



cutting through complexity™

City of Toronto
Core Service
Review Project

**Council Committee Presentation:
Executive Committee**

July 28, 2011

Core Service Review Project

Terms of Reference

In May of 2011, the City engaged KPMG LLP (KPMG) to conduct the Core Service Review. As per the City's Statement of Work, the purpose and intent of the review is as follows:

- The project purpose is to review and analyze all City of Toronto services, activities and service levels provided by divisions and agencies and to apply a core service filter to assist Council's decision-making. The filter identifies services that are not core, or that are provided at higher than standard service levels.

In Scope

- Review and analysis the City's approximately 105 services.
- Review and analysis of approximately 50 services provided by the City's agencies, boards, and commissions.
- Research and analysis of several comparable municipalities and jurisdictions.

Out of Scope

- Detailed analysis of services to identify efficiency and effectiveness opportunities (these will be delivered through a separate Efficiency Review process).
- Detailed articulation of cost savings potential to be achieved through service changes.
- Management decisions on what actions to pursue with respect to City services.

Roles and Responsibilities

Projects of this nature require a very clear governance structure, unambiguous roles and responsibilities, and well-defined accountabilities. The following table outlines the roles of the City and KPMG:

Roles and Responsibilities	
City of Toronto	KPMG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an inventory of all services, service standards and service levels • Provide, validate, and ensure accuracy of all financial and budget data and all other available information related to particular services and activities • Provide relevant service-related policy directions, reports, and Council decisions • Provide any input gathered through the public engagement process (if available in time) • Review and validate factual information of service assessment • Present results of this report at Council's Standing Committees • Council to decide on changes to services provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct an assessment of all in-scope services provided by the City and its agencies, boards, and commissions • Conduct a jurisdictional review of comparable municipalities/jurisdictions • Apply a core service filter to determine the degree to which services are core and whether service levels are above standard • Identify options and opportunities to change services and service levels • Support the City at Council Committee presentations • Provide guidance, advice, and support to the City, as required

Project Approach

To meet the objectives of this review, KPMG conducted an assessment of services delivered and service levels, and identified options and opportunities the City could potentially undertake to make changes to its suite of services. The approach is described below and on the following pages.

Service and Service Level Assessment

- Assessment involved evaluation of each service through a core ranking filter on a mandatory/discretionary continuum
- KPMG also compared current service levels against established service standards set by legislation, council, management, funding sources or industry best practices
- KPMG used four sources of input to perform the assessment (also detailed on the next two pages):
 1. Program maps and type profiles provided by the City. These were developed by the City as a result of its service mapping and cost allocation initiative, and included financial data submitted by programs and divisions
 2. Jurisdictional review of comparative cities and governmental bodies. These included municipal, regional, and provincial governments either of similar size and profile, or of similar approach to delivering specific services
 3. Input and validation from City of Toronto senior management. Numerous interviews and workshops were held with City representatives to gather and subsequently review and validate service assessment information
 4. KPMG experience, including global KPMG Specialist Panel. KPMG involved its own senior employees in other countries with specialized expertise related to a particular domain (e.g., law enforcement, transportation, etc.) to identify global trends and leading practices to inform analysis of services

Jurisdictional Review/Leading Practices

Jurisdictional review included an analysis of OMBI data for Ontario cities and research of jurisdictions, which are comparable to Toronto, were generally established and built out in the same timeframe, and with similar urban characteristics. Provincial and federal jurisdictions were reviewed for information primarily related to governance and administration of large public sector organizations. Note that all cities do not necessarily provide a good comparison for all services (e.g., snow and ice control). List of jurisdictions was validated with City management. Some additional jurisdictional information was provided by the City.

Cities

- Chicago, USA
- Philadelphia, USA
- Boston, USA
- Montreal, Canada
- Barcelona, Spain
- Melbourne, Australia

Governments

- Government of Canada
- Government of Ontario
- Government of Alberta
- Government of Saskatchewan

Options and Opportunity Identification

- Options and Opportunities were identified based on the service and service level assessment
- Services that were ranked closer to the “discretionary” side of the core/discretionary continuum were considered for opportunities for scaling down, divestiture, or elimination
- Services that appeared to have elevated service levels were considered for opportunities for service level reductions, alternate service delivery, or reengineering
- Other opportunities were also presented on the basis of jurisdictional review, City management input, and KPMG experience
- Risks and implications of each option were identified and validated with City Management
- While KPMG was not explicitly contracted to quantify the potential savings of each opportunity, a high-level classification of savings potential was nevertheless performed
- Potential timelines for implementation (when first financial impacts would begin to materialize), as well as barriers for implementation (conveying ease or difficulty in pursuing the option) were also identified

Options and Opportunities – Intended Use

- Options and opportunities presented in this report should not be construed as recommendations; they are included solely for informed decision making by the CMO. Options are identified as things the City could consider doing, rather than advice to proceed.
- Presented options are suggested for consideration if the primary objective is cost savings. Some may have negative effects on the City, its residents and communities, and these have been identified to the extent possible. KPMG has made no effort to evaluate whether the negative impacts outweigh the savings possible.
- Options and opportunities have been classified into several categories: **potential savings, risks, timing, and barriers to implementation.** These categories closely align with decision criteria, which have been used extensively by other public sector organizations to prioritize opportunities for change. The classification was done by KPMG to assist the Committee with prioritization and decision making, and should not be construed as detailed analysis of options.
- **Potential Savings** – this is a categorization of cost savings that relates to a specific service, activity, or type. These related services and activities have been included in the summary table only to demonstrate relationship of options to services. The committee is not advised to calculate potential savings by multiplying savings categories and service/activity budgets.

Core Service Review Methodology

Methods and Tools

Core Service Reviews typically involve an assessment of a suite of services to understand to what degree they are core. Some organizations define this categorization as a simple binary choice – “core” vs. “non-core”. Others adopt a more descriptive approach of classifying services as “mandatory”, “critical”, “discretionary” (or other relevant terms pertinent to their industry, scope, and scale). KPMG experience suggests that a “core continuum” is a more useful assessment method, yielding better results and more informative products.

KPMG, with validation by the City, has developed a customized continuum for assessing core versus discretionary services. Along the continuum, there are four descriptive categories, which, when applied to a service formed the “Core Ranking” for that service. Services that were deemed to be classified between these four categorizations were given a fractional ranking (e.g., 3.5).

Service Assessment Methodology

The “core continuum” was defined with the following categories:

- **Mandatory(1):** mandated or required by legislation from the federal or provincial government
- **Essential (2):** critical to the operation of the City. Without the service, the City would stop functioning
- **Traditional (3):** municipal service, provided by virtually all large municipalities for many years
- **Other (4):** service provided by the City to respond to particular community needs, based on a positive business case, or other specialized purposes

Service Level Assessment Methodology

In order to assess service level performance, we used the following scale to compare the current service levels of City of Toronto activities with service level standards:

- Below Standard (B)
- At Standard (S), with S- and S+ indicating somewhat below or above standard
- Above Standard (A)

Service level “At Standard” is:

- Consistent with the level required by legislation, or where there is no legislation...
- Consistent with industry standards and practices, and where they are not clear...
- Consistent with business case analysis justification, and where that is not clear...
- Consistent with service levels in other municipalities, and where that is not clear...
- Consistent with reasonable expectations



Opportunities for Executive Committee – Governance Services

Executive Committee – Governance

List of Opportunities 1/3

Related program / service / activity			Options and Opportunities					
Program Service Activity	Gross Budget (\$ m)	Net Budget (\$ m)	Type	Description of Opportunity	Potential Savings*	Timeframe**	Risk and Implications	Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Clerk's Office Promote Open Government City Printer and Mail Distribution 	15.5	5.01	ASDR	Consider outsourcing printing and design services.	Medium (up to 20%)	2012	Low	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Clerk's Office Promote Open Government Lifecycle Management of City Information 	12.8	10.3	SSR	Continue to work with city divisions to proactively provide access to information/data.	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Medium	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Clerk's Office Promote Open Government Lifecycle Management of City Information 	12.8	10.3	SSR	Continue to explore expanded shared operations across ABCs and with other levels of government for records storage management	Medium (up to 20%)	2013	Low	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Manager's Office Strategic Communications 	3.3	2.8	ASDR	Consider centralizing communications responsibilities and activities across city divisions	Medium (up to 20%)	2012	Low	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Manager's Office Internal Audit Audit Reporting 	0.7	0.6	SSR	Consider providing internal audit for TTC	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Low	Low

*Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements. Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.

** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer.

Executive Committee – Governance

List of Opportunities 2/3

Related program / service / activity			Options and Opportunities					
Program Service Activity	Gross Budget (\$ m)	Net Budget (\$ m)	Type	Description of Opportunity	Potential Savings*	Timeframe**	Risk and Implications	Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Manager's Office Internal Audit Business and Risk Consulting 	0.4	0.3	SSR	Evaluate requirement for business and risk consulting	Medium (up to 20%)	2012	Low	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City Manager's Office Human Resources Employee and Labour Relations 	5.9	5.0	SSR	Consider the use of shared services for Labour Relations across all City agencies and departments.	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Medium	High
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal Services Civil Litigation 	14.2	6.7	ASDR	Consider strategic sourcing options (i.e. either increasing or decreasing the amount of external services)	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Medium	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal Services Solicitor 	22.8	10.8	ASDR	Consider strategic sourcing options (i.e. either increasing or decreasing the amount of external services)	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Medium	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal Services Solicitor 	22.8	10.8	SSR	Consider supporting all TTC legal needs and also those of other ABCs	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Medium	High
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legal Services Civil Litigation 	14.2	6.7	SSR	Consider supporting legal needs of all agencies	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Medium	High

*Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements. Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.

** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer.

Executive Committee – Governance

List of Opportunities 3/3

Related program / service / activity			Options and Opportunities					
Program Service Activity	Gross Budget (\$ m)	Net Budget (\$ m)	Type	Description of Opportunity	Potential Savings*	Timeframe**	Risk and Implications	Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corporate Finance Investment and Debt Management 	1.1	0.2	ASDR	Consider benefits of external investment management	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Medium	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corporate Finance Corporate Finance 	4.1	1.6	SSR	Rationalize Corporate Finance services across City Agencies and corporations.	Medium (up to 20%)	2013	Medium	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Financial Planning Financial Planning 	4.9	4.3	ASDR	Consider forming a single shared service organization for Finance.	Medium (up to 20%)	2013	Medium	Medium

*Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements. Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.

** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer.

Opportunities for Executive Committee – Clusters A and B

Executive Committee - Cluster A and B

List of Opportunities 1/3

Related program / service / activity			Options and Opportunities					
Program Service Activity	Gross Budget (\$ m)	Net Budget (\$ m)	Type	Description of Opportunity	Potential Savings*	Time Frame	Risk & Implications	Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable Housing Office Affordable Housing Office Housing Improvement Loans 	0.6	0.3	NCSR	Consider eliminating Housing Improvement Loans program	High (more than 20%)	2013	High	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable Housing Office Affordable Housing Office Housing Improvement Loans 	0.6	0.3	NCSR	Consider delivering Housing Improvement Loans program through a third party, community agency	Medium (up to 20%)	2013	Low	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable Housing Office Affordable Housing Office New Affordable Housing Development 	1.2	0.5	NCSR	Consider eliminating New Affordable Housing Development service	High (more than 20%)	2013	Medium	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable Housing Office Affordable Housing Office Housing Policy and Partnerships 	1.1	0.5	SLR	Consider limiting the Housing Policy and Partnership activities to those funded by the senior government	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Low	Low

*Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements. Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.

** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer.

Executive Committee - Cluster A and B

List of Opportunities 2/3

Related program / service / activity			Options and Opportunities					
Program Service Activity	Gross Budget (\$ m)	Net Budget (\$ m)	Type	Description of Opportunity	Potential Savings*	Time Frame	Risk & Implications	Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable Housing Office Affordable Housing New Affordable Housing Development 	1.2	0.5	NCSR	Consider reducing New Affordable Housing Development capacity	Medium (up to 20%)	2013	Low	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable Housing Office Affordable Housing Office 	2.9	1.3	RE	Consider a stronger consolidation of housing and homelessness planning and program delivery within City divisions and Toronto Community Housing Corporation.	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Low	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social Development, Finance and Administration Toronto Office of Partnerships Toronto Office of Partnerships 	0.7	0.5	NCSR	Consider reducing or eliminating some or all of the activities in this program	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Low	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social Development, Finance and Administration Toronto Office of Partnerships Toronto Office of Partnerships 	0.7	0.5	RE	Measure impact of the Office, establish City-wide revenue targets and seeking division input on contribution of Office to new revenues attained	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Low	Low

*Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements. Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.

** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer.

Executive Committee - Cluster A and B

List of Opportunities 3/3

Related program / service / activity			Options and Opportunities					
Program Service Activity	Gross Budget (\$ m)	Net Budget (\$ m)	Type	Description of Opportunity	Potential Savings*	Time Frame	Risk & Implications	Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waterfront Secretariat Waterfront Secretariat Waterfront Revitalization Advancement 	1.6	0.9	RE	Consider integrating this activity with others, likely in City Planning Division.	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Low	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Partnership and Investment Program (CPIP) 	47.4	47.4	NCSR	Consider reducing or eliminating this program.	High (more than 20%)	2012	Low	High
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Partnership and Investment Program (CPIP) 	47.4	47.4	RE	Consider moving grant administration to the divisions responsible for the program areas involved.	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Low	Low

*Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements. Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.
 ** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer.

Opportunities for Executive Committee – Agencies

Executive Committee – Agencies

List of Opportunities 1/6

Related program / service / activity			Options and Opportunities					
Program Service Activity	Gross Budget (\$ m)	Net Budget (\$ m)	Type	Description of Opportunity	Potential Savings*	Timeframe**	Risk & Implications	Barriers
• Arena Boards of Management	6.5	-0.03	SSR	Consider examining the existing business and governance models currently in place at all arenas (internally operated arenas, and all 8 arena boards). This could be done with a similar study of community centres.	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Low	Medium
• Association of Community Centres:	15.6	7.3	SSR	Consider examining the existing business and governance models currently in place at all community centres (internally operated and association operated). This could be done with a similar study of arenas.	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Low	Medium
• Exhibition Place	64.3	-1.3	NCSR	Divest of Exhibition Place assets and / or privatize operations	Low (up to 5%)	2014	Medium	Medium
• Exhibition Place	64.3	-1.3	SSR	Consider discussions with the Province regarding the amalgamation of Exhibition Place with Ontario Place	Low (up to 5%)	2014	Low	Medium
• Exhibition Place • Canadian National Exhibition	24.6	0.22	SSR	Move CNEA to financial & programmatic independence from Exhibition Place & City; review necessary governance arrangements required because of this direction	Low (up to 5%)	2014	Low	Low
• Heritage Toronto	0.9	0.4	NCSR	Consider divesting of the agency/program to a third party	High (more than 20%)	2012	Low	Low
• Theatres	25.6	3.3	ASDR	Consider the amalgamation of all three theaters under a single board structure	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Low	Low
• Theatres	25.6	3.3	NCSR	Consider the sale or lease of one or more theatre facility	High (more than 20%)	2013	Medium	High

*Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements.

Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.

** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer.

Executive Committee – Agencies

List of Opportunities 2/6

Related program / service / activity			Options and Opportunities					
Program Service Activity	Gross Budget (\$ m)	Net Budget (\$ m)	Type	Description of Opportunity	Potential Savings*	Timeframe**	Risk & Implications	Barriers
• Toronto Atmospheric Fund	2.2	0	NCSR	The Toronto Atmospheric Fund could be wrapped up as a program.	High (more than 20%)	2012-3	Medium	Low
• Toronto Atmospheric Fund • Investment of TAF Assets	0.13	0	RE	Fund investment could be managed in whole or in part by the City	Medium (up to 20%)	2012	Low	Low
• Toronto Parking • Off-Street Parking	48.2	-54.3	NCSR	Consider option to lease or sell off-street lots and garages.	High (more than 20%) (one time)	2012-3	Low	High
• Toronto Parking • Off-Street Parking	48.2	-54.3	SSR	Consider program for intensification of garage sites where possible.	Low (up to 5%)	2014	Low	Low
• Toronto Parking	68.5	-79.5	SSR	Consider implementing pay-by-cell parking payment system.	Low (up to 5%)	2014	Low	Low
• Toronto Police Service • Response/Public Order Maintenance	n/a	227.3	NCSR	Consider reducing service level for following services that are not core, or transferring them to the City: By-law Enforcement, Parking Enforcement, Pounds and Towing Management (Parking Enforcement)	Low (up to 5%)	2012-4	Low	Medium
• Toronto Police Service • Community-Based Crime Prevention	n/a	74.7	NCSR	Consider eliminating or reducing service levels for the School Crossing Guard Program	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Low	Low
• Toronto Police Service • Response/Public Order Maintenance	n/a	227.3	RE	Consider options for delivery of call taking & dispatch services	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Low	Medium
• Toronto Police Service • Front Line Policing	n/a	715.9	RE	Consider a business process based approach to improving efficiency and effectiveness of front line services	Medium (up to 20%)	2013	Low	Low

* Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements.

Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.

** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer.

Note: n/a denotes data not available

Executive Committee – Agencies

List of Opportunities 3/6

Related program / service / activity			Options and Opportunities					
Program Service Activity	Gross Budget (\$ m)	Net Budget (\$ m)	Type	Description of Opportunity	Potential Savings*	Timeframe*	Risk & Implications	Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Police Service Community-Based Crime Prevention 	n/a	74.7	RE	Consider transferring the lifeguard program to the City	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Low	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Police Service Front Line Policing 	n/a	715.9	SLR	Consider removing the requirement for police officers at construction sites	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Low	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Police Service Front Line Policing 	n/a	715.9	SLR	Consider exploring opportunities in the next CBA for cost reductions in areas such as one-officer patrols, reduced salary, benefits, retirement benefits and shift overlap.	Medium (up to 20%)	2013	Medium	High
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Police Service 	974.3	905.9	SLR	Consider reducing the size of the police force through budgetary means. This could include reducing or temporarily eliminating hiring of new officers, and/or, providing incentives for early retirement.	Medium (up to 20%)	2012-4	Medium	Med-High
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Police Service Infrastructure 	n/a	149.1	SSR	Consider options for how the following critical infrastructure services are provided: Facilities Management, Fleet Management, Purchasing, Payroll, IT Services, Accounting Services, Hiring of non-uniformed officers	Medium (up to 20%)	2014	Low	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Public Health CPIP - Municipally Mandated 	6.3	6.3	NCSR	Consider eliminating this program, reducing the service level, or identifying alternative funding offsets.	High (more than 20%)	2012	Medium	High
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Public Health 	244.9	51.4	RE	Applicable to all legislatively required services delivered by Toronto Public Health. The manner in which standards and protocols under legislation are implemented is in some cases discretionary based on local needs. Continuously review decisions on the execution of the program delivery (volume, resource allocation, strategy), to seek and generate efficiencies and cost savings.	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Medium	Medium

* Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements.

Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.

** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer.

Note: n/a denotes data not available

Executive Committee – Agencies

List of Opportunities 4/6

Related program / service / activity			Options and Opportunities					
Program Service Activity	Gross Budget (\$ m)	Net Budget (\$ m)	Type	Description of Opportunity	Potential Savings*	Timeframe**	Risk & Implications	Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Public Health Municipally Mandated - Dental Health & Investing in Families 	7.55	7.55	NCSR	Consider eliminating this program or reducing the service level	High (more than 20%)	2012	Medium	High
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Public Library Administration 	9	8.8	ASDR	Consider shared services with City for finance and human resources.	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Low	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Public Library Collection Use 	87.4	77.6	RE	Consider consolidating Toronto Archives with Library Services	Low (up to 5%)	2014	Medium	High
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Public Library Collection Use 	87.4	77.6	SLR	Consider opportunities to reduce services (hours and days of operation)	Low-Medium (up to 20%)	2012	Medium	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Public Library Facility Access 	69.4	66.6	SLR	Consider rationalizing the footprint of libraries to reduce service levels, closing some branches	Medium (up to 20%)	2013	Medium	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Public Library Programs and Outreach 	18.5	17.8	SSR	Consider reducing or eliminating some programs and outreach activities	Medium (up to 20%)	2012-3	Medium	Med-High
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTC Conventional Transit 	1436	429	ASDR	Consider use of contractors for delivery of some TTC services.	Medium (up to 20%)	2014+	Medium	High
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTC Conventional Transit 	264.2	n/a	ASDR	Consider opportunities to integrate administrative and back office services with City shared service groups	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Low	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTC Conventional Transit 	166.2	n/a	ASDR	Consider use of more external suppliers for aspects of facility and vehicle maintenance	Medium (up to 20%)	2013	Low	High
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTC Conventional Transit 	7.9	-1.6	NCSR	Consider monetizing parking lots through sale or lease	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Medium	Low

* Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements. Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.

** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer.

Note: n/a denotes data not available

Executive Committee – Agencies

List of Opportunities 5/6

Related program / service / activity			Options and Opportunities					
Program Service Activity	Gross Budget (\$ m)	Net Budget (\$ m)	Type	Description of Opportunity	Potential Savings*	Timeframe**	Risk & Implications	Barriers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTC Conventional Transit 	573	n/a	SLR	Consider rolling back some of the service improvements implemented under the Ridership Growth Strategy, including changes to the crowding standard and the minimum service frequency standard. Also consider reducing/eliminating the Blue Night network, or making it a premium service by raising fares.	Low (up to 5%)	2012	High	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTC Conventional Fleet Management 	289.8	n/a	SLR	Review service levels of support activities to conventional transit	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Medium	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTC Wheel Trans Transit 	96.6	91.1	ASDR	Involve more private sector operators in the delivery of Wheel-Trans service – seek the proper contractor/city employee ratio.	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Medium	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTC Wheel Trans Transit 	96.6	91.1	SLR	With conventional transit becoming significantly more accessible, the role and service levels should be continuously reviewed. Consider potentially developing individual plans for riders to use conventional services for their needs, relying less on Wheel-Trans.	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Low	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TTC Wheel Trans Transit 	68.9	n/a	SLR	Review eligibility criteria for Wheel-Trans participants to make it stricter, thereby lowering total demand	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Low	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Zoo Zoo Finance & Administration 	7.6	7.5	ASDR	Consider integrating Finance and Administration services with the City, as applicable	Low (up to 5%)	2012	Low	Low
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Zoo Zoo Infrastructure Management 	11.04	11.04	ASDR	Consider integrating Infrastructure Management services, with the City, where applicable	Low (up to 5%)	2013	Low	Medium
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toronto Zoo 	46.4	11.6	SSR	Consider sale of zoo to private owners	High (more than 20%)	2014	Low	High

* Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements. Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.

** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer. Note: n/a denotes data not available

Executive Committee – Agencies

List of Opportunities 6/6

Related program / service / activity			Options and Opportunities					
Program Service Activity	Gross Budget (\$ m)	Net Budget (\$ m)	Type	Description of Opportunity	Potential Savings*	Timeframe**	Risk & Implications	Barriers
• Toronto Zoo	46.4	11.6	SSR	Consider options for partnering with or divesting to the federal government or other governments	High (more than 20%)	2012	Low	Medium
• Toronto Zoo	46.4	11.6	SSR	Consider the creation of a non-profit entity and examine possible governance and operating models	Medium (up to 20%)	2013	Low	Medium
• Yonge-Dundas Square	1.89	0.52	SSR	Move Yonge-Dundas Square Board to financial and programmatic independence, keeping any profits and responsible for any losses from operations.	High (more than 20%)	2014	Low	Low

•Potential Savings are relative to the size of the corresponding program/service/activity the option/opportunity relates to, and may include increased revenues to produce lower tax requirements. Savings will accrue to utility rates rather than taxes where noted.

•** Timeframe refers to first year in which savings could be realized. Full savings may take longer.