Committee of the Whole
REPORT 10-006

9:30 a.m.
February 8, 2010
Albion Room
Hamilton Convention Centre

Present:
Mayor F. Eisenberger
Deputy Mayor B. McHattie
Councillors B. Bratina, B. Clark, C. Collins, S. Duvall,

Absent with regrets:
Councillor M. McCarthy – Personal

Also Present:
C. Murray, City Manager
R. Rossini, General Manager, Finance and Corporate Services
G. Davis, General Manager, Public Works
T. McCabe, General Manager, Planning and Economic Development
J.A. Priel, General Manager, Community Services
P. Barkwell, City Solicitor
M. Gallagher, Co-ordinator, Council and Committee of the Whole/Budgets

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE PRESENTS REPORT 10-006 AND RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS:

1. Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities Report 10-001, meeting of January 12, 2010 (Item 8.1)

   (a) Signage at City Hall (Item 5.1(a))

      (i) That the signage for the City Hall Renovations to be more accessible, according to the Clear Print Accessibility
Guidelines and the Barrier-Free Design Guidelines, with consideration of providing accessibility to everyone;

(ii) That glass doors meet the Barrier-Free Design Guidelines irrespective of the Heritage Designations of City Hall, as this is a safety and accessibility issue.

(iii) That, as it is important to have signs showing where people can and cannot go, signage be placed at all accessible entrances, exits, ramps and stairwells.

(iv) That, as soon as possible and prior to any final decision-making respecting signage at City Hall, the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities review the designated Project Manager’s report respecting the resolution of interior and exterior signage issues.

(b) Buildings and Renovations (Item 5.1(a))

That, for anything built or renovated, the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities be part of the planning/project process from the beginning.

(c) Accessible Transportation (Item 5.2(a))

(i) That whereas in the future, demand will increase for accessible transportation services; the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities advises Council that it has concerns regarding the availability of resources for Accessible Transportation Services (ATS), including DARTS, required so that persons with disabilities have access to accessible transportation required to meet their daily needs for work, school and health care;

(ii) That staff be directed to bring a report back to Committee of the Whole by early fall 2010 investigating other transportation service delivery models to ensure that persons with disabilities are guaranteed 100% trip service.

(c) Reinstatement of Marlene Thomas to the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities (Item 6.4)

That Marlene Thomas be reinstated as a member of the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities for the 2006 to 2010 term of Council or until such time as a successor is appointed by Council.
2. **Accessible Washroom – East Hamilton Recreational Trail Hub and Waterfront Link (PW10015) (Ward 4) (Item 8.2)**

That Report PW10015 respecting Accessible Washroom – East Hamilton Recreational Trail Hub and Waterfront Link be received.

3. **Hamilton Ontario Water Employees Association (HUR10006) (Item 8.4)**

That Report HUR10006 respecting Hamilton Ontario Water Employees Association, be received.

4. **Infrastructure Stimulus Fund - Change of Scope for Coronation Arena (CS10015) (Ward 1) (Item 8.5)**

   (a) That the scope, for the Infrastructure Stimulus Fund for the Coronation Arena project (No. 2344), be amended to include the renovation of the existing Coronation Arena rather than a redevelopment of the arena into a three pad complex, as part of a public/private partnership.

   (b) That staff be directed to submit a formal letter to Infrastructure Canada requesting approval of the change of scope for the Coronation Arena Project (No. 2344), to include the renovation of the existing Coronation Arena rather than a redevelopment of the arena into a three pad complex, as part of a public/private partnership.

5. **Citizens Forum Options (CM10002) (City Wide) (Item 8.6)**

   (a) That the Terms of Reference, attached as Appendix ‘A’ to Report 10-006 for the Citizens’ Forum Recommendations be approved.

   (b) That costs for a citizen's forum in the amount of $95,000 be funded from tax stabilization reserve #110046 and approved.

   (c) That there be an interim progress report half way through the process to update Committee of the Whole.

6. **Requirement for Local Food at new City Hall (10.1)**

Whereas, many Hamiltonians are expressing great interest in eating locally-grown food, and;
Whereas, the Local Food Plus (LFP) organization has certified a number of Hamilton-area farmers as “local” and “sustainable”, who can now provide food to local facilities with the LFP certification label, and;

Whereas, the City of Hamilton’s Community Food Security Stakeholder Advisory Committee is working on local food policies and education programs, and;

Whereas, the high profile, new City Hall restaurant provides Council with the opportunity to demonstrate its commitment to supporting local agriculture and healthy food;

Therefore Be it Resolved,

(a) That the request for proposals for the new City Hall restaurant include a requirement to provide LFP-certified local food to the extent possible;

(b) That respondents to the RFP clearly outline the percentage of local food to be utilized

Note: “Local” means preferably grown in Ontario

7. Bruce Wood, President/CEO, Hamilton Port Authority respecting update on Port Activity and progress of major initiatives (Item 6.1)

That the presentation by the Hamilton Port Authority respecting Port activity and progress of major initiatives be received.

8. Madina Wasuge, Hamilton Centre for Civic Inclusion respecting progress update (Item 6.2)

That the progress update presented by the Hamilton Centre for Civic Inclusion be received.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL:

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

The Clerk noted the following changes to the agenda:

With respect to the delegation request 5.1 from Ian Rowe, you will recall that Council approved this request at the January 27, 2009 meeting of City Council and therefore no further action is required at this time.
Added delegation request noted as Item 5.4 from Tim Dobbie to address Committee of the Whole at our special meeting of February 18th respecting Pan Am Games

With respect to Item 7.1(a) Amendments to Schedule 20 of the Licensing By-Law

The 5th speaker noted on the agenda Aldo Berlingieri has withdrawn his request to speak today

However we have additional speakers who have indicated the opportunity to address committee on this matter today and they are:

Kim Janjic of Lakeview Retirement Centre
And a delegation representing Atrium Villa – they are: Dawn Lyons, Debbie Kerr-Phillips and Brenda Tozer

The agenda was adopted as amended.

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

(c) ADOPTION OF MINUTES

3.1 January 11, 2010

The Minutes of January 11, 2010 were approved.

3.2 January 14, 2010 (special)

The Minutes of January 14, 2010 were approved.

3.3 January 20, 2010

The Minutes of January 20, 2010 were approved.

(d) DELEGATION REQUESTS

The following delegation requests noted below were approved:

5.1 Request to address Committee by Ian Rowe, President, Wentworth Condominium Corporation No. 236 On behalf of Canadian Condominium Institute, Golden Horseshoe Chapter respecting
residential tax matters affecting condominium corporations – No action required

5.2 Request to address Committee by John Dolbec, Hamilton Chamber of Commerce respecting Pan Am Games Stadium Location

5.3 Request to address Committee by Andrew Iler, National Cycling Centre Hamilton respecting Pan Am Games Velodrome

5.4 Request to address Committee by Tim Dobbie respecting Pan Am Games

5.5 Kim Janjec of Lakeview Retirement Centre

5.6 Dawn Lyons, Debbie Kerr-Phillips, Brenda Tozer, Atrium Villa

(e) PUBLIC DELEGATIONS

(i) Bruce Wood, President/CEO, Hamilton Port Authority respecting update on Port Activity and progress of major initiatives (Item 6.1)

Mel Hawkridge, Chair of Port Authority and Bruce Wood, President/CEO provided an update on the progress of major initiatives of Port Activity.

Highlights included:
- Mission and Vision
- HPA Strategy
  - Business Growth, Strategic Infrastructure Investment, A Focus on Social Responsibility, Build a High Performance Organization
- What the Future Holds

Committee members raised the following issues of note:

- the future development of Pier 22 – Old Stelco Rod Mill - 80 acres – will now be a bulk port
- Randall Reef – continued funding and update on the status of project
- Tonnage Report – drop in 2.7 million tones – impact on steel industry
- Future with steel industry winding down
- Comparators of how Hamilton fairs with respect to grants/funds received from other levels for the Port Authority
The presentation was received.

(ii) **Madina Wasuge, Hamilton Centre for Civic Inclusion**
respecting progress update (Item 6.2)

Madina Wasuge and Members of HCCI (Marco Romero, Gary Warner and Gerry Fisher) provided an update on the work of the Hamilton Centre for Civic Inclusion. Highlights included:

- Strategic directions
- Organizational Development
- Funding
- Accountability
- Importance of having the Centre in Hamilton
- Social cohesion
- HCCI received status as a charitable non profit organization
- establish fund raising efforts

The presentation was received.

(f) **PRESENTATIONS**

(i) **Amendments to Schedule 20 (Residential Care Facilities) of the Licensing By-Law 07-170 (PED10005) (City Wide) (item 7.1)**

Vince Ormond, Planning, provided an overview of the report. Highlights included:

- Background of issue
- revisions made to by-law – secured storage space, tenant security and privacy, complaint process, access to a private phone;
- concerns not addressed – inadequacy of current per diem funding for subsidized residential care facilities and community services will be reviewing the funding process

Members of Council addressed various issues including:

- secured/locked units and Bill 68
- locked boxes - operator access
- Cost per tenant – $120.00 – unnecessary – tenant shouldn’t be paying for it
- Provisions for Power of Attorney
- Per diems for housing tenants
- Consultation with police services - issues that arise from residential care facilities – most stem around level of care or supervision
- One piece to review moving forward – consultation with neighbourhood and police service (COAST); seems to be extreme levels of good and bad operations;
- Not much time to look at bylaw - needs to move forward; but having looked at it and see some issues, would like to delay two or three weeks for additional review;

(a) Public Delegations

(i) Roy Bennett, Ontario Homes for Special Needs Association

The delegation provided written material for circulation. Included in the verbal presentation were the following issues:
Residential care facilities were not opposed to the new enhance by-law; that this new enhanced by-law comes with a price – very costly, will cost operators a lot of money to implement by-law and ask review costs have a number of operators present today who are very concerned

(ii) Steve Rolfe/Graham Cubitt, Homestead Christian Care - regrets

(iii) Lance Bimgman/Henry Aviles, Housing Help Centre

Requests 1 to 5 that existing tenants receive same information similar to RCF information package; tenants right to access to a phone

Appreciate efforts of Health Department

(iv) Bob Wood, McQuesten Legal and Community Services

Copy of comments distributed

(v) Kim Janjic of Lakeview Retirement

The delegation addressed the following:
- They are not a publicly funded retirement home;
- Have been advocating for residents with regard to clauses in by-law
- with respect to confidential medical records; in 2006, court said that 2 clauses in schedule 20 were unconstitutional – separate file containing medical information and unlocked closet allowing inspection of files; why are these clauses still in schedule 20?; staff responded that these two sections have been amended 56.2(g) now clearly prescribes medical information to care service being provided and section regarding inspection no longer refers to making copies of contents of files; court made clear statement that City of Hamilton has the right if not duly to capture areas not covered by existing laws

- rewording and renumbering does not cover local decision of the court
- suggest that publicly funded second level lodging homes should be licensed than privately-funded retirement homes

(vi) Dawn Lyons, Debbie Kerr-Phillips, Brenda Tozer

Brenda Tozer – General Manager of Georgian Retirement Residents in Dundas and also President of Region 4 for ORCA which goes from Niagara falls to Mississauga so all retirement homes certified by ORCA – 6 homes in Hamilton; also a surveyor for ORCA to do their certification

Addressed: Concerns with respect to Admission procedures in by-law

The presentations were received.

Amendments to Schedule 20 (Residential Care Facilities) of the Licensing By-Law 07-170 (PED10005) (City Wide)

The following Amendments to the staff report were put and CARRIED at Committee:

Amendment #1

Whereas the Substitute Decisions Act prohibits owner operator agents of Residential Care Facilities from acting as Attorney for Personal Care;
Whereas the Substitute Decisions Act does not speak to owner operators or agents of Residential Care Facilities ability to act as Power of Attorney for Residents under their care;

Whereas this omission has serious potential for conflicts of interests;

Therefore, be it resolved, that the City of Hamilton requests amendments to the Substitute Decisions Act that prohibits owner operators from acting as Power of Attorneys under their care or in the care of a related Company.

**Amendment #2**

That Section 47 be deleted in its entirety and replaced with the following in lieu thereof:

47. The operator shall ensure that no facility is equipped with a locked unit provided that the Operator of any facility with a locked unit on date of passage shall make the necessary changes such as removing locks as soon as possible to eliminate such locked units.

**Amendment #3**

That staff be directed to include information respecting Provincial policies relating to this matter in the report.

**Main Motion as Amended TABLED**

The main motion outlined in Report PED10005 respecting Amendments to Schedule 20 (Residential Care Facilities) of the Licensing By-Law 07-170 (PED10005) as amended, was TABLED for one month to allow staff to report back on all information received at committee.

With respect to separating the issue of per diem costs which is being reviewed by Community services, staff will advise by email how quickly this information can be provided to committee.

(ii) **City Manager Performance Review (Item 7.2)**

Chris Murray presented highlights of his Performance Review including the following:

- Strategic outcomes
  - Strategic Plan Update (June)
  - ADM Meeting – Business Readiness (September)
  - Corporate Priority Plan (December)
- Relationship Building

- Operational Outcomes
  - hiring of two general manager

- Financial Outcomes
  - proposed modification to 2010 budget process;
  - worked with staff and council to find area rating compromise, established service delivery review function in CMO
  - initiated customer contact centre review and continue to support OMBI

- People Focus
  - maintain regular contact with staff
  - recommended new Employee Code of Conduct and Whistleblower By-law
  - Support new employee recognition program
  - Regularly attend new employee orientation program

- Citizen Focus
  - Introduced Citizen Centred Service Delivery to Extended Management Team
  - Immigration Portal
  - Review website issues and governance structure
  - Report on Citizen Forum

- Senior Management Team Leadership
  - Developed SMT Purpose Statement
  - Revised SMT meeting focus and began issuing meeting minutes to Council
  - Developing work plan to support Corporate Priority Plan
  - Provide Support to Pan Am and LRT initiatives
  - Completing GM Performance Reviews

- Organization Values
  - Honesty, Accountability, Innovation, Leadership, Respect, Excellence and Teamwork

(g) 2010 Property/Liability Policies Renewal (FCS10008) (Item 8.3)

This report was tabled.
Citizens Forum Options (CM10002) (City Wide) (Item 8.6)

The motion as Amended CARRIED on a Standing Recorded Vote as follows:

Yeas: Bratina, Ferguson, Jackson, McHattie, Pasuta, Mitchell, Pearson, Powers, Eisenberger
Total: 9

Nays: Whitehead, Collins, Duvall, Morelli
Total: 4

Absent: McCarthy, Merulla, Clark
Total: 3

PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Committee moved into Closed Session further to the following subsections of the City's Procedural By-law and Municipal Act:

8.1(d) Labour Relations
8.1(e) litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals affecting the municipality
8.1(f) Receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor client privilege

Committee reconvened in Open Session with the following to be reported:

Closed Session Minutes of January 14, 2010 (Item 11.1)

The minutes of the Closed Session of January 14, 2010 were adopted as presented.

City v Avero Security (GTA1) Inc, et. al., Superior Court Action No. 09-11760 (LS10001) (City Wide) (Item 11.2)
Direction provided in closed session.

Verbal Report on RFP C5-37-09 (Item 11.3)
Withdrawn

City Manager’s Performance Evaluation by Council (11.4)
Direction provided in Closed Session.
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mayor F. Eisenberger

M. Gallagher, Co-ordinator
Committee of the Whole/Council/Budgets
February 8, 2010
TERMS OF REFERENCE
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PREAMBLE

Participatory democracy, specifically, the Citizens’ Forum idea, is a relatively new concept which has not been undertaken previously by the City of Hamilton. While some other municipal governments are currently undertaking such exercises (e.g.: the City of Edmonton has engaged a citizen forum type group for the establishment of a new strategic plan and priority setting goals), the City of Hamilton is introducing a new form of citizen engagement through the issue of Area Rating. This method will be evaluated as a potential future corporate citizen engagement initiative.

Inviting citizens to deliberate and advise on complex issues such as area rating would assist the City in fulfilling Vision 2020 while achieving the City Mission Statement’s objective of public engagement. Such efforts can invigorate citizen engagement in a positive manner and build citizen capacity to understand and respond to the complex and difficult decisions that politicians must make.

Such processes are designed to bring people together to foster a dialogue complete with divergent viewpoints in the absence of judgment and to solve problems in a more community-minded way. This approach would help to enhance our community’s capacity to address complex and controversial issues in a systematic and healthy manner.

By ensuring that this process respects the qualities of an open, transparent and inclusive process, engaging the broader public will also create confidence from the that the decision City Council makes on area rating reform is fair and that the communities concerns have been taken into account.

The process being recommended is mindful of the need for a strong communications strategy which would provide opportunities for input from City Staff so that citizens, municipal politicians and city staff go down this road together working towards a common goal.

The prerequisites or principles for any community-based, deliberative process are as follows:

**Transparency** – the public and the politicians have access to the same information and can see the rationale that informs the recommendation. Communication is proactive in providing information in a fulsome and timely fashion.

**Inclusiveness** – the process must be representative of the city both geographically and demographically. Input should be sought from citizens and organizations across the city to inform the deliberative process, again ensuring that diverse perspectives are solicited.
and embedded in the discussions.

**Accountability** – Participants and those managing the project will be accountable for their work to City Council and the citizens of Hamilton, committing to putting aside their personal preferences on the issue while, at the same time, acting in service to the community as a whole.

Similarly, in accepting this process, City Council is accountable to the Citizens’ Forum and to the entire community to be respectful of the process and the recommendations that come forward.

**Resources** - Appropriate resources are allocated to ensure the success of the process.

**PURPOSE**

To hear from the citizens of Hamilton prior to making a decision on how to approach area rating for property taxes. This will be facilitated through a Citizens’ Forum process whereby ordinary citizens will be asked to make an informed consensus recommendation to Council on the options associated with this issue.

**PROJECT DELIVERABLES**

Overall, such a public engagement process should achieve the following outcomes:

- An area rating recommendation for Council based on a rich dialogue of engaged citizens
- A better-informed public. A transparent and inclusive process will help build consensus across the community and with opinion leaders; they will better understand the final decision, even if it is not their preference
- A framework of values and principles to guide the policy decision
- An analysis of why citizens think what they do, and what sticking points prevent progress
4. GOVERNANCE

The Governance structure and associated resources needed would include the following:

Organization Chart
1. An Independent Steering Committee

**Selection of Independent Steering Committee:** Members would be selected by an external expert (agency) that is hired to facilitate this process in conjunction with the City Manager’s Office.

The City Manager’s Office will oversee the request for proposals and hire the external resource.

**Purpose:** An independent steering committee will provide oversight for the entire process, which would include choosing a transparent “citizen forum panel” and overseeing the selection process as well as any relevant consultation.

**Membership:** The Steering Committee would be comprised of:

- Chair
- Community Representatives as per Vision 20/20 (Business, Social, Environment),
- One representative of the City Manager’s Office (appointed by CM)
- Civic Engagement Expert(s),
- Project Director
- Research Director

2. Project Management Team

**Selection of Project Management Team:** Members would be selected based on external expertise (agency) that would be hired to facilitate this process. This will occur in conjunction with the City Manager’s Office.

The City Manager’s Office will oversee the request for proposals and hire the external resource.

**Purpose:** The project team is anticipated to handle the majority of the work. The team would work closely with City Staff but would have to be neutral, objective and unbiased. The team would carry out the majority of the organization and implementation responsibilities and facilitate the receipt and dissemination of information.

**Membership:** This would include:

- Project Director
- Research Director
- Lead Facilitator
3. Citizens' Forum

RECOMMENDATION FOR RANDOM CITIZENS' FORUM PANEL SELECTION

The Independent Steering Committee would oversee the Selection Process, this is imperative to ensure the process is independent and neutral.

Membership Recommendation: Jury to be composed of 1 person from each ward for a total of 15 members.

Process: Randomly generate 2000 names from the tax rolls and other methods currently used for random selection processes/committees and send a letter to these households asking homeowners to complete a short questionnaire indicating their interest in participating in this process as any of:

- Citizen Forum Panel member
- Part of the public consultation
- Not interested at this time but possibly in the future for another consultation.

Assuming a 10% response rate, we should generate 200 names, and collecting demographics.

The Citizens' Forum Panel should aim to best reflect the community at large in terms of its composition - i.e. gender, age, family composition, etc.

A shortlist from that list would be created and interviews conducted designed to provide in greater detail the duties and commitment, various answers to questions to assess willingness to participate.

Then, a short-list of potential panel members – as suggested 1 from each ward and 5 spares (as back up) – be selected, contacted and confirmed.

Key Assumptions:
- Letter to ratepayers would clearly define the process, explain the proposition and include a postage-paid envelope/questionnaire.
- City staff would generate random names, conduct mail-out and collect responses via tax roll, finance department and City Manager's Office.
- External consultant would compile list of potential panel members and conduct interviews.
- Steering Committee to work with project team to do short listing and selection of names.

### 5. SCHEDULE & ESTIMATED COST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiate the Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Report to Council for approval of Approach,</td>
<td>February 8, 2010</td>
<td>$55,000 (depends on how much work is done by City staff versus Project and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget, a preliminary Terms of Reference for</td>
<td></td>
<td>Research Directors) Assumes that administrative and logistics work is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Steering Committee and project process and</td>
<td></td>
<td>by the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizen selection criteria.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appoint/retain external expertise – this</td>
<td>Completed by early to mid-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also includes Project and Research Directors</td>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o External expertise to facilitate Citizens'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum Process i.e. responsible for steering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee and project team establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o A Project Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o A Research Director (to advise on panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selection process, oversee the development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the Issues Book (summary of staff report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on area rating, public consultation, focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups), analyze feedback, other materials,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ads, etc. for public forums)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set Up the Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Define roles and terms for all parties</td>
<td>Mid-March to end of March</td>
<td>$10,000 - facilitation for the Citizen Forum Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Retain a Lead Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Begin panel selection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens’ Forum Panel Selection Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Steering Committee confirms panel selection process</td>
<td>Early to mid-April</td>
<td>Up to $5000 to compensate 8-10 Steering Committee members for expenses (i.e. mileage, transportation, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Carry out selection process &amp; confirm panel members and alternatives with Steering Committee</td>
<td>Mid-April to mid-May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues Book &amp; Public Sessions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Survey 200-300 Hamiltonians</td>
<td>Completed by mid-April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct Focus Groups</td>
<td>Completed by end of April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Analyse and integrate staff Options Report into Issues Book</td>
<td>End of April – Mid May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Develop and Test Issues Book</td>
<td>Mid-May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Final Issues Book (and analysis of focus group findings)</td>
<td>End of May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Post Issues Book on website and provide for the public to use the issues book and submit comments to Citizens' Forum Panel</td>
<td>First two weeks in June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citizen's Forum Panel Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Convene for orientation</td>
<td>mid – late May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Provide information in advance of their deliberation (includes issues book, other data collected via survey, issues book)</td>
<td>early June – late June</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hold the deliberation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2-3 days of discussion on the Issues Book, background information (also open to the public to observe)</td>
<td>Beginning to end of July</td>
<td>Up to $5000 to compensate 15-20 panel members for expenses only (i.e. Mileage, transportation, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3-5 days of community/public submissions (also open to the public to observe)</td>
<td>Beginning August – mid September</td>
<td>Up to $5000 for expert presenters (for expenses as necessary, this also depends on the need for external experts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3-4 days to hold facilitated deliberation on the options</td>
<td>Mid-September – mid October</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1-2 day to write recommendations and finalize report</td>
<td>Mid October - early November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Presentation to Council &amp; Public</td>
<td>November 30, 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disbursements:**

- meeting space, refreshments, printing, materials for sessions

| Total | $95,000 |

The cost of the project as per the breakdown $95,000 and will be funded from the Tax Stabilization Reserve # 110046.