



City of Toronto Council and Committees

All Council and Committee documents are available from the City of Toronto Clerk's office. Please e-mail clerk@city.toronto.on.ca.

- [Accessing City Hall](#)
- [Mayor](#)
- [Councillors](#)
- [Meeting Schedules](#)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES

AND OTHER COMMITTEES

As Considered by

The Council of the City of Toronto

on June 3, 4 and 5, 1998

EMERGENCY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE

REPORT No. 5

1 Appointment of Weed Inspectors

2 Collision Reporting Centres

3 Seizing and Impounding of Vehicles used by Persons Charged with Prostitution Offence

4 Transitional Project - Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA)

5 Other Items Considered by the Committee

City of Toronto

REPORT No. 5

OF THE EMERGENCY AND PROTECTIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE

(from its meeting on May 22, 1998,

submitted by Councillor Denzil Minnan-Wong, Acting Chair)

As Considered by

The Council of the City of Toronto

on June 3, 4 and 5, 1998

1

Appointment of Weed Inspectors

(City Council on June 3, 4 and 5, 1998, adopted this Clause, without amendment.)

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee recommends the adoption of the following

joint report (April 20, 1998) from the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services, the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism and the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services; and that the necessary Bill be introduced in Council to give effect thereto:

Purpose:

As required under the provisions of the *Weed Control Act*, this report requests approval for Municipal Weed Inspector appointments for the City of Toronto.

Source of Funds:

Funds have been provided annually in the operating budgets of various departments in each of the former municipalities. It will be necessary to ensure that adequate funds are included in the operating budget of whichever City department is assigned responsibility for this program in the revised municipal structure.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

(1) Pending a decision about which City Department will administer and enforce the provincial *Weed Control Act* in the new City of Toronto, this responsibility continue to rest with the functional areas in each of the former municipalities which have traditionally handled weed control inspections.

(2) Toronto City Council pass a by-law (Appendix I) to appoint the following staff as Weed Inspectors and that they be authorized to do all things necessary to carry out such as provided for under the authority of the *Weed Control Act*.

East York

Ron Clark and Robert Ward, Parks and Recreation.

Etobicoke

Debbie Edmonds, Randy Berg and Stephen Miller, By-law Enforcement Officers, Urban Development.

North York

Robert Crump and Virginia Dracup, Parks and Recreation.

Scarborough

Brian Lawrence and Bryan Yule, Works and Environment.

Toronto

Dave Chapman, Rusty Warkman, and Stan Gilpin, Parks and Recreation.

York

Helen Sousa, Parks and Recreation.

Council Reference/Background/History:

The *Weed Control Act* designates twenty-three plants (e.g. poison ivy, ragweed) to be noxious weeds, and requires that every person in possession of land shall destroy all noxious weeds on that land.

Under the provisions of this Act, the City may by by-law appoint one or more persons as municipal Weed Inspector(s) who shall cause the noxious weeds located on any subdivided portion of the municipality and lots not exceeding 4.1 hectares (10 acres) whether or not the lots are part of a subdivision, to be destroyed in a manner described in the regulations.

Where it is determined that parcels of land exceeding 4.1 hectares (10 acres) should be cut in order to control noxious weeds located thereon, the owner is ordered in writing to destroy the noxious weeds, but no order shall specify a time less than seven days. If the weeds are not destroyed within the time specified in the order, the Weed Inspector shall then cause same to be cut.

Each former local municipality passed by-laws naming the Weed Inspectors for their geographical area.

With the exception of North York, which appointed its inspectors on an annual basis, the period covered by the appointments in each of these by-laws was indefinite. Therefore, with the exception of North York's Weed Inspectors, the appointments are still in effect until the by-laws of the former municipalities are rescinded.

A new by-law is required in order to re-appoint the Weed Inspectors for the North York District in the City of Toronto. The same by-law can also be used to rescind previous bylaws, some of which name as Weed Inspectors employees who are no longer in the employ of the City of Toronto or who no longer act as Weed Inspectors for their respective districts.

Responsibility for this program has been vested with different departments. North York, York and East York administered the program through their Parks and Recreation Departments. Toronto divided responsibility for the Act's enforcement between their Building Inspectors and Parks and Recreation staff, while the Works Departments in Scarborough and Etobicoke have handled the task in their cities. Etobicoke has recently transferred responsibility for the program from Works to Urban Development. The Metro Parks and Property Department has been responsible for the eradication of noxious weeds on their own property, but have not appointed formal Weed Inspectors to inspect and control noxious weeds on property other than their own.

During the restructuring process, a decision will be made about which City Department will assume responsibility for this function. In the interim and through most of 1998 we expect that the program will continue to be administered by the departments in each of the former municipalities who have traditionally done so.

Section 7(1) of the Act specifies that the clerk of a municipality "shall, before the 1st day of April in each year, give the (provincial) chief inspector a written notice indicating the name and address of every area weed inspector and the area for which the appointment is made." In order to be able to provide the Chief Inspector with this list for all the districts in the new City of Toronto, we are submitting the attached by-law for Council's approval. Although we will not be able to notify the Chief Inspector by April 1, the *Weed Act* also permits notification after this date provided that the clerk gives the Chief Inspector a written notice indicating the name and address of every inspector and the areas for which the appointments are made within seven days after the passing of a by-law appointing them. The passing of the attached by-law will enable us to provide this notification prior to the beginning of June when most field work under this program commences.

The *Weed Control Act* also requires the municipal council to publish notice in a newspaper having general circulation in the municipality of its intent to have the noxious weeds destroyed. Each former municipality has published its own notice in the past. In 1998, it is our proposal to publish an advertisement (Appendix II) in the *Toronto Star* giving notice to all owners and occupants of subdivided land in the new City of Toronto that unless the noxious weeds are destroyed by June 1, 1998, the Weed Inspector shall cause the said noxious weeds to be destroyed in a manner he/she may deem proper. Listings for the Weed Inspectors for each District will be included in the advertisement.

Comments and/or Discussion and/or Justification:

The authority granted to municipalities under the *Weed Control Act* allows the municipality to take appropriate action to control the spread of noxious weed species which may cause injury to human health or damage to adjacent properties. Most property owners maintain their lands in a way that prevents these kinds of weed species and problems from becoming established. Where this level of maintenance is not provided and noxious weeds become established, the City has the authority to eradicate them and prevent potential harm to neighbouring residents.

In accord with the Act, the expenses incurred by the Weed Inspector shall be invoiced to the property owner and if not paid by December 31, 1998, shall be placed on the Collector's Roll of the municipality and collected in the same manner as taxes under the *Assessment Act*.

Conclusions:

Appointment of municipal weed inspectors is necessary in order for the City of Toronto to comply with the requirements as set out in the *Weed Control Act*. The appropriate by-law is attached for consideration.

Contact Name:

Robert Crump, Parks and Recreation Department

North York Region

Telephone: 395-7991, Fax: 395-7937

Appendix I

City of Toronto

Draft By-law

A BY-LAW to appoint Weed Inspectors.

WHEREAS the Weed Control Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter W.5 provides that Council may pass by-laws appointing one or more persons as Municipal Weed Inspectors to enforce the provisions of the said Act;

THEREFORE THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF TORONTO HEREBY ENACTS AS FOLLOWS:

1. That the following staff be appointed Weed Inspectors and that they be authorized to do all things necessary to carry out such duties as provided for under the authority of The Weed Control Act.

Randy Berg, Dave Chapman, Ron Clark, Robert Crump, Virginia Dracup, Debbie Edmonds, Stan Gilpin, Brian Lawrence, Stephen Miller, Helen Sousa, Robert Ward, Rusty Warkman, Bryan Yule

1. That the following By-laws are hereby repealed:

Section 6 of By-law 11-95 as amended of the former Borough of East York

By-laws 1996-5, 1993-48 of the former City of Etobicoke.

By-law 24763 of the former City of Scarborough

By-law 1997-0205 of the former City of Toronto

By-law 3439-97 of the former City of York

ENACTED AND PASSED this day of A.D., 1998

Clerk Mayor

Appendix II

Draft Notice

CITY OF TORONTO

NOTICE TO PROPERTY OWNERS

DESTROY WEEDS

Notice is hereby given to every person in possession of land within the City of Toronto, in accordance with The Weed Control Act of Ontario, 1990, that unless noxious weeds or weed seeds are destroyed by June 1, 1998 and throughout the season, the Municipality may enter upon said lands to cause the noxious weeds or weed seeds to be destroyed, charging the costs against the land in taxes as set out in the Act.

In the interest of public health, noxious weeds requiring eradication as they appear, are Goat's-beard, Thistles, Ragweed, Poison Ivy, Wild Carrot, etc. Please note that Dandelions, Burdock and Goldenrod are not considered noxious weeds under the Weed Control Act, therefore complaints regarding these weeds cannot be accepted.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CALL THE FOLLOWING CUSTOMER INQUIRY LINES IN YOUR COMMUNITIES. ANONYMOUS COMPLAINTS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED. YOUR COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE IS GREATLY APPRECIATED .

EAST YORK396-2810

ETOBICOKE394-8055

NORTH YORK395-7997

SCARBOROUGH396-7372

TORONTO CENTRAL

DOWNTOWN392-7559

DON RIVER AND EAST TORONTO392-0828

NORTH TORONTO AND MIDTOWN392-6940

HIGH PARK, TRINITY NIAGARA AND DAVENPORT392-0855

YORK394-2875

2

Collision Reporting Centres

(City Council on June 3, 4 and 5, 1998, amended this Clause by adding thereto the following:

"It is further recommended that:

(1)Councillor Giansante be appointed as the Council representative on the Collision Reporting Centres Sub-Committee; and

(2)WHEREAS Collision Reporting Centres (CRCs) were established to save the Police money and to provide better service to the public; and

WHEREAS CRCs have proven to be very lucrative for their private sector operator and his insurance industry partner; and

WHEREAS the City is in dire need of additional revenue to fund services like policing; and

WHEREAS the City wants to provide enhanced service to the public;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT:

(1)the Chief Administrative Officer be requested to submit a report to the Emergency and Protective Services Committee for its meeting to be held on September 11, 1998, on the benefits and possible establishment of three additional Collision Reporting Centres (CRCs) in the City of Toronto, such report to include the impact of existing CRCs on auto body shops in the City; and

(2)the City Solicitor and the City Auditor also be requested to submit reports to the Emergency and Protective Services for its meeting to be held on September 11, 1998, on the question of liability for the City in light of the existing Collision Reporting Centre contracts."

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee recommends that the Toronto Police Services Board be requested to appoint a City of Toronto Councillor who is a member of the Emergency and Protective Services Committee to its Collision Reporting Centres Sub-Committee.

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee submits the following report (April 14, 1998) from the Chair, Toronto Police Services Board:

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the following report be received for information.

Council Reference/Background History:

At its meeting of March 26, 1998, the Toronto Police Services Board was in receipt of the following report March 11, 1998 from Mr. Albert H. Cohen, Toronto Legal Dept.:

"Subject: Motion by Councillor Fotinos Regarding

Collision Reporting Centres

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Board receive this report for information.

Background:

At the meeting of Metropolitan Council held on December 10 and 18, 1997, Councillor Dennis Fotinos moved the following motion with respect to a report entitled Amendments to By-law 20-85 - Accident Towing:

It is further recommended that Metropolitan Council recommend to the new City of Toronto Council that a Committee be appointed to evaluate the performance of the Collision Reporting Centres, and that such Committee be requested to submit a report thereon to the appropriate Standing Committee of the new City of Toronto at the same time as the accreditation program is being considered by such Standing Committee.

Metropolitan Council referred this motion to the Police Services Board.

At its meeting held on January 29, 1998, the Board adopted a report from former Chair Maureen Prinsloo requesting that the City Solicitor review the motion to determine whether Councillor Fotinos' "proposed evaluation mechanism and attendant reporting structure are permissible [sic] within the existing contracts between the Board and the Collision Reporting Centres" (Minute No.7/98 refers).

Discussion:

As Board members are aware, the existing contracts respecting the Service's participation in the collision reporting centres (CRCs) are between the Board and the three CRC operators. Consequently, those contracts are silent on the relationship of the City to the CRCs. The contracts were simply not designed for that purpose and only govern the relationship between the Board, the Service and the CRC operators.

With respect to the Board's contractual ability to establish a committee to undertake the functions identified in Councillor Fotinos' motion, there is no provision in the current contracts that addresses the matter. The contracts do contain provisions requiring the operators to report on a quarterly basis to the Unit Commander of Traffic Services and to provide specified types of information, including the number of persons who have used the CRC and the number and type of complaints received. As well, the operators must advise the Unit Commander of complaints about the operation of the CRCs within 72 hours of receipt of a complaint.

In the absence of any contractual provisions dealing with the concept of an evaluation committee and the provision of reports on the CRCs' evaluation to the appropriate City standing committee, neither the Board or the City is prohibited from so doing. However, since the City has had no direct involvement in establishing the CRCs, the Board may wish to consider establishing such committee and reporting to City Council on its conclusions. Given that the Board has a contractual relationship with the CRC operators, it is in a better position to engage in the evaluation process and obtain the cooperation of the CRC operators. Notwithstanding the foregoing, it should be noted that there is no contractual obligation on any of the CRC operators to participate in that process and assist, or provide information to, any such committee."

The Board was also in receipt of the following report FEBRUARY 26, 1998 from David J. Boothby, Chief of Police:

SUBJECT: EVALUATING PERFORMANCE - COLLISION REPORTING

CENTRES

RECOMMENDATION: THAT the Board receive this report.

BACKGROUND:

At its meeting on January 19, 1998, (Board Minute #7/98 refers) the Board received a report Amendments to By-law No. 20-85 - Accident Towing which had been adopted by Metro Council at their meetings held on December 10, and December 18, 1997. Metro Council had referred a motion from Councillor Fotinos concerning a proposed evaluation mechanism and attendant reporting structure for Collision Reporting Centres to the Police Services Board.

The Board further approved a recommendation that Councillor Fotinos' motion be referred to the City of Toronto Solicitor for review to determine if it was appropriate, given the existing contracts between the Board and the Collision Reporting Centres. In addition, the Board approved a recommendation that the Chief of Police submit a report outlining mechanisms currently in place to evaluate the performance of the Collision Reporting Centres.

The following is a list of criteria used to assess the performance of the Collision Reporting Centres.

INTERNAL

Daily statistics are maintained on the number of people using the CRCs to report collisions and other incidents. These reports indicate a high volume usage of the Centres (more than 120,000 people per year 1996 and 1997).

Monthly statistics, maintained by the Insurance Investigation Officers and the Hit & Run Co-ordinators, indicate a high activity level for each section.

A Complaints file is maintained by the Officer in Charge of the CRCs. All complaints about the program are documented, investigated and concluded. Most complainants require only an explanation of the program.

The CRC supervisors continually evaluate personnel and CRC operations, recommending and making improvements where necessary. Supervisory meetings are held regularly to discuss items of performance and implement improvements.

Further, in 1997 (February to May), the Toronto Police Service conducted an internal audit of the Collision Reporting Centres. The report, provided to the Executive Review Committee on May 22, 1997, concluded that the CRCs were operating in accordance with Service procedures. The report also found that public satisfaction with both the program and the service provided was high.

A recent cost benefit analysis determined that the performance of the Toronto Police Collision Reporting Centres is a cost effective system for the reporting of minor motor vehicle collisions, specifically those classified as property damage collisions.

EXTERNAL

The services provided by North, East and West Accident Support Services Limited (ASSL) are evaluated by the Toronto Police Service in the following manner:

Quarterly statistical reports are received from ASSL and maintained on file by the Officer in Charge. These reports indicate the number of people using the insurance support service offered by Accident Support Services Limited.

Customer surveys, generated through ASSL, are received and maintained on file. The customer surveys indicate a consistent 90% public satisfaction with ASSL and 95% public satisfaction with police services provided at the Centres.

The Toronto Police Service is notified of all complaints received by ASSL. Resolution of the complaints and investigation or follow-up is also reported. ASSL responds promptly to legitimate complaints and actions taken by ASSL employees are consistent with good business practices.

The Staff Sergeant in Charge of the CRCs has the responsibility to ensure that the conditions of the contracts between the Police Services Board and ASSL are continually met.

Additional performance evaluations of ASSL are conducted by the Insurance Industry through a User Group Committee which meets to discuss the services provided by the Operator. The Toronto Police Service has advisor only status on this committee.

Further, the Toronto Licencing Commission has recently been mandated, through amendments to By-law 20-85, to take an active role in monitoring the compliance of the Operator and ASSL in regard to specific on-site business conduct.

The Toronto Police Service CRC Program is seen as a benchmark program for other CRC operations in the Province of Ontario. Several other police services have followed our example, notably London Police Service and Niagara Regional Police Service.

Acting Superintendent Gary Grant (8-1914) and Staff Sergeant Thomas Huntley (8-1918) will be present to answer any questions."

Conclusions:

Board Member Jeff Lyons declared a conflict as he represented the Independent Auto Repairer's Association when this issue was considered by Metropolitan Toronto Council and did not participate in the discussion of this matter.

The Board approved the following Motions:

1. THAT a subcommittee of the Board be established pertaining to Collision Reporting Centres;
2. THAT the Collision Reporting Centres Subcommittee be responsible for:
 - evaluating the performance of Collision Reporting Centres
 - hearing complaints from representatives of the towing industry and auto body repair shops regarding Collision Reporting Centres
 - review on-going problems related to Collision Reporting Centres
3. THAT the structure of the Subcommittee be composed as follows:
 - 2 members of the Toronto Police Services Board
 - 1 City of Toronto councillor
 - 1 staff representative from the Toronto Police Service
 - 1 staff representative from the Ontario Provincial Police
4. THAT the Chief of Police provide the Board with semi-annual statistical reports on the results of the Collision Reporting Centres and include any recommendations which he feels the Board should consider; and
5. THAT copies of the foregoing reports be provided to the Emergency and Protective Services Committee for information.

Contact Name and Telephone Number:

Acting Superintendent Gary Grant, Traffic Services Unit, Telephone No. 808-1914.

3

Seizing and Impounding of Vehicles used by Persons Charged with Prostitution Offence

(City Council on June 3, 4 and 5, 1998, struck out and referred this Clause back to the Emergency and Protective Services Committee for further consideration at its meeting to be held on June 16, 1998, and report thereon to Council for its meeting to be held on July 8, 1998; and, further, that:

(1) the Commissioner of Community and Neighbourhood Services and the Chief of Police submit comments thereon to the Emergency and Protective Services Committee for such meeting; and

(2) the Chief of Police also examine whether vehicles could be seized and impounded now, without the need for any specific new legislation, and report thereon to the Emergency and Protective Services Committee for such meeting.")

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee recommends the adoption of the following motion (May 11, 1998) from Councillor Frances Nunziata, York-Humber:

WHEREAS in Manitoba the Provincial Attorney General, as part of the battle against prostitution, has endorsed the launching of a program in the City of Winnipeg to permit police to seize and impound the vehicles of "johns" when charged with communicating for the purpose of prostitution;

AND WHEREAS this program has been very successful in helping the police to reclaim communities and neighbourhoods;

AND WHEREAS every mechanism available to the police and the communities that make up the City of

Toronto to battle prostitution should be made available and utilized;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Council request that the Government of Ontario, through the Attorney General, introduce similar enabling legislation, that would permit the Toronto Police Service to seize and impound vehicles, for a specified period of time, owned or occupied by individuals or "johns", that have been charged with communicating for the purpose of prostitution.

4

Transitional Project - Self-Contained Breathing Apparatus (SCBA)

(City Council on June 3, 4 and 5, 1998, adopted this Clause, without amendment.)

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee recommends that the appropriate City officials be authorized to release a Request for Proposal for SCBA equipment and to report back to Council through the Committee when the terms and conditions of an agreement to purchase new SCBA equipment and trade-in existing SCBA equipment from one or more recommended suppliers is ready for Council approval.

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee submits the following report (May 21, 1998) from the Fire Chief:

Purpose:

This report is to respond to Committee's request for further information relating to the acquisition options available and the methodology to be used by staff of the Fire Services to choose a supplier of SCBA, the criteria and rationale for its selection, the opportunities for salvaging existing equipment and information on the life span of the current stock.

Funding Sources, Financial Implications and Impact Statement:

Transitional funding in the amount of \$2,000,000.00 has been placed on budget Priority List "B" for the purpose of acquiring approximately 700 breathing apparatus, cylinders, voice amplifiers, face pieces, associated equipment and spare parts.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that this report be received for information purposes, that staff be authorized to release a Request for Proposal for SCBA equipment, and that staff be directed to report back to council through committee when the terms and conditions of an agreement to purchase new SCBA equipment and trade-in existing SCBA equipment from one or more recommended suppliers is ready for council approval.

Council Reference/Background/History:

Currently, there are three different types of self-contained breathing apparatus in use by firefighters in the Toronto Fire Services: (1) Mine Safety Appliances - 4500 Custom II; (2) Scott (4.5 & 2.2); and (3) International Safety Instruments. These three different apparatus types are not compatible with each other with the result that firefighter safety could be compromised.

Comments and/or Discussion and/or Justification:

Staff of the Fire Services have had various conversations with suppliers active in this marketplace and through experience, have determined that the only proven way to confirm an SCBA supplier is to outfit firefighters with different equipment from the various suppliers and test these products in the field. Suppliers have been obviously reluctant to provide large quantities of SCBA equipment to fire departments for lengthy testing periods without first having some commitment from council that funds have been budgeted for this purpose. Accordingly, the Fire Service requests approval to release a Request for Proposal for the acquisition of new equipment, and the trade-in of existing SCBA equipment.

The technology that is required would have to incorporate amongst others, the following criteria: built-in safety factors, (e.g., voice communications, pass alarms, etc.), be sufficiently light in weight, durable, relatively maintenance free, cost effective both in initial capital cost and ongoing operating costs, manufacturer's service support, cost of replacement parts, length and conditions of warranty, etc.

The evaluation process would include an equipment testing period that would extend for 90 - 120 days and would occur in various stations across the city. Selected staff from all affected and applicable divisions (including the Health and Safety Committee) would form an Evaluation Committee and be charged with the responsibility of recommending to the Fire Chief a supplier for new SCBA equipment and a purchaser for our used equipment. It is possible that one supplier might be contracted for both of these needs. The Evaluation Team would conduct the applicable equipment tests (e.g., water submersion test, fogging test, etc.) and be responsible for ensuring that each supplier's product meets the required safety regulations presently in effect.

Many opportunities exist for salvaging existing equipment as discussions have been held with interested parties. From verbal valuations given to date, we expect to realize approximately \$500.00 per unit for each of the 843 units presently in use for a total of about \$421,500.00. We would of course obtain written quotations for the purchase from us of this surplus equipment.

Due to the fact that the six former fire departments acquired equipment that was not compatible amongst themselves, we must now standardize for a variety of reasons, the most important reason being firefighter safety. The current stock still has a reasonable life span and it is this residual value that makes these units attractive to the 'used equipment' marketplace.

Conclusions:

The next step in the acquisition process is the release of a Request for Proposal detailing the technical requirements for SCBA equipment and the conditions for the bidding process. In order to effectively amalgamate the former six Fire Departments into one emergency response service, this is a very necessary component that will allow for the safe movement of staff between fire station locations.

Contact Names:

William Stewart

397-4304

Norm Gibbons

397-4315

Other Items Considered by the Committee

(City Council on June 3, 4 and 5, 1998, received this Clause, for information.)

(a)Police Complaints Process.

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee reports having:

(a)received the following communication; and

**(b)directed that the Chair of the Toronto Police Services Board be requested to report to th
Emergency and Protective Services Committee on the existing structure for handling civilian
complaints and its plans or proposals for the future.**

(February 4, 1998) from Councillor Joe Mihevc, York Eglinton, advising that he has received concerns from various members of the community regarding the development of the new police complaints process; that he has suggested to the new Chair of the Police Services Board, Councillor Norman Gardner, that this would be an excellent opportunity for the Police Services Board to bring forward its concerns, and its efforts at allaying community concerns, in dealing with police complaints; and recommending that the Committee encourage greater public awareness and debate of any new proposed policy.

Councillor Joe Mihevc, York Eglinton, addressed the Emergency and Protective Services Committee in connection with the foregoing matter.

(b)Accident Towing - Regulation of Collision Reporting Centres.

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee reports having referred the following report back to the City Solicitor for a further review to determine if wording can be found to assist Council to achieve its intent.

(April 30, 1998) from the City Solicitor, recommending that Section 15 of Part 6 to Schedule 24 of By-law No. 20-85 of the former Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto not be amended as proposed in the following motion referred to the City Solicitor by the former Metropolitan Toronto Council:

"It is expressly forbidden for any employee or official of a Collision Reporting Centre or a representative of an insurance company on the premises, to recommend verbally or by telephone, computer or other electronic medium, a body shop or automotive repair facility."

(c) Towing from Private Property.

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee reports having:

(a) referred the following report to the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services, the Commissioner of Works and Emergency Services and the Toronto Police Services Board for a report to the Emergency and Protective Services Committee; and

(b) directed that a public meeting be scheduled when this matter is brought forward for the Committee's consideration.

(April 29, 1998) from City Clerk, advising that the East York Community Council, on April 1, 1998, recommended to the Emergency and Protective Services Committee that a review of the Towing of Private Property By-laws from the former municipalities with the purpose of harmonizing the various by-laws be undertaken.

(d) Court Challenge to Metropolitan Toronto By-law No. 129-95 respecting Lap Dancing.

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee reports having referred the following report to the City Solicitor and the General Manager of the Toronto Licensing Commission for a joint report on the effectiveness of the enforcement of By-law No. 129-95.

(April 28, 1998) from the City Solicitor, advising that an appeal of the legal validity of Metropolitan Toronto By-law No. 129-95 respecting lap dancing was dismissed with costs by the Supreme Court of Canada on February 19, 1998.

(e) By-law to Amend By-law No. 20-85 - Accident Towing - Mandatory Drop and Accreditation of Vehicle Repair Facilities.

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee reports having deferred consideration of the following report to its next meeting to be held on June 16, 1998:

(May 15, 1998) from the General Manager, Toronto Licensing Committee, recommending that:

1. By-law 20-85, Schedule 24 be amended to:

a) implement that mandatory drop and the accredited vehicle repair facilities system on July 2, 1998;

b) specify the criteria a vehicle repair facilities must meet to qualify for accreditation;

c) revise "forms as approved by the Commission" to "forms as approved by the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services or her/his designate"; and

d) describe an Appeal Process for applicants who are refused accreditation;

2. the recommendation of the Working Group, for an interim accreditation program, operated through the Toronto Licensing Commission and by Reg Quinn Ltd. be approved and the existing contract with the Toronto Licensing Commission be amended accordingly;

3. an appeal process to either the Toronto Licensing Tribunal or the Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services be approved;

4. a review of the need to continue the interim program be conducted within the next six months; and

5. the appropriate City of Toronto Officials be authorized and directed to take the necessary action to give

effect thereto.

(f)Olde Town Toronto Tours Limited and Proposed Amendment to By-law 20-85, Schedule 35.

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee reports having deferred consideration of the following report to its next meeting to be held on June 16, 1998:

(May 20, 1998) from the General Manager, Toronto Licensing Commission, recommending that:

(1)By-law 20-85, Schedule 25, Section 17 be amended to permit the operation of horse drawn trolleys with a passenger capacity of 25 persons; and

(2)By-law 20-85m Schedule 25, Section 23(3) be amended to delete the work "Commission" and to insert the words "Commissioner of Urban Planning and Development Services.

(g)Request for Briefing from the Toronto Police Services Board on the Need and Options for a Helicopter Patrol Service.

The Emergency and Protective Services Committee reports having requested the Toronto Police Services Board to provide a briefing to the Committee on the following issue as soon as possible:

(May 22, 1998) from Councillor Brad Duguid, Scarborough City Centre, recommending that the Toronto Police Services Board be requested to provide a briefing to the Committee on the need, advantages and disadvantages of a helicopter patrol capability including:

(1)an analysis of the past consideration and reports on this issue;

(2)an estimate of the capital and operating costs of a helicopter patrol capability;

(3)the viability of a pilot program to better determine the effectiveness of a helicopter patrol in Toronto; and

(4)options to make helicopter patrol program more cost effective such as corporate sponsorship of the capital and/or operating costs of such a program.

Respectfully submitted,

DENZIL MINNAN-WONG,

Acting Chair

Toronto, May 22, 1998

(Report No. 5 of The Emergency and Protective Services Committee was adopted, as amended, by City Council on June 3, 4 and 5, 1998.)

Please note that council and committee documents are provided electronically for information only and do not retain the exact structure of the original versions. For example, charts, images and tables may be difficult to read. As such, readers should verify information before acting on it. All council documents are available from the City Clerk's office. Please e-mail clerk@city.toronto.on.ca.