

Clerk's Files

OCT 1 9 2011

Originator's Files

CD.12-TRA

DATE:

September 12, 2011

TO:

Chair and Members of Budget Committee

Meeting Date: October 19, 2011

FROM:

Paul A. Mitcham, P.Eng., MBA

Commissioner of Community Services

SUBJECT:

Staffing for Garry W. Morden Centre (Ward 9)

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council approve the hiring of the Facility Manager for the Garry W. Morden Centre as identified in the Fire and Emergency Services 2011-2014 Business Plan and Budget with a start date of November 1, 2011 and the complement be increased by 1 FTE.

BACKGROUND:

The Garry W. Morden Centre (GWMC) includes a 62,000 sq.ft (5743 m2) administration building that will have programmable area for Mississauga Fire and Emergency Service Mechanical and Training divisions, City of Mississauga Information Technology Disaster Recovery and training classroom, and the Department of National Defence. Using funding from the Provincial Government, (MIII grant) LEED silver accreditation is being pursued for this facility. The site will include a 1.2 km driver training circuit that will be shared with the Peel Regional Police as well as Fire Training Props such as new and improved versions of the smoke tower and burn house and adequate training areas for confined space, trench rescue, HAZMAT, auto extrication and structural collapse.

As part of the Fire and Emergency Services 2011-2014 Business Plan and Budget, Budget Request (BR) #61 was submitted for consideration, at a net cost of \$83,000. Among other operating requirements for this facility, this budget request highlighted the need

- 2 -

for a facility manager to be responsible for the ongoing operation of this multi use, multi tenanted facility.

PRESENT STATUS:

As part of the 2011 budget discussions, on March 9, 2011, Council approved Budget Committee resolution BC-006-2011 which deferred the start date of this initiative to January 2012.

COMMENTS:

At the time this position was being considered at Budget Committee, the substantial completion date was still uncertain however since that time, staff have confirmed a substantial completion date of late

November 2011. In order to facilitate the occupancy, and have the position poised to take on the responsibility of the ongoing operations, budgeting, programming and scheduling of the administration building and driver training track, the hiring of the position is requested for November 1, 2011. As this is a large, operationally complex, multi tenanted facility, it is critical that this position be in place to ensure a smooth transition for City staff as well as tenants and visitors.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The annualized cost of the facility manager position, including fringe, is estimated at \$106,800. It has been included in the 2012-2014 Fire and Emergency Service's Business Plan and Budget, within the *Cost to Maintain Existing Services* category. The budget discussions are scheduled to start with Budget Committee in December 2011. As the position is requested at a start date of November 1st, 2011, this report is recommending approval of the position in advance of the budget deliberations. The incremental impact will be in 2011 and will be reflected in the 2011 year end results.

CONCLUSION:

The Garry W. Morden Centre is designed to be a facility that will provide superior training opportunities for both Mississauga Fire and Emergency Services staff and other emergency service providers. This building will be the City of Mississauga's first LEED accredited building and is anticipated to draw visitors from across the country to take advantage of the many training opportunities.

Now that staff have confirmed the date for substantial completion, a position is required to maximize its potential benefits for city staff, tenants and guests.



Paul A. Mitcham, P.Eng. MBA Commissioner of Community Services

Prepared By: Tracey Martino, Manager Financial and Strategic Planning, MFES



Originator's Files MG.23.REP

DATE:

September 27, 2011

TO:

Chair and Members of Budget Committee

Meeting Date: October 19, 2011

FROM:

Martin Powell, P.Eng.

Commissioner of Transportation and Works

SUBJECT:

Option to Reduce the 2012 Budget: Suspension of the Driveway

Windrow Snow Clearing Pilot Program

RECOMMENDATION:

That the Budget Committee provide direction on the option to reduce the 2012 Budget through the suspension of the Driveway Windrow Snow Clearing Pilot Program commencing with the 2011-2012 winter season as outlined in the report dated September 27, 2011 from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works.

BACKGROUND:

In 2009, during 2010 Budget Committee discussions, a Committee of Council was formed to develop a plan for the provision of windrow snow removal service to senior adults and disabled residents who demonstrate a financial need and other residents on a pay for service basis. A city-wide pilot Driveway Windrow Snow Clearing Program was established to run from January 2010 to March 2010.

Due to the late start and mild winter conditions, Council decided to extend the pilot for the 2010/2011 winter season.

COMMENTS:

The second year of the pilot saw a dramatic decrease in interest for the program even though it was offered to anyone, not just people 65 and older, who were willing to pay for the snow removal service.

A total of 73 seniors/physically disabled people who qualified for the City's Active Assist Program received this service at no charge. As well, 199 paying participants enrolled in this program making the total enrolled in this program 272. This was a decrease of approximately 40% in enrolment from the 2009/2010 winter season.

During the 2010/2011 winter season, complaints regarding the program were logged by 311. Often the complaint centered on the time required to complete this service and that only three meters (ten feet) of the windrow was removed. The level of service provided windrow clearing up to 12 hours after the completion of the road snow plowing operation. This may equate up to 36 hours from the last snowfall.

To increase this level of service to less than 12 hours after the completion of the road snow plowing operation would require increasing the number of contractors. It is estimated that the cost would be at least double to increase the level of service to have the windrow clearing up to 6 hours after the completion of the road snow plowing which would equate to 30 hours from the last snowfall.

Budget and Program Limitation:

A budget of \$100,000 was allocated for this program in 2011. The total cost for providing this service for the 2010/2011 winter season was \$111,860. Most of this cost was for standby which was paid to the contractor to ensure he has his equipment and drivers available to respond in accordance to the established level of service. It was anticipated that when the program was expanded to all residents, the City would have 2,500 homes requesting this service, but since this did not occur the cost per driveway is high at \$411/driveway.

Revenue:

The total revenue realized through this program was \$39,800. The \$200 fee per household for those not eligible for receiving the service for free was estimated on full cost recovery for operating costs. However, given the low participation the cost per driveway was higher than \$200. If the program is to continue the cost for those who do not qualify for the Active Assist Program should be increased to \$411 per resident. This in turn will likely decrease the participation rate for those who must pay.

- 3 -

Advertisement of the Program:

Advertisement of this program was completed through the City web page, community centres, libraries and other public areas, seniors clubs and the City 311 services. Flyers and posters were also utilized as well as advertisement within the local newspapers.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

By discontinuing the Driveway Windrow Snow Clearing Program, the 2012 winter maintenance budget can be decreased by \$100,000 from the 2011 winter maintenance budget.

CONCLUSION:

Due to this decline in enrolment, difficulty in determining the demand and setting cost per driveway, dissatisfaction with the level of service provided and challenges in logistics to clear the driveway windrows sporadically throughout the City, the benefit of the program is very limited.

Budget Committee should consider whether to provide this program for the 2011/2012 winter season. Given that application process is scheduled to start in November, a decision is required before the end of October.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 1: Report titled "Driveway Windrow Removal" dated November 2, 2009 from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works.

Appendix 2: Snow Removal Subsidy Program

Martin Powell, P.Eng.

Commissioner of Transportation and Works

Prepared By: Ezio Savini, P.Eng.,

Manager, Works Maintenance and Operations



Clerk's Files

Originator's Files

MG.23.REP

DATE:

November 2, 2009

TO:

Chair and Members of Budget Committee

Meeting Date: November 9, 2009

FROM:

Martin Powell, P. Eng.

Commissioner of Transportation and Works

SUBJECT:

Driveway Windrow Removal

RECOMMENDATION:

- That an additional \$500,000.00 be allocated to the 2010 Winter
 Maintenance Operating Budget to allow for a City-wide pilot to
 remove snow windrows from driveways for older adults and
 people who are physically disabled to run from January 4, 2010 to
 March 26, 2010 and to fund continuation of the program the
 following season subject to Council approval.
- That the driveway snow windrow removal program be limited to persons 65 years or older and people who are physically disabled as verified by a regulated health professional.
- 3. That those persons who are 65 years or older and people who are physically disabled as verified by a regulated health professional who qualify with the financial requirements of the City's Active Assist Program, receive this service at no charge.
- 4. That those persons who are 65 years or older and the people who are physically disabled as verified by a regulated health professional who do not qualify under the financial requirements of the City's Active Assist Program, have the service available at a cost of \$120.00 for the duration of the pilot program.

- 5. That the City's pilot Driveway Windrow Removal Program be limited to 2,500 residences who qualify under the Active Assist Program and limited to 1,000 residences who do not qualify under the Active Assist Program, on a first come, first serve basis.
- That the Commissioner of Transportation and Works report back to General Committee upon conclusion of the pilot Driveway Windrow Removal Program with recommendations for future winter seasons.

BACKGROUND:

The Transportation and Works Department received a request from Budget Committee during 2010 budget deliberations to re-examine the issue of providing driveway windrow removal and to survey other municipalities to determine the varying levels of service provided for older adults and disabled residents. That report was presented to Budget Committee on October 20, 2009 (Appendix 1).

In discussing the report, Budget Committee passed the following recommendation:

"That a committee consisting of Councillors Eve Adams, Maja
Prentice and Pat Saito be formed to meet with City and Region of Peel
staff to develop a plan for the provision of windrow snow removal
service to senior adults and disabled residents who demonstrate a
financial need and other residents on a pay for service basis, to be
implemented for the upcoming winter season, and that the report on
the implementation of the program including eligibility criteria be
provided to Budget Committee as quickly as possible."

COMMENTS:

A Committee of Councillors Eve Adams, Maja Prentice and Pat Saito was formed and met with City staff. Due to time constraints, Regional staff were not involved at this time. The following were the outcomes of discussion with the Committee:

Eligibility and Fees

That the program be made available only to adults 65 years and older and to people who are physically disabled as verified by a regulated health professional. Those persons who qualify under the Active Assist Program would receive the service at no cost; all others would pay a fee of \$120.00 per household for the duration of the pilot program. The cost to provide this service for a full winter season is estimated at \$200.00 per household per season.

Scope of Program

It was agreed that because driveway windrow removal would be a new service and the City has no experience with this type of service, the program should be run as a City-wide pilot.

Duration of Pilot Program

In order to properly advertise, receive and process applications and to organize equipment, the pilot program cannot be available prior to January 4, 2010. In order to meet this timeline Council approval would be required by November 11, 2009. The pilot would run from January 4, 2010 to March 26, 2010. Upon conclusion of the program, the Commissioner of Transportation and Works would report back to General Committee with recommendations for future winter seasons.

Budget and Program Limitations

Because uptake of the program is not known, it is difficult to predict administrative demands and a corresponding budget. It was therefore decided that the program be on a first come, first serve basis, and be limited to 2,500 households of older adults or people who are physically disabled that meet the financial requirements of the Active Assist Program. For those older adults and people who are physically disabled that do not meet the Active Assist Program criteria and are prepared to pay \$120.00 (estimated full cost recovery for a 3-month period) be limited to the first 1,000 households that apply.

A budget of \$500,000.00 is required assuming all 2,500 households apply and qualify for the service and that the program is continued for 2010-2011 winter season.

Advertisement of Program

Assuming that the pilot program is approved by Council on November 11, 2009, advertising would start immediately and would run until December 18, 2009.

The Committee proposed that advertising take place on the City's web page, Community Centres, libraries and other public areas, seniors clubs and over the City's 311 service. Flyers and posters detailing the service would be prepared and distributed strategically.

Subsequent to the Committee's concurrence and recommendations, Transportation and Works staff are also recommending that some form of advertising be conducted in the local newspaper following the example of those municipalities that offer the same kind of service.

Application Review and Approval

Applications will be available on the City's web page for download as well as all Community Centres. The applications along with supporting documentation and fees if applicable will be received at all Community Centres and processed by Community Services.

In order to qualify as a person who is physically disabled, there will be a section on the application form requesting verification by a regulated health professional and a declaration by the applicant that there are no able-bodied people living at their residence.

Final approval for acceptance into the program will be done by Transportation and Works based on physical constraints such as onstreet parking, extended parking or anything else that may prevent equipment from performing the work.

Level of Service

The pilot Driveway Windrow Removal Program will provide service after every plowing operation. Bare pavement cannot be guaranteed. The clearing will be approximately 3.0 m (10 ft) wide to allow one car to pass. It could take up to 12 hours after the completion of the plowing operation before the windrows are removed.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

In order to initiate and provide a driveway windrow removal service at no cost to 2,500 qualifying residences for a full winter season, an additional \$500,000.00 is required in the Winter Maintenance Operating Budget.

CONCLUSION:

There are many municipalities in the GTA area that provide a driveway windrow removal service with varying degrees of service, eligibility and fees. In order to gauge the demand for this kind of program as well as gain operational experience, a pilot program would be beneficial to both residents and staff.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 1: Report dated October 8, 2009 from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works.

Martin Powell, P. Eng.

Commissioner of Transportation and Works

Prepared By: J.J. Pitushka, P.Eng.

Director, Engineering and Works



Clerk's Files

Originator's

MG.23.REP

DATE:

October 8, 2009

TO:

Chair and Members of Budget Committee

Meeting Date: October 20, 2009

FROM:

Martin Powell, P.Eng.

Commissioner of Transportation and Works

SUBJECT:

Windrow Removal

RECOMMENDATION:

That a City program to provide windrow removal service for older adults and the disabled not be implemented and that the annual \$200.00 subsidy program for older adults and disabled residents continue to offset the cost of private snow clearing.

BACKGROUND:

The Transportation and Works Department received a request from the Budget Committee during 2010 budget deliberations to re-examine the issue of providing driveway windrow removal, and to survey other municipalities to determine the varying levels of service provided for older adults and disabled residents.

A tendered cost of \$3.2 million per season excluding administration to provide driveway snow windrow removal for certain residential driveways that meet certain criteria was received as part of the tender for the current five year Winter Maintenance contracts.

In the "Five-Year Winter Maintenance Tender" report dated June 22, 2009 Council adopted to award a five-year winter maintenance contract which did not include driveway snow windrow removal.

COMMENTS:

Seventeen municipalities were surveyed to determine the level of service for driveway snow windrow removal for older adults and disabled residents. The survey results are attached as Appendix 1.

The following is a summary of the survey results:

- Four of seventeen municipalities provide no windrow removal or any assistance to older adults or disabled residents.
- Six of seventeen municipalities provide windrow removal to qualifying older adults and disabled residents free of charge.
- Five of seventeen municipalities provide windrow removal to qualifying older adults and disabled residents for a fee ranging from \$50.00 to \$120.00 per resident per season.
- Two of seventeen municipalities provide windrow removal to all residents.

Mississauga offers up to \$200.00 snow removal subsidy to qualifying older adults and disabled residents to offset the cost of arranging for private snow clearing services which could include windrow clearing. For the 2008/2009 winter season, 199 residents received the subsidy while 22 applicants did not qualify. The current budget for the program is approximately \$40,000:

If the City were to take on providing snow windrow clearing for all older adults (65 years and older) and the disabled, it is anticipated that the uptake for the program would be significantly greater than the 199 residents currently in Mississauga's subsidy program. Currently for Oshawa, windrow clearing is provided to disabled and older adults (65 years and older) residents, at no charge. Residents must provide proof of disability or proof of age and declare that no able person under the age of 65 resides in the home. There is no restriction regarding the income of the resident or household. For Markham, it is the same as Oshawa except that the older adult is 60 years and older.

Based on the numbers in Markham and Oshawa, it is estimated that 0.7% of the population or 5,200 households would qualify and receive the service. However, this number is likely low as based on the 2006 census data, there are a total of 17,500 single and semi-detached dwellings (owned and rented) where the primary household maintainer is 65 years and older. Staff can only approximate the number of dwellings that do not have an able person under 65 residing in the home as well as the demand for the service.

For Mississauga, if 5,200 homes throughout the City qualified, requested the service and based on eight storm events per winter season, where street plowing is required, the estimated gross cost including standby, operating and administrative cost is \$1,133,000.

The current Mississauga program is unique and none of the municipalities surveyed, has a similar subsidy program.

Although the City does not arrange for the actual windrow clearing, the \$200.00 per season subsidy for qualifying older adults (based on financial need) and disabled residents appears reasonable to arrange for private windrow clearing. The City's subsidy program in effect meets or exceeds other municipalities' programs and provides the financial ability for windrow clearing to those residents who really need it.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

The current subsidy program of providing up to \$200.00 per season per qualifying resident has been allocated in the 2010 proposed budget and no additional funding is necessary.

CONCLUSION:

A survey of seventeen municipalities revealed that there is substantially varying degrees of assistance to older adults and disabled for windrow removal. Mississauga's financial subsidy program is unique from the seventeen municipalities surveyed, and the amount of subsidy offered by the City, \$200.00 per season per resident, is sufficient to compensate qualifying older adults and disabled residents arranging for private driveway windrow clearing.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 1: Windrow Clearing Survey Results.

Martin Powell, P.Eng.

Commissioner of Transportation and Works

Prepared By: Silvio Cesario, P.Eng., Manager, Works & Operations

| Municipality | Universal Windrow Clearing | Snow Windrow Clearing for Older Adults And Disabled | Seasonal Fee Charged | Number of Residents Participating | Total Population | Program Participation Rate | Comments |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Brampton | No | No | N/A | N/A . | 434,000 | N/A | There may be program in future |
| Caledon | No | No | N/A | . N/A | 57,000 | N/A | |
| Halton Hills | No | . No | N/A | . N/A . | 55,000 | N/A | , |
| Newmarket | No | No | N/A | N/A | 74,000 | N/A | |
| Pickering | No . | Yes | Free Unlimited | 300 | .88,000 . | 0.34% - | . 1 |
| Markham · | No | Yes | Free Unlimited | 1,846 | 262,000 | 0.70% | |
| Oshawa' :: >- · | No . | Yes | Free Unlimited | 1,000 | 141,000 | 0.71% | 2-1 |
| Richmond Hill | · No | Yes | Free Unlimited | 1,000 | 163,000 | 0.61% | 18 |
| Whitby | No | Yes | Free Unlimited | 660 | 120,000 | .0.55% | Cost to Municipality is \$180 to \$200 per year per residents |
| Burlington | No | Yes | . \$50. | 150 | 164,000 | 0.10% | |
| Milton | No | Yes | \$50 | New program for 2009/2010 season | 54,000 | N/A | |
| Oakville | и́о | Yes | \$50 | 550 | 170,000° | 0.30% | 10-15% more each year |
| Ajax | No ' | Yes | \$120 | 240 | 90,000 | 0.30% | Also do driveway on private property |

| Municipality | Universal Windrow Clearing | Snow Windrow Clearing for Older Adults And Disabled | Seasonal Fee Charged | Number of Residents Participating | Total Population | Program Participation Rate | Comments |
|--|----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Hamilton | No | Yes | Actual cost \$11 to \$16 per hour | 200 | 505,000 | 0.04% | Ontario Works sends out volunteers to clear snow Called Helping Hands Program |
| Toronto * o East York o Toronto o York | No | Yes | Free Unlimited | 10,000 | 926,000 | 1.10% | |
| Toronto * o Etobicoke o North York o Scarborough | Yes | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1,574,000 | 100% | |
| Vaughan | Yes | N/A | N/A | N/A | 239,000 | 100% | 60,000 to 70,000 driveways cleared 8 times per year avarage. |

| Mississauga | See comments | N/A | 199 | 750,000 | 0.03% | Snow removal subsidy of \$200 per qualifying senior and disabled residents |
|-------------|--------------|-----|-----|---------|-------|--|
|-------------|--------------|-----|-----|---------|-------|--|

^{*} Toronto has two different service levels and was counted as two municipalities.

APPENDIX 2

Snow Removal Subsidy Program Registration and Claim



City of Mississauga
Finance Division
300 City Centre Drive
MISSISSAUGA ON L5B 3C1
Tel: 905-615-3200 ext. 5266
www.mississauga.ca/finance

| Payee | | | This form is your application and claim for subsidy for snow removal during the winter of 2010/2011 |
|-------|-------|--|---|
| | | | Completed applications must be returned no later than APRIL 30, 2011 |
| _ | To qu | alify for the program, the applicant must be: | |
| | (a) | a Mississauga resident who resides as owner residential property for which the snow remove | |
| | (b) | able to provide receipts or other documentation | on verifying the claim |
| | (c) | not living in a high-rise or similar multi-unit bu | ilding |
| | (d) | the only person making application for subsid | y at this municipal address |

(f) handicapped or physically disabled in such a way as to restrict his/her mobility and in receipt of benefits under the Ontario Disabilities Support Program (ODSP) or in receipt of assistance under the Ontario Works Support Act.

If you meet the above criteria, please complete the section of the back of this form providing all information requested. An incomplete form will delay payment of your claim.

Supplement under Part II of the Old Age Security Act (Canada)

65 years of age or over and in receipt of a monthly Guaranteed Income

If you are in receipt of benefits under the Ontario Disabilities Support Program (ODSP) or Ontario Works Support Act, please provide a copy of your most recent cheque stub as verification of your claim.

Note: You must be in receipt of the above benefits between November 1, 2010 - March 1, 2011.

(e)

OR

City of Mississauga Snow Removal Subsidy Application

| Please Print: (Do not compl | ete shaded areas) | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| *Applicant's Name: | | Date of Birth: | | | |
| Spouse's Name: | | Date of Birth: | | | |
| Address: | | | | | |
| Postal Code: | | Telephone: | | | |
| Service Date | Amount Paid | Received By | | | |
| | | | | | |
| * I hereby certify that I and/or (sixty-five) years of age or old disabled. I occupy as owner oproperty on which costs have understand that I must provide expenditures deemed necess before any subsidy will be pai | er or permanently r legal tenant the been incurred. I e any receipts of ary by the City | * I hereby certify that I have paid the above amounts to the individual(s) named above and am now claiming a subsidy of \$ (maximum of \$200.00) under the Senior Citizens Subsidy Program. | | | |
| Authorization * I hereby agree to provide Sofollows: * I hereby authorize Human Rouvelopment Canada to releated Mississauga such information | tesources and Social use to the City of | (*applicant's social insurance number) | | | |
| recipient under the Guarantee Signature of App | ed Income Supplement. | Date of Application | | | |
| Signature of App Human Resources and Social Develo Is applicant in receipt of Guaranteed Income Supplement? | To all Republic Street | Date of Application | | | |



Seasonal Services

▶Snow Clearing Operations

Driveway Windrow Pilot Program

Spring Clean-Up

Fall Leaf Pick-Up

Residential Pool Installation



Pilot Program Click Here



STREET PLOW GUIDE



Street Plow Guide Priority Road Plow Maps



Sidewalk Plow Guide Priority Sidewalk Plow Maps

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

- Will the City plow my driveway at the same time it is clearing the sidewalks?
- The snow plow came by my street but didn't plow. Why not?
- Who can I contact to find out about the status of snow clearing in Mississauga?
- The snow plow damaged my driveway curb. Will the City pay for the repair?
- How many kilometres of road and sidewalk does the City clear during and after a snow event?
- Does the service level of snow clearing vary depending on the amount of taxes a neighbourhood

Residents > Seasonal Services > Snow Clearing Operations

Snow Clearing Operations

FEATURED ARTICLE

Financial Assistance for Snow Clearing

If you are a low income Senior (65 or older), or a low income physically disabled person, you may be eligible to receive a financial subsidy of up to \$200 to offset the cost of snow removal from your sidewalks and driveway. Only Mississauga residents in receipt of either the GIS, ODSP or the Ontario Works Support Act will be considered for the subsidy. If you qualify, please complete the Snow Removal Subsidy Application form below.

Financial subsidies for snow removal are sent to qualified residents after the winter season.

Please note: The City does not provide personal snow clearing services, and the snow clearing match program is no longer available.

Related Links:

Financial Services - Snow Removal Subsidy Registration and Claim

Memorandum



DCT 1 9 2011

TO:

Chair and Members of Budget Committee

FROM:

Martin Powell

DATE:

October 5, 2011

SUBJECT:

Transit Route Map Charge

The following information is submitted to Budget Committee in response to Council's decision on September 28, 2011 to reopen the issue of charging for transit route maps,

Background

During the development of the 2011-14 Business Plan & Budget, service areas were challenged to identify cost savings and/or revenue opportunities to offset inflationary pressures in the operating budget. Transit staff proposed charging for route maps which would reduce printing and distribution costs and generate revenue. This was presented as an efficiency measure under Budget Request # 509 (copy attached). The initiative was originally approved by Budget Committee on December 13, 2010, as well as included in a service presentation to Budget Committee on January 17, 2011. The \$2 charge was outlined in the November 25, 2010 Corporate Report – Fees and Charges: Mississauga Transit Fares Proposed Fare Increase (effective April 4, 2011).

Historically, MiWay prints and distributes 200,000 free route maps annually over two print runs (May and October). The cost to print these maps is approximately \$32,000 annually. The number of occasional or new riders on our system is approximately 60,000, which indicates that many riders are taking 2 or more maps per person. Consequently, the free maps are often perceived as having minimal value and are typically discarded after one use – similar to the way a Styrofoam cup is disposed of once the coffee it holds has been consumed. Attaching a value to the paper transit map will encourage customers to retain it and reuse it – more like a travel mug – and will reinforce efforts to develop a transit-oriented city. The next edition of the route map will also be printed on higher-quality paper so that it is more durable and valuable.

Transit route maps have limited utility as they do not contain schedule information. Except for a few core routes (Hurontario, Dundas, Bloor, Dixie) most routes do not have the hours or frequency of service that would allow you to simply walk out to the transit stop and take the next bus. As we have a large system with 88 routes, with time changes every 8 weeks, it is not practical to include this information in the map.

Schedule information is essential to use the transit system and must be sought out from another source such as a customer service agent, our interactive voice system, the website or mobile application. The map is available on the website or mobile application and customer service agents assist with trip planning. Offering the printed route map at \$2.00 helps support the City's strategic goal of promoting a green culture leading to a change in customer behavior and a more sustainable approach to the environment.

Customer Information Options

The behavioral shift toward environmentally-sustainable alternatives is already underway: customers have shown a growing preference for MiWay's electronic tools, which offer the most up-to-date information and are free to use. The options include the full website (www.miway.ca), the mobile website (http://m.miway.ca) and Citylink (905-615-4287).

Additionally, customers can now access transit service information using the new MiWay iPhone/iPod application, which enables customers to view interactive route maps on an Apple iPhone or iPod Touch. The app is available for \$1.99 through the Apple iTunes Store (www.miway.ca/app) and with sales about to exceed the thousand threshold.

Starting in 2012 MiWay Route Navigators will be available free of charge to the public to view or print from our website, at outreach events, high schools, seniors' centers etc. These Route Navigators are individualized by route and provide both the up-to-date map of the entire route and a corresponding schedule.

Transit systems that make printed route maps available for \$2 include Grand River Transit (serves the Waterloo Region) and Guelph Transit. STO (Société de transport de l'Outaouais – service area includes Gatineau) charges \$1 for its transit map.

Printed route maps would be made available for \$2 from the City Centre Transit Terminal (200 Rathburn Road West) and through the Mississauga eStore (www.mississauga.ca/store), which offers free shipping. It is expected that these distribution channels can satisfy the shrinking demand among customers for paper route maps in Mississauga.

Transit Marketing Department staff will continue to distribute limited quantities of promotional maps to target markets (seniors residences, community agencies, businesses and student ambassadors). As these maps will have value it is more likely that they will be retained.

Financial Impacts

MiWay will print a reduced amount of route maps (40,000) which will save \$24,000 annually in printing costs. The 2011 transit budget also identifies \$80,000 in revenue from map sales which represents an 80% reduction in demand from 200,000 maps annually. If direction is given to continue to distribute all maps free of charge this revenue would have to be made up through increases to fares, property tax or service cuts. By way of comparison the map revenue is comparable to the cost of maintaining Sunday/Holiday service on Route 45 - Winston Churchill which wasn't recommended for eliminating just meets our minimum performance standards.

Conclusion

Customer demand for transit information is shifting steadily from print to digital communication because of the additional benefits in convenience and accessibility that electronic options can deliver. Offering the printed route map for \$2.00 (rather than for free) not only supports the City's "Green" and "Move" Strategic Pillars but also reflects a growing preference among transit riders for environmentally sustainable options that better meet their transit service information needs. Staff recommends the implementation of the \$2 charge for route maps effective October 24, 2011.

Martin Powell, P.Eng

av

Commissioner of Transportation and Works

City of Mississauga **Business Plan and Budget** Budget Request # 509 Description of Proposed Initiative Reduce Transit Route Map Annual Print Production Service Area Mississauga Transit Department Transportation and Works 2014 Impacts (000s) 2011 2012 2013 2010 & Prior **Net Operating** 1,410 -31 22 0 0 Net Cost Funded from -31 22 0 0 1,410 Tax Levy Net Impact on Tax Levy 0.00 % -0.01 % 0.01% 0.00 % FTE 0 1 0 0 6 Capital Approved Forecast Net Incremental 0 0 0 0 0 Capital

Details of Service Change

The current annual Transit Route Map press run totals 200,000 at a cost of approximately \$32,000. Route and information changes that occur after each May and October printings render the publication inaccurate until the next printing. There is a high degree of wastage as customers often use the free map only once and then discard it.

Up to date, accurate travel information is not an issue with the Transit website as it can be posted immediately for customers. The move from traditional print communications to digital media is evident in the number of hits the Mississauga Transit website receives - the highest number of hits on the corporate website.

The suggestion is to reduce the production quantity by 50% and charge a minimal fee for each map thereby raising the perceived value of the map with it less likely to be discarded. A reduction in maps will likely drive more customers to the website where information is current and up to date.

With the redesign of Transit's website for the October 2010 launch of the new Transit brand, the new site will introduce the first transit app of its kind in the GTA featuring bus departure times for all Mississauga bus stops available on iPhones and iPods. Further, a Transit micro-site and simplified trip planning features are being developed for other popular mobile devices.

T&W is currently pushing out up to date city snow clearing information on Twitter and is investigating communicating planned and unplanned traffic/construction/detour information through RSS feeds to customers and residents.

As customer demand for information and service moves from traditional print to digital communications, it will be necessary to acquire staff that are specialized in the design, development and ongoing management of these types of new social media. The development and delivery of digital customer information becomes increasingly more necessary as we move toward the opening of the BRT and the implementation of the iBus project. The recommendation is to hire an Information Coordinator (Labour Grade E, April 1, 2011 start date) to support basic web design and post digital communications for T&W customers.

Service Impact

Increase the accuracy of customer information.

Increase the number of avenues customers have available to receive essential travel information. Reduce print production costs.

Generate new revenue by charging \$2 each for the printed map.

Attract 'choice' riders to the transit system.

There is the potential that in acquiring a Web Application Specialist more communications can be developed and pushed out to residents and customers, thereby further reducing the cost of producing other print publications in T&W.

Comments

Annual savings in reducing print production costs = approx. \$16,000 Revenue generation estimated at \$80,000 (charging for Transit Route Map)

Further savings could be realized if print communication collateral is reduced and this information migrates to digital communications through the web and personal mobile devices.

Green initiative.



RESOLUTION 0229-2011 adopted by the Council of The Corporation of the City of Mississauga at its meeting on September 28, 2011

0229-2011 Moved by: Pat Saito

Seconded by: Frank Dale

1. That the question regarding charging for transit route maps be re-opened

 That the matter regarding charging for route maps be referred to Budget Committee on October 19, 2011

Carried



Clerk's File

BUDGET COMMITTEE OCT 1 9 2011

Originator's Files

DATE:

October 7, 2011

TO:

Chair and Members of Budget Committee

Meeting Date: October 19, 2011

FROM:

Brenda R. Breault, MBA, CMA

Commissioner of Corporate Services and Treasurer

SUBJECT:

Toronto Service Review

- **RECOMMENDATION:** 1) That the report dated October 7, 2011, from the Commissioner of Corporate Services and Treasurer entitled "Toronto Service Review" be received; and
 - 2) That Budget Committee provide direction with regard to any service reduction or elimination opportunities identified in the Toronto Service Review which they would like more information on or to be considered for the City of Mississauga.

BACKGROUND:

The City of Toronto is facing a significant shortfall in its 2012 Budget. To address this shortfall Toronto is undertaking a Service Review Program. The program includes three key components:

- A core service review that examines what services the City delivers and at what service level;
- Service efficiency studies that examine how the City delivers it services; and
- A user fee review that examines the City's fees to determine the extent to which they are fair, and collect the full service cost.

The first component has now been completed. Toronto retained the services of KPMG to undertake the core service review. KPMG was asked to review and analyze all City Services provided by divisions and agencies, and identify which services are core services. Services are identified as either:

- Mandatory required by legislation
- Essential critical to the operation of the City,
- Traditional provided by virtually all large municipalities
- Other/ discretionary provided by the City in response to community needs.

Based on these criteria, KPMG ranked 90% of the City of Toronto services as core services. Services were also compared to other major jurisdictions and service levels were defined as below standard, at standard or above standard and the degree to which the standard was prescribed by legislation, set by Council, management, funding agreement or industry best practice.

Based on this assessment KPMG provided 69 options for the City of Toronto to consider that eliminate, divest or reduce service levels and generate Budget savings. KPMG also identified 119 opportunities to conduct further review to achieve efficiencies and cost savings. The results of this review were presented to Toronto's various Standing Committees from July 18 to July 28, 2011. The Toronto City Manager reported back on September 19th, 2011 and Toronto City Council continues to review the service reduction and elimination opportunities.

COMMENTS:

City of Mississauga staff have been monitoring the City of Toronto process. This process was designed to assist in addressing Toronto's budget shortfall. While not to the same extent as Toronto, Mississauga is also facing a budget shortfall, and the opportunities and ideas coming forward for Toronto may also be opportunities for Mississauga. Staff are considering budget reduction options in developing the 2012 Budget, based on direction from Budget Committee on June 28, 2011.

The City of Toronto is a single tier municipality and therefore has many more services than Mississauga. Many of these additional services are provided by the Region of Peel, while some are unique to Toronto (eg. Toronto Zoo). Staff have reviewed all the opportunities presented which are applicable to Mississauga services. Attached to this report in Appendix 1 are comparisons by service area. For each service, opportunities presented in the Toronto reports that are relevant to Mississauga services are summarized, by activity. For each opportunity identified in the Toronto reports, staff have assessed whether the option is applicable to Mississauga's service and if so, the impact of implementing the Toronto service recommendation in Mississauga. Staff are not recommending any of these opportunities and comments are provided only to assist Council in understanding the implications of implementing the applicable Toronto recommendations on Mississauga services.

It is important to note that the City of Mississauga reviews services on an ongoing basis through service reviews to identify efficiencies and cost savings. The Management Consulting section of the City Manager's office regularly conducts e3 reviews of services to identify efficiencies and savings. The City also undertook a comprehensive core service review in 2004. Many of the services proposed for elimination or service level reduction for the City of Toronto are not provided by Mississauga at present (eg. Windrow removal) or Mississauga's service levels are already at or below the reduced service levels proposed for Toronto. Many of the opportunities being considered by Toronto have been considered by Council in the past. such as reducing library hours, and reducing winter maintenance service levels. Additionally a number of the opportunities being considered in Toronto deal with centralization of services for efficiencies or outsourcing - the City of Mississauga is already much more centralized than Toronto and we currently outsource a larger proportion of our service delivery.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Staff has not costed the impact of implementing the various applicable opportunities identified in the Toronto Service Review in Mississauga. Budget Committee direction is being requested as to the service reduction/elimination opportunities identified in the appendices which they would like further investigated.

- 4 -

CONCLUSION:

The City of Toronto is undertaking a detailed service review to identify services that can be eliminated, reduced or where efficiencies can be achieved. The review is also considering Agencies and Boards which can be divested. This review is designed to identify significant savings to help address the City of Toronto's significant budget shortfall. City of Mississauga staff have reviewed the opportunities identified in the Toronto process, which are relevant to the services provided by the City, and have provided comments on the impact to the City of Mississauga if these opportunities where to be implemented. In many cases, the City of Mississauga's service levels are already at or below the levels being recommended in the Toronto reports and Council has considered some of these opportunities in the past. Staff is seeking Council direction as to whether they would like further investigation of any of these opportunities.

ATTACHMENTS:

Appendix 1: City of Mississauga Comments on City of Toronto

Service Review Report by Service and Opportunity

result

Brenda R. Breault, MBA, CMA

Commissioner of Corporate Services and Treasurer

Prepared By: Patti Elliott-Spencer, Director, Finance

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|---|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Internal Audit / Audit Reporting | Essential service to successfully run and operate the City Meeting service level standards set by management directive Internal Audit accounts for 0.07% of the City Budget | Essential service Meeting needs and expectation of senior management and Audit Committee Internal Audit accounts for 0.18% of City's Operating Budget | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | Consider providing internal audit for TTC | No impact – Internal Audit is already providing audit services to Mississauga Transit (MT does not have a separate audit group like TTC) |
| Internal Audit / Business and Risk Consulting | Discretionally service provided internally Meeting service level standards set by management directive | Essential service Meeting needs and expectation of senior management and Audit Committee | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | Evaluate requirement for business and risk consulting | Business and Risk Consulting is an essential and not discretionary service. It is part and parcel of City's Internal Audit Mandate to "promote risk awareness and risk management throughout the City". This service is not a distinct service provided by a separate group within Internal Audit. Elimination or reduction will also impact on audit services and could potentially increase the risk exposure of the City. |
| Corporate | Essential service to | Essential service | D – | D – | No | No impact |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG - 2 -

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Leadership and Strategic Direction / Governance | successfully run and operate the City Service Levels are consistently met Corporate Leadership and Strategic Direction accounts for 0.057% of the City Budget Intergovernmental relations accounts for 0.013% of the | Corporate Strategy and Innovation accounts for 0.004% of the City Budget with no dedicated intergovernmenta I relations expenditures | Delivery by City staff | Delivery by City staff | opportunities identified other than general continuous improvement | |
| Legal Service Solicitors / To provide legal advice, review contracts and related documents | City Budget Essential Service Ensuring that staff are highly trained and possess the current expertise to meet client needs and participate in Solicitor training workshops to City Programs. | Essential Service Very similar service levels in Mississauga as in Toronto | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | Consider supporting all TTC legal needs and also those of other ABCs Consider strategic sourcing options (i.e. either increasing or | 1 st option is not significant to the setting in Mississauga. We have few ABCs and while we could increase the services provided to them, we do provide certain legal services to Enersource (minor real estate related to development applications) and receive a charge back for the work based on an hourly rate. We should also note that in the case of Enersource, there is another shareholder so it |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG - 3 -

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | Providing efficient | | | | decreasing the | may not be appropriate for the City |
| | and timely legal | | | | amount of | to expand its legal role there. |
| ľ | services to support | | | | external | |
| | the development | | | | services) | The KPMG report concludes that |
| | process. | | | | | external sourcing for legal services is considerably more costly than |
| , ` | Responding to the | ! | | | | internal resources. Cost |
| | increase in demand | | | | | implications and overall |
| | for Legal Services. | | | | | efficiency/effectiveness may |
| | This includes | | | | | suggest greater reliance on in- |
| | providing | | | | | house resources. This is consistent |
| | innovative, | | | | | with Mississauga's approach to |
| | excellent legal | | | | | adding in-house legal counsel |
| | advice in a timely | | | | | when the business case justifies it. |
| | manner to reflect | | | | | |
| | the priorities of the | | | | | |
| | Mayor and City | | | | | . 1 |
| | Council, City | ļ | | | | |
| | Programs and | | | | | · |
| | Agencies, and | | | | | |
| | supporting City | | | | | |
| | initiatives. | | | | | |
| | Continuing to | | | | | |
| | provide legal | | | | | |
| | support to the | | | | | |
| | City's Programs | | | | | |
| | and Agencies in | | | | | |
| | the areas of | | | | | |
| | municipal, real | | | | | |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG - 4 -

| Printer Laborated States and Committee and C | Section 10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 (10 | I shifts facilitate to to be defined as between the control of the | - | | representation of the second of the second | |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
| Legal Services Litigation / To provide representation to the City in resolution of lawsuits and claims | estate, litigation, planning and development, prosecutions and employment law. Essential Service Continuing to provide legal support to the City's Programs and Agencies in the areas of litigation (including defending against | Essential Service Very similar to Toronto, except Legal Services does not provide litigation support to defend against insurance claims | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | Consider supporting legal needs of all agencies Consider strategic sourcing options (i.e. either increasing or | We currently do not provide any litigation support to any of the City's agencies. As per KPMG's report, investigation in whether any conflict would arise from providing litigation support would be required before we can determine whether to expand our role. For example in the case of Enersource, there is another shareholder aside from the City. |
| | insurance claims), planning and development law. Providing efficient and timely legal services to support the development process. | | · | | decreasing the amount of external services) | As such, it may not be appropriate for us to expand our legal role there. According to the KPMG report, external sourcing for legal services is considerably more costly than internal resources. Cost implications and overall efficiency/effectiveness may suggest greater reliance on inhouse resources. This is consistent with Mississauga's approach to adding in-house legal counsel when the business case justifies it. |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG - 5 -

| | | | - 3 - | | | |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
| | | | | | | Legal Services and Risk Management staff are exploring the potential for our in-house staff to assume some responsibility for defending small claims property damage cases, recognizing the cost savings and other benefits to doing this. Once this is implemented and can be assessed, there may be potential to expand this support using in-house lawyers. |
| Legal Services Prosecution / Responsible for the prosecution of a wide range of offences committed under City bylaws and Provincial statutes. | Mandatory Service Continuing to provide legal support to the City's Programs and Agencies in prosecutions. | Mandatory Service Very similar to Toronto. | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | N/A | N/A |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – CULTRAL SERVICES

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Cultural Services / Arts Programming | Art Education; Art Events (community organized); Art exhibits (city organized) Gross Cost: \$2180K Net cost: \$1820K UF 83% of programs cost funded from tax base | Variety of Arts Education programs provided on cost recovery basis. Municipal support for community organized events is through grant program as outlined below. Staff do not organize art exhibits. Gross Cost: \$280K Net Revenue: (20K) F 0% program funded from tax base | D – Delivery by City staff Mc = Manager - Contracted | D – Delivery by City staff D – Delivery by City staff N/A | Consider reducing or eliminating any or all of the activities. | No other arts program opportunities as LAC and VAM programs are at capacity. \$0 savings as programs operate on a cost recovery basis including staff salary to administer \$0 budget impact - community organizes art exhibits. |
| Cultural Development | Archaeological Sites Act legislates standard for conservation | | D – Delivery by City staff | | Consider reducing or eliminating any or all of the | |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – CULTRAL SERVICES

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG - 2 -

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | of artefact collections to ensure state of good repair and at least 75 % of City art collection made publicly | | Mc = Manager - Contracted | D – Delivery by City staff | activities. | \$0 budget impact - all artefacts donated. |
| | available Acquisition and conservation of art and artefact collections; Adaptive Reuse of Heritage Sites; Cultural Facilities | Do not solicit or collect archaeological artefacts. Only small, donated artefacts are accepted Cultural facility maintenance and development is responsibility of | | N/A D – Delivery by City staff | | Safety and longevity of facilities impacted if not maintained and will result in need to spend significant future funds to repair or demolish. City owned designated buildings in disrepair will violate Ontario Heritage Act |
| | Maintenance and Development Grants | F&PM, with an annual budget of approximately \$550K to perform both in-house and contracted work. 1 part time staff coordinates grants | | D – Delivery by City staff | | Elimination of grant coordinator will require all grants to go through Council Elimination of only Research staff will result in the City operating in a vacuum with no basis for decision making and no understanding of how we |
| | Coordination | | | D – Delivery | | compete with other |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – CULTRAL SERVICES

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | Research, Advocacy | 1 staff conducts research for development of culture map, statistics, background data for reports etc. | | by City staff | | municipalities in terms of offering a livable city. Will reduce ability to attract grants and corporate support for events as will be no basis to demonstrate impact or data to support requests. |
| | Public Art Selection, Location and maintenance Gross Cost: \$6470K Net cost: \$4610K 71% of program cost funded by tax base | 1 staff oversees selection, location and maintenance of public art. Category includes all administrative costs Gross Cost: \$1350K Net cost: \$1350K 100% funded from tax base | | | | Eliminate only Public Art staff will defeat one of the cool factors in the City's Strategic Plan and reduce our ability to attract tourists, industry and businesses as there will be no sense of place or "vibe" to attract and retain people. Eliminating or reducing the very small amount of cultural development that currently takes place in Mississauga will result in it becoming a cultural wasteland. |
| Events Programming | Community event coordination (3 rd | 1 staff designs and delivers of 10 | D – Delivery by | N/A | Consider reducing or | Cancellation of events will result in loss of performance |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – CULTRAL SERVICES

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | Party); Design and Delivery of Events. Gross Cost: \$7620K Net Cost: \$5180K 68% funded from tax base | city-wide events attracting thousands of internal and external tourists Net Cost of \$100K | City staff Mc = Manager - Contracted | D – Delivery by City staff | eliminating any or all of the activities. | opportunities for over 100 Mississauga artists and arts organizations. Audiences will have to go to other municipalities to participate in these activities. Negatively impacts quality of life for thousands of residents who participate in these events |
| Heritage Programming and Support | Museum and Heritage Programs | Museums offer programs and tours Heritage staff administer | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | Consider reducing or eliminating any or all of the activities. | as they are accessible to all. \$60K in grants to operate museum programs lost 10,000 registrants with no other museum program opportunities available in Mississauga. |
| | Gross Cost: \$ 7140K Net cost: \$5660K 79% funded from tax base | Ontario Heritage Act Gross Cost: \$970K Net budget: \$750K 77% funded from tax base | Mc = Manager - Contracted | D – Delivery by City staff | | Elimination of Heritage Planners will result in an inability to protect local heritage as required by the Ontario Heritage Act |
| Business Services | Permit turnaround time is better than | 3 working day | Mc = Manager – | D – Delivery by | Consider reducing or | 100+ shoots annually generating between \$30K and \$125K per |
| Film & Digital | standard. | permits achieved | Contracted | City staff | eliminating any or | day economic benefit to local |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – CULTRAL SERVICES

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG - 5 -

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Media Services | Gross Cost: \$1270K Net cost: \$1150K UF 90% funded from tax base | Gross Cost: \$90K Net Revenue (\$30K) F 0% funded from tax base | D – Delivery by City staff | | all of the activities. | economy |

City of Toronto Cultural Services Gross Cost: \$23.7 Million

\$3.0 Million

City of Toronto Cultural Services Net Cost: \$17.3 Million

\$2.2 Million

City of Mississauga, same services, Gross Cost:

City of Mississauga, same services, Net Cost:

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Fire Safety Education / Public Fire Safety | Toronto Fire Services have a ratio of 1 per 130,000 population. 21 FTEs dedicated to Public Fire Safety | MFES has a ratio of 1 per 365,000 population 2 FTE's dedicated to Public Fire Safety | D – Delivery by City staff and Mp – Mgr Partnership | D - Delivery by City Staff | None | |
| Fire Prevention, Inspection & Enforcement / Site Plan and Building Plan Review | Education TFS reviews site plan only | Education MFES does both Site Plan and Building Plan Review | R - Regulator | D - Delivery by City Staff | | |
| Fire Code Enforcement | Lack staffing to carry out inspection of high risk occupancies such as hospitals, nursing homes and hotels. | MFES has a mandatory annual inspection program for high risk occupancies. | R – Regulator | D - Delivery by City Staff | None | · |
| Fire Rescue & Emergency | 90th percentile response travel | 90th percentile response travel | D – Delivery by | D- Delivery by City Staff | Consider reducing the | MFES tiered response protocol currently requires MFES to |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Response / Fire Rescue & Emergency Response | time is 4:51 minutes compared to the target of 4:00 minutes Total response time is 6:40 minutes (plus 911 and TFS call handling time) | time is 5:38 minutes compared to the target of 4:00 minutes Total response time is 7:01 minutes (to compare to Toronto this includes prep and travel time) | City staff | | range of medical calls to which the fire department responds Consider integrating EMS and Fire organizational ly and developing new models to shift more resources to EMS response and less to fire response over time | respond to obvious immediate threats criteria: 1) Choking 2) Unconsciousness 3) Respiratory Arrest 4) Sever Respiratory Arrest 5) Vital Signs Absent (VSA)/Cardiac Arrest It is assumed that fire will be tiered to all calls in which their assistance is required as part of the responsibilities as identified in the Fire Protection and Prevention Act. (FPPA) This includes: 1) Multi Casualty Incidents 2) Entrapment and other Rescue Calls 3) Motor Vehicle Collisions with Ambulance Responding MFES 90th percentile total response time is approximately 4 minutes faster than EMS total response time. MFES is on scene first in 83% of reported VSA calls and therefore can provide quicker |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | initial contact with the patient. If MFES reduced the range of medical calls to which it responds, the immediate impact would be increased response times and consequently have a negative impact on patient outcomes. Survival rates are proven to be higher in those communities where Cardio Pulmonary Resuscitation (CPR) and/or defibrillation are administered in less than six minutes from the start of a sudden cardiac arrest. |
| | | | | | | A two tier government structure is a significant barrier to being able to implement an integration of Fire and EMS in the City of Mississauga. The City of |
| | | | | | | Mississauga emergency medical services are delivered at the regional level while fire and emergency services are delivered at the municipal level. Both of these services are dispatched by a third tier Central Ambulance Communications Centre operated |

| | - 4 - | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga | | |
| | | | | | | by the Province on Ontario. In the | | |
| | | | | | | City of Toronto, all of these | | |
| | | | | | | services are municipally operated. | | |
| | | | | | | Notwithstanding the above, MFES | | |
| | | | | | | is well positioned to complement | | |
| | | | | | | and enhance the EMS delivery | | |
| | | | | | | system in Mississauga, thus | | |
| | | | | | | significantly improving patient | | |
| | | | | | | outcomes. To that end MFES has | | |
| | | | , | | | reviewed Winnipeg Fire | | |
| | | | | | | Paramedic Services (WFPS) as a | | |
| | | | | | | combined service model. WFPS | | |
| | | | | | | has indicated that as a direct result | | |
| | | | | | , | of having firefighter/primary care paramedics on board 37 fire | | |
| | | | - | | | apparatus, there were | | |
| | | | | | | approximately 9400 medical calls | | |
| · | | | | | | (13%) where primary care was | | |
| | | | | | | provided by the paramedic on the | | |
| | | | · | | | fire truck and an ambulance was | | |
| | | | | | | not required. For the City of | | |
| | | | | | | Mississauga to implement a model | | |
| | | | | | | similar to WPFS, consideration | | |
| | | | | | | should first be given to engaging | | |
| | | | | | | an independent consultant to | | |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | Consider the opportunities to improve response times and decrease equipment requirements through dynamic staging of equipment | initiate a review of pre-hospital medical care provided by Fire/EMS that would include: The identification of any service duplication in the existing business model A cost benefit analysis of an integrated Fire/EMS model including a review of staffing fire trucks with trained paramedics. A thorough review of other Fire/EMS models and industry best practices with specific emphasis on the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service. A review of legislative requirements within the Province on Ontario pertaining to an integrated Fire/EMS model. Options and recommendations for emergency medical response in the Region of Peel that will provide the best, most cost effective service to the taxpayer. The identification of any primary care paramedics already |

| | | | - 6 - | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
| | | | | | | employed by each fire service |
| | | | | | | MFES delivers a superior service at a lower cost and with fewer suppression staff than comparable municipalities. Expanding EMS resourcing at the expense of fire would negatively impact fire response times, the ability to |
| | | | | | | provide a safe working environment for MFES |
| | | | | | | suppression staff and compromise |
| | | | | | - | the existing delivery model. |
| | | | | | | The dynamic staging of fire apparatus as a method of improving response times is already done as part of MFES regular operations. MFES regularly employs station covers (move ups) to fill gaps is high risk areas. Where apparatus are tied up at large or simultaneous calls, trucks are moved from other stations to provide necessary coverage. Staging vehicles at various locations throughout the City is unnecessary as MFES stations are already dynamically staged to respond appropriately to |
| | | | | | | all types of incidents within |

| 7 | - |
|---|---|
| | |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | | | identified response times. |
| | | | | | | Furthermore, MFES 90th |
| [| | | | | | percentile response time is more |
| | | | | | | than 4 minutes better than that of |
| | | | | | | EMS for medical incidents. |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – LIBRARY SERVICES

| Program/Service | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Mississauga Comments |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
| Administration | Mandatory board | Mandatory board | R - Regulator | Legal employer | Consider shared services with City for finance and human resources. | The Mississauga Library System is heavily integrated with the municipality. |
| Library Facility Access / Study and Community Access Room Booking Facilities Maintenance and Support | Total sq ft 1,776,897 17,544,470 visits per year 1 library branch per minimum of 25,000 population 0.1 hours service labour per capita Meeting rooms available 25% of time for public booking | Total sq ft 396,628 4,400,000 visits per year 1 library branch per 40,000 pop. 0.07 hours service labour per capita NA | C – Contracted Out | Integrated with municipal services wherever possible | Consider rationalising the footprint of libraries, closing some branches. | Geographically the Sheridan, South Common, Clarkson and Lorne Park branches are fairly close to each other, and consequently provide the most reasonable choice in the consideration of a branch closure. The rest of the library branches each serve a significantly larger geographic area and population, so consideration of a closure would be significantly detrimental to the local community. |
| Library Collections | 49.44 | 36 workstations | D | Computer | Consider | Library hours are justified by |
| Use | workstations per | per 100,000 | Delivery by | operations | opportunities to | usage levels in all locations. |
| / | 100,000 | | City staff | are | reduce services | |
| Borrowing and In- | | 1.04 | | performed by | (hours and days | Mississauga Library System |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – LIBRARY SERVICES

| | | | - 2 - | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| Library Use | | workstation use | | city IT staff. | of operation) | service level metrics continually |
| E-Services and | 1.44 | per capita | | | | rank among the best with |
| Digitization | workstations use | | | Many | İ | national comparator libraries. |
| Information Services | per capita | Wireless in all | | products and | Consider | |
| Collection | | locations | | services are | consolidating | The Library is a tremendously |
| Development and | | | | acquired | Toronto | busy library system with among |
| Maintenance | Wireless in all | Email response | | under | Archives with | the highest number of items |
| | locations | within 24 hours | | contracts. | Library | borrowed per capita, visits per |
| | | | | | Services | capita and circulations per hour. |
| | Response to E- | | | | | The Library cooperates with |
| • | Mail request | | | | | many other agencies and |
| | within 24 hours | | | | | organizations to avoid |
| | | | | | | duplication and works closely |
| | | | | | | with Recreation and Parks as |
| | r | | | | | well as local schools. |
| Programs and | 60% of all | All 18 library | Some | Many | Consider | A lower level of programs |
| Outreach | Toronto Public | locations are | services are | services are | reducing or | already is due to a philosophy of |
| / | Library programs | well placed to | provided in | not offered | eliminating | service based on cooperation |
| Literacy | are for children | cover the entire | partnership | by the | some programs | with other community agencies. |
| Instructional and | and youth. | city with | with other | Library but | and outreach | |
| Informational | - | reasonable | organization | by other | activities. | |
| Cultural and Library | 27,862 Literacy | access and good | S . | agencies | | |
| Volunteer and | programs offered | access by public | | (literacy), or | | |
| Service | and support early | transportation. | • | offered in | - | |
| Development and | literacy skills and | | | partnerships | | |
| Customer | a love of | | | (multilingual | | |
| Engagement | reading/learning | | | storytimes) | 1 | |
| _ - | for all ages. | | | or charged | | |
| | | | | for. | | · |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Torento Identified Options / Opportunities | Mississauga Comments |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Parks, Forestry and Recreation Parks, Sport fields, Trails and Horticulture Maintenance | Weekly grass cutting and litter pick up. | General Parkland — cut every 10 working days Destination Parks cut weekly | D – Delivery by City staff | Delivered by City staff Contracted grass cutting on | Consider reducing standard for grass cutting, other than on sports fields | Mississauga standard already lower than Toronto for general parkland. In 2004 Mississauga eliminated |
| - | | | | boulevards, City maintained cemeteries and one park (Erindale) | Consider eliminating horticulture activities | all 4 cold frame greenhouses and reduced plantings of annuals in horticulture in favour of shrubs and perennials |
| ì | | <i>:</i> | | | Consider contracting maintenance of | Mississauga contracts 100% boulevard grass cutting and litter pick up. We already have community |
| | | | | | Consider partly contracting maintenance of park facilities | groups providing maintenance (horticulture, leash free areas) through the Parks Community Stewardship Program. The interest and capacity is limited by volunteer time. |
| | | | | | to interested community groups. Example: Sports associations | Standard is currently 8 cm for Mississauga. |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Mississauga Comments |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | for sport fields, horticultural groups for some flower displays. | |
| | | | | · | Consider reducing standard for snow clearing to be eight centimetres of snowfall. | |
| Parks, Forestry and Recreation Zoo and Farm Attractions | | Not applicable | D – Delivery by City staff | Not applicable | Consider elimination of the zoo and farm attractions. | Not applicable |
| Parks, Forestry and Recreation Urban Agriculture Program | Service standard calls for twice as many urban community gardens as are now provided. | 4 Community Gardens – no service standard | D – Delivery by City staff | Delivered by third party (Ecosource) | Consider eliminating Urban Agriculture program | Maintain or expand. No cost reduction potential as program delivered by third party. |
| Parks, Forestry and Recreation Tree planting | Target 40% tree canopy (20% current | Approximately 12% canopy | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | Consider reducing the target canopy | No target for canopy. Program to plant one million trees over ten (10) years deferred. |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

- 3 -

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Mississauga Comments |
|---|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | actual) | | | Mc – Manager, Contract | cover or extending the target timeframe to achieve, allowing a lower rate of new tree planting and maintenance of existing trees. | |
| Parks, Forestry and Recreation Tree pruning | Not meeting target maintenance cycle | Not meeting target maintenance cycle | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff Mc – Manager, Contract | | 2012 Budget request for funding of contract for block pruning |
| Toronto Environment Office - Environmental Support for Residents and Businesses / Community | At service | No community | Combinatio | Delivered | Reduce or | 2000 - Toronto's first |
| Community grants | At service standard | No community grant program | Combinatio n of | Delivered by staff | Reduce or eliminate | Environmental Sustainability |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Mississauga Comments |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Community partnerships Community engagement | Above standard At service standard | No formal partnerships/corporate sponsorships Community engagement | F – Funder Mp – Partnership s SM – Service Manager D – Delivery by City Staff | | activities | Plan versus 2011 - Mississauga's first Environmental Plan (Living Green Master Plan) (under development). Living Green Master Plan will identify environmental priorities and recommend future service levels Work collaboratively with other departments, agencies and businesses to leverage dollars and deliver programs Receive in-kind Corporate Sponsorship Living Green Master Plan stakeholder engagement/public consultation, school programs, outreach events, web and social media |
| Toronto Environment Office Corporate Environmental Support Services / Strategic Policy | At service standard | Strategic Policy | D- Delivery by | Delivered by staff | | Environmental Advisory Committee; |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Mississauga Comments |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Environmental | | Environmental | City Staff | Consultant | | Environmental Network Team; |
| Advisory, | At service | Advisory and | | hired to help | | as |
| Coordination and | standard | Coordination | | develop | | Living Green Master Plan will |
| Regulatory | | (Regulatory | | Living | | identify environmental priorities |
| Reporting | | reporting done | | Green | Ì | and recommend future service |
| | | by program area/not centralized in | | Master Plan | | levels |
| Program Design and Delivery | At service standard | EMS) | | | | / |
| | | Program Design and Delivery | • | | | · |
| Monitoring, | Below standard | · | | | | |
| Research and | | Monitoring, | | | | |
| Evaluation | | Research and | | | | |
| | | Evaluation | | | | |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – PARKS AND RECREATION

| Program/Ser vice / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto. | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Community | 30% of services | Over 50,000 | D- | D – Delivery | Consider | The Vic Johnson Arena in |
| Recreation | delivered in facilities | volunteer hours | Delivery by | by City staff, | innovative | Streetsville is an existing example |
| / Recreational | are by member | per year 190 volunteer | City staff | and Mc – | operating | of the city successfully working with a community board to |
| Facilities | groups – e.g. community groups, | | | Contracted | approaches for more | manage and operate a recreation |
| Maintenance | etc. | groups 12 Major | | Contracted | facilities, such | facility. The City would actively |
| and Support | Community Centres | Community | - | The City | as the arena | explore similar partnerships on an |
| and Support | (small/large) | Centres | | currently has | and | opportunity driven basis. |
| | Pools | 18 Pools | | a | community | opportunity arriver subject |
| • | (indoor/outdoor) | (indoor/outdoor) | | management | centre boards, | The Square One Older Adult |
| | TDSB Pools, Wading | 19 Splash pads | | contract with | purchased | Centre is operated by a |
| | Pools, Splash pads | 25 Ice pads | | SMG to | service | community board with an annual |
| | Ice pads | (indoor/outdoor) | | operate the | agreements or | operating grant from the City. |
| | (indoor/outdoor) | 7 Skateboard | | Hershey | P3 | |
| | Ski Hills, Stadiums | Parks | | SportsZone. | arrangements | |
| | | 2 Golf Courses | | | with | |
| | • | and 2 Marinas | | , | community | |
| | | | • | | based partner | |
| | | | | | and private | |
| , | G (1.50.000 | G (44.000 | <u></u> | | operators | T |
| / D : 1 | Camps (150,000 | Camps (44,800 | D- | D – | In view of | Lower cost to deliver programs |
| Registered | hours) | hours) | Delivery by | Delivery by | growing | through use of part time seasonal |
| Recreation | Instructional Fitness | Aquatics | City staff | City staff | private | labour. |
| Programs | (223,000 hours) | (78,700 hours) | | | involvement | The City of Mindianana's budget |
| | Aquatics (165,000 hours) | Skating (4,200 hours) | | | in recreation services, | The City of Mississauga's budget and business planning process |
| | Skating (8,600 hours) | Sports (18,600 | | | reconsider the | provides Recreation, and all other |
| | Sports (49,000 hours) | hours) | | | City's role, | divisions, the mandate and ability |
| | | Fitness (15,000) | | | I - | to review and critically assess the |
| | Fitness (44,000 | Fitness (15,000) | | | purpose, goals | to review and critically assess t |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – PARKS AND RECREATION

| Program/Ser. Wish vice / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|--|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | hours) Ski (21,000 hours) Arts (43,000 hours) General (33,000 hours) After school care | Arts (1,400) General Interest (2,800) Gym Memberships | | | and objectives in Community Recreation. | scope and level of service provided to residents. This process requires the approval of City Council which in essence approves the service levels on which the process is based. |
| | (15,000 hours) Clubs (9,000 hours) Leadership (9,000 hours) Gym Memberships | * Hours were calculated by multiplying the number of individual sessions by the duration (length in hrs) for each session. | | | Establish a clear approach to evaluating what recreation programs to operate or support based on the benefits expected. | Recreation services are consistently rated highly in terms of customer satisfaction, and are delivered based on the City of Mississauga's corporate values of trust, quality and excellence. Programs offered by a third party need to be assessed for standards of service, the number and type of programs, price, hours of operation, compliance to legislated standards and approvals by Council. |
| / Drop-In and Leisure Recreation Programs | Swim (129,000 hours) Skating (52,000 hours) Leisure Fitness and Sports (170,000 hours) Golf (171,000 rounds) | Swim (18,000) Skating (6,500) Golf (72,000 rounds) | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | As above. | As above. |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA - PARKS AND RECREATION

| Program/Ser vice / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options/ Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | * Hours were calculated by multiplying the number of individual sessions by the duration (length in hours) for each session. Golf rounds are represented as a count of individual round sales. | | | | |
| / D:441 | Permit city facilities | Permit city facilities to be | D – | D- | As above. | As above. |
| Permitted Parks and | to be used by other groups | used by other | Delivery by City staff | Delivery by City staff | | |
| Recreation Activities | 1.8 millions total permit hours Swimming (19,000 hours) Sports (Approx 1 million hours) Birthday (3,500 hours) | groups. Over 603,000 total permit hours. Swimming (6,300 hours) Birthday (hours in room | | | | |
| | Birthday (3,500 | Birthday (hours | | · | | |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – PARKS AND RECREATION

| Program/Ser vice / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | Stadium (11,000 hours) Skating (80,500 hours) Picnics (43,000 hours) Room Rentals (278,000 hours) | (381,000 hours) Skating (49,000 hours) Picnics (30,000 hours) Room Rentals (136,000 hours) | | | | |
| | | * Rental hours were calculated by adding the total number of hours booked. | · | | | |
| Community Capacity Building | Major types of activities include: Youth Reach (93,000 contacts) Investing in Families (100% subsidized by Federal /Provincial/ Municipal funds) New Comer Initiatives (100% | Major types of activities include: ActiveAssist Jerry Love Foundation Got Skates Wal-mart at Play Swim to | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | | N/A |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA - PARKS AND RECREATION

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

- 5 -

| Program/Ser vice / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | subsidized by Federal | Survive | | | | |
| | /Provincial/ | | 1 | | | |
| | Municipal funds) | | | | | |
| | 97,000 subsidized | | | | | |
| | registrations | | | | · | |

| identi arrive As a i for To comp busin expla Missi | KPMG Report for the City of Toronto does not ify the methodology which was employed to e at the service level figures, indicated below. result it is unclear whether the figures below oronto and Mississauga offer a valid arison of service level based on similar criteria, ess drivers and scope of operations. An nation of how the figures for the City of ssauga were determined is listed in the sponding fields. | |
|---|---|--|
| namb under Main | dition, the KPMG report does not identify the per of facilities the City of Toronto provides the general heading of Recreational Facilities tenance and Support which makes it difficult upare the relevance of registration activity. | |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| Government Management Court Services | Court Hearings range between 7-16 months vs.6-9 month standard Payments, collections and case management at standard level | Part 1 Matters (ticketable offences) are less than 8 months. Part 3's are 9 month to 16 months (do not meet standard) | D – Delivery by City Staff Multiple locations and a charge level in excess of 650,000 annually. Trial rate is well over 45% | D – Delivery by City Staff Single location; charge level of 85,000 annually. Trial rate isapprox. 35% | Consider seeking legislative change to allow higher fees and streamlining of court operations. Current minimal fees do not support recovery of actual costs and new collection methods, sanctions and more effective use of technology are constrained by legislative requirements | If the province approves these changes it will marginally increase revenue and it will make it easier to collect from non-payees. The City of Toronto is very interested in having income tax returns reduced by the amount payable to the City for fines; it also wants licence suspensions for non-driving matters. This is a very aggressive approach which may have considerable opposition. |

Appendix 1 - 30

| | 7 | |
|---|---|---|
| - | _ | - |

| Program/Service // / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Executive Committee - Governance / City Clerk's Office / Election Operations/Elections | At standard Municipal Elections Act, 1996: Council By-laws | At standard Municipal Elections Act, 1996: Council By-laws | D – Delivery by City Staff | D – Delivery by City Staff | No options/ opportunities identified | N/A |
| Readiness Executive Committee - Governance / City Clerk's Office: Manage Government Decision Making; Support Elected and Accountability Officials; Provide Protocol and Official Services / Deliver Provincially Delegated Services | At standard City of Toronto Act, 2006 Marriage Act; Criminal Code of Canada; Lottery License Terms and Conditions, Gaming Control Act, 1992, Vital Statistics Act | At standard* *Mississauga Clerk's Office does not deliver Protocol, enforcement or lottery licensing services Municipal Act, 2001 Marriage Act; Vital Statistics Act, Liquor Licence Act | D – Delivery by City Staff | D – Delivery by City Staff | No options/opport unities identified | N/A |
| Executive Committee - Governance | At standard Municipal Freedom of Information and | At standard Municipal Freedom of Information and | D – Delivery by City Staff | D – Delivery by City Staff | Continue to work with city divisions to proactively | The City of Mississauga already endeavours to provide public access to information/data. In instances where FOI requests Appendix 1 - 31 |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|--|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| City Clerk's Office: Lifecycle Management of City Information | Protection of Privacy Act; Personal Health Information Act; City of Toronto Act, 2006 | Protection of Privacy Act; Personal Health Information Act; Municipal Act, 2001 | | | provide public access to information/dat a. | are received for information which should be publicly available, the Access and Privacy Officer will work with the department to review the material and provide outside of the FOI process where possible. With ongoing education that will commence once the second Access and Privacy Officer is recruited, this trend should continue. |
| Executive Committee - Governance / City Clerk's Office: Lifecycle Management of City Information | At standard Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act; Personal Health Information Act; City of Toronto Act, 2006 | At standard Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act; Personal Health Information Act; Municipal Act, 2001 | D – Delivery by City Staff | D – Delivery by City Staff | Continue to explore expanded shared operations across ABC;s and with other levels of government for records storage management. *we have assumed ABC's are Agencies, Boards and Commissions, | The City's records management section does not have the capacity currently to take on additional responsibilities to support other agencies or levels of government. Not all City work units are supported by City records management staff. Given security and confidentiality of information, any shared operations with external organizations would require a significant governance structure. The City records management section is in the early stages of introduction of electronic |

Appendix 1 - 32

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – LEGISLATIVE SERVCIES

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | but could not find a definition in the document. | records management standards and system. The City currently does not provide any records storage management services for ABCs, although in the past we were approached to take the records for one of the BIAs. At the time, the City did not have the storage capacity in the Records Centre and was not able to assist. |
| Executive Committee – Governance / City Printer and Mail Distribution | At standard Mail distribution can be considered essential, central printing service is more traditional | At standard Design services provided by Communication s Division, not the print shop | D – Delivery by City Staff | D – Delivery by City Staff | Consider outsourcing printing and design services | Costs would increase (currently all jobs are reviewed to determine the most economical way to produce (ie. in house or outsourced) A portion of the jobs cannot be outsourced due to turnaround times (ie. Council and Committee agendas) Service levels would decrease from current levels Difficult to enforce confidentiality of documents provided to a vendor |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – LEGISLATIVE SERVCIES

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| City Planning / Committee of Adjustment | Above standard Service level involves extensive consultation and coordination | At standard Service level involves circulation to internal departments and outside agencies and legislated notification to the public | D – Delivery by City Staff | D – Delivery by City Staff | No options/opport unities identified | N/A |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

Corporate Finance, Financial Planning

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississaug a | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Corporate Finance / Investment and Debt Management | Essential Service At Standard based on Legislated, Council, Management and Industry Standards | Essential Service At Standard based on Legislated, Council, and Management Standards | Delivered by City Staff | Delivered by City Staff | Consider benefits of external investment management | Mississauga manages all its investments internally. Portfolio returns exceed benchmarks. Management fees related to City staff are only 0.021%. The external fees would be approximately 0.3% so cost savings from external management unlikely. |
| Corporate Finance / Risk Management | Essential Service At Standard based on Council, Management and Funding Standards | Essential Service At Standard based on Council, Management and Funding Standards | City retains services of external vendors and manages contacts | Blended service delivery – City staff plus external contracts for broker services, adjusting and legal | No opportunities identified | N/A |
| Corporate Finance / Long Term financial strategies and | Essential Service At Standard based on Legislated, Council, Management and Industry | Essential Service At Standard based on Legislated Standards Below Standard | Delivered by City Staff | Delivered by City Staff | Rationalize Corporate Finance Services across City Agencies and | Corporate Finance currently provides consolidated long term financial strategies and analysis for all services of the Corporation |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississaug a | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| analysis | Standards | based on Management and Industry Standards in financial policy development due to resource restrictions | | | Corporations | |
| Financial Planning Budgeting Financial Advice Financial Planning and Policy Financial Reporting and Control | Core/Essential Service At Standard based on Legislated, Council, Management and Industry Standards | Core/Essential Service At Standard based on Legislated, Council, Management Standards for Budgeting, Financial Control Below Standard based on management and industry standards in Policy Development due to resource limitations | Delivered by City Staff | Delivered by City Staff Dept Finance Managers report to Corporate Finance. Decentraliz ed department financial planning units. | Consider forming a single shared service organization for Finance | Would required detailed review of Organization structure/processes to determine efficiencies. Departments would need assurance that level of service would remain the same or improve. |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississaug a | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|--|---|
| Special Projects | Essential Service | Essential Service | Delivered | Delivered | No | N/A |
| / | At Standard based | Below Standard | by City | by City | opportunities | • |
| Development | on Legislated, | due to resource | Staff | Staff | identified | · |
| Financing | Council Standards | limitations | | | | |
| Project Analysis, | | | | | | , |
| Advisory and | | | | | | |
| Negotiation | | | | | | · |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Strategic Communications / Advertising Public Communications Internal Communications Media Relations | Essential Service At Standard – part of City Manager's Office | Essential Service At Standard – part of Corporate Services Dept | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | Consider centralizing communications responsibilities and activities across City Divisions | Communications is a centralized service in Mississauga |
| / Communications Support | | | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | Similar activities to Cluster A and B | Considered essential |
| 311 Customer Service \ 311 Enquiry | Target of 80% of calls within 75 seconds could be higher | Target of 80% of calls answered within 30 seconds could be higher - Mississauga 311 has been unable to meet service level target the last 2 years (2009 – 70%, 2010, 71%) We are predicting 65% | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | Consider outsourcing some 311 activities to the private sector. | Outsourcing is a standard approach for call centre management and mostly in the private sector hence the comment – "relatively little experience for outsourcing 311 specifically" The savings, if any are low and in fact, costs could be anywhere from 5-20% higher as there are on-going program management fees at the service bureau, which increase year over year as well as program management requirements at the city, e.g. a |

| Program/Service / / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | for 2011 | | | | small core group of staff that have accountability for the service bureau relationship, data, information, training and contract management. Barriers may be "low" as stated for Tier I General Inquiries (i.e. information only) however Tier II / Tier III, barriers would be high, e.g. skill, knowledge and required technologies that the outsourcer would require. Plus high impact on (city) business units if Tier II / Tier III calls are returned to them (versus outsourcer), increasing the operating costs of business units May impact staff morale as staff will worry about their job security and future with the City Opportunity for the selected outsourcer to assume some (trained & skilled) staff |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | May be some opportunities in combining with 211. | As a single tier municipality, Toronto may have an opportunity to combine 211 with 311. As such, barriers could be low for them. For Mississauga, 211 is managed by the Region of Peel. 211 call takers are certified "Referral Specialists" and in Peel, can take both Peel 311 calls (water, waste, recycling) however Peel 311 call takers do not take 211 calls. There could be an opportunity for the Region of Peel to assume (some) Mississauga 3-1-1 calls (like a service bureau) however savings could be low and barriers high (skill, knowledge and technologies as Peel and Mississauga use different telephony, CRM etc.). Also Peel (call centre) is a unionized environment. |

| _ | 4 | _ |
|---|---|---|
| | | |

| Program/Service Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 311 Customer | Below Standard | Below | D – | D- | Consider | Mississauga 311 is not |
| Service | 72% of calls | Standard | Delivery by | Delivery by | expanding the | consolidated with Mississauga |
| / | within 75 sec. | See Above | City staff | City staff | range of call | Dispatch functions (Animal |
| 311 Service Request - | | | | | centre services | Services, Parking Enforcement, After-hours dispatch) at this |
| service fulfillment, | | | | | that 311 provides to client | time. |
| service tracking | | | | | divisions. | However, T & W evaluated in |
| | | | | | | 2010 the feasibility of |
| | | | | | | consolidating dispatch functions |
| | | | | | | into a centralized T &W dispatch |
| 311 Service | | | | | | and concluded that there were no |
| Processing - | At Standard | Above standard | | | Consider | cost savings identified with a |
| Service Referral, Complaint | | Mississauga 311 has a | | , | developing one- stop counter | consolidated T&W Dispatch as there were no staff reductions |
| logging, Service | | different service | | | service for | identified. |
| transactions, | | delivery from | | | access to a wide | identified. |
| service process | | Toronto as we | | | range of | |
| tracking | | provide Tier I, | | | municipal | Mississauga has consolidated a |
| | | II and III | | | services. | number of counters in the |
| | | servicing: | | | | business areas- Planning and |
| | | 337 1 | | | · | Building, Clerk's and T&W to |
| | | We have a very high FCR (first | | | | improve the customer experience; however at this time, |
| | ĺ | call resolution | | | | we do not offer a "one-stop" |
| | | rate) in the call | | | | service for all services. |
| | | centre @ 92% | | | | |
| | | 8% of the | | | | |

| | _ | |
|---|-----|---|
| - | . 7 | - |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | inquiries received by 311 result in a service request to the business unit | | | | |
| 311 Customer Service / 311 Performance Reporting -Internal reporting to divisional services (clients) | At Standard | Below standard Reporting position eliminated (prior budget cut). We have been using a CSA position to satisfy reporting requirements to divisional clients, Mayor and Council as well as required reporting for 311 operations | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | | |
| 311 Customer Service | At Standard | Above standard This is an internal service | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | | |

| _ | 6 | _ |
|---|---|---|
| | v | |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| 311 Information and Business Processing - internal service for managing the knowledge base, scripting and conducting business process reviews. | | for Mississauga as well managing a combination of the knowledge base, conducting business process reviews, CRM design and training | | | | |
| 311 Customer Service / 311 Development | At Standard | Below standard | D – Delivery by City staff | D – Delivery by City staff | Consider reducing or eliminating the 311 Development capacity once the model is fully implemented. | Like Toronto, the 311 model for Mississauga will continue to evolve over time with contract resources, i.e. "Development Services" added on an as required basis, e.g. Animal Services Licensing Program will require a business analyst and IT resources. Other than the (marginal) required contract resources for consolidations and funding 2 IT technical positions, we do not have a "development" group. Resources in 311 who |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – COMMUNICATIONS

| Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | consolidate / manage the consolidations also manage the BAU (business as usual) operations, e.g. Manager 311 is also the Project Manager for consolidations, KB Specialist is also the business analyst. When Mississauga 311 model is stabilized, it will allow resources to focus on managing the operations versus a combination of 311 development (or consolidations) and running the |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – FACILITIES & PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunitie | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| Facilities Management / Energy Management Custodial Care Facilities Maintenance Security and Safety | Facilities Management is an essential service required to successfully operate the City. Service level standards set by legislation, Council and management are being met Essential Service At Standards set by legislation, Council and/or management | Essential Service At Standards set by legislation, Council and/or management | D – delivered by staff | Mixed service delivery model – staff and outsourced resources. | Consider increasing shared services approach with agencies for all activities. Consider strategic sourcing of custodial and security activities. | At Mississauga, most of Facilities management is done by FPM, but not all. Fire, Transit, Recreation and Parks all have staff engaged in similar activities. There may be some opportunity for consolidation of this but would not consider the potential cost savings to be significant while the barriers to change (especially unionized work forces) would make it a difficult transition. Mississauga already outsources a considerable amount of custodial services (ie. offices other than City Hall, comfort stations, libraries) and staff are actively studying the expansion of this method of service delivery. Significant cost savings may be possible. Outsourced security services would result in a reduced level and quality of service and reduced flexibility in addressing security issues and concerns as they arise. |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – FACILITIES & PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunitie s | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Real Estate | Essential Service | Essential | D – | D – | Consider | At Mississauga, all real estate |
| Services | Meeting Standards | Service Meeting | delivered | delivered by | increasing | services are centralized within our |
| / | set by legislation | Standards set by | by staff | staff. | shared | Realty Services Section. There is |
| Property | | legislation | | | services | no duplication of staff in other |
| Appraisal | | | | | approach with | departments. |
| Property | | | | | agencies for | · . |
| Acquisition | | | | | all activities. | |
| Lease | | | | | | |
| Management | | | | | · | |
| Property Disposal | | | | | | |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

General Government - Clusters A&B (Departmental Business/Financial Services)

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| Policy, Planning, Finance & Administration / Financial Management Budget Planning, Coordination and Submission Financial Transaction and Payment Processing Management Reporting and Control Business Advice and Consultation | Essential Service — At or somewhat below Standard set by Management | Essential Service – At or somewhat below Standard set by Management | Delivered By City Staff – decentraliz ed throughout Clusters | Delivered By City Staff – Decentralize d to each dept, dept Finance Managers report to Corporate Finance | Consider forming a single shared service organization for Administration | Would required detailed review of Organization structure/processes to determine efficiencies. Departments would need assurance that level of service would remain the same or improve. |
| Policy, Planning, Finance & Administration / Financial | Essential Service At or somewhat below Standard set by Senior Management | Essential Service – At or somewhat below Standard set by Senior | Delivered By City Staff decentraliz ed | Delivered By City Staff decentralize d to each | Consider opportunities to use technology to automate | The recent Finance e3 included a number of recommendations to improve use of technology to enhance processes. Currently implementing an Integrated |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – GENERAL GOVERNMENT

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Management Budget Planning, Coordination and Submission Financial Transaction and Payment Processing Management Reporting and Control Business Advice and Consultation | | Management | throughout Clusters | dept, dept Finance Managers report to Corporate Finance | manual processes (Example: electronic approvals / signatures, interfaces between SAP and other systems / processes) | Budget System. A number of projects are planned over the next four years to enhance SAP capabilities. |
| Policy, Planning, Finance & Administration / Organizational Effectiveness Cross Divisional Planning and Coordination Performance Measurement Program | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Delivered By City Staff decentraliz ed throughout Clusters | Delivered By City Staff Performance Measuremen t and Program review (Manageme | Consider external partners for some Program Review activities such as continuous improvement initiatives, quality management, business process | City has an internal Management Consulting group which undertakes e3 (Efficiency, Effectiveness, Economy) reviews of all City services. External assistance sought when internal expertise not available. Performance measurement is led by City Manager's office and is centralized |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| Review | | , | | nt Consulting) delivered by City Manager's Office | reengineering support Consider moving Performance Measurement to a single Finance shared service group | |
| Policy, Planning, Finance & Administration / Program Support Time and Attendance - Data Entry and Reporting Complement Management and Reporting Program Communications and Consultation General Administration | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Delivered By City Staff decentraliz ed throughout Clusters | Delivered By City Staff Through a combination of centralized/d ecentralized units | Consider forming a single shared service organization for Administration | Would required detailed review of Organization structure/processes to determine efficiencies. Departments would need assurance that level of service would remain the same or improve. Moving to shared service unit for HR transactional services. |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Social Development, Finance & Administration / Financial Management and Program Support Financial Management and Reporting Revenue Management Financial Planning and Coordination Program Support Communications Management and Event Planning | Essential Service — At Standard set by Management | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Delivered By City Staff decentraliz ed throughout Clusters | Delivered By City Staff Financial Planning decentralize d to each dept, dept Finance Managers report to Corporate Finance Communicat ions delivered by Corporate Communicat ions Managemen t Consulting is delivered by City Manager's Office | Consider forming a single shared service organization for Finance Management and one for Administratio n Consider opportunities to use technology to automate manual processes Consider external partners for activities such as continuous improvement initiatives, quality management, business | Would required detailed review of Organization structure/processes to determine efficiencies. Departments would need assurance that level of service would remain the same or improve. A number of E3 projects have been identified to enhance functionality of SAP and to improve processes. Opportunities being assessed and implemented on ongoing basis. City has a small Management Consulting unit in the City Manager's Office to facilitate such initiatives. Some departments have business and event planning teams for their specific service areas. External partners are engaged when appropriate. |

| Program/Service Service Level in City of Toronto Activity | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | · | | process reengineering support, event planning | |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

<u>General Government – Clusters C - Corporate</u>

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Accounting Services / Financial Reporting and Control | Essential Service — At Standard set by legislation and Management | Essential Service — At Standard set by legislation and Management | Delivered by City Staff | Delivered by City Staff | No Opportunities identified | N/A |
| Provincial and Federal Report Submission Financial Statement Preparation Management Reporting Control | Federal and Provincial Governments set standard for reporting PSAB sets Financial Statement standards | Federal and Provincial Governments set standard for reporting PSAB sets Financial Statement standards | | | | |
| Accounting Services / Payment Processing Corporate Banking Accounts Receivable Processing | Essential Service – Somewhat below Standard set by Management | Essential Service — At Standard set by Management | Delivered by City Staff | Delivered by City Staff | Consider increasing shared services approach for accounts receivable (e.g. revenue services) | These activities are centralized in Corporate Finance |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Accounts Payable Processing P-card Processing | | | | | | |
| Accounting Services / Tax and Financial Systems Support SAP Financial Systems Training SAP User Support Tax Advisory and Policy | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Delivered by City Staff | Delivered by City Staff | No Opportunities identified | N/A |
| Pension, Payroll, Benefits / Employee and Retiree Benefit and Pension Compensation OMERS Pension Administration Benefit and | Mandatory Service -At Standards set by legislation | Mandatory Service - At Standards set by legislation | D – Delivered by City Staff | D – Delivered by City Staff | Continue to pursue outsourcing options for non-OMERS pension plans. Consider shared service or outsourcing | Mississauga does not have any non-OMERS pension plans Payroll is centralized in Mississauga. Complexity of Payroll with numerous union, part time staff, etc would make it very difficult to outsource. This option |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| OMERS Pension Management Reporting | | | | | Payroll for divisions and ABCs | was reviewed several years ago and it was not as cost effective as in house service. |
| Finance & Administration Financial Management & Program Support / Capital and Operating Budget Support Financial Control Program Support | Core and Essential Services At standard — meeting legislated requirements and management defined standards | Core and Essential Service At standard — meeting legislated requirements and management defined standards | D – Delivered by City Staff | D – Delivered by City Staff | Consider increasing shared services approach Consider opportunities to use technology to automate manual processes | Would require detailed review of Organization structure/processes to determine efficiencies. Departments would need assurance that level of service would remain the same or improve. A number of E3 projects have been identified to enhance functionality of SAP and to improve processes. Currently implementing an Integrated Budgeting System. |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

<u>Government Management – Cluster C (Information Technology)</u>

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| Information Technology / IT Activities Client Support and IT Service Improvement IT Infrastructure Business IT Solutions Enterprise IT Strategy | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Delivered by City Staff decentraliz ed throughout Clusters | Delivered by City Staff with minimal Outsourcing of operations Centralized City-wide IT Service with Decentralized departmental IT support Staff | Continue to develop and examine key performance indicators beyond availability and timeliness. | In the 2011-2014 Business Plan and Budget IT established Financial Measures for Total Cost of Ownership as well as % of Operating Budget Spent on outsourcing. An e3 review is currently under way for IT which includes identification and assessment of key performance indicators. |
| Information Technology / IT Activities Client Support and IT Service Improvement IT Infrastructure Business IT Solutions Enterprise IT Strategy | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Delivered by City Staff decentraliz ed throughout Clusters | Delivered by City Staff with minimal Outsourcing of operations Centralized City-wide IT Service with Decentralized departmental IT support Staff | Continue to investigate strategic sourcing of IT infrastructure, Business IT Solutions, Client Support and IT Service Improvement. | The IT Division is currently developing a set of outsourcing rosters to address a backlog in the delivery of new functionality in the areas of Web Development, Media- Audio Visual and Application/Software Development. The City already has an outsource roster for SAP which has proven to be effective. A performance objective was established in the 2011-2014 |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | | | Business Plan and Budget for the % of Operating Budget Spent on Outsourcing. This will need to be revised to include IT Capital Budget to capture expenditures from the rosters established. |
| | | · | | | | The roster system is an effective outsourcing option and is an enabler to addressing IT requests and also takes some pressure and overhead away from the Procurement process. |
| | | | | | | The measure of success will be an increase in % outsourced, and an improvement to the IT Work Plan and backlog without increasing the operating and capital budgets. |
| Information Technology / IT Activities Client Support and IT Service Improvement IT Infrastructure Business IT Solutions Enterprise IT | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Delivered by City Staff decentraliz ed throughout Clusters | Delivered by City Staff with minimal Outsourcing Centralized City-wide IT Service with Decentralized | Continue to pursue standardization of enterprise applications. | IT established Simplification as a mandate to consolidate hardware and software over the past 5-7 years with great success. Through the use of Server Virtualization a great deal of server hardware was eliminated. Software simplification introduced |

| Program/Service Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| Strategy | | | | departmental IT support Staff | | Hansen Enterprise as standard software with a significant range of business lines now transitioned to Hansen. HR functions previously managed through PeopleSoft have been migrated to SAP introducing much efficiency in managing the system, infrastructure and support. All new application requests are assessed for fit with existing software solutions before any request for a new software product would be considered. This standard process will ensure that simplification continues as a mandate at the City. |
| Information Technology / IT Activities Client Support and IT Service Improvement IT Infrastructure Business IT Solutions Enterprise IT Strategy | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Essential Service – At Standard set by Management | Delivered by City Staff decentraliz ed throughout Clusters | Delivered by City Staff with minimal Outsourcing Centralized City-wide IT Service with Decentralized departmental | Consider further consolidation of IT functions into a shared service centre. | The IT Organization does have a centralized-decentralized model that provides a higher level of service to the operating departments in how they support their specific lines of business. An e3 review is currently under way reviewing processes and delivery model in IT with |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | | IT support Staff | | recommendations to come forward in 2012. |
| | | | | | | Any further centralization would need to result in increased efficiencies without reducing business area service and support. |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

Executive Committee- Human Resources

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options/ Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| City Manager's | Essential | Essential | Delivered | Delivered By | Consider the | Labour Relations currently |
| Office | Services | Service | By City | City Staff – | use of shared | centralized. Moving forward |
| 1 | | | Staff – | Centralized | services for | shared services for HR |
| HR | | | decentraliz | (Corporate | Labour | transactions and centralization of |
| Employee Labour | | | ed | Decentralize | Relations | department HR under HR |
| Relations | | | | d | | division. |
| | | | | Departments) | | |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – REVENUE, MATERIEL MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS SERVICES

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Purchasing and Materials Management / Purchasing | Essential Service – at standard set by Council and management | Essential Service – somewhat below standard set by management | D – delivery by staff only | D – delivery by staff only | Consider consolidating purchasing with ABCs to obtain greater purchasing power | Purchasing is a centralized service. Procurements are consolidated where feasible |
| Purchasing and Materials Management / Materials Management Stores and Distribution | Essential Service - at standard set by Council and management | Essential Service – at standard set by Council and management | D – delivery by staff only | D – delivery by staff only | Evaluate if exceeding material issue and delivery standard (5 days vs. 7 days) has a significant associated cost | Service standard is 48 hours for orders. Central stores also provides other services such as storage, receiving and disposal. A reduction in service would have no appreciable impact on cost |
| Property Tax Billing / Property Tax Billing & Payment in Lieu of Tax Billing | Mandatory Service – at standard set by legislation and Council | Mandatory service at standard set by legislation and Council | D – delivery by staff only | D – delivery by staff only C – payment processing and bill printing and mailing | Consider online payment options for property tax (e.g. e-billing) | Option included in 2014 business plan |
| Property Tax Billing / Property | Discretionary Service – at standard set by Council and | Discretionary Service – at standard set by Council and | D – delivery by staff only | D – delivery by staff only | Evaluate if eliminating property assessment | City has reviewed in the past. Until MPAC improves its ability to get assessment on the roll and to deal with taxpayer inquiries, |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Assessment | management | Management | | | reviews is cost | we need to maintain this area. |
| Review | | | | | effective | Area also files appeals on behalf |
| | | | | | | of the City. Potential savings |
| | | | | | | would be limited to no more than |
| | | | | | | one FTE since the area would still |
| | | | | | | be required to manage RFR's, tax |
| | | , | | | | appeals, etc. Reduction in staff |
| | | | | | | would also impair ability to |
| | | | | | | monitor GTAA assessments on |
| | | | | | | tenant properties. |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

City of Toronto Planning and Growth Management

b) Toronto Building

| D) 1010Ht0 1 | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Program/Service | Service Level in | Existing | Service | Service | Toronto | |
| | City of Toronto | Service Level | Delivery in | Delivery in | Identified | Impact if Recommendation |
| Activity | | in Mississauga | Toronto | Mississauga | Options / | implemented in Mississauga |
| | | | | | Opportunities - | |
| Building Inspection | Proactive | Proactive | Delivered | Delivered | Eliminate or | Negatively affect the City goal to |
| / | inspections | illegal sign | by City Staff | by City Staff | reduce | clean up illegal signs and sign |
| Sign By-law | which support | enforcement: | | | proactive | clutter. |
| Inspections | the collection of | Year round – | | | inspections for | Proliferation of illegal signs would |
| | an annual sign | 1 FTE and 1 | | | illegal signs and | increase. |
| | tax on third | truck. | | | investigation of | Cleanliness and aesthetic quality of |
| | party signs | Summer (17 | | | sign complaints | the City would be reduced. |
| | levied under the | weeks) – 6 | | | | Citizen complaints to politicians |
| | City of Toronto | students and 3 | | | | and staff would increase. |
| | Act | additional | | | | |
| | | trucks. | | | | |
| | | Election | | | | |
| | | campaigns (4 | | ı | | |
| | | weeks) – 4 | | | | |
| | | contract staff | | | | |
| | | and 1 | | | | |
| | | additional | | | | |
| | | truck. | | | | · |
| | | Number of | | | | |
| | | signs collected | | | | |
| | | (2010) – | | | | |
| | | 29,700 | | • | | |
| Building | Service levels | Online | Delivered | Delivered | Adopt process | Positive impact. Plans already in |
| Permission and | for permit | services | by City staff | by City staff | improvements | place to expand online services, |
| Information | review and | available e- | | | and accelerate | improve information available on |
| 7 | issuance are | signs (portable | | | adoption of new | web and facilitate field automation. |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

- 2 -

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|--|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Processing Building Permit Applications | somewhat lower than legislated standards. Self Supporting service/full cost recovery | sign applications), online inspection booking and compliance letters, building permit status information. | | | technologies to improve efficiencies | |
| Building Permission and Information / Providing information to the public to assist application submission process | Service levels for permit review and issuance are somewhat lower than legislated standards. Self Supporting service/full cost recovery | Assistance provided at the Planning and Building Services Centre to public (average of 75 customers a day). With respect to zoning information requests, volumes are high. 48 hour turnaround on call backs is generally met | Delivered by City staff | Delivered by City Staff | Reduce or charge for information explained to the public e.g. zoning information | Creating new fees could assist in obtaining full cost recovery for services. This would mean a reduction in customer service and could lead to an increase in incomplete applications and/or discourage questions being asked. This would result in more illegal construction or poor quality construction, increasing risks to public health and safety and placing more pressure on enforcement services. |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

. 3 -

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | (no charge); | | | | |
| | | as is 5 | | | | |
| | | business days | | | | |
| | | for written | | | · | |
| | | responses | | | | |
| | | requests | | | | |
| • | | (\$100.00 | | | | |
| | | charge per | | | | · |
| | | letter). | | | | |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

City of Toronto Planning and Growth Management

a) City Planning

| Program/Service // Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Civic and Community Improvement / Public Realm Improvements | There is a Public Realm Office in Transportation Services that coordinates City street furniture, pedestrian initiatives and streetscape and beautification projects. The service provided in City Planning is not a program. It is an activity embedded in the development application review process which involves providing planning input and establishing conditions of approval for | Monies for public art have been included in budgets for some major capital projects. | Delivered by City staff | Delivered by City staff. | Eliminate or reduce service levels for public realm improvement programs. | No savings would be realized. If comments and conditions were not set the applicant would not be required to pay for public realm items such as streetscape improvements which would be a lost opportunity to improve the City's public lands at no cost to the City. |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

- 2 -

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | matters related to lands outside of private lands under application i.e. streetscape requirements, environmental assessments, community improvement plans. | | | | | |
| Civic and Community Improvement / Heritage Inventory and Incentives | Provide heritage grants and Heritage Tax Rebates. Heritage designations falling behind. Grant and rebate programs exceed requirements. | \$75K available to provide heritage grants to owners of designated homes. No tax rebate program in Mississauga. | Delivered by City staff. | Grant program delivered by staff. | Eliminate or reduce heritage grant and heritage tax rebate programs. | Mississauga does not have a heritage rebate program. More difficult to convince owners to retain heritage buildings if grant program eliminated (value of 75K). |
| Development Review, Decision and Implementation / Heritage Review / Public Art | Public sector contribution to public art is 1% of gross construction costs obtained through Section 37. Also have | 0.5% private sector contribution for public art can be negotiated under Section 37 of the | Delivered by City Staff. | Delivered by City Staff. | Eliminate public art programs. | Lose private investment in public art and lose opportunity to enhance appearance and cultural vibrance of the City. |

| | 2 | |
|---|----|---|
| - | .) | _ |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | Official Plan policies and capital budget dollars for public art related to major City projects i.e. St. Clair reconstruction. | Planning Act through the processing of development applications for significant and/or large-scale private developments. An annual capital budget of \$200,000 to fund the Civic Public Art Program starting in 2012 is in the Culture Service Area Business Plan. | | | | |
| Development Review, Decision and Implementation / Proactive Review and Providing Comments on Potential | Planning offers proactive review of "intent" and provides information and reactions and provides explanations of zoning by-laws | Planning Services Centre staffed to provide information and advice. DARC is a formal process to provide | Delivered by City Staff. | Delivered by City Staff. | Eliminate or charge a fee for proactive review of "intent" and providing information and reactions and | Reduction in customer service. Could lead to incomplete/unsatisfactory applications being submitted resulting in more time spent later on in process i.e. referrals to OMB. Charges for these services being considered as part of 2012 Fees & Charges By-law Review. |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Development Proposals | and resulting options. | preliminary application review as required by the Mississauga Official Plan in accordance with the Planning Act complete application requirements. | | | explanations of zoning by- laws and resulting options. | |
| Development Review, Decision and Implementation / Community Planning / Review of Planning Applications | Applications not consistently processed within target time frames — this is generally due to more extensive circulation, public involvement and discussion than required. | Steps taken to maximize co- ordination include: one stop Planning and Building Customer Services Counter; preliminary review meetings held with staff from all departments brought together to discuss proposals and | Delivered by City Staff. | Delivered by City Staff. | Streamlining review of planning applications by reducing the level of consultation and co-ordination in review. | Reduction in customer service. Reducing consultation and coordination could result in unanticipated issues needing to be resolved late in process and / or in lower quality developments. |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | who then meet | | | | |
| | | with applicants | | | | |
| | | (DARC); cross- | | , | | |
| | | department | | | | |
| | | project teams; | | | | |
| | | cross- | | | | |
| | | department | | | | |
| | | Planning | | | | |
| | | Directors | | | | |
| | | meetings to ensure co- | | | ŀ | |
| | | ordination of | | | | |
| | | work plans. | | | | |
| | | MAX system | | | | |
| | | used to allow | | | | |
| | | comments from | | | | |
| | | various | | | | |
| | | departments and | | | | |
| | | agencies to be | | | | |
| | | read by all | | | | |
| | | commenters. | | | | |
| | | Inter- | | | | |
| | | departmental | | | | |
| | | meetings held | | | | |
| | | twice a year to | | | | |
| | | identify and | | | | |
| | | resolve issues | | | | |
| | , | and clarify roles | | | | |
| | | and | | I | 1 | |

| | _ | |
|---|---|---|
| • | b | - |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Development Review, Decision and Implementation / Community Planning / Review of Planning Applications | Applications not consistently processed within target time frames – this is generally due to more extensive circulation, public involvement and discussion than required. | steps taken to maximize co- ordination include: one stop Planning and Building Customer Services Counter; preliminary review meetings held with staff from all departments brought together to discuss proposals and who then meet with applicants (DARC); cross-department project teams; cross-department Planning Directors meetings to | Delivered By City Staff. | Delivered by City Staff. | Co-locate with other City Divisions which could result in cost savings. | Possible negative impacts on service delivery by splitting planning and operational staff in departments such as Community Services and Transportation and Works. Costs to relocate staff again when the Office Accommodation Plan moves have just recently been completed. |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | ensure co- ordination of work plans. MAX system used to allow comments from various departments and agencies to be read by all commenters. Inter- departmental meetings held twice a year to identify and resolve issues and clarify roles and responsibilities. | | | | |
| Development Review, Decision and Implementation / Community Planning / Site Plan Review | Design and Site Plan requirements inconsistent across the City. | Mississauga only has one Site Plan By- law that ensures consistency of site plan requirements across the City. | Delivered by City Staff. | Delivered by City Staff. | Harmonize the Site Plan By- law to achieve consistency in design and site plan | No impact as it already exists. |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – TPO/BUSINESS SERVICES

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

В. **Parking**

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississanga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|
| Parking / Off-Street Parking | Manages an estimated 20,700 off street spaces in 188 facilities. Of these 6 are attended lots. | Manages 2,152 off street spaces Civic Precinct (Pay) Library: 392 Civic: 582 LAC 428 Sheridan: 352 Other Areas (Free) Garages/Munic ipal Lots: 750 Planned Downtown Parking Structure, potentially 1000 spaces | In 2009, it costs \$1,925 to manage one off street space. Same year revenue generated by same type of space was \$3,210, net \$1,285 | Off-street parking was introduced on July 4, 2011. Data not available yet. | Lease or sell off-street lots and garages. However, this would eliminate the on-going revenue stream. | Civic Precinct: Library, Civic, LAC, are City owned facilities. Low probability/practicality of selling or leasing. City owns Sheridan lands and there will be parking changes in the future as Sheridan Phase 2 develops. Land could be considered for sale but should be viewed from a strategic objective point of view. Other Areas: Municipal surface parking lots are also available in BIA's and various other City locations. There is some potential for sale, however, BIA lots may have been funded with Payment in Lieu funds and/or be considered BIA like assets and therefore may not result in funds to the City. Planned Parking: There is potential for efficiencies (land/structure/operating) by |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – TPO/BUSINESS SERVICES

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | | | | | entering into a Private/Public Partnership for parking in the City Centre. |
| Parking / Pay for Parking – Pay by Cell System | Pay by cell is not offered. | Pay by cell is not offered. | 'N/A | N/A | Pay-by-Cell Parking Payment System could reduce costs over time. | Mississauga is in its infancy with pay for parking systems and have recently entered into a multi-year contract. The implications for making this change now, given its low potential savings (up to 5%), is likely not viable. It should be considered during the next generation of pay for parking system procurement. |
| Parking / Potential for intensification of garage sites | Information wasn't included in KPMG report. | N/A | N/A | N/A | Consider program for intensification of garage sites. Full business case required before feasibility and net benefit known. | Future downtown parking could be provided as part of a new development. |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - CITY OF TORONTO POLICE SERVICES REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

| | • |
|---|-----|
| _ | I - |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Parking Enforcement and By-law Enforcement / By-law Enforcement Parking Enforcement Pounds and Towing Management (Parking Enforcement) | Services currently considered core services, at standard | Services currently considered core services, at standard | Services provided by Toronto Police Services | Parking Enforcement and Compliance and Licensing Enforcement are part of the Enforcement Division of the Transportati on and Works Department | service level for following services that are not core, or | Reducing parking enforcement service levels will negatively impact City revenue for parking infractions. The City will need to create a busine3ss case to understand the revenue implications of reducing service levels in these infractions, and to examine the costs of operating these services within the City and/or Toronto Parking Authority |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - CITY OF TORONTO POLICE SERVICES REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

- 2 -

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Animal Services / Cat and Dog Licensing and Enforcement | | On April 27, 2011 Council adopted recommendatio n GC-0193-2011, which endorsed proposed strategies to improve the compliance rate for animal licensing. The first phase of this strategy begins with a Neighbourhood Outreach Licensing Campaign in the Fall of 2011. Staff have been very active in preparing for this campaign. | Delivered By City Staff | Delivered By City Staff | Consider value of Cat and Dog Licensing and Enforcement Eliminate cat and dog incensing and Animal Services Enforcement | Loss of existing revenue Loss of anticipate revenue from the E3 licensing initiative The cost of the operation of Animal Services would be entirely Funded from the general tax base Negative public reaction |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - CITY OF TORONTO POLICE SERVICES REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

- 3 -

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Animal Services / Animal By-law Enforcement and Mobile Response | | Animal Services staff on site within 30 minutes | Delivered By City Staff | Delivered By City Staff | Consider reducing service level (response time) for Emergency Animal Rescue and Care by increasing service response time Expect emergency animal rescue and care to take more than two hours to arrive, at least outside normal weekday hours | Emergency animal rescue situations are not the place to increase response times as a means to reduce service levels. An emergency in most cases means an animal is suffering or in some kind of distress. The savings would be very limited if at all because staff still have to attend. |
| Animal Services / Animal | i e | Presently, more that 50% of animals | Delivered By City Staff | Delivered By City Staff | Consider requiring owners | Negative public reaction Hardship on some owners |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - CITY OF TORONTO POLICE SERVICES REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Sheltering and Adoption | | surrender are delivered by their owners to the shelter. A cost recovery fee of \$56.00 is charged for staff to pick up the animal being surrendered. | | | wishing to surrender animals to deliver them to the shelter. Expect owners to deliver their animals to the shelter when they wish to surrender them rather that picking the animals up | Increased number of strays Loss of revenue |
| Animal Services / Animal Care and Enforcement | | | Delivered By City Staff | Delivered By City Staff | Consider outsourcing some or all animal care and enforcement Outsourcing may reduce costs but also gives less direct control over service | Animal Services is about to embark on the first of the E3 initiatives related to strategies for improving the compliance rate for animal licensing, while realizing cost savings as more animals are identified. This will require more diligent enforcement, an activity that needs to be done by experienced and qualified professionals. The same enforcement expertise applies to |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - CITY OF TORONTO POLICE SERVICES REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

- 5 -

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | Autorities and control | The state of the s | The state of the s | | delivery | other areas of the by-law and DOLA as well. There are opportunities for some services to be contracted out such as cremation, which we already do, and dead animal removal. |
| Animal Services | | City wide | Delivered By City Staff | Delivered By City Staff | Consider the opportunity to deliver these services citywide instead of district-based. | The service is currently offered City Wide |
| | | | | | Currently district based. Delivery of services city- wide could allow for an increased span | : |
| | | | | | of control and more consistent service delivery – this could result in | |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - CITY OF TORONTO POLICE SERVICES REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

- 6 -

| Program/Service | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities better | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Business | | Staff are | Delivered | Delivered By | processes and reduced cost Consider | Once the benchmarking exercise |
| Licensing, Enforcement and Permitting / Business Licensing and Enforcement | | currently conducting a benchmarking exercise on all licensing fees and charges to determine "value added" and the appropriate fees for the service provided. | By City Staff | City Staff | eliminating license categories that do not clearly serve a public service. May reduce paper burden in the City but may not produce a net saving s for the City | is complete, staff will prepare the necessary information as part of the 2012 budget submission |
| / Property Enforcement | | City wide | Delivered By City Staff | Delivered By City Staff | Consider the opportunity to deliver these services citywide instead of district-based. Currently district based. Delivery of services city- | The service is currently offered City Wide |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - CITY OF TORONTO POLICE SERVICES REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

-7-

| Program/Service Activity | Service Level in City of Poronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Foronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities wide could allow for an increased span of control and more consistent service delivery – this could result in better processes and | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Business Licensing, Enforcement and Permitting / Business Licensing and Enforcement | | Compliance and Licensing Enforcement is predominantly re-active to complaints or expired licences. Proactive business licensing enforcement is nominal. | Delivered By City Staff | Delivered By City Staff | Consider reducing the level of proactive investigation and enforcement. May lead to reduced compliance with licensing requirements | Compliance and Licensing Enforcement is predominantly reactive to complaints or expired licences. Proactive business licensing enforcement is nominal. |

-8-

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Property Enforcement / Waste Enforcement | | This is a Regional issue. | | | Consider outsourcing waste diversion enforcement. | None, this is a regional issue |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – ENFORCEMENT

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

ENFORCEMENT

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Animal Services / Cat and Dog Licensing and Enforcement | | On April 27, 2011 Council adopted recommendation GC-0193-2011, which endorsed proposed strategies to improve the compliance rate for animal licensing. The first phase of this strategy begins with a Neighbourhood Outreach Licensing Campaign in the Fall of 2011. Staff have been very active in preparing for this campaign. | Delivered By City Staff | Delivered By City Staff | Consider value of Cat and Dog Licensing and Enforcement Eliminate cat and dog incensing and Animal Services Enforcement | Loss of existing revenue Loss of anticipate revenue from the E3 licensing initiative The cost of the operation of Animal Services would be entirely Funded from the general tax base Negative public reaction |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Animal Services | | Animal Services | Delivered | Delivered By | Consider | Emergency animal rescue |
| / | | staff on site | By City | City Staff | reducing | situations are not the place to |
| Animal By-law | • | within 30 | Staff | City Stair | service level | increase response times as a |
| Enforcement and | | minutes | Stall | | (response | means to reduce service levels. |
| Mobile Response | | | | | time) for | An emergency in most cases |
| 1,100110 1ttspons | | | | | Emergency | means an animal is suffering or in |
| | | | ı | | Animal | some kind of distress. The |
| | | | | | Rescue and | savings would be very limited if |
| | | | | | Care by | at all because staff still have to |
| | | | | | increasing | attend. |
| 1 | | | | | service | |
| | | | | | response time | |
| | | | | | Expect | |
| | | | | | emergency | |
| | | | | | animal rescue | |
| | | | | | and care to | |
| | | | 1 | | take more | |
| | | | | | than two | |
| | | | | | hours to | |
| | | | | | arrive, at least | |
| | | | | | outside | |
| 1 | | | | | normal | |
| | | | | | weekday | |
| | | | | | hours | |
| | _ | | | | | |
| Animal Services | | Presently, more | Delivered | Delivered By | Consider | Negative public reaction |
| / | | that 50% of | By City | City Staff | requiring | |
| Animal | | animals | Staff | | owners | Hardship on some owners |
| Sheltering and | | surrender are | | | wishing to | . |
| Adoption | | delivered by | | | surrender | Increased number of strays |
| | | their owners to | | | animals to | |
| | | the shelter. A | - | | deliver them | Loss of revenue |
| | · | cost recovery | | | to the shelter. | |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|
| | | fee of \$56.00 is charged for staff to pick up the animal being surrendered. | | | Expect owners to deliver their animals to the shelter when they wish to surrender them rather that picking the animals up | |
| Animal Services / Animal Care and Enforcement | | | Delivered By City Staff | Delivered By City Staff | Consider outsourcing some or all animal care and enforcement Outsourcing may reduce costs but also gives less direct control over service delivery | Animal Services is about to embark on the first of the E3 initiatives related to strategies for improving the compliance rate for animal licensing, while realizing cost savings as more animals are identified. This will require more diligent enforcement, an activity that needs to be done by experienced and qualified professionals. The same enforcement expertise applies to other areas of the by-law and DOLA as well. There are opportunities for some services to be contracted out such as cremation, which we already do, and dead animal removal. |
| Animal Services | | City wide | Delivered By City Staff | Delivered By City Staff | Consider the opportunity to deliver these | The service is currently offered City Wide |

| Program/Service | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service | Service Delivery in | Service Delivery in | Toronto Identified | Impact if Recommendation |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Activity | | Level in Mississauga | Toronto | Mississauga | Options / | implemented in Mississauga |
| | | | | | Opportunities services city- | |
| | | | | | wide instead | |
| | | | | | of district- | |
| | | | | • | based. | |
| | | | | | Currently | · |
| | | | • | • | district based. | |
| | | | | | Delivery of | |
| | · | | | | services city- | |
| | | | | | wide could | |
| | | | | | allow for an | . * |
| ļ | | | 1 | | increased span | |
| | | | | | of control and | |
| | | | | | more | |
| | | | | | consistent | |
| | | | | | service | |
| | | | | | delivery – this could result in | |
| | | 1 | 4 | | better | |
| | | | | 1 | processes and | |
| İ | | | | | reduced cost | |
| | | | | | 10000000000 | • |
| Business | | Staff are | Delivered | Delivered By | Consider | Once the benchmarking exercise |
| Licensing, | | currently | By City | City Staff | eliminating | is complete, staff will prepare the |
| Enforcement and | | conducting a | Staff | | license | necessary information as part of |
| Permitting | | benchmarking | | | categories that | the 2012 budget submission |
| / | | exercise on all | | | do not clearly | |
| Business | | licensing fees | | [| serve a public | |
| Licensing and | | and charges to | | | service. May | |
| Enforcement | | determine | | | reduce paper | |
| | | "value added" | | | burden in the | • |
| | | and the | | | City but may | |
| | <u> </u> | appropriate fees | | | not produce a | |

| Program/Service Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga for the service | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities net saving s for | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | provided. City wide | Delivered | Delivered By | the City Consider the | The service is currently offered |
| Property Enforcement | | | By City Staff | City Staff | opportunity to deliver these services city-wide instead of district-based. Currently district based. Delivery of services city-wide could allow for an increased span of control and more consistent service delivery – this could result in better processes and reduced cost | City Wide |
| Business Licensing, Enforcement and Permitting / Business | | Compliance and Licensing Enforcement is predominantly re-active to complaints or | Delivered By City Staff | Delivered By City Staff | Consider reducing the level of proactive investigation and | Compliance and Licensing Enforcement is predominantly reactive to complaints or expired licences. Proactive business licensing enforcement is nominal. |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Licensing and | | expired | | | enforcement. | |
| Enforcement | | licences. Proactive business licensing enforcement is nominal. | | | May lead to reduced compliance with licensing requirements | |
| Property Enforcement / Waste Enforcement | | This is a Regional issue. | | | Consider outsourcing waste diversion enforcement. | None, this is a regional issue |

DEPARTMENTAL COMMENTS ON THE CITY OF TORONTO SERVICE REVIEW REPORT PREPARED BY KPMG

Roads, Storm Drainage and Watercourses Service Area

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Works Maintenance and Operations / Winter Maintenance | Toronto's level of service for snow plowing of residential roads is as follows: Snowfall Response Time * Up to 5 cm 5 to 15 cm 14 to 16 hours 15 to 25 cm 18 to 20 hours Over 25 cm 24 to 36+ hours After the end of the snowfall. The objective is to make residential roads safe and passable. | Mississauga's current winter level of service for secondary roads were recently endorsed by Council and are tiered based on the amount of snowfall as follows: Snowfall Response Time* 15 cm or less 24 hours 15-30 cm 36 hours Over 30 cm/ ASAP Successive Storms After the end of the snowfall. | The outsourcing statistics for Toronto's Winter Maintenanc e Program are not available | Based on 2011 operating budget allocations, approximatel y 66% of Mississauga's Winter Maintenance Program is outsourced | Consider reducing snow plowing and snow removal standards on residential streets. | Focus is to make secondary roads safe and passable; bare pavement may not be achievable. Current winter service levels for secondary roads are considered reasonable and any proposed reduction may cause negative reaction from residents, especially during severe snowfalls. Pre-treated salt is to be used on all secondary roads and sidewalks starting in the 2011/2012 winter season (recently endorsed by Council). The additional material cost for pre-treated salt is offset with cost reductions in the number of sand/salt applications and in spring clean-up costs, and with environmental benefits. Currently meets Provincial Minimum Maintenance Standards but reduced level of service would drop us below the standard for local roads. |

| | $^{\circ}$ | |
|---|------------|---|
| - | _ | _ |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Works Maintenance and Operations / Winter Maintenance | Toronto's level of service for driveway windrow snow clearing is as follows: Snowfall Response Time Up to 5 cm to 15 cm to 16 hours 15 to 25 cm 18 to 20 hours Over 25 cm 24 to 36+ hours * After the end of the snowfall. | Mississauga's level of service for driveway windrow snow clearing includes a response time of up to 12 hours after completion of road snow plowing operations. | The outsourcing statistics for Toronto's Winter Maintenanc e Program are not available | Program is outsourced | Consider eliminating the driveway windrow clearing program. | Consideration is being given during the 2012 budget process to discontinue pilot. May cause inconvenience to elderly/disabled. Politically sensitive. |
| Works Maintenance and Operations / Street Cleaning | Toronto's level of service for street sweeping is based on the seasons. Typical sweeping level of service is as follows: | Mississauga's current level of service for street sweeping is as follows: Spring Sweeping All roads are swept twice. | Toronto's street sweeping program is carried out entirely by in-house forces; (not outsourced). | Based on 2011 operating budget allocations, approximatel y 53% of Mississauga's Cleaning and | Consider reducing frequency of mechanical and /or manual sweeping. | Contract service delivery improvements and efficiencies were recently made (i.e. area based contract). The potential savings from any service level reductions are considered low and raise environmental concerns. Environmental air quality |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | Road Frequency Downtown – Heavy 7 nights/wk Downtown – Light 4 nights/wk Inner City & Parking Once/wk Suburban – Arterial Once/wk Suburban – Local Once/mth | Regular Sweeping — BIA's are swept weekly, major arterial and collector roads are swept twice monthly and industrial roads are swept once monthly. All other streets are swept on an as required basis. Emergency Sweeping — On an as required basis. | | Litter Program is outsourced. | | concerns are creating budgetary pressures to upgrade contracted sweeping equipment from mechanical sweepers to vacuum regenerative air sweepers. |
| Works Maintenance and Operations / Roads and Sidewalks | N/A | N/A | N/A | Based on 2011 operating budget allocations, approximatel y 79% of Mississauga's | Consider a more detailed review of the service level standards and performance for road and sidewalk repairs. | Annual Business Plan and Budget Reviews are undertaken for efficiencies and best practices, while seeking to meet Provincial Minimum Maintenance Standards for the City's roads and sidewalk. Currently cannot fix backlog of requests |

| _ | 4 | _ |
|---|---|---|
|---|---|---|

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | | | Road and Sidewalk Program is outsourced. | | |
| Works Maintenance and Operations / Roads and Sidewalks | N/A | N/A | N/A | Core group of in-house staff resources for emergency work or labour stoppage by others. | Consider shifting the mix of in-house and outsourced service delivery. | Substantial contract resources are currently employed by Works Maintenance and Operations through various programs. |
| Traffic Operations \ Special Events | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Consider collecting fees from all street event permits issued to ensure full cost recovery. | Permit fees are collected for Special Events within the municipal road allowance. Fees are annually reviewed under the T&W Fees and Charges By-law. Fees are waived for affiliated groups. Implementing fees for these groups would be politically sensitive. |
| Cycling Office / Bicycle Infrastructure Management | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Consider reducing the scale of bicycle infrastructure being | Mississauga's new Cycling Office has a \$3.8M annual capital budget funded through Development Charges and it is already poised for reduction due to diminished |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|--|--|
| , | | | | | developed. | DC revenues. It is noted that the proposed start up budget for 2011 was cut in half. Additional funding proposed for 2012 (\$55K) has already been eliminated. |
| Geomatics / Land Surveys and Mapping | Not Available | Third party support is already in place to deal with high volume, large project or very short turnaround. Services are at standard with added internal cost and quality controls. | Not Available | Legal Surveys are completed in house with a team complement of 1FTE and 1Field Crew (not 100% dedicated). Project timelines are negotiated with client and contracted out if the client has funds to pay for contracted out services and the work | Consider third party support for mapping or surveying. | Legal surveying services are outsourced when required. No impact foreseen. |

| Program/Service Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|---|---|
| | | | | cannot be done internally. | | |
| Geomatics / Land Surveys and Mapping | Not Available | Storm sewers are compiled by internal staff (small fraction of 1FTE). Service is at Standard. Other utilities are the responsibility of each utility group. As an example the Region is responsible for mapping water and sanitary and Enersource, Enbridge, Bell rogaers and others are all responsible for their own mapping to meet minimal standards to support PUCC | Not Available | Storm sewer asset managed with a partial FTE and referenced for PUCC applications and is accessed at will and as needed by all City staff. | Consider process improvements to achieve standard levels. | Responsibilities are different than in Toronto, where Toronto has numerous FTEs managing the entire underground utility for the "old" City of Toronto area. They are behind in continuing to update changes for this area, and standards are not in place to apply the same collection model for the old areas of Scarborough, North York, and Etobicoke. No impact foreseen as we maintain a much simpler data model of the storm network, while still being complete and sufficient for Standard service provision |

| | $\overline{}$ | |
|---|---------------|---|
| - | 1 | - |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | | road occupancy and road cut permits. | | | | |
| Capital Works / Infrastructure Design and Construction | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Consider further use of third party vendors for job contracting as well as alternate delivery models such as program management through external consultants. | Capital Works currently has the ability to cost effectively deliver on projects using both in-house and external resources. Opportunities for such a flexible delivery model are constantly being reviewed and incorporated, particularly on larger scale projects where existing in-house resource capacity may be stretched. |
| Capital Works / Design and Construction Infrastructure | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Consider developing and implementing service level standards where they do not exist. | Service level standards exist within Capital Works. Procedures are standardized and audited, and where possible, improvements are made. Contracts are standardized and reviewed by Materiel Management and Legal. |
| Transportation and Infrastructure Planning | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Consider process improvements to | The Transportation and Infrastructure Planning Division has procedural guidelines and |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| Engineering Review and Approvals | | | | | achieve standard levels. | documentation in place to achieve service standards. The potential savings from any further process improvements are not apparent. |
| Transportation and Infrastructure Planning / Engineering Policy, Standards and Support | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Consider developing and implementing service level standards. | Service level standards exit within the Transportation and Infrastructure Planning Division and improvements are made where possible. Additional cost savings are not apparent. |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – TRANSIT

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Conventional Transit / Fixed Route Transit Bus Operations | SubwayStreetcarsBus | Bus | Extensive 24 hour network with minimum frequencies (30 min.) and 7 day service. | Lesser network on reduced frequencies (1 hour minimum) with reduced evening / weekend network. | Consider use of contractors for delivery of some TTC services. | Would have to contract out all or portions of the network. Significant undertaking and would take several years to implement (2014+). |
| / Administrative and back-office services | TTC is a structured as a stand-alone Agency, Board or Commission. | Mississauga Transit is a city division | Assumed to be equivalent | Assumed to be equivalent | Consider opportunities to integrate administrative and back office services with City shared service groups. | Mississauga Transit is provided with city services, for i.e.: HR, IT, Legal, Materiel Management, Property, F&PM, Finance & Risk Management. Based on CUTA statistics the administrative overhead for Mississauga Transit and the TTC are the same on a percentage of total operating cost. |
| Facility and Vehicle Maintenance | Vehicles - standards set by MTO. Facilities - standards set by | Vehicles - standards set by MTO Facilities - assumed to be similar | Provided by in-house resources | Mix of in house and contract resources | Consider use of more external suppliers for aspects of facility and vehicle maintenance | Vehicles – Mississauga already contracts out all heavy maintenance – engines, transmissions, major collision work, air conditioning, tires, towing. |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – TRANSIT

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | industry practice | | | | | Any further contracting would have to be as a complete package. This is a significant undertaking and would take several years to implement – (2014+). |
| | | | | | | Facilities – most facility work is already contracted out. |
| Parking Lots | Sixteen (16) lots – charges vary by lot and time of day. | None currently. BRT will have lots at Cawthra Station and Dixie Station. | Operated and maintained in-house | Likely contracted out | Consider monetizing parking lots through sale or lease. | BRT lots may be able to generate revenue to offset costs. |
| Ridership Growth Strategy (RGS) | (RGS) Increased service levels in 2008, 2009 and 2010. Operate blue night network (late night to give 24 hour service) | (RGS) increased service levels in 2008. 2009 - plan cut by half and 2010 plan was reduced further. | In-house | In-house | Consider rolling back some of the service improvements implemented under the Ridership Growth Strategy, including changes to the crowding standard and | Roll back of RGS will result in higher operating costs for BRT when it opens due to lower ridership. Regular review of non-performing routes ensures that non —warranted service is reduced/eliminated as necessary. No equivalent of the blue night service exists. |

CITY OF MISSISSAUGA – TRANSIT

| | 2 | |
|---|---|---|
| - | | - |

| Program/Service / Activity | Service Level in City of Toronto | Existing Service Level in Mississauga | Service Delivery in Toronto | Service Delivery in Mississauga | Toronto Identified Options / Opportunities | Impact if Recommendation implemented in Mississauga |
|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | the minimum service frequency standard. Also consider reducing/elimi nating the Blue Night network, or making it a premium service by raising fares. | |
| / Support activities | Full range of Customer Service, Marketing, Training, Fleet & Facility support. | Similar range of support on a much smaller scale. | In-house | Mix of in- house and contract | Review service levels of support activities to conventional transi. | E-3 review of transit benchmarked our support activities identifying several areas for enhancement not reduction (i.e. marketing, business metrics). |