business models, allocate their own ice time and set their own fees for ice. While the Boards are responsible for the operating costs of the arenas, the ongoing cost of capital maintenance is the responsibility of the City. The Relationship Framework that governs the Boards of Management outlines the roles and responsibilities of the Boards and the City. A key mandate of the Boards outlined in Article 2: Mandate and Operating Principles, item (b) is to allocate use of the arena and other recreational facilities in a fair and equitable manner among neighbourhood citizens and organizations and arena user groups, with particular consideration given to addressing the needs of the local community.

Public concern has been expressed about a lack of equitable access to ice at these City-owned Board-operated arenas. Specifically, complaints have been received by City Council and the Mayor's Office that the City has not adequately or equitably accommodated girls' hockey in the same way as boys' hockey in arenas run by Arena Boards of Management. One girls' hockey group has indicated that it is considering launching a Human Right's complaint. The City has also been requested, via signed petition, to provide equitable ice allocation in all city-owned arenas for the 2010/2011 season.

COMMENTS

Arena Board Allocation Practices

As noted previously, Council directed that the Arena Boards of Management submit their full allocation plan for 2010/2011 to the General Manager of Parks, Forestry and Recreation for approval prior to implementation and that such allocation be carried out in a manner consistent with the City's Ice Allocation Policy. It should be noted that while some Arena Boards of Management have initiated the process for ice allocation for 2010/2011 not all Boards have begun the application process. As a result, the Division reviewed both the allocations for both the 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 seasons to determine compliance with the City's Ice Allocation Policy.

On December 15, 2009, Arena Boards of Management were asked to submit to the City key information pieces with respect to their ice allocation processes. This information was due no later than December 30th, 2009 at 4:30 pm.

All Arena Boards of Management were required to submit:

- a. The current Ice Allocation Policy for their respective arena.
- b. A completed Weekly Schedule template showing the actual 2009/2010 ice allocation. This template would include an Account Information Form for each permit group detailing their membership breakdown.
- c. A list of all applications/requests for ice time for 2009/2010 that they did not or could not accommodate. This also required a completed Account Information Form for each one of these groups.
- d. A draft of the 2010/2011 Ice Allocation Policy for their arena.
- e. The proposed 2010/2011 ice allocation on the Weekly Schedule template which also included a completed Account Information Form for each group detailing the membership breakdown.
- f. Copies of all application requests for ice time in 2010/2011.
- g. A copy of the ice rate sheet for their arena.

In addition to the request for information, the General Manager of Parks, Forestry and Recreation met with representatives from the Arena Boards on January 6, 2010. Each Arena Board was invited to send two representatives to the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss Council's direction, review each Board's information submission, and to provide an opportunity for the Boards to ask questions and identify issues.

There were some challenges in collecting the information requested from most of the Arena Boards, due to inconsistent and varying business practices. While some Boards use more formal administrative practices, to manage and track their application and allocation processes and practices, others do not. While all Boards responded to the request for information, the data provided was in various formats and was completed to varying degrees.

Results of Analysis

In order to assess the ice allocation practices of the various boards, the Division reviewed the actual allocations for 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 against the applications received by each Board. Two conditions must be met for the Board policies to be in compliance with the City's policy. Firstly, the Board must demonstrate that it meets the percentage allocation targets outlined in the policy; and secondly, that it has granted ice to all teams that applied in the Community Youth (not for profit resident) category, proportional to their participant numbers. After analysis of the provided information only one of the Arena Management Boards could be considered 'in compliance' with the City Ice Allocation Policy. For a full description of submitted information and a review of compliance, see Appendix B.

As the Division reviewed the application of the City policy as a benchmark for the Arena Boards, it became clear that the policy works well where there are multiple ice surfaces and locations over which the City can balance the requests for ice time. With 48 ice pads

available for booking, the City is able to ensure that all Community Youth groups get their proportionate share of ice at a local arena.

The Arena Boards of Management will face several challenges in implementing the City's Ice Allocation Policy for their respective arenas. Because each of the eight Arena Boards operates as a single stand-alone facility, with a combined total of only 10 ice pads, overall, achieving both proportional representation and the percentage targets in each user group category outlined in the City's Ice Allocation Policy may be difficult. By contrast, the City of Toronto has 40 arenas and 48 pads of ice that it can use to ensure that the overall allocation of ice across the city meets the allocation targets established in the policy. Some consideration also needs to be given to the unique design and physical attributes of each facility. Variables such as the size of the ice surface, seating capacities and available parking will, in some way, impact each arena's ability to comply with the policy. Competitive leagues will avoid arenas where the ice surface is not compatible with the level of play, for example, and locations with limited parking space and seating will deter community use.

A review of the current demand for ice at the City-operated arenas and the Arena Boards of Management also demonstrates that not only are there more ice surfaces at the City's disposal to balance demand, the ratio of house league participants to arenas is significantly different between the City-operated arenas and the Arena Boards of Management. The City of Toronto administers approximately 13,780 community house league players (boys) through ice allocation at 48 pads of ice. The Arena Management Boards administrate 8,165 community house league players (boys) at 10 pads of ice. The simple player to available ice ratio supports the fact that the Boards face a more difficult process, than the City, when allocating their available ice if the applications can only be managed within the current 10 pads.

During the review of the allocation policy, many of the Arena Board representatives were concerned about teams applying to multiple locations for ice time. They asked how the City would ensure that individual teams did not receive a disproportionate amount of ice time when they applied for ice from multiple Arena Boards of Management and the City. In fact, with nine possible application processes, there is no way to ensure that this does not happen.

Further, in order to allow clubs and leagues to run sustainable programs the City tries to ensure the leagues and clubs get a consolidated allocation of ice in a limited number of arena locations. This helps the leagues and clubs manage their activities in a cost effective manner. With nine separate application processes it is difficult to ensure that this kind of consolidation will occur.

In general, there is significant benefit to allocating ice on a City-wide basis, utilizing all of the City's ice assets to the maximum benefit to ice users. Implementation of a centralized process will allow for much greater flexibility to accommodate user groups. In addition, a centralized application and allocation process will provide sufficient City-wide oversight to ensure that user groups do not attain more than their proportionate

share at all City-owned arenas, based on their membership numbers. In addition, it will provide increased capacity to account for the unique features and conditions at the City's various arena assets to ensure fit and compatibility with the use.

As staff reviewed the information provided by the Arena Management Boards on the Weekly Schedule Templates, it also became apparent that a centralized process could help to better accommodate new groups while mitigating the impact on existing Community Youth groups. In several instances, if a centralized application/allocation system had been in place, several new Community Youth groups who were not allocated prime-time ice at a Board Arena during the 2009/2010 season could have been accommodated. In one example, the relocation of three commercial men's groups to City-operated ice surfaces would have resulted in improved ice access for new Community Youth groups without the loss of any ice time for the existing Community Youth group. Several other scenarios reviewed by staff produced the same results. This confirms that a centralized approach is fairer and better able to achieve equitable outcomes for new and emerging groups, while mitigating impacts on existing Community Youth groups. A centralized approach to allocate all City ice is the model of choice.

Analysis of the data received also highlighted a need for in-depth review of programs that are directly operated by Arena Boards. At City-operated arenas, directly operated programs are allocated ice on a priority basis, ahead of applicants. Some Arena Boards have also adopted this programming model. While the vast majority of the City's directly operated programs serve children and youth, this may not be the case at Board-operated facilities. Further review is required with respect to this aspect of Arena Board operations in order to understand who these programs serve and to ensure that practices do not disadvantage new and emerging groups. Staff will report back in May 2010, after opportunity for further review.

Financial Impacts on the Arena Boards of Management from Changing Ice Allocation Practices

A review of the current rates charged by the Arena Boards of Management indicated that all eight Boards have varying rate schedules. Further review indicated that some Boards charge similar groups different rates for ice time. However, it is clear that there may be revenue impacts experienced by some Boards due to the potential relocation of some historical groups. While this would vary from arena to arena, based on a review of the rates and schedules provided, it is expected that impacts would be minimal. However, to mitigate any loss the Arena Boards of Management may need to adjust their rate structures accordingly. Such minor adjustments would minimize the affects of any revenue decrease from user group changes.

Business Practices & Public Accountability

Throughout the process of requesting information and reviewing submissions from the Arena Boards, it has become apparent that the allocation of ice at these City-owned assets could benefit from more formalized business practices and standardized administrative

processes. Application forms, formal issuance of permits, standardized fee schedules, and cash-handling protocols are aspects of Arena Board operations and the ice allocation process which require review. While these types of core business practices are set-out as basic objectives of the Relationship Framework, it is clear that the processes and practices would benefit from improvements. Better business practices are necessary to improve service to user groups, ensure better tracking, reporting, oversight, and public accountability. A centralized process offers a more cost effective option to achieve these outcomes and will provide opportunity to utilize City technologies, improve transparency and will be easier for the public to understand.

Access & Equity

Equitable access to all City services is fundamental to municipal government. It is important to ensure that basic principles and policies – especially those with respect to access and equity - are adhered to regardless of the management model or geographic area of the city. While the Relationship Framework discusses the needs of local communities, it should be recognized that many user groups draw from city-wide participants and they should have equitable access to any City facility. For example, our local community centres do not prevent residents from participation based on local address.

During this review the representatives of most Arena Boards expressed the desire to prioritize the needs of their current user groups, especially those located within their neighbourhood, above those of new applicants. However, it must be noted that in practice this premise puts new and emerging groups at a decided disadvantage and does not promote the City's principles of access and equity for all Torontonians, regardless of address. All groups should be provided with opportunity to gain their proportionate share of the City's ice. All residents, regardless of where they live within the City, should have equitable access to all City-owned arenas.

To achieve equity goals at these City-owned facilities, ongoing cooperation and collaboration with the Arena Boards is required.

Guiding Principles of any Future Ice Allocation

In order to move forward effectively to achieve equity outcomes, a strong basis needs to be established to guide the next steps in the process for both the City and the Arena Boards. The following principles have been developed to guide the process of future ice allocation:

1. Fair and equitable distribution and pricing of ice time.
2. Equitable opportunity for all applicants to attain ice at City-owned arenas as outlined in the City's Ice Allocation Policy.
3. Respect for the independence and role of the Arena Management Boards.

4. Understanding that Board-operated arenas are City-owned assets and must be viewed as such in terms of public access and accountability.
5. Attempt to allocate all city ice time in a way that allows for concentrated 'league' operations.
6. Ensure that ice allocation adheres to the City's existing Human Rights and Equity policies and practices.
7. That all City ice is allocated and coordinated 'centrally' to ensure compliance, fairness and balanced distribution.
8. That the ice allocation process and subsequent results be made readily accessible to the public.
9. That the ice allocation process is consistent, city wide, with respect to application forms, waivers, insurance and permits issued.

Implementation and Next Steps

At its meeting of November 30, December 1, 2, 4, and 7, 2009, City Council directed the General Manager of Parks, Forestry and Recreation to ensure that each of the eight Board-operated arenas allocated its ice for the 2010/2011 season in a manner consistent with the City's Ice Allocation Policy. The desired outcome of this directive is to ensure equitable access to ice time for all groups, with a priority on those serving resident children and youth, based on their current participation numbers. Given consideration for seasonal timelines, and the specific challenges that need to be addressed with respect to Board-operated arenas, implementation of the City's Ice Allocation Policy at Board-operated facilities will need to occur utilizing a phased-in approach.

Further, a phased approach to manage this shift is consistent with past practice in regard to implementation of the Division's Permit Fee Harmonization and Allocation policies, which took place over a two-year period and takes into consideration the timeline requirements for seasonal ice allocation processes. Staged implementation will help minimize impacts or location changes for existing user groups, while still ensuring that all groups qualifying as Community Youth (not-for-profit - 90% resident children and youth) receive their proportionate share of prime time ice within the system of complete City-owned arenas. A phased approach will also provide opportunity for the Division to consult with existing users and new and emerging groups, such as those that deliver girls' and women's programs.

Until a centralized application and allocation process is implemented, it is not feasible for the Arena Boards to achieve both the percentage and proportionate targets outlined in the City's Ice Allocation Policy. This season (2010/2011), it is reasonable to expect the Boards to achieve the percentage allocation targets identified in the Policy for each user group. However, the Boards cannot easily meet the criteria to allocate ice based on groups' proportionate participation numbers, until a centralized application/allocation process is implemented in time for the 2011/2012 season. Otherwise, groups could potentially be relocated, forced to play at up to eight or nine different arenas. There is also the potential for some groups to receive more than their proportionate share of city-

wide ice time than others by making separate applications to both the City and Arena Management Board facilities.

Implementation of Recommendation 1 for the 2010/2011 season will mean that each Board's allocation plan will be reviewed only against the percentage targets outlined in the City's Ice Allocation Policy. Specifically, where Boards received sufficient applications for Community Youth (not-for-profit resident), they will be deemed to be in compliance with City Policy if they have actually allocated 60% or more of their prime-time ice to Community Youth (not-for-profit resident). Arena Boards that could have achieved 60% Community Youth allocation based on their applications but did not allocate enough prime-time ice to Community Youth organizations will be deemed non-compliant and will be expected to adjust their allocations accordingly.

In order to ensure fair treatment of all applicants, careful review of all proposals to implement new directly-operated programs or leagues at the Arena Board facilities is required. This will ensure an equitable opportunity for all groups to access ice time that could otherwise be utilized by directly-operated programs which currently receive priority allocation.

It will be necessary for staff to report back to Council on implementation and progress at key milestones, for information purposes or for further direction to staff that may be necessary to achieve the desired outcome.

Leaside Arena

During Council's discussion with respect to equitable allocation of ice at Board-operated arenas, further questions arose about whether there were enough City arenas to meet the needs of residents. In response, Council requested that the General Manager of Parks, Forestry and Recreation provide an update on the status of efforts to add an additional ice pad at the Board-operated Leaside Memorial Gardens facility.

The Leaside Board of Management has developed a plan to 'twin' the existing single ice pad at the arena location in order to provide more ice time for the community. The required land to do so was purchased by the City for this expressed purpose in 2008. Ongoing work to develop a Business Plan for this project has continued since that time. The current Business Plan submitted by the Leaside Board of Management describes a total budget of \$11.7 Million for the project. The analysis conducted by City Finance staff indicates that the Pro Forma used to show revenue from ice rentals would support a recoverable debt of up to \$7 Million. This estimate was based on future ice rental plans from the Leaside Board, which may need to be reviewed in the context of the ice allocation process changes recommended in this report. The cost of constructing a second ice pad is estimated at a little over \$6 Million. However, the Leaside Board's Business Plan outlines other improvements to the current structures on site which contribute to the higher cost estimate. The staff team is continuing to review these improvements and how they might be funded through alternative sources or how the scope of the project could be reduced to meet available resources. This report

recommends that staff continue to work with the Leaside Arena Board of Management on the business plan and that subject to resolving the sources of funding, the Division include this project in its 2011 Capital Budget submission for Council's consideration.

CONTACT

Malcolm Bromley, Director of Recreation, Parks, Forestry and Recreation, Tel: 392-7252
Fax: 395-0105, E-Mail: mbromley@toronto.ca

Mark Lawson, Manager of Customer Service, Parks, Forestry and Recreation, Tel: 392-1902, Fax: 392-1551, E-Mail: mlawson@toronto.ca

Norm Lebrun, Supervisor of Customer Service, Parks, Forestry and Recreation, Tel: 338-2559, Fax: 396-4747, E-Mail: lebrun@toronto.ca

SIGNATURE

Brenda Patterson
General Manager, Parks, Forestry and Recreation

ATTACHMENTS

Appendix A – City Ice Allocation Policy

Appendix B – Arena Management Board Compliance Summary Chart

ICE ALLOCATION POLICY

The Ice Allocation Policy provides the City of Toronto a harmonized method to permit ice at indoor arenas and outdoor rinks. This includes equitable distribution to males, females, persons with disabilities, etc. The Ice Allocation Policy is established to permit City prime time ice on the most equitable basis for the greatest number of Toronto residents who wish to use City of Toronto arenas and rinks.

The City of Toronto reserves the right to allocate ice time based on the assessment of staff of the Parks, Recreation, and Forestry Division with due consideration for the City's program needs, the local committees and the best interests of the users. Consideration will be given to the previous years' ice allocations.

Time Definitions

Prime Time: Monday to Friday 5:00 pm to 11:00 pm Saturday and Sunday 7:00 am to 11:00 pm

Non Prime Monday to Friday 8:00 am to 5:00 pm. Ice contracts will be issued by the City of Toronto on a 26 week basis for prime time ice. Ice time will be allocated in one hour blocks, which includes an allowance for ice maintenance.

The City of Toronto will allocate ice using the following definitions: Category Definitions:

“Community Youth” (Not-for-Profit 90% Resident Children & Youth) – Organizations providing youth activities with an elected volunteer executive, constitution and by-laws, are not for profit, and may be required to provide financial statements, and that they meet an 90% residency requirement. Ice time will be allocated through a formula based on participant numbers. Minor sports groups are defined as persons 3 to 19 years of age inclusive. This category is house league and recreational participants.

“Competitive Youth” (Not-for-Profit Non-Resident Children & Youth) – Organizations or teams providing youth activity with less than 90% residency and do not qualify for “Community Youth” (Not-for-Profit Non-Resident Children & Youth) status. Residency for game ice will be based on a combination of all member organizations or teams.

“Competitive Junior Hockey” (Original Ice Allocation Policy) – This Account Category includes levels A, B and C.

“Community Adult” (Not-for-Profit 90% Resident Adult and Older Adult) –

Organizations providing adult or older adult activities with an elected volunteer executive, constitution and by-laws, are not for profit, and may be required to provide financial statements, and that they meet an 90% residency requirement. Ice time will be allocated through a formula based on participant numbers. Adult or older adult groups are defined as persons 18 years or older.

“Commercial” (Private/Commercial) – Organizations, individuals or teams providing activities on ice which do not qualify for “Not-for-Profit” status are considered Private/Commercial. Commercial programs organized for youth or adult which include schools will be assessed at the “Commercial” rate.

Allocation:

All attempts will be made during allocation to allow for minor or youth organizations to permit ice in the local arenas where traditionally that league or association has participated. Ice will be allocated in the North, South, East and West Districts but not on a City wide basis. Historical use and requests are taken into consideration. The City may adjust initial allocations after registration is completed for Community Youth (Not-for-Profit 90% Resident Children & Youth) organizations in order to respond to annual growth or reduction.

Ice Allocation will be completed on an annual basis using the following priority listing:

- 1 Departmental Programs (These are programs offered by the Parks, Forestry, and Recreation Division)
- 2 Community Youth (Not-for-Profit 90% Resident Children & Youth)
- 3 Competitive Youth (Not-for-Profit Non-Resident Children & Youth)
- 4 Competitive Junior Hockey (Original Ice Allocation Policy)
- 5 Community Adult (Not-for-Profit 90% Resident Adult and Older Adult)
- 6 Commercial (Private/Commercial)

All allocated ice may be used solely for the intended use by the permit holders. The sublet of ice is strictly prohibited and may lead to cancellation of season permit and future ice allocation consideration. Leagues or Associations that are considering new programs that may require additional ice time must present in writing, expansion or re-organization plan 18 months prior to implementation for consideration. Annually, staff and the user groups review the Ice Allocation Policy to make recommendation for change as required.

Residency

Community and Competitive Youth and Community Adult groups (Not-for-Profit groups) that request prime time ice will be required to submit a membership list that demonstrates an 90% residency in the City of Toronto.

Annually, resident groups or organizations are required to submit the current session's players' list. The player lists submitted will be reviewed for residency. Competitive and house league girls hockey players will be combined to allow for residency of 70% until the 2003/04 season. 80% residency for Girls Hockey will be required for the 2004/05 season.

Procedure

Annually, all resident groups or organizations will submit to staff their membership lists, including telephone numbers and addresses for review. The membership lists may be verified with the governing body to establish residency and proper insurance coverage. The residency number will be used in the allocation formula. Staff in each district will calculate the number of prime time hours available. Staff will deduct departmental program ice time required. Balance of ice will be allocated using the distribution guidelines stated in this policy. In June of each year, ice contracts will be sent to applicants for review. Applicants will follow City policy regarding "Payment for Permit". Groups will have until mid-July to turn back ice to the City for re-allocation with no penalty. All other returned ice will follow City policy. The falsification of any information may result in the immediate cancellation of the permit.

Percentages of Ice Allocation after City of Toronto Directly Operated Programs are booked:

- 1 (CY) Community Youth (Not-for-Profit 90% Resident Children & Youth)-60%
- 2 (CC) Competitive Youth (Not-for-Profit Non-Resident Children & Youth)-25%
- 3 (CJ) Competitive Junior Hockey(Original Ice Allocation Policy)-.5%
- 4 (CA) Community Adult (Not-for-Profit 90% Resident Adult and Older Adult)-14%
- 5 (CM) Commercial –(Private/Commercial)-.5%

The formula:

CY – League allocation in hours = [Total Prime Ice] X [60%] X [Total Residents (CY)] X [League Residents (CY)]
CC – League allocation in hours = [Total Prime Ice] X [25%] X [Total Residents (CC)] X [League Residents (CC)]
CJ – League allocation in hours = [Total Prime Ice] X [.5%] X [Total Residents (CJ)] X [League Residents (CJ)]
CA – League allocation in hours = [Total Prime Ice] X [14%] X [Total Residents (CA)] X [League Residents (CA)]
CM – League allocation in hours = [Total Prime Ice] X [.5%] X [Total Residents (CM)] X [League Residents (CM)]

The formula will be calculated City Wide. The Allocation numbers of the leagues will be given to the district Supervisors for the specific allocation of location and times.

Return of Ice

Three (3) weeks notice is required to return ice to the City of Toronto. This will allow for maximized ice sales. If the ice can be resold, there will be no charge to client. Tournaments and Special Events Requests for tournaments and special events must be made in writing to the City of Toronto prior to June of each year to be considered for fall/winter ice allocation.

Any user group wishing to operate a tournament or special event in prime-time during the period October 1 to April 30, must secure this time from their existing allocation. Where additional ice time may be required, an application must be made to the City. Regular ice users will not be pre-empted except under exceptional circumstances.

Further definitions as outlined in the Allocation Policy

Not-For-Profit Organization

A not-for-profit organization provides services, programs and opportunities for residents which support the principle of community building. Volunteer trustees or a board of directors governs the organization and there is no personal financial gain for members, trustees or directors. Any excess of revenues over expenditures are turned back into the organization and funds can only be used for promoting its organizational purpose.

Proof of Not-for-Profit status must be provided:

1. Where the organization's annual budget exceeds \$5,000.00 the group must have: i. A volunteer executive elected at an Annual General Meeting; ii. A constitution, by-laws and/or letters patent; and iii. Financial statements (Note: The City reserves the right to request and audited financial statement)
2. Where the organization's annual budget is less than \$5,000.00, the group must submit an application form, endorsed by a staff member, verifying not-for-profit status.

Recreational Activities

Programs and activities that are recreational, cultural or leisure focused such as, but not limited to, aquatics, arts, camps, crafts, festivals, heritage, hobbies, fitness and wellness, sports and life skills.

Residency

Residents are people who live in, own property in or own or operate a business in the City of Toronto. Residency can be verified through, for example, a current utility bill, assessment notice or telephone bill with a current address.

Appeals Process

Step 1

Organization requests in writing an Appeal at the location where the permit was issued.

Step 2

Request for appeal is forwarded for investigation and response to the respective Customer Service Supervisor or Recreation and Facility Supervisor with the assistance of 2 community based representatives.

Step 3

Supervisor investigates the Appeal considering the following:

- Main group (s) that the organization serves
- Impact on other community groups
- Organization participant growth/decline projections
- Space permitted to organization at other local facilities

- Availability of space at other community facilities
- Other forms of grants from City of Toronto
- Extent of compliance with Permit Allocation Policy
- Additional service contributions to Toronto residents

Step 4

Outcome of Appeal is communicated in writing to the appealing Organization by the Supervisor.

Copies to the respective local Councillor, District Director, Regional Manager, Community representatives involved in appeal and all internal staff involved in the process.

Appendix B -- Arena Boards of Management Allocation Information

2009 – 2010 Season

Arena	Allocation Policy **	Weekly Allocation	Applications*	Account Information*	Rates	Percent Community Youth	Ice Allocation Compliant with City Policy
George Bell Arena	Does not have one	Submitted	None	Completed	Supplied	43%	No
Larry Grossman Rink 1	Does not have one	Submitted	Some	Incomplete	Supplied	50%	No
Larry Grossman Rink 2	Does not have one	Submitted	Some	Incomplete	Supplied	50%	No
Leaside Memorial Arena	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted	Complete	Supplied	95%	Yes
North Toronto Arena	Submitted Proposed Policy	Submitted	Some	Complete	Supplied	67%	No
McCormick Arena Large	Submitted	Submitted	None	Incomplete	Supplied	67%	Unknown
McCormick Arena Small	Submitted	Submitted	None	Incomplete	Supplied	67%	Unknown
Moss Park Arena	Submitted	Submitted	Some	Incomplete	Supplied	41%	No
Ted Reeves Arena	Submitted	Submitted	Some	Incomplete	Supplied	34%	No
William H. Bolton Arena	Submitted	Submitted	Submitted	Complete	Supplied	50%	No

2010 – 2011 Season

Arena	Allocation Policy **	Weekly Allocation	Applications*	Account Information*	Rates	Percent Community Youth **	Ice Allocation Policy in Compliance
George Bell Arena	Does not have one	Not started	None	N/A	None	N/A	N/A
Larry Grossman Rink 1	Does not have one	Not Stared	None	N/A	None	N/A	N/A
Larry Grossman Rink 2	Does not have one	Not Started	None	N/A	None	N/A	N/A
Leaside Memorial Arena	Submitted	Submitted - proposed	None	N/A	None	N/A	N/A
North Toronto Arena	Submitted Proposed Policy	Not Started	None	N/A	None	N/A	N/A
McCormick Arena Large	Submitted	Submitted - proposed	None	N/A	None	N/A	N/A
McCormick Arena Small	Submitted	Submitted - proposed	None	N/A	None	N/A	N/A
Moss Park Arena	Submitted	Not Started	None	N/A	None	N/A	N/A
Ted Reeves Arena	Submitted	Not Started	None	N/A	None	N/A	N/A
William H. Bolton Arena	Submitted	Submitted - proposed	None	N/A	None	N/A	N/A

* “Some” means that applications were received for some user groups but not all. “None” means that none of the applications were submitted.

“Incomplete” means that no account information was rec’d or some with information missing.

** “Submitted” means that an arena had an existing policy which they provided. “Proposed” means that an arena revised an existing policy or developed one after the City request. “N/A” means not assessed.