Public Input on the Core Service Review and KPMG Opportunities

How to read the following tables:
- The tables are organized by Standing Committee and then by service area.
- Each Standing Committee section begins with a summary of deputations made to that committee at the July 2011 special committee meetings.
- Each table indicates the number of people who chose to provide detailed responses on that particular service and the number of written comments received in the Public Consultation Feedback Form.
- Information from the in-depth multiple choice questions and written comments are combined when there is no, or little, differences between them. Otherwise, where there is a difference between them, the data source is identified. When a figure includes percentages (%) it is derived from the multiple choice data.

Sample Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Title (This is the service title that was used in the Public Consultations)</th>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details from City Manager's Report on the Core Service Review to Council's Standing Committees</td>
<td>At the top of each table is information on the number of people who chose to respond to in-depth questions in the consultation feedback form and the number of written comments that were recorded through the consultation feedback form.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Titles that are underlined indicate that the options are grouped by service activity. | What's important and why:  
- The proportion of written comments (e.g. most, many, some, a few) that suggested that this service was important, and why.  
- The average ranking of the service's activities, noted in terms of which activity was ranked higher or lower than the others. | |
| | Service quality/levels:  
- Input from the written comments on the service quality and quantity, as well as concerns, suggestions for improvements or ideas about service delivery.  
- Summary of the in-depth question on whether maintaining the quality of each activity was more or less important to participants than lowering the cost of the activity to the City. | |
| | Who should deliver:  
- Input from the written comments and quantitative data on whether participants thought the City should provide this service, if it should be contracted out, or if cost or quality should be considerations when making a decision. | |
| | Funding options:  
- Which funding options (increased user fees, increased user fees only for those who can afford them, increased property tax, or a mix of property tax and user fee increases) participants preferred, as well as other revenue ideas they submitted. | |
Public Works and Infrastructure Committee

- A total of 28 deputations were made to the Public Works and Infrastructure Standing Committee.
- A majority of deputants opposed the elimination of the Toxic Taxi and Community Environment Days. Reasons included: health and environmental implications of improper disposal; equity for people in apartments who may have to bear increased costs for disposal and/or who are unable to drive to disposal centres; increased long term costs. About one third opposed a reduction in the target diversion rate of 70%, for environmental reasons and to improve access to recycling for those who live in high rise apartments.
- About one quarter of the deputants opposed a reduction in bicycle infrastructure commitments. Reasons included: increasing cycling rates, lower impact of cycling on roads and current safety risks to cyclists and others that would be alleviated with more bicycling infrastructure.

Service: Garbage, compost, recycling and hazardous waste collection and disposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste collection</td>
<td>3750 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 1134 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider replacing Toxic Taxi with drop off.</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating community environment days.</td>
<td>- Members of the public consider solid waste collection and disposal to be a core service because it affects almost everyone; many also cited environmental reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider further contracting out of Collection Services.</td>
<td>- Of the service activities, “residential waste collection” received the highest average rank, and “community environmental days/toxic taxi” received the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating the (4) free garbage tag program.</td>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider elimination of small commercial waste collection.</td>
<td>- Most preferred maintaining quality of the solid waste activities over lowering costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid waste processing, transfer and disposal</td>
<td>- Some participants expressed concerns about service levels and the possibility of another &quot;garbage strike,&quot; some wanted to improve service levels for composting and recycling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce 70% diversion target</td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of “Drop and Load” at transfer stations.</td>
<td>- 50-60% of participants preferred City provision for all solid waste activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsource facility security services.</td>
<td>Funding options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsource grass cutting.</td>
<td>- A majority of participants were open to increasing user fees for all solid waste activities, although some commented that this should be combined with property taxes, or preferred property taxes alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Many suggested that increased user fees be tied to City diversion targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Service: Engineering, Design, and Construction Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Surveys, Mapping</td>
<td>935 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 22 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider process improvements to achieve standard levels.</td>
<td>• Over 75% indicated that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for most service activities; a smaller majority (59%) said maintaining quality was more important when providing engineering advice to companies planning construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider third party support for mapping or surveying.</td>
<td>• Of three service activities, “Provide engineering expertise to City of Toronto construction projects” and “Review and approve building projects proposed by private developers” received almost the same average rank; “providing engineering advice to companies planning construction” received a lower average rank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Review and Approval</td>
<td>• 73% said the City should provide &quot;review and approval of building projects proposed by private developers&quot;; 59% said the City should provide &quot;engineering expertise to City of Toronto construction projects&quot;; participants were split on who should provide engineering advice to companies planning construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Policy, Standards and Support</td>
<td>• More participants chose &quot;increase user fees&quot; for two of three activities; participants were split on how to fund the provision of engineering expertise on City of Toronto construction projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider developing and implementing service level standards.</td>
<td>• In the written comments, participants suggested that the City should look for efficiencies in the service area by combining similar services or activities across divisions, and through coordinated and long-term planning across the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Infrastructure Design and Construction</td>
<td>• Several participants were concerned about enforcement, oversight and accountability and would like to see improved standards for this service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider developing and implementing service level standards where they do not exist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider further use of third party vendors for both job contracting as well as alternate delivery models such as program management through external consultants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Service: Roads, Sidewalks and Traffic Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road and sidewalk maintenance</td>
<td>2571 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 3988 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating the windrow clearing program.</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing snow plowing and snow removal standards on residential streets.</td>
<td>• Some participants indicated that these services were important because they enhanced the quality of life in the city, the economy, the environment and safety of pedestrians, motorists and cyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct a more detailed review of the service level standards and performance for Repairs.</td>
<td>• Of the service activities, managing the network of City roads including cleaning and clearing snow received the highest average rank and issuing permits for parking received the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing frequency of mechanical and/or manual sweeping.</td>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider shifting the mix of in-house and outsourced service delivery.</td>
<td>• 60% or more responded that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for cleaning, clearing snow, traffic signs and lights activities, and managing construction and events. Participants were split on whether the City should maintain quality or lower costs for issuing parking permits and receiving complaints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing the scale of bicycle infrastructure being developed.</td>
<td>• The majority of participants who expressed concern about service levels focused on traffic congestion in the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public right of way management</td>
<td>• Participants also mentioned improving co-ordination of road maintenance with other agencies, improving bike lanes, and commented on the appropriateness of having police guard road construction sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider collecting fees from all street events permits issued to ensure full cost recovery.</td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants were split on the principles that should be used to decide who delivers some activities. About 60% favoured City delivery of road cleaning, clearing snow and traffic signs and lights activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In the quantitative data, participants were split among funding options for different activities. About 50% of participants supported increasing property taxes for cleaning, clearing snow and traffic signs and lights activities. More people supported increasing user fees than property taxes for issuing parking permits, hearing complaints and managing construction and street events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participant comments suggested using road tolls and/or congestion charges, as well as charging commuters coming from different municipalities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Service: Water Treatment and Distribution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Treatment and Supply</td>
<td>2123 people chose to provide in-depth responses; 429 written comments were recorded. \</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating fluoridation of Toronto water.</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue implementing the final elements of the WBPP and DSIP restructuring to ensure additional efficiencies are obtained.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What's important and why:
- A significant number of participants noted that maintaining our aging water and sewer infrastructure was an important issue to them. Many suggested that investing in our water system now would avoid expenditures in the future.
- Many simply noted that protecting our water supply from pollution was a priority.
- On average, participants ranked the service activity “Treat and distribute safe drinking water” highest and “Collect and treat water from problem or significant storms” the lowest.

Service quality/levels:
- Several participants expressed concern for our aging and deteriorating water infrastructure and called for improvements in maintenance, upgrades and investment in this area.
- Very few participants commented on removing fluoride from City water.
- Numerous participants requested increased coordination of roadwork, utilities and water main replacements.
- 89% or more chose maintaining quality over lowering cost for each service activity.

Who should deliver:
- At least 78% said the City should deliver each service activity.
- A majority of participants stated they do not support contracting out water services and strongly expressed that the City should continue to provide and develop expertise in this field.
- Few people mentioned contracting out or selling Toronto Water; some that did suggested that if water services were contracted out they should be closely monitored by City staff.

Funding options:
- In the quantitative data, between 49% and 55% chose “increase property tax” to fund service activities.
- A significant number of participants wrote that an increase in user fees would be their preferred method of maintaining and improving Toronto’s water treatment and distribution network.
- Many noted that increased user fees would assist with water conservation efforts.
- Some participants noted necessities like water should take precedence over expenditures related to delivering other non-essential services and programs.
A total of 20 deputations were made to the Economic Development Committee.

- One third of deputants opposed reducing City support to BIAs. Deputants focused on the significant return on investment the City receives through BIA supports because of the streetscape improvements and increased property values they generate; City staff support and skills were viewed as critical to completion of work by BIAs, especially smaller BIAs.
- About one fifth of deputants supported maintaining arts, cultural and heritage programming because culture is very important to the success of the city and makes the City internationally distinct. Arts services provide economic, academic and social supports to the city.
- Three deputants opposed cuts to various economic development programs. These services are considered critical to attract and retain businesses in the City and to compete with other cities in attracting business, such as film production. On the issue of film services, it was noted that permits and fees paid by productions benefit many other areas of the City (PFR, Transportation, Police, etc).
- Two deputants opposed reduction of social support through TESS because of long-term impact on youth and marginalized communities, and on the ability of the disabled to live independently.

### Service: Economic Development Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing or eliminating any or all of the activities in this program.</td>
<td>1123 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 433 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants gave several reasons for the importance of economic development programs including encouraging employment, keeping the business sector vital, and attracting investment. Many suggested that economic development and a healthy economy would help solve many urban problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Of the service activities, &quot;programs to support small business, entrepreneurs and local industries&quot; received the highest average rank and &quot;information and programs to promote trade&quot; the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Many expressed the importance of small business retailers and the need to support them through BIAs, and the need for benefits to flow to priority neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some expressed concerns about competition with other world cities and the 905 area for businesses, and suggested that the City should take our competition into consideration, including lowering our business tax rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 73% indicated that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for programs to support small business, entrepreneurs and local industries. Participants were somewhat split for other service activities, with slightly more in favour of maintaining quality than lowering costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants were split on who should deliver each service activity; 50% supported City delivery of programs to support small business, entrepreneurs and local industries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some commented that the City should act as a catalyst for business while others suggested the City create</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
opportunities for small business to take over some City activities.

Funding options:
- Participants were split on increasing property taxes and/or user fees for each of the service's activities.
- Participants suggested if the public sector takes the lead, the private sector will follow. Some comments focused on the City getting more investment from business groups.

## Service: Arts, Culture and Heritage Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing or eliminating</td>
<td>2982 people chose to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any or all of the activities.</td>
<td>provide in-depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responses on these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>services; 1214 written</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Service: Business Improvement Areas (BIAs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing staff support services to BIAs, or, recovering costs of support provided.</td>
<td>994 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 33 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 70% said that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for the activities &quot;Work to improve safety, streets, buildings and opportunities for neighbourhood-based businesses&quot;, and &quot;Support neighbourhood redevelopment and community activities&quot;; participants were split on which was more important for &quot;marketing and promoting local businesses&quot;. This activity was also ranked last of the three.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More participants preferred that the City provide activities related to working to improve safety, streets etc. and supporting neighbourhood redevelopment. Participants were split on who should provide activities related to &quot;marketing and promoting local businesses&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants were split on how BIA activities should be funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants who mentioned BIAs generally suggested that they provided benefits to their communities and were seen as good public/private partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some suggested that BIAs could undertake some of the work the City does in improving streetscapes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some participants expressed concerns about accountability and transparency of funding and expenditures by BIAs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service: Employment Services and Managing Social Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment services</td>
<td>1593 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 1123 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider adjusting the mix of contracted and directly delivered employment services.</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants wrote that these services were important because they supported the most vulnerable, created local economic benefits, and saved funds over time by preventing people from &quot;falling through the cracks&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social supports</td>
<td>• Participants were split on the importance of each service activity and ranked all of them closely together. &quot;Deliver provincially-funded financial assistance and health benefits to eligible residents&quot; had the highest average rank, and &quot;career planning and job search services&quot; the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing or eliminating this program.</td>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some expressed concerns that the rates of social assistance currently provided are too low to properly support recipients; some had concerns that too many people are receiving social assistance, that many may be abusing the system, or that the system may be flawed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For each service activity, 70% or more indicated that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who should deliver:
- Many wrote that these services should be uploaded since they considered them to be a provincial responsibility. Others suggested that the City could benefit from increased partnerships with non-profits and other organizations.
- In the quantitative data, 66% suggested that the City should deliver provincially-funded financial assistance and health benefits to eligible residents, but participants were split on who should deliver other service activities.

Funding options:
- In the written comments, some suggested uploading to the provincial government, some indicated they would pay more property taxes, some suggested seeking matching grants from external agencies or other levels of government. A few suggested seeking efficiencies to save money.
- In the quantitative data, a small majority of participants chose "increase property taxes" to fund two activities: "delivery of provincial financial assistance and health benefits", and "provision of skills training and support to low income workers"; participants were split on how fund the remaining service activities.
Community Development and Recreation Committee

- A total of 58 deputations were made to the Community Development and Recreation Committee.
- Almost half of the deputants expressed strong opposition to the Child Care Services options presented by KPMG. Many raised concerns around the lack of affordable quality child care in the city, noting that cuts to subsidized child care disproportionately impact low income families and women. Deputants also pointed out that loss of subsidized spaces will have implications for workforce participation and reliance on other services such as Ontario Works.
- About one quarter of all deputants spoke about recreation services. Deputants suggested privatization of recreation services will further disadvantage low–income communities, and that the City should ensure equity and access in recreation services. Recreation was identified as playing a critical role in the leisure and health of Torontonians, and supporting youth at risk.
- About 12% of deputants discussed housing and homelessness services. Deputants raised concerns around the prioritization of homeless individuals in accessing social housing, citing the length of the social housing wait list, and the need to provide adequate supports to individuals with mental health issues. Drop-in services were also described as essential to homeless individuals and redirects demand from EMS. Concerns were also raised regarding the potential sale of TCHC housing putting further strain on the social housing stock.
- About 10% of deputants spoke to the option to integrate Fire and EMS, and raised concerns related to service level impacts and public safety risks.

### Service: Child Care, Child Subsidies, and Family Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child care delivery</td>
<td>2688 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 1036 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider making changes to program structure consistent with the full-day</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kindergarten initiative</td>
<td>• Participants typically indicated that child care services were important, and that they should be affordable and accessible as well to benefit the long-term health and quality of life of the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing the maximum subsidized per diem rates the City will</td>
<td>• Of three service activities, “operating child care centres” and “providing funding, managing subsidies for child care” had almost the same average rank. “Provide information on parenting and child care” had a lower one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support to levels near the average rates of non-profit providers.</td>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider transferring city-operated child care centers to community or</td>
<td>• Many suggested that current service levels are insufficient; and expressed concern about cost and availability, particularly long waitlists, poor quality and inadequate supply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private operators</td>
<td>• Many mentioned child care in relation to after-school care, full-day kindergarten and recreation programs suggesting the City should look at the spectrum of care-related services in a coordinated manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing the number of subsidized child care spaces over time to</td>
<td>• At least 74% indicated that maintaining quality was more important than lowering cost for each service activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eliminate 100% municipally funded spaces</td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care service system mgmt</td>
<td>• In the quantitative data, at least 68% preferred that the City deliver child care centres and provide funding and management of subsidies; participants were split on who should deliver information on parenting and child care.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Review Child Care Funding and Subsidies to reduce funding and subsidies.
Consider whether city quality assessments are required.

contracted out to non-profit or for-profit organizations or other levels of government.

Funding options:
- Participants were split on how to fund this service. Some said they would pay higher property taxes to support affordable child care even if it was not for themselves; others suggested increasing user fees was fairer.

---

Service: Emergency Medical Services (EMS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider outsourcing some or all of non-emergency inter-facility patient transports</td>
<td>1958 people chose to provide in-depth responses; 376 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating Community Medicine activities</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider integrating EMS and Fire organizationally and developing new models to shift more resources to EMS response and less to fire response over time.</td>
<td>- Most participants consider EMS an essential service and support EMS, police and fire services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Of four service activities, “Emergency medical care and ambulance transportation to hospitals” had the highest average rank and “Non-emergency community health care (such as immunization)” the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some participants stated concerns with wait times for emergency services. Others suggested that emergency services are overstaffed and suggested their budget could be reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A number of comments suggested integrating EMS, Fire and Police, either with staff training or co-locating facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- At least 60% chose “maintain quality” over “lower costs” for each service activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- About 80% said the City should deliver “Emergency medical care and ambulance transportation to hospitals” and “Emergency 911 telephone service”; 52-55% said the City should provide “Medical care and ambulance transportation of patients between hospitals” and “Non-emergency community health care (such as immunization)”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Many participants noted that the City’s focus should be on delivering core services which include EMS, and urged the City not to contract it out. A few suggested some EMS activities could be contracted out, e.g. inter-facility transfers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Many participants indicated that EMS is underfunded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Most chose “increase property tax” to fund “emergency medical care and ambulance transportation to hospitals” and “Emergency 911 telephone service”; participants were split on how to fund other activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There were few written comments about funding EMS. Some suggested that the province should pay, others suggested that as a core service, property taxes should fund EMS. A few suggested that user fees should be charged for those abusing EMS services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Service: Fire Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing the range of medical calls to which the fire department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider integrating EMS and Fire organizationally and developing new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>models to shift more resources to EMS response and less to fire response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the opportunities to improve response times and decrease equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements through dynamic staging of equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1823 people chose to provide in-depth responses; 342 written comments were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In the written comments, many participants noted this was an important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City service, but did not elaborate on why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants gave &quot;Fire rescue and emergency response&quot; activities the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>highest average rank and &quot;Fire safety and public education&quot; activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For each activity, between 73% and 93% said that maintaining quality was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more important than lowering costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many participants wrote that service levels in Fire Services should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintained. Some participants wrote that service levels should be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved. Several participants commented on consolidation or streamlining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services with other emergency services like Police and EMS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A few comments were made about staffing levels, both in terms of a lack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of staff and a perception of too many staff. Salaries of employees in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services were also raised as a concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants strongly expressed that the City should continue to provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In the written comments, those that chose to comment on the idea of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contracting out wrote that service levels would be compromised if this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service was not City run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In the quantitative data, 61% chose “increase property taxes” to fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire rescue and emergency response activities; about 50% chose “increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property taxes” to fund other activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• While some participants requested maintaining or increasing the budget for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services, a majority proposed decreasing costs and reducing the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget, mainly through efficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A few participants wrote that property taxes should be increased to pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for essential services like Fire Services, and that funding core services,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including Fire Services, should be prioritized over other non-essential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Numerous participants suggested duplications with EMS, and wrote that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emergency services could be merged and integrated to find cost efficiencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Core Service Review – Final Report to Executive Committee
### Service: Long-Term Care Homes and Services for Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term care homes</strong></td>
<td>1774 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 330 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer of most municipal operated LTC homes to operation by non-profit community organizations could reduce costs and transfer net costs to the province over time.</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of municipally operated LTC homes to private sector operators would reduce city cost more quickly and may provide some recovery of investment in buildings.</td>
<td>• Many participants commented on affordable long-term care and the importance of housing for seniors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-engineering the operations of the LTC homes to achieve specified target cost reductions.</td>
<td>• Of the service's three activities, &quot;Homes, food, recreation and medical care for people living with chronic illness or recovering from illness&quot; received the highest average rank and &quot;Social and recreation day programs for seniors, providing breaks for caregivers&quot; the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community based programs</strong></td>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminate services, or transfer day programs to a community agency.</td>
<td>• Participants identified concerns about service levels for seniors and the types of programming provided, suggesting the City should increase all services for seniors and not cut any services that affect seniors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83% or more said that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for each service activity.</td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many wrote the City has a role in providing services to vulnerable seniors including helping to keep seniors in their homes longer. 64% said that the City should deliver &quot;homes, food, recreation and medical care for people living with chronic illness or recovering from illness&quot;. For the other activities, slightly more favoured delivery by the City than other options.</td>
<td>Funding options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Several participants suggested that the non-profit sector could play a larger role, or collaborate with the City to deliver this service.</td>
<td>• Participants were split on how to fund this service. In the written comments, some suggested user fees linked to income should be used. Some indicated the province should pay for this service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service: Recreation and Community Centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KPMG Opportunities

- In view of growing private involvement in recreation services, reconsider the City’s role, purpose, goals and objectives in Community Recreation.

- Establish a clear approach to evaluating what recreation programs to operate or support, based on the benefits expected.

- Consider innovative operating approaches for more facilities, such as the arena and community center boards, purchased service agreements or P3 arrangements with community-based partners and private operators.

### Public Consultation Input

- 2489 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 762 written comments were recorded.

**What's important and why:**

- Recreation centers and programs were identified as an integral part of the city, improving quality of life, keeping people healthy, and bringing people together.

- The issue of greatest concern to participants was maintaining access, affordability and responsiveness of programs, especially for vulnerable populations such as youth, seniors and low-income residents.

- Of four service activities, “providing recreation, education and arts programs”, and “maintaining and repairing recreation facilities” were tied for the highest average rank; "giving permits to community groups for park use" received the lowest.

**Service levels:**

- Over 70% responded that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for all activities except for giving permits to community groups for parks use (58% supported maintaining quality).

- Many participants commented on the need for maintenance and upkeep of facilities.

- A strong majority indicated that the Welcome Policy should be maintained or expanded.

**Who should deliver:**

- 59% or more suggested that the City should provide each of the service’s activities.

- Participants who wrote that the City should provide this service suggested it would maintain quality and accessibility; a comparable number suggested that some activities could be contracted out or managed by volunteer groups.

- A smaller group of participants wrote about maintaining or increasing access to Toronto District School Board pools.

**Funding options:**

- In the quantitative data, participants were split on funding for the service activities. There was no clear majority in support of increasing property taxes and or user fees.

- In their written comments, many said they would support increasing property taxes to support these services.

- Participants were split on increasing user fees. Some suggested increasing user fees would compromise accessibility and equity, others suggested user fees could be increased as long as they remained affordable.

- A few suggested increasing community centre rentals to private groups or leveraging more development fees.
## Service: Shelter, Support and Housing for Homeless and Low-Income People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social housing system management</strong></td>
<td>3037 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 3020 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop strategy to maximize benefit from projects where mortgages and subsidy agreements are expiring</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeless and housing first solutions</strong></td>
<td>• Participants noted that affordable housing, along with other supportive City services, was a core service and had a significant impact on the quality of life of low-income residents and on the liveability of the City as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give homeless people higher priority in accessing social housing</td>
<td>• Of five service activities, “helping people find and keep housing” had the highest average rank, followed closely by “providing shelter and meals to the homeless”. “Providing housing and support in local or city emergencies” had the lowest average rank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand support for the Streets To Homes initiative to reduce need for shelters</td>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop wider range of supportive housing options</td>
<td>• 79% or more indicated that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for all shelter support and housing activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Many participants commented that they would like to see these programs improved, in particular repairing and expanding the existing stock of affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two thirds of respondents indicated that the City should provide these services because City oversight may provide more accountability, and for-profit provision might undermine the quality of housing options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Those who suggested the City could privatize social housing proposed that private industry could be more effective at maintaining the housing and that selling the housing could ease the City’s fiscal pressures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Most indicated that property taxes should be used to fund all activities and user fees were not appropriate given the vulnerability of people using these services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants noted that the City should approach other levels of government to fund services and should strive to find efficiencies in management of the services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parks and Environment Committee

- A total of 76 deputations were made to the Parks & Environment Committee.
- Over 40% of deputants opposed the elimination of Toronto Environment Office (TEO) and its programs. Support for this service focused on the important role TEO plays in addressing the health and economic impacts of climate change, the City's energy reduction goals, and reducing the costs and impact of severe weather on infrastructure. The public spoke to the unique role TEO plays in co-ordinating City divisions and external stakeholders to achieve these goals, and how it leverages a relatively small budget into action on many fronts.
- About 20% of deputants wanted to maintain or improve Toronto's tree canopy. Reasons included health and environmental benefits of the current tree canopy such as improved air quality, temperature moderation, flood prevention, soil amelioration, and City beautification. Deputants also argued that reducing the tree canopy would cost the City money in the long run.
- About 20% of deputants opposed closing Riverdale Farm and about 15% spoke against eliminating or reducing the urban agriculture programs. Reasons included: numerous social, economic, physical, health, educational and environmental benefits for both individuals and communities. Deputants generally did not support user fees or service reductions for Riverdale Farm because of the high number of school children using it from across the city. Some were open to alternative funding ideas such as optional family memberships or community fundraisers.

Service: City Forests and Tree Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing the target canopy cover or extending the target timeframe to achieve, allowing a lower rate of new tree planting and maintenance of existing trees.</td>
<td>1951 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 166 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What's important and why:
- Many wrote that they were concerned about the age and health of our urban forest and the effect fewer trees would have on the City’s quality of life. Many stressed the importance of maintaining the health of our existing trees and adding to the tree canopy.
- Of the four activities related to these services, "care for existing trees and forests" and “maintain a multi-year plan for city trees and forests” tied for highest average rank, and "inspect and remove hazardous trees” had the lowest.

Service quality/levels:
- At least 79% of participants suggested maintaining quality over lowering costs for all service activities.
- Many participants requested that the City plant additional trees, with some suggesting the tree canopy be doubled.

Who should deliver:
- 77% said the City should "maintain a multi-year plan for city trees and forests", while participants were somewhat split on who should deliver the service's other activities.
- In the written comments, participants were equally split between the City retaining responsibility for tree planting and maintenance, and privatizing the service. A few preferred a mixed service delivery model for tree care.
- The concept of neighbourhood forestry stewards or volunteers was also raised.

Funding choices:
- A majority of participants chose "increasing property taxes" to fund all activities.
- Some participants suggested using corporate sponsorships to assist with planting additional trees.
- Others noted that the private sector should take more responsibility for planting additional trees on new developments they build in the City.
## Service: City Parks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing standard for snow clearing to be eight centimetres of snowfall.</td>
<td>3240 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 1057 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing standard for grass cutting, other than on sports fields.</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider partly contracting maintenance of park facilities to interested community groups. Examples: Sports associations for sport fields, horticultural groups for some flower displays.</td>
<td>• Parks, beaches and green spaces were identified as an integral part of the city; they enhance quality of life, keep people healthy, make the city beautiful, clean and green, and bring people together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider contracting maintenance of parks.</td>
<td>• Parks activities should be responsive to the community and accessible to the most vulnerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating horticulture activities.</td>
<td>• Participants gave activities which &quot;Maintain and protect parks, beaches sports fields, trails, green space and gardens&quot; the highest average rank, and &quot;Operating the High Park Zoo and farm attractions and provide transportation to Toronto Island Park&quot; the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating Urban Agriculture service.</td>
<td>Service levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider elimination of the Zoo and Farm attractions.</td>
<td>• Participants commented that their greatest concern was parks maintenance and upkeep, followed by improving access to parks, green spaces, community gardens and associated programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Over 80% of participants indicated that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for maintaining and protecting parks, as well as involving the community in parks planning; about 70% indicated that maintaining quality was more important for growing plants and gardens and urban agriculture activities; and, 60% indicated that maintaining quality was more important for farm and zoo attractions and transportation to Toronto Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In the quantitative data, over 70% of participants indicated that the City should deliver parks maintenance and work with communities to plan parks. Respondents were split on who should deliver other parks activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants’ written comments suggested that the City had a role to play in maintaining park quality and accessibility: a comparable number noted that some activities could be contracted out or managed by volunteer groups, including parks maintenance and garbage collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 60% or more selected “increase property taxes” for parks maintenance and working with community on planning. About 50% chose “increase property taxes” for growing plants and gardens; participants were split between user fees and property taxes choices for the other parks activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Many wrote that they supported paying higher property taxes to support parks activities in order to promote the liveability of the City. A small number was against this idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some participants suggested that user fees should not be increased in order to support accessibility and equity, others suggested they could be increased if they were affordable to the user.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Service: Environmental Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduce or eliminate activities.</td>
<td>2815 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 1563 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants suggested that environmental programs were important to enhancing quality of life, integrated planning, sustainability, air quality, and addressing climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the quantitative data, participants ranked activities for businesses and communities as almost equally important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- At least 80% indicated that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for each of the City’s environmental activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants said they would like to see environmental programs maintained or expanded, and that the City should have a long term vision for environmental sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Over 60% responded that environmental activities should be delivered by the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants said they wanted to see the City manage initiatives, work with private and not-for-profit organizations that were familiar with the issues and coordinate services across City divisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants said they wanted Toronto to remain an environmental leader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants were split on how to fund activities: 50% chose increasing property taxes to support community-oriented programs. In their written comments, participants suggested increasing property taxes and applying user fees or fines to individuals and businesses that pollute. A few mentioned funding from other levels of government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some said environmental programs were not a priority among other budgetary pressures at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Licensing and Standards Committee

- 13 deputations were made to the Licensing and Standards Committee.
- Over half opposed the KPMG opportunities regarding Toronto Animal Services (TAS). There was strong opposition to reducing the TAS services related to cat and dog licensing and enforcement. Animal safety and proper government oversight were described as important factors in keeping the service City-run.
- Deputants also opposed any reduction in animal rescue times or outsourcing animal care for a variety of reasons including: low savings and high impact on animal welfare (longer rescue times may lead to more euthanizing, for-profit companies may not have animal welfare as their priority), the current integrated model provides better control of stray animals and reduces risks to public, and capacity of external stakeholders to handle more work in the absence of TAS.
- A few deputants proposed alternatives to the KPMG opportunities including:
  - Reorganization and assessment of Building licensing and enforcement priorities before eliminating services;
  - A more formal arrangement with other service providers to more efficiently serve geographical areas and;
  - Prioritizing the types of care and services TAS provide by moving to a “first station” model.
  - Use micro-chipping to facilitate animal rescue and return to owners.

Service: Licenses and Inspection for Businesses, Property and Animal Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business licensing, permitting and enforcement</td>
<td>1155 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 229 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating license categories that do not clearly serve a public service.</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing the level of proactive investigation and enforcement.</td>
<td>- People commented that a clean city, where property standards are upheld, makes Toronto respectable, nice to live in, and appeals to tourists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the opportunity to deliver these services city-wide instead of district-based.</td>
<td>- The average ranks of the activities were close together. &quot;Enforce property standards and maintenance&quot; had the highest average rank and &quot;medical care, shelters and adoption services for animals&quot; had the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property enforcement</td>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the opportunity to deliver these services city-wide instead of district-based.</td>
<td>- Many commented that public litter is a problem in the city, particularly along streets and in parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider outsourcing waste diversion enforcement.</td>
<td>- Some referred to the debate over graffiti vs. public art. Some suggested graffiti is an eyesore and should be removed; others said that focusing on removing it is not a good use of public resources, particularly when removal can be expensive for business owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 60% or more indicated that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for all activities except issuing licences to businesses, where a smaller majority preferred maintaining quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the quantitative data, over 60% indicated that the City should be responsible for issuing licenses to businesses, enforcing City by-laws against illegal dumping, and enforcing property standards. Participants were split on who should deliver animal care and enforcement activities, with just 50% supporting delivery by the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the written comments, almost all suggested the City deliver these services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal care and enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider outsourcing some or all of animal care and enforcement delivery.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider value of Cat and Dog Licensing and Enforcement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing service level (response time) for Emergency Animal Rescue and Care by increasing service response time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the opportunity to deliver these services city-wide instead of district-based.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider requiring owners wishing to surrender animals to deliver them to the shelter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding options:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants were split on funding options. Around 40% chose “increase user fees” to pay for issuing licenses to small businesses, and enforcing City by-laws against illegal dumping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some written comments suggested increasing the fines for littering or for pet licences to help generate revenue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government Management Committee

- 7 deputations were made to the Government Management Standing Committee.

- Two deputants spoke in support of 311, and one spoke specifically against outsourcing the service. Support for this service focused on the important role it plays in helping the public and the need for local staffing who will have the most up to date and relevant information.

- About half of the deputants opposed outsourcing of custodial services, especially those services provided to Toronto Police Service. Deputants expressed concerns about lower quality of work, loss of government oversight and increased health risks when custodial services are outsourced to for-profit companies.

Service: 24-hour Information about City Services (311)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May be some opportunities in combining with 211</td>
<td>1225 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 60 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider developing one-stop counter service for access to a wide range of municipal services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 General Inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider outsourcing some 311 activities to the private sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing or eliminating the 311 Development capacity once the model is fully implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 Service Processing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider expanding the range of call centre services that 311 provides to client divisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Of three service activities, "taking and tracking requests for service" received the highest average rank and "receiving feedback about City services and programs" received the lowest.
- For all 311 activities more participants said that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs.
- 59% said the City should take and track requests for service; participants were split on who should deliver other activities.
- Slightly more participants chose increasing property taxes to fund 311 activities.
- In their written comments, participants were split on whether or not the City's 311 service was great and should be kept or was poor and should be eliminated. When participants suggested keeping the service, they suggested it should be kept public. When participants suggested the service should be reduced or eliminated, they suggested it could be outsourced.
- Some participants suggested that 311's services could be coordinated or delivered through other means such as the public library, internet or through members of Council.
## Service: Managing Courts for Provincial Offenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Consider seeking legislative change to allow higher fees and streamlining of court operations. | 913 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 17 written comments were recorded.  
• Participants were split on whether the City should focus on maintaining quality or lowering costs for this service.  
• Of the service's activities, "Supporting hearings and trials" had the highest average rank and "Keep records of court decisions and court orders" the lowest.  
• Participants were split on how to fund these activities, with no majority supporting any funding option of user fees, property taxes, or a mix of both.  
• Participants were split on who should deliver these activities.  
• In the written comments, participants were clear that they would like to see the provincial government take back responsibility for this service, or pay a fair share of the costs. |
### Planning and Growth Management Committee

- 7 deputations were made to the Planning & Growth Committee.
- Half of the deputants opposed the elimination of the public art program or Public Realm improvements. The public art program was considered a high value service delivered for a relatively low cost while generating significant partnership revenue from private sector, adding to the value of development projects, and creating art that appreciates in value over time. Perceived benefits of Public Realm improvements and pedestrian infrastructure include improved local economy, reduction in congestion, safety for all road users, increased green spaces and increased tourism.

### Service: Planning and Approving City Growth and Development Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development review, decision and implementation</td>
<td>1768 people chose to provide in-depth responses; 363 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider less proactive and detailed intents review process.</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating public art programs.</td>
<td>- Many participants mentioned an ongoing need for effective and sensible city planning,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the opportunity to harmonize the Site Plan By-law.</td>
<td>suggesting that planning promotes an enhanced quality of life in the city and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider co-location with other City Divisions.</td>
<td>required increased investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider streamlining review of planning applications.</td>
<td>- All of the service activities were ranked closely together, with a slightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic and community improvement</td>
<td>higher average rank for “Help to design buildings and streets to make the City more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing the Heritage Grant and Heritage Tax Rebate Program.</td>
<td>beautiful, and work well for residents and businesses” and a lower average rank for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing the services levels and/or eliminating the Public Realm</td>
<td>“identify and protect historic (heritage) buildings”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements program.</td>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- At least 80% chose “maintaining quality” over “lowering costs” for each service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A significant number of participants suggested that work on preserving Toronto's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>heritage buildings needed to be continued and improved. Several suggest the City may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lack the ability to protect notable heritage structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Concerns were raised regarding the perceived lack of connection between the planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>process and planning for other city needs (including transit and community services).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- At least 70% said the City should provide each service activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There was less detailed written commentary on who should deliver planning services,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>though some participants stated strongly that the City should continue to provide and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>invest in planning, growth and development services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Approximately 50% chose “increase property taxes” to fund most activities; 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chose “increase user fees” to fund the review and processing of applications to develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>new buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                                              |   - There were few specific written comments on how to pay for these services. Participants who did comment, suggested that property taxes were the appropriate since all Toronto residents benefit from the provision of this service.
## Service: Building Permits, Inspections and Zoning Information Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Permit Inspections and Enforcement</strong></td>
<td>1151 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 19 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing or eliminating proactive inspection for illegal signs and investigation of sign complaints.</td>
<td>• For each service activity 60%-85% said that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Permission and Information</strong></td>
<td>• Of this service’s activities, &quot;reviewing applications for building permits and provide information for permit applicants&quot; received the highest average rank and &quot;Manage building records and information&quot; received the lowest average rank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider adopting process improvement and accelerate adoption of new technologies.</td>
<td>• Over 75% indicated that the City should deliver most activities; fewer (57%) said the City should manage building records and information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Permission and Information</strong></td>
<td>• Participants were split on how to fund most activities; a majority (55%) chose &quot;increase user fees&quot; for &quot;Review applications for building permits and provide information for permit applicants&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing information being explained to the public, or charging for the service – example: reduce provision of zoning information provided.</td>
<td>• Participants suggested that the City should look for efficiencies in this service by combining similar services or activities across divisions, and through coordinated and long-term planning across the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Others would like to see improvements in standards and enforcement in this service area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Committee

- A total of 169 deputations were made to the Executive Committee.
- Many deputants spoke about a range of City services and the investment in the City's overall quality of life. Many raised concerns that the KPMG options would have an impact on the most vulnerable and cited the value of programs and services such as late night TTC and affordable housing in promoting social inclusion and equity, community safety, improved health outcomes, and general livability of the city.
- There was strong opposition to the reduction in Library Service hours and closure of branches. Many of the deputants on this topic noted libraries are in high use by the general public; others identified libraries as a critical service to residents and students, particularly in low income communities where access to computers and other resources would otherwise not be possible.
- Many deputants opposed the reduction or elimination of the Community Partnership and Investment Program (CPIP). Reasons included: the program provides core funding for many community based agencies; it enables agencies to leverage funds from other partners including the private sector; the program affects a wide range of vulnerable groups; community groups add value by providing localized services and supporting specific needs of residents and communities. Deputants opposed cuts to CPIP health grants for student nutrition and HIV/AIDS prevention and drugs prevention programs.
- Concerns were raised by several deputants regarding the overall process being undertaken to identify service reductions, suggesting it was inadequate.
- Several residents indicated they would be willing to pay increased property taxes in order to maintain public services.

Service: Increasing Affordable Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider limiting the Housing Policy and Partnership activities to those funded by the senior government.</td>
<td>3108 people chose to provide in-depth responses on this service; 2773 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating New Affordable Housing Development service.</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consider reducing New Affordable Housing Development capacity.                |   • Most participants commented that affordable housing affects the economy, quality of life for the City as a whole and is related to other City service areas and should be considered as an urban planning issue that affects many who are not on social assistance, such as renters, new homeowners, and older homeowners on fixed incomes.
| Consider eliminating Housing Improvement Loans program                       |   • Of the service activities, "support building of low-cost housing through new construction and converting old buildings" received the highest average rank and "loans for house repairs and retrofits to low-income families" received the lowest. |
| Consider delivering Housing Improvement Loans program through a third party, community agency. | Service quality/levels:                                                                    |
| Consider a stronger consolidation of housing and homelessness planning       |   • Over 70% responded that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for each activity. |
|                                                                              |   • Many people were concerned about the length of wait lists, capacity of the system and demand exceeding supply; participants suggested the need for a long term strategy to move people off waitlists. |
|                                                                              |   • Many expressed concern about the quality of maintenance, cleanliness and repair of housing stock, as well as safety and accessibility. |
|                                                                              | Who should deliver:                                                                        |
and program delivery within City divisions and Toronto Community Housing Corporation.

- Most participants suggested that the City should deliver affordable housing activities rather than contracting them out.
- Those who suggested the City should not be providing affordable housing generally indicated that the Provincial or Federal government should have this responsibility; some suggested that the City could partner or provide incentives to the private sector.
- Participants indicated that the City should provide affordable housing if other governments or private sector could not.

Funding options:
- Between 47% and 56% indicated that increasing property taxes should fund the City’s affordable housing activities;
- Most participants commented that affordable housing should be funded through provincial and/or federal taxes and property tax increases should not compromise the affordability of people’s current housing.
- Many suggested that TCHC should keep its assets; some suggested that TCHC assets could be sold and the money reinvested in new stock or repairs.

Service: Funding and Programs for Vulnerable Groups and Neighbourhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDFA Community Development</td>
<td>2720 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 790 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing or eliminating some or all of the activities in this program.</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Partnership and Investment Program (CPIP)</td>
<td>- This service was seen as a means of achieving community safety, supporting youth employment and youth at risk,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing or eliminating this program.</td>
<td>- improving community and individual health, supporting priority neighbourhoods and other vulnerable groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider moving grant administration to the divisions responsible for the program areas involved.</td>
<td>- Investments in this area was seen as benefiting the City overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Many suggested it was important to co-ordinate these programs with other City services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Of the service activities, &quot;improve low-income neighbourhoods by improving local services&quot; had highest average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- rank, and &quot;work with community residents to reduce violence and improve community safety&quot; the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Many indicated it was important to consider the relation between these services and other City services, and to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- consider vulnerable communities in all decisions by the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Over 85% chose &quot;maintain quality&quot; over &quot;lower costs&quot; for all activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the written comments, those in favour of City provision cited greater accountability and funding and the City's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- responsibility to meet the basic needs of its residents. Others proposed contracted out the service to the non-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the quantitative data, 60% or more indicated that the City should deliver each service activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the quantitative data, about 60% indicated that property taxes should be used to fund each service activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In their written comments, participants suggested the City seek funds from the charitable sector to pay for these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Service: Community-Run Ice Rinks and Arenas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>1324 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 61 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• At least 65% of participants indicated that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for most activities; 57% chose maintaining quality over lowering costs for the activity &quot;renting rinks and arenas&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Of three activities, &quot;Maintain, repair and operate ice rinks and arenas&quot; received the highest average rank and &quot;Rent rinks and arenas&quot; received the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants were somewhat split on who should provide service activities, with slightly more in favour of the City providing maintenance, repair and operation of ice rinks and arenas including organizing ice time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants were split on how to fund service activities; a majority chose &quot;increase user fees&quot; or &quot;increase user fees for those who can afford them&quot; for renting out rinks and arenas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Very few participants suggested that the City should invest in additional rinks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants who mentioned arenas and rinks indicated they should be supported by user fees or corporate donations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some expressed concern about the need for more City or board accountability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Service: Community-Run Community Centres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>1830 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 7 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For each service activity, at least 75% indicated that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Participants were split on how to pay for community centre activities, with no clear majority favouring any funding option (user fees, property taxes, or a combination of the two).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Over 2/3 thought the City should deliver these services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Very few participants provided written input on Community-Run community centres. Some commented that the City should keep the centres; others suggested that they should be delivered collaboratively with, or contracted out to, non-profit organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Service: Exhibition Place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divest of Exhibition Place assets and / or privatize operations.</td>
<td>1131 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 26 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider discussions with the Province regarding the amalgamation of Exhibition Place with Ontario Place.</td>
<td>Slightly more participants favoured lowering the cost than maintaining quality for all activities except hosting the CNE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move CNEA to financial and programmatic independence from Exhibition Place and City; review necessary governance arrangements required because of this direction.</td>
<td>At least 60% chose &quot;increase user fees&quot; to fund most activities; 49% chose &quot;increase user fees&quot; to fund hosting the CNE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants were split on who should deliver these services. In their written comments participants who mentioned Exhibition Place and its facilities (BMO field, CNE, Royal Winter Fair or the Direct Energy Centre) suggested the City should not be in the business of running these types of facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participants suggested uploading Exhibition Place to other levels of government or selling it outright.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the City keeps Exhibition Place, participants suggested improvements will be needed to ensure it is used year-round, more effectively, and perhaps seeking funds through naming rights or corporate sponsorships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Service: Community-Led Heritage Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider divesting of the agency/program to a third party.</td>
<td>1122 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 155 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many people commented that the City should increase its focus on heritage preservation because it promotes Toronto's unique identity, culture and history, including its Aboriginal legacy, and contributes to Toronto's status as a liveable, dynamic and world-class city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74% chose maintaining quality over lowering costs for this service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some participants wrote that developers should be required to preserve heritage buildings, either through legislation, targeted funding or incentives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3 chose the City to provide this service. Some participants wrote that the City should look to community groups to help run heritage programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the quantitative data, participants were split on how to fund this service. A majority chose &quot;increase property tax&quot; or &quot;use a mix of property tax and user fee increases&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In their written comments some participants indicated that taxes should be increased or user fees levied to fund heritage programs; others did not want tax dollars spent on these services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several people commented that cuts in heritage programs should be considered before services they suggested were more essential such as police, fire and infrastructure services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Service: City-Run Live Theatres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider the amalgamation of all three theatres under a single board structure</td>
<td>1279 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 44 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consider the sale or lease of one or more theatre facility                  | - 63% said that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for this service.  
- Respondents were split on how to fund major theatres, but a majority supported either increasing user fees or increasing user fees for those who could afford them.  
- Respondents were split on who should run city theatres. In their written comments they were split on whether or not they should be funded at all. Some participants suggested the City should keep the theatre because they are part of what makes Toronto attractive to tourists and have a positive economic impact. Others suggested they should be sold because the City should not be in the business of running or funding theatres particularly in the face of difficult financial times. |

## Service: Toronto Parking Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider option to lease or sell off-street lots and garages.</td>
<td>1421 people chose to provide in-depth responses; 438 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Consider implementing pay-by-cell parking payment system.                  | What's important and why:  
- Many participants thought that parking services could be integrated with comprehensive transportation services, including public transit and biking infrastructure.  
- People commented that parking services were necessary, but inadequate for the number of vehicles in the city, especially the downtown core; others commented that space was wasted on parking.  
- Some people commented that access to parking is detrimental to the environment as it encourages driving.  
Service quality/levels:  
- Some participants commented that parking is especially inadequate on residential streets, better permitting options should be provided, and parking enforcement should be relaxed.  
- Many people commented that better street planning is necessary to integrate public transportation, parking, bike lanes and driving, particularly during rush hour.  
- Some people advocated better parking technology.  
- A majority said lowering the cost to the city is more important than maintaining quality for each activity  
Who should deliver:  
- People equally suggested the City should continue to operate the Parking Authority as it provides revenue, or changing the delivery model for parking services, including contracting out, selling the Parking Authority or working with other governments.  
- In the quantitative data, participants were split on who should provide parking services |
### Funding options:
- A large number of people commented that increased user fees or other types of charges should be levied for parking as a way to increase the City's budget.
- Some suggested reducing the cost of parking services.
- Some people suggested lower parking fees generally, or eliminating parking fees near hospitals, parks and schools.
- Over 60% chose “increase user fees” to fund each parking services activity.

### Service: Police Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider a business process based approach to improving efficiency and effectiveness of front line services.</td>
<td>3241 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 3014 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider options for delivery of call taking and dispatch services such as joint service delivery with Fire and EMS.</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider options for how critical infrastructure services are provided (includes Facilities Management, Fleet Management, Purchasing, Payroll, IT Services, Accounting Services, Hiring of non-uniformed officers)</td>
<td>- In the quantitative data, almost all participants viewed police services as necessary; in their comments, many participants mentioned community safety as an important &quot;core&quot; issue for government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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)</td>
<td>- Many suggested that community safety is a complex and long-term issue that could not be addressed by policing alone, but should involve increased spending on programs to prevent crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider transferring the Lifeguard Program to the City.</td>
<td>Service levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating or reducing service levels for the School Crossing Guard Program.</td>
<td>- For each of the Police Services activities, 50-60% of participants were in favour of maintaining quality, and 40-50% in favour of lowering costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing the size of the police force through budgetary means. This</td>
<td>- Some commented that they would be comfortable with reducing police service levels for items such as the number of cars sent per event, number of officers per car, or assignment to traffic and construction projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Some mentioned gangs, guns, drug crimes and violence against women as issues that police services need to do more to address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Many mentioned a lack of trust in police services and raised concerns about police oversight, accountability, fair treatment, and protection of civil liberties in relation to the G20 meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- With regards to contracting out services, 75% indicated that the City should deliver policing activities; 60% responded that the City should deliver investigations and other policing support activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Most comments indicated that policing was a core municipal responsibility but could also be shared with other levels of government; a few noted that privatization of some services might help to reduce costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants were split on funding options for police services. Some wrote that as a core service, police should be funded by increasing property taxes; some mentioned working with other levels of government to pay for policing related to provincial or national events; a few mentioned road tolls, user fees or increasing fines as sources of police funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
could include: Reducing or temporary eliminating hiring of new officers, providing incentives for early retirement.

Consider removing the requirement for police officers at construction sites.

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.

- In the written comments, a majority advocated cutting the costs of policing through a variety of means; some advocated investing in preventative services as a way to reduce the demand for policing.

### Service: Public Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chronic diseases and injury</td>
<td>2732 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 1111 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously review decisions on the execution of the program delivery (volume, resource allocation, strategy), to seek and generate efficiencies and cost savings.</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- People wrote that public health programs were important to quality of life, and prevented longer-term costs. People frequently mentioned public health services for marginalized communities as important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Of five service activities, &quot;Programs to prevent and control chronic, infections and preventable diseases&quot; received the highest average rank and &quot;Reduce the use of drugs and the impact of drug use to individuals and the community&quot; received the lowest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincially mandated dental and Child Health</td>
<td>Service quality/levels:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuously review decisions on the execution of the program delivery (volume, resource allocation, strategy), to seek and generate efficiencies and cost savings.</td>
<td>- For each service activity, 75% or more indicated that maintaining quality was more important than lowering cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipally mandated dental health and investing in families</td>
<td>- Participants mentioned mental health services, dental services and the City's drug strategy as programs that needed continued effort or expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider eliminating this program or reducing the service level</td>
<td>- Service levels should reflect legislative requirement, be coordinated with services offered by other levels of governments, and the City should leverage partnership opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipally mandated – CPIP</td>
<td>Who should deliver:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Between 60% and 85% said the City should deliver each service activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the written comments, many suggested it was important to maintain or invest in public health, however some mentioned uploading all activities to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Seeking partnerships with local community agencies or non-profit groups was also suggested as a way to deliver public health services; however some mentioned that services should not be contracted out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the quantitative data, between 50% and 60% said that each public health activity should be funded through</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consider eliminating this program, reducing the service level, or identifying alternative funding offsets.

**Infectious diseases**

Continuously review decisions on the execution of the program delivery (volume, resource allocation, strategy), to seek and generate efficiencies and cost savings.

**Environmental Health**

Continuously review decisions on the execution of the program delivery (volume, resource allocation, strategy), based on changing epidemiology and risks to seek and generate efficiencies and cost savings.

**Emergency preparedness**

Continuously review decisions on the execution of the program delivery (volume, resource allocation, strategy), to seek and generate efficiencies and cost savings.

- property taxes.
- In the written comments, participants suggested paying more taxes or seeking funding from other levels of government. Funding for sexual health services was particularly important to respondents.

---

**Service: Toronto Public Library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>4199 people chose to provide in-depth responses; 791 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider shared services with City for finance and human resources.</td>
<td>What's important and why:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library facility access</td>
<td>• A considerable number of participants noted that libraries were an issue of importance for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider rationalizing the footprint of libraries, closing some branches.</td>
<td>• Quality of life in the City was frequently cited as a reason to maintain and expand the public library system. Other participants indicated that libraries are a contributing factor to a healthy economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Several participants expressed the view that reducing library service had social implications and that vulnerable populations would be negatively impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Of five activities, “Provide library collections (e.g. books, magazines, DVDs)” had the highest average rank and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Library collection use
- Consider opportunities to reduce services (hours and days of operation)
- Consider consolidating Toronto Archives with Library Services
- Programs and outreach
  - Consider reducing or eliminating some programs and outreach activities

“Volunteer opportunities for youth and adults” the lowest.

**Service quality/levels:**
- Generally participants expressed concern about the potential loss or reduction of library services.
- A majority of participants wrote that library services should be maintained and enhanced.
- Some participants requested an investigation into the efficiency of library services and staffing levels. A few participants thought that there are some duplication of services between community centres and libraries and programs could be streamlined to increase the effectiveness of both services.
- Between 65% and 94% chose maintaining quality over lowering costs for each activity.

**Who should deliver:**
- Most participants prefer the City to operate and own the library system.
- A small number of participants wrote that libraries could be privatized or perhaps run with the assistance of volunteers.
- 69% or more said the City should deliver each service activity.

**Funding options:**
- A significant majority of participants requested an increase in funding and investment in library services, specifically requesting no reduction in libraries or the services they provide. A few participants noted that library services (i.e. hours of operation, acquisitions) could be reduced in order to achieve savings.
- Some participants suggested that a combination of property taxes and user fees could be used to fund the library system. Many commented that funds to maintain and expand library services should be secured through property taxes. Some stated that a modest user fee would be appropriate, while others strongly stated that user fees, particularly for vulnerable groups were not a feasible option.
- A few participants suggested that the library increase late fees in order to assist with balancing the budget.
- In the quantitative data, a majority of participants chose “increase property taxes” to fund most library activities; 49% chose “increase property taxes” to fund volunteer opportunities for adult and youth.

### Service: Public Transit (TTC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Conventional Transit  
Use of contractors for delivery of some TTC services.  
Use of more external suppliers for aspects of facility and vehicle maintenance.  
Rolling back some of the service improvements implemented under the | 6527 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 7043 written comments were recorded.  
What's important and why:  
- Public transit was viewed by almost all participants as a necessary service. Many indicated this service was important for environmental, economic and social reasons. Other suggested overall quality of life benefits including equity, health, reduced commute times, congestion and emissions.  
- Participants indicated that both transit accessibility and affordability were important considerations.  
- Public transit was often mentioned alongside other transportation modes – most frequently cycling. Many mentioned the need for co-ordination of public transit and cycling plans. |
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Ridership Growth Strategy, including changes to the crowding standard and the minimum service frequency standard.

Reducing/eliminating the Blue Night network, or making it a premium service by raising fares.

Consider monetizing parking lots through sale or lease.

Review service levels of support activities to conventional transit.

Consider opportunities to integrate administrative and back office services with City shared service groups.

Wheel Trans
Consider potentially developing individual plans for riders to use conventional services for their needs, relying less on Wheel-Trans.

Involve more private sector operators in the delivery of Wheel-Trans service – seek the proper contractor/city employee ratio.

Review eligibility criteria for Wheel-Trans participants to make it stricter, thereby lowering total demand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service quality/levels:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- For all transit activities, over 75% indicated that maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many suggested that the current system was out-of-date, or needed to be fixed in order to compete with vehicle travel and noted the need for a comprehensive transit plan or strategy to help the City make steady gains in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many wanted improvements to the system including greater accessibility, better scheduling and greater reliability both in terms of being on time and maintenance of vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There were many ideas but no consensus about the type of transit infrastructure that the City should invest in as well as the location for infrastructure investment and which investments should be a priority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Who should deliver:

- Approximately 75% indicated that the City should deliver conventional transit services rather than contract them out; approximately 50% indicated that the City should deliver Wheel Trans services.
- Many mentioned co-ordinating transit provision along regional lines or uploading to the Province.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding options:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- In the in-depth questions, more people suggested that increasing property tax or a mix of property tax and user fee increases should be used to fund public transit activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In their written comments, participants mentioned that affordability was a barrier to use; there was an interest in ensuring that vulnerable communities not face additional fare hikes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Many suggested finding alternative sources of transit funding including: Provincial or Federal funding from general revenues, allocation of Federal gas taxes to transit, road tolls and congestion charges, zoned fares and public-private partnerships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Service: Toronto Zoo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPMG Options</th>
<th>Public Consultation Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider the creation of a non-profit entity and examine possible governance and operating models</td>
<td>1427 people chose to provide in-depth responses on these services; 75 written comments were recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider sale of zoo to private owners</td>
<td>- 2/3 or more indicated maintaining quality was more important than lowering costs for all Zoo activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Participants were split on who should provide this service. Generally participants who mentioned the City’s Zoo suggested that it should be sold, eliminated or have its budget cut, fewer suggested contracting out the service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider options for partnering with or divesting to the federal or provincial governments</td>
<td>Participants were split on how to fund this service; slightly more participants chose “increase user fees” or “increase user fees for those who can afford them”. Some commented that naming rights or corporate sponsorship in addition to user fees should be examined to support the Zoo's budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider integrating Infrastructure Management services, with the City, where applicable</td>
<td>Participants suggested that the Zoo was not a priority during difficult fiscal times; some were concerned about waste and accountability. Some participants would like animals moved to sanctuaries, others suggested they did not want City funds to be spent on moving animals and that the educational goals of the zoo could be met through the internet or other organizations and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider integrating Finance and Administration services with the City, as applicable</td>
<td>There were several comments expressing concern for the animals, some suggested investing in better care or eliminating the zoo because zoos are not ideal living environments for animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Those who suggested the City should keep the Zoo also suggested that improvement to animal care, efficiencies and accountability needed to be made.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>