TO: Chair and Members Planning Committee  
WARD(S) AFFECTED: CITY WIDE  

COMMITTEE DATE: May 3, 2011  

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Amendments to Schedule 25 (Taxi Cabs) of the Licensing By-law 07-170 (PED10063(c)) (City Wide)  

SUBMITTED BY:  
Tim McCabe  
General Manager  
Planning and Economic Development Department  

PREPARED BY:  
Vincent Ormond 905-546-2424 ext 1358  
Marty Hazell 905-546-2424 ext 4588  

RECOMMENDATION  

a) That the annual approval process for new taxi plate owner licences be streamlined by:  

i. authorizing and directing staff to annually invite applications for new taxi plate owner licences from the next three persons on the Taxicab Priority List without requiring Council approval; and,  

ii. that, subject to (d) below, authorizing and directing staff to annually issue three new taxi plate owner licences, in accordance with the May 28, 2003, City Council direction that three new taxi plate owner licences be issued per year for ten years, to applicants who meet the requirements of the Licensing By-law without requiring Council approval.  

(b) That Schedule 25 (Taxi Cabs) of the Licensing By-law No. 07-170 be amended as detailed in the proposed amending by-law attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED10063(c).
(c) That the item titled “ACPD Proposed Reforms to Taxi Licensing By-law” be removed from the General Issues Committee Outstanding Business List and added to the Planning Committee’s Outstanding Business List,

(d) That no new taxicab plate owner licences be issued until a review of the accessible taxi service can be undertaken and reported back to the Planning Committee; and,

(e) That the amending by-law attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED10063(c), which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by Council.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Approval of the recommendations in this Report will:

- adjust By-law wording to comply with the July 2008 Council direction (as recommended by the City Clerk in Report CL08009) to eliminate all administrative functions such that the Licensing Tribunal acts solely as a “hearings body”,

- provide a more efficient approvals process for new taxi plate owner licences and remove Appendix 3 “Taxicab Priority List” from Schedule 25 of the Licensing By-law; and,

- address the request from the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities (ACPD10-006) received by Council on January 12, 2011, and referred to the General Manager of the Planning and Economic Development Department for a report.

*Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 4*

**FINANCIAL / STAFFING / LEGAL IMPLICATIONS** (for Recommendation(s) only)

Financial/Staffing/Legal: N/A

**HISTORICAL BACKGROUND** (Chronology of events)

On July 10, 2008, Council approved a recommendation by the former Committee of the Whole (Report CL08009) to change the name of the Licensing Committee to the Licensing Tribunal and confirming that the Tribunal is to be solely a hearings body. This Report recommends adjusting the wording in the Licensing By-law to comply with that direction.

On January 12, 2011, Council received the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities (ACPD) Report 10-006, which proposed reforms to the Taxi Licensing By-
Council referred the matter to the General Manager of the Planning and Economic Development Department for a report to the General Issues Committee.

### POLICY IMPLICATIONS

N/A

### RELEVANT CONSULTATION

Legal Services, the Hamilton Street Railway and Disabled Accessible Regional Transit Service were consulted in the preparation of this Report.

### ANALYSIS / RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

(include Performance Measurement/Benchmarking Data, if applicable)

#### Hamilton Licensing Tribunal:
The recommended By-law amendment adjusts wording in the Licensing By-law in accordance with the July 2008 Council direction to have the Licensing Tribunal act solely as a “hearings body”.

#### Issuance of New Taxi Plate Licences:
Council, on May 28, 2003, directed that three new taxi plate owner licences be issued per year for ten years. Accordingly, staff report annually with a recommendation to invite applications from the next three persons on the Priority List, and then staff follow up with a subsequent report recommending the issuance of three licences to the three invitees if they meet the By-law requirements.

In staff's opinion, the current annual approval process for issuing new taxi plate owner licences is cumbersome in that it requires staff to complete two Committee reports, several months apart, as well as an amendment to the Licensing By-law to update the Taxicab Priority List. As Council provided policy direction, on May 28, 2003, that three new taxi plate owner licences be issued per year for ten years, it is the opinion of staff that there is no reason for the Committee and Council to be involved in the annual administrative process of issuing new taxi plate owner licences annually to qualified applicants.

It is therefore recommended that the annual issuance process be streamlined to be consistent with all other licence approval processes. This would also allow the Taxicab Priority List to be removed from the Licensing By-law and not require an annual amendment to keep the list current. Any person on the Taxicab Priority List whose licence is not approved would always maintain the right to appeal to the Licensing Tribunal.
Recommendations from ACDP (Report 10-006): Several reforms to the Taxi Licensing By-law are proposed by the ACPD through Report 10-006 item 2, a copy of which is appended hereto as Appendix “B” to this Report. The requested reforms include:

- that by the end of 2012, 20% of licensed taxis in the City be fully accessible to people with disabilities, with a goal of achieving 100% accessible taxis within a reasonable timeframe,

- that as of 2011 all new taxi plates are issued only to accessible taxi cabs,

- that all transfers and/or sales of taxi cab plates be permitted to accessible taxis only,

- that the Licensing By-law be amended to ensure all new taxis are accessible,

- developing a communication strategy to inform the public of reforms to the accessible taxi system and fares.

Currently there are no licensed accessible taxicabs in the City. There are unlicensed (i.e. illegal) accessible transportation services currently offered through two taxi service providers. Neither service is legal because the operators have not followed the Licensing By-law requirements for converting their existing licensed taxi cabs to licensed accessible taxi cabs. This issue will be addressed fully as part of a comprehensive review of accessible taxi vehicle standards.

The Taxi Working Group (a taxi industry stakeholder advisory group) has endorsed the concept of a 100% accessible taxi service. However, no definitions or terms have been developed to date, and appropriate timelines would need to be established because of the added costs for implementing accessibility features on vehicles.

Staff intends to conduct a comprehensive review of accessible taxi vehicle standards, in consultation with the Taxi Working Group, the ACDP and other stakeholders, and in accordance with the January 12, 2011 Council direction report back to the General Issues Committee in the Fall of 2011. In the meantime, staff concurs with the request to not issue any new taxi plate owner licences until the review and follow-up report is presented to Committee.

While Council directed that this matter be reported to the General Issues Committee, staff recommend that the Planning Committee deal with the matter, as all Taxi Licensing issues are dealt with by the Planning Committee.
Council could direct that three new taxi plate owner licences issued annually be only to accessible vehicles. However, the accessible vehicle standards in the By-law are not in accordance with current standards.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN (Linkage to Desired End Results)**


*Healthy Community* - an efficient and effective By-law enforcement program is critical to Community quality of life and public safety.

**APPENDICES / SCHEDULES**

- Appendix “A” to Report PED10063(c) - Amending By-Law to Report PED10063(c)
- Appendix “B” to Report PED10063(c) - Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities Report 10-006 received by Council on January 12, 2011

MH/VO/dt
CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO. __________

To Amend By-law No. 07-170, a By-law to License and Regulate Various Businesses

WHEREAS Council of the City of Hamilton enacted a by-law to license and regulate various businesses being City of Hamilton By-law No. 07-170;

AND WHEREAS this By-law provides for various housekeeping and technical amendments to Schedule 25 of City of Hamilton By-law No. 07-170 with respect to the Priority List;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. Paragraph 1(1)(P) of Schedule 25 of By-law No. 07-170 is deleted and replaced with the following new paragraph 1(1)(P):

   “Priority List” means the list of applicants for a taxicab owner licence maintained by the Issuer of Licences and made available to the public with names set out thereon in chronological order as to the date and time of receipt;

2. Section 26 of Schedule 25 of By-law No. 07-170 is amended by deleting the second sentence.

3. Subsection 28(2) of Schedule 25 of By-law No. 07-170 is amended by deleting the words “on Priority List, note any changes, and submit an
amended list to the Licensing Tribunal for approval” and replacing them with “on the Priority List”.

4. Paragraph 28(8)(c) of Schedule 25 of By-law No. 07-170 is deleted and replaced by the following new paragraph 28(8)(c):

(c) Where an applicant elects to file a certification under paragraph 28(8)(b), the applicant shall provide evidence, to the satisfaction of the Issuer of Licences, of the medical disability from not less than two duly licensed medical practitioners of the applicant’s choice and, if required by the Issuer of Licences, shall submit to a medical examination by a medical practitioner selected by the Issuer of Licences and the City of Hamilton Human Resources Division.

5. Subsection 29(1) of Schedule 25 of By-law No. 07-170 is deleted and the subsequent subsections renumbered accordingly.

6. Subsection 29(2) of Schedule 25 of By-law No. 07-170, renumbered as subsection 29(1), is deleted and replaced by the following new subsection 29(1):

(1) The Issuer of Licences may send a notice to the persons whose names appear on the Priority List, starting with the person with the earliest application date and continuing in chronological order, as they become eligible to apply for a taxicab owner’s licence in accordance with subsection 20(v) of this Schedule or as otherwise directed by Council, provided that if two or more persons have the same application date, both or all of them shall be eligible to apply for a taxicab owner’s licence.

7. Subsection 29(4) of Schedule 25 of By-law No. 07-170, renumbered as
subsection 29(3), is deleted and replaced by the following new subsection 29(3):

(3) A person who is entered on the Priority List, after being notified or deemed notified by the Issuer of Licences under subsections 29(1) and 29(2), shall submit a completed application with the Issuer of Licences within fourteen (14) days of the date of the said notice together with the following:

(a) proof of compliance with sections 12 and 14 of this Schedule;
(b) a certification, in a form prescribed by and available from the Issuer of Licences, that he or she has actively engaged in operating a taxicab full-time in the City as:

(i) a taxicab owner;
(ii) a taxicab driver;
(iii) a taxicab dispatcher;
(iv) a taxicab business mechanic; or
(v) a taxicab telephone service operator,

for a period of not less than two (2) full and consecutive years immediately preceding the date of filing the completed application; and

(c) either,

(i) a certified true copy by the Canada Revenue Agency of income tax returns for two consecutive years immediately preceding the date of filing the completed application; and/or
(ii) any one of, or any combination of the following in respect of the two consecutive years immediately
preceding the date of filing the completed application:

a certified copy of record of employment, statements of insurable earnings as issued by the Canada Employment Insurance Commission, statements of contributions to the Canada Pension Plan as issued by the Canada Revenue Agency, monthly charge statements as issued by a taxicab broker operating in the City of Hamilton, original trip records, or such other or equivalent documentation as the Issuer of Licences may accept.

(d) In the case of a taxicab driver, for all purposes of paragraphs 29(3)(a) and 29(3)(b), “one full year” shall mean not less than 1400 hours in a full year;

(e) In the case of a taxicab dispatcher or telephone service operator, for the purpose of paragraphs 29(3)(a) and 29(3)(b), “one full year” shall mean not less than 1400 hours in a full year;

If the applicant fails to submit with the Issuer of Licences the required documentation in the stipulated time, the application shall be voided, no licence issued and the applicant struck from the Priority List.

8. Subsections 29(5) and 29(6), renumbered as subsection 29(4) and 29(5) are deleted and the subsequent subsections renumbered accordingly.
9. Subsection 29(7), renumbered as subsection 29(4) is deleted and replaced with the following new subsection 29(4):

(4)(a) The Issuer of Licences shall issue the licence to an applicant who complies with subsection 29(3) and all other applicable provisions of this Schedule and By-law.

(b) If the Issuer of Licences refuses a licence for any reason other than the applicant’s failure to submit the required documentation or to do so in the stipulated time, both under subsection 29(3), the applicant is entitled to a hearing before the Licensing Tribunal and the hearing shall be in accordance with the General Provisions of this By-law which provide for a hearing when an application is refused.

(c) When, under this section, a taxicab owner’s licence is:

(i) issued by the Issuer of Licences or by Council after a Licensing Tribunal hearing;

(ii) refused by the Issuer of Licences when no Licensing Tribunal hearing has taken place, because such a hearing has not been requested or for some other reason;

(iii) refused by Council after a Licensing Tribunal hearing has taken place,

the applicant whose licence has been issued or refused shall be struck from the Priority List.

10. Subsection 29(10) of Schedule 25 of By-law No. 07-170, renumbered as subsection 29(7), is amended by deleting the words “Subsections 29(8) and 29(9)” and replacing them with “Subsections 29(5) and 29(6)”.

11. Subsection 29(11) of Schedule 25 of By-law No. 07-170, renumbered as
subsection 29(8), is amended by deleting the words “Subsections 29(8) and 29(9)” and replacing them with “Subsection 29(5) and 29(6)”.  

12. Subsection 29(12) of Schedule 25 of By-law No. 07-170, renumbered as subsection 29(9) is deleted.  

13. Subsection 30(2) of Schedule 25 of By-law No. 07-170 is deleted and replaced by the following new subsection 30(2):  

(2) In the event that the applicant fails to meet the thirty (30) day period set out in subsection 30(1):  

(a) his or her application for the licence shall be voided;  
(b) he or she shall be ineligible for the licence;  
(c) his or her name shall be struck from the Priority List; and  
(d) the next person on the Priority List shall become eligible for the licence.  

14. Appendix 3 (Taxicab Priority List) of Schedule 25 of By-law No. 07-170 is deleted.  

15. This By-law comes into force on the day it is passed.  

PASSED this day of , 2011.  

__________________________  __________________  
R. Bratina       Rose Caterini  
MAYOR          CITY CLERK
THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES PRESENTS REPORT 10-006 AND RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS:

1. Request for Policy on usage of video surveillance in relation to public transit

That the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities request that staff be directed to prepare a set of guiding principles, policies and procedures for video surveillance cameras usage in relation to public transportation.
2. Proposed Reforms to Taxi Licensing By-law

a) That staff be directed to take the required steps to ensure that by the end of 2012, 20% of licensed taxis in the City of Hamilton are fully accessible for people with disabilities, with a goal of achieving 100% accessible taxis within a reasonable timeframe;

b) That staff be directed to bring forward the required amendments to the Taxi Licensing By-law and program to ensure that as of 2011 all new taxi plates are issued only to accessible taxi cabs

c) That staff be directed to bring forward the required amendments to the Taxi By-law and program to ensure that all transfers and/or sales of taxi cab plates be permitted to accessible taxis only.

d) That staff be directed to amend the Taxi Licensing By-Law to ensure that all new vehicles are accessible.

e) That staff be directed to create a communication strategy to inform the public of reforms to the accessible taxi system and fares.

3. Request for HECFI to provide outline of their implementation Plan on the Accessible Customer Service Standard

The Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities requests that City Council requests a copy of the Hamilton Entertainment and Convention Facilities Inc.’s implementation plan on the Accessible Customer Service Standard.

4. Request for Information on renovations and Barrier-Free design from HECFI

The Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities recommends that City Council requests the Hamilton Entertainment and Convention Facilities Inc. prepare a document outlining how the Barrier-Free Design guidelines are used, where they are used and to provide a list of all planned renovation projects for the next five years.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF COMMITTEE:

The meeting was called to order at 4:08 p.m. by Chair Nolan.

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

The Clerk advised of the following changes to the agenda.

General Issues Committee – January 10, 2011
(i) That the Report of the October 28, 2010 Customer Service Subcommittee be added as item 5.4.

(ii) The clerk also indicated that he would like to introduce item 7.1 under new business in respect to a memorandum he circulated to board members to arrange a tour date of the McNab Street Transit Terminal.

On a motion the agenda was approved as amended.

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

(c) MINUTES (Item 3)

(i) Minutes of the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities meeting held on October 12 (Item 3.1)

The minutes of the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities meeting held on October 12, 2010 were approved as presented.

-There was some discussion on when the appropriate time was to raise matters that arouse from the Minutes
-The clerk indicated that if staff wished to report back on direction given by the Committee in the minutes of the previous meeting the appropriate time to do so would be to provide an update under discussion items
-Items not submitted in time for the printed agenda could also be brought up under New Business
-Chesney raised a concern about how then are matters requiring follow-up tracked?
-The clerk advised that all follow-up related to recommendations reported to Committee of the Whole (General Issues Committee) is tracked by the Committee clerk,
-the clerk indicated that one way to track these items would be to institute and Outstanding Business List.
-the Clerk advised that tracking for items that are not recommendations to Standing Committee are the responsibility of the Committees staff resources

General Issues Committee – January 10, 2011
(d) **SUB-COMMITTEE UPDATES (Item 5)**

(i) **Transportation Sub-Committee Minutes, August 24, 2010 (Item 5.1) (referred from September and October meetings)**

(a) **ATS Performance Report – June 2010: REVISED**

Mallett provided the following update, her points included but were not limited to the following:

- There are a few outstanding things such as the extension of hours hasn't happened to darts
- Discussed how DARTS was going to be used to test the system
- Discussion on the installation on rapid transit

Chesney asked in regards to the cameras if there would be a notification to the riders
- There will be a notification to passengers
- had some discussion around the privacy issues related to this
Chesney indicated that if it is used as a performance tool she has a concern about it but if it used as a safety measure then it is okay
- K. Nolan indicated that HSR are currently doing the trial runs and and only one person currently has access to watch the video
- Mallett indicated that she feels it is unfair that the disabled are being used to test out a new system

Lane questioned whether there could be a polling done by the people in the disabled community to institute this.
- Mallet indicated that the only thing that would do this is a successful lawsuit against the cameras as these vehicles are public property
- Lane indicated that he had a problem with voices being recorded

Chair Nolan indicated that the Access Committee requested that they do a policy around who can access to the footage of these tapes and under what circumstances they would be allowed to do so. Chair Nolan indicated that he received a basic refusal from staff

By motion the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities requested that staff be direct to prepare a set of guiding principals, policies, procedures and guidelines for video surveillance cameras usage in relation to public transportation.

- There was some discussion on the fact that this was implemented by City Council without advising ACPD in any form.
- There was the indication that this should be provided to Council as background information.
- Chair Nolan indicated that Council should also be informed that the absence of a policy means that the City of Hamilton is in violation of AODA legislation

**General Issues Committee – January 10, 2011**
Wallis indicated that this is will result in the death of the occasional chit chat with bus drivers.
Mallett pointed out that this should not be used as a performance measurement tool.
Later Jane Lee advised that the Minutes of the September meeting of the Transportation Sub-Committee showed that staff had indicated they would be making a video surveillance policy, notify the public and posting the policy online.
Committee members indicated that they still wanted the previously moved motion to go ahead as insurance that staff are directed to enact these measures.

There was some discussion around the numbers in the ATS Performance Report and there was an indication that they would be discussed after the next performance report is received.

The Transportation Sub-Committee Minutes, August 24, 2010 were received.

(ii) Transportation Sub-Committee Report, September 28, 2010 (Item 5.2)
(a) Minutes of September 28, 2010

Mallett provided the following update, her points included but were not limited to the following:

- Mentioned concerns that the Taxi Advisory Committee hasn’t met although reforms in relation to taxi’s are being brought forward

The Transportation Sub-Committee Report and Minutes of, September 28, 2010 were received.

(iii) Transportation Sub-Committee Report, October 27, 2010 (Item 5.3)
(a) Citizen Committee Report – Provision of Accessible Taxis in the City of Hamilton

Malett provided the following update, her points included but were not limited to the following:

- Smithson asked about whether there is special training and licensing required for accessible taxis
- Malett indicated that there was
- Smithson inquired about why the wait times and fares have to be the same for accessible taxis as regular ones

General Issues Committee – January 10, 2011
Chair Nolan indicated that it was an essential human rights issue that disabled people are not required to pay a larger amount for the same services than the rest of the general public.

Lane indicated that he was pleased with the fact that the City was willing to move forward with this as the municipality is not required to move forward with this at this point.

Aznive indicated that Vince Ormond had spoken before for the need for accessible taxis something she indicated was very positive.

Chair Nolan indicated that there was the issue that taxi owners may simply pulling their fleet from an area if by-laws are enacted.

Chair Nolan indicated that with that we will achieve complete equality in this system.

Chair Nolan requested that there be follow-up on the Accessible Taxi issue.

Smithson discussed that fare charge system there was a suggestion to add an subsection (e) to the report.

Smithson asked about how accessible taxi’s need to be in terms of scooters and wheelchairs.

Chair Nolan and Mallett discussed the current standards and how rear loaders are currently not permitted.

Chesney asked about the reinstatement to the DARTS list after they are hospitalized asked how they can get back on the subscription list?

Mallett and Jane Lee indicated that is likely an ATS issue.

The following motion was passed by Committee:

(ii) Proposed Reforms to Taxi Licensing By-law

(a) That staff be directed to take the required steps to ensure that by the end of 2012, 20% of licensed taxis in the City of Hamilton are fully accessible for people with disabilities, with a goal of achieving 100% accessible taxis within a reasonable timeframe;

(b) That staff be directed to bring forward the required amendments to the Taxi Licensing By-law and program to ensure that as of 2011 all new taxi plates are issued only to accessible taxi cabs;

(c) That staff be directed to bring forward the required amendments to the Taxi By-law and program to ensure that all transfers and/or sales of taxi cab plates be permitted to accessible taxis only.

(d) That staff be directed to amend the Taxi Licensing By-Law to ensure that all new vehicles are accessible.

(e) That staff be directed to create a communication strategy developed to inform the public of reforms to the accessible taxi system and fares.

General Issues Committee – January 10, 2011
The Transportation Sub-Committee Report of October 27, 2010 was received.

(iv) Customer Service Sub-Committee Report, October 28, 2010 (Added Item 5.4)

Smithson provided the following update, her points included but were not limited to the following:

- Discussed the trip to the Museum of Steam and Technology and that numerous accessible features were already in place
- Discussed how they indicated the need for signage, print and some discussion on the drop off locations
- Indicated that they were very accommodating and receptive to the ideas brought forward by the Sub-Committee

The Customer Service Sub-Committee Report of October 28, 2010 was received.

(e) DISCUSSION ITEMS (Item 6)

(i) Clerical error respecting Report of ACPD's June 2009 meeting, that was never submitted to Committee of the Whole. (Item 6.1)

-The Clerk provided an update that the Report of the June 2009 ACPD meeting was never submitted to Committee of the Whole due to a clerical error. Since the error was discovered so long after the fact the clerk suggested that the recommendations of the Report are now out of date and should be reconsidered by the Committee.

-Smithson discussed how this is related to the Fire Plan however was informed by staff that was another Report that is still being worked upon

-The Committee decided to make amendments to the first motion and restate the second motion to correct the reporting error.

By motion The Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities requested that City Council requests a copy of the Hamilton Entertainment and Convention Facilities Inc.'s outline for the implementation plan Accessible Customer Service Standard.

General Issues Committee – January 10, 2011
Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities Minutes

By motion The ACPD recommended to City Council that the Hamilton Entertainment and Convention Facilities Inc. prepare a document outlining how the Barrier-Free Design guidelines are used, where they are used and to provide a list of all planned renovation projects for the next five years.

(ii) Rescue Vehicles working group discussion (Item 6.2)

- Chair Nolan indicated that the working group will hasn't met yet so would it be worthwhile for the working group to meet or just to wait until new members are appointed
- Chesney discussed the need for staff liaison on the working group
- Mallet suggested inviting the police to sit on the working group
- The Clerk was asked how the Committee should proceed, he indicated that staff should be consulted to gauge their willingness to sit on the working group, also pointed out that since this issue relates to transportation it could be sent to the Transportation Sub-Committee
- Committee members indicated that this issue was too big to go to the Transportation Sub-Committee
- Jane Lee agreed that this issue should be handled by a working group provided she an update on previous efforts in this vein and indicated that she is willing to sit for the first meeting of the working group
- That the new appointments be declared to help facilitate the next meeting of the with Mallet, Chesney, K. Nolan, R. Cameron

(iii) Representation of people with disabilities on boards and committees (Item 6.3)

- The Clerk provided an update on the selection process indicating how the City of Hamilton works on the selection process
- Outlined how wording is including in the application to encourage marginalized groups to apply
- Described how this is an equity not a disability related issue as it relates to numerous groups.
- Indicated that any approach to address this would need to consider all marginalized groups and not just those with disabilities, making it a matter that is beyond the mandate of the ACPD Committee
- Suggested that ACPD liaise with other Advisory Committees representing the interest of various marginalized groups in the City if they desired to bring a reform policy forward

General Issues Committee – January 10, 2011
- Staff liaison to the Committee disagreed with the clerks assessment indicating that she believed it was appropriate for the Committee to pass recommendations on this matter.
- Staff went on to indicate that they have been working with clerks in relation to this aspect of the selection process

- Chesney indicated that there is a question on how deficiencies are indicated and what can be done in terms to address them
- Staff indicated that there is record keeping done on a voluntary basis and that those numbers are examined
- Lee indicated that they are working on it with Clerks
- There was some discussion on the need for the policy to be brought forward
- Chair Nolan expressed concerns that this has been brought forward previously and nothing had been done.
- Suggested in the past that appointments were made based on favours done to Councillors and that the entire system is in need of reform
- Jane Lee indicated that matters of equity in appointments are being moved forward with clerks however in terms of timelines they may not be achievable during this selection process
- Lane indicated that there is a need to push these issues forward so that they are simply not buried again

By motion the Advisory Committee tabled item 6.4, Update on Audible Signs and Item 6.5, Request from David Lepofsky, Chair of the AODA Alliance, for the ACDP to write to the Premier of Ontario in support of the AODA Alliance's brief on proposed integrated Accessibility Standards until their next meeting.

(iv) Update on audible signs (Item 6.4)
Tabled until December meeting

(v) Request from David Lepofsky, Chair of the AODA Alliance, for the ACDP to write to the Premier of Ontario in support of the AODA Alliance's brief on proposed integrated Accessibility Standards (Item 6.5)
Tabled until December meeting

General Issues Committee – January 10, 2011
(f) NEW BUSINESS (Item 7)

(i) McNab Street Transit Terminal Tour

- Committee members agreed to the December 7, 2010 date proposed by staff
- The Committee Clerk was advised to provide them with further details when they become available

(h) ADJOURNMENT (Item 8)

The Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tim Nolan, Chair
Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities

Andy Grozelle
Legislative Assistant
November 9, 2010