

REPORT ON COMPLAINT OF VIOLATION OF CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS OF COUNCIL RE: FILE 8.18.09

Recommendation

The Integrity Commissioner recommends that City Council seriously consider the implementation of:

1. the City Auditor's recommended amendments to the current City purchasing policies contained in Report 4 submitted to City Council on December 14, 2009 to facilitate more transparent procurement processes and to ensure that City policy is linked to the compliance by Members of Council with the rules contained in the Code of Ethical Conduct.
2. The recommendations put forward by The Audit and Operational Review Committee of December 14, 2009.

Contribution to Sustainability

N/A

Economic Impact

N/A

Communications Plan

N/A

Purpose

Under the Code of Ethical Conduct Complaint Protocol (the "Complaint Protocol"), the Integrity Commissioner shall report to Council the result of the investigation.

Background - Analysis and Options

- A. In the attached Report, Appendix A, the following clarifications should be noted.
 1. Page 3, paragraph 12: A yearly audit is conducted at the City of Vaughan on various processes, not specific to the FPO process;
 2. Page 3, paragraph 13: Only RFPs are awarded on the basis of a scoring matrix and other bids are awarded to the lowest qualified bidder.
- B. Integrity Commissioner Report is attached as Appendix A.

Section 18 (2) of the Complaint Protocol provides that:

At the time of the Integrity Commissioner's report to Council, and as between the parties, the identity of a complainant and the identity of the person who is the subject of the complaint shall not be treated as confidential information.

The Office of the Integrity Commissioner operates at arms length to the administration of the City and reports directly to Council. Given that the Complaint Protocol is a Council-approved document, the requirement therein would have the Integrity Commissioner disclose the identity of the complainant. However, at this time, the subject of confidentiality of the identity of a complainant in investigations before the Integrity Commissioner is subject of a privacy complaint before the Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario (the "IPC") and in order to not fetter the decision-making authority of the Provincial Privacy Commissioner and with a view to upholding best practices for the City of Vaughan, I recommend that the force and effect of section 18(2) be held in abeyance until the outcome of the IPC ruling on the privacy breach complaint and until this office has developed a policy to implement Council's direction on section 18(2).

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council and the necessary resources have been allocated and approved, however the City Auditor's recommended changes may impact allocated resources.

Regional Implications

There are no Regional implications to the recommendation contained in this report.

Attachments

Appendix A – Integrity Commissioner's Report File 8.18.09

Other attachments

1. Extract from Council Meeting Minutes of December 14, 2009
2. City of Vaughan Policy 05.2.03, Professional Fees Policy

Report prepared by:

Suzanne Craig
Integrity Commissioner

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne Craig
Integrity Commissioner

RE: REGIONAL COUNCILLOR JOYCE FRUSTAGLIO

Background

[1] On August 10, 2009, a private citizen filed a formal complaint with the City of Vaughan's City Clerk's Office. The request was received by the Office of the Integrity Commissioner on August 18, 2009. In the request, the private citizen (the "Complainant") asked the Office of the Integrity Commissioner to investigate into Regional Councillor Frustaglio's purchase of business cards and pens in February 2009. The Complainant alleged that the Regional Councillor had breached several sections of the Code of Ethical Conduct (the "Code"). The complaint referenced several events and actions that occurred prior to February 10, 2009, in particular events that occurred in 2003.

[2] The complaint relates to the purchase and the cost to print by the Regional Councillor, of magnetic business cards and pens in February 2009. The complaint alleges that Ms. Frustaglio contravened the rules of the Code by not adhering to a corporate standard and by purchasing magnetic business cards in a quantity in excess of other Members of Council. In addition, the complaint alleges that, in 2003, Ms. Frustaglio had used a family member to seek out competitive pricing for printing of magnetic business cards.

[3] Pursuant to the City of Vaughan's Complaint Protocol, section 2 states:

After September 30, 2008 all complaints must be addressed in accordance with the below captioned procedure within six (6) months of the alleged violation or no action will be taken on the complaint

[4] On August 18, 2009 the Office of the Integrity Commissioner confirmed receipt of the formal complaint and advised the complainant and the respondent that a complaint file had been opened.

[5] This complaint is governed by the Complaint Protocol which was adopted by Vaughan City Council at its meeting held on June 23, 2008, in addition to the Code of Ethical Conduct for Members of Council, City of Vaughan, approved in September 2009.

The Complaint

[6] In the complaint, the Complainant alleged that Regional Councillor Frustaglio breached, or may have breached rules 1(b), (c), (d), (g), (h), 7, 9, 15 and 17 of the Code, which require an elected Member of Council to conform to ethical rules of conduct, which include the obligation to act with dignity, in the best interests of all people in the municipality, without consideration for personal gain, to avoid the improper use of the influence of their office, and conflicts of interest, both apparent and real and to abstain from extending, in their discharge of their official duties, preferential treatment to family members, organizations or groups in which they or their family member have a pecuniary interest.

The Relevant Provisions of the interim Complaint Protocol for the Code of Ethics and Conduct for Members of Council

[7] Sections 3 and 5 of the Complaint Protocol, in addition to the Council direction of June 11, 2007, provide the Integrity Commissioner's jurisdiction to investigate into the alleged contraventions of the Code:

Part A: Informal Complaint Procedure

3. Individuals (including City employees, members of the public, members of Council or local boards) who identify or witness behavior or activity by a member of Council that appears to be in contravention of the Code of Conduct for Members of Council – (the “Code of Conduct”) may address the prohibited behavior or activity themselves as follows.

Part B: Formal Complaint Procedure

5. Individuals (including City employees, members of the public, members of Council or local boards) who identify or witness behavior or activity by a member of Council that appears to be in contravention of the Code of Conduct for Members of Council, may file a formal complaint with the required information on the prescribed affidavit.

Facts

[8] Interviews with City staff and a reading of City records show that in February 2009 Regional Councillor Frustaglio purchased office products, which included a purchase in the amount of \$2,343.60 for magnet business cards.

[9] Although facts ascertained in this investigation indicate that Regional Councillor Frustaglio used the services of a family member's company to do research to look for competitive printing prices for magnetic business cards in 2003, based on the facts presented to me in this investigation, the February 2009 purchase of magnetic business cards did not involve the services of a family member.

[10] The City of Vaughan's process for operating Field Purchase Orders (FPO) provides that the field purchase order is used for:

- Low value maintenance, repair and operational supplies up to a limit of \$3000 excluding all taxes.

- Low value purchases where expense tracking is not required for accounting purposes through People Soft.

[11] The City of Vaughan's purchasing department has an approved vendor of record list, pursuant to the City of Vaughan's FPO process. However, under the current FPO process, Members of Council are permitted to go to any external vendor for services and office supplies within their spending authority.

[12] The City of Vaughan has an accounting firm conduct yearly audits of the FPO process. The City of Vaughan's Internal Auditor has recently conducted an extensive review of the FPO policy and procedures and has identified various areas of the procurement process that need to be addressed to ensure that the City effectively manages its financial assets.

[13] The City of Vaughan's current purchasing policy does not require an award to go to the lowest bid (but rather is determined on the basis of a scoring matrix), nor does it contain a prohibition for relatives of Members of Council to bid on services or products.

[14] The current Councillor's Expense Policy allows great latitude to Members of Council when purchasing products for their office administration. Further, there is no requirement that Members of Council consult with purchasing staff for certain dollar amounts.

[15] No staff member of the purchasing department recalls providing a quote for magnetic business cards.

[16] For the purchase of business cards in 2009, Regional Councillor Frustaglio's office used the services of Costa Printing, a City of Vaughan approved vendor since 2000.

[17] As part of her role as Regional Councillor, Ms. Frustaglio provides welcome packages which include her business cards, to new residents to the City of Vaughan and this accounts for the volume of business cards.

Criteria for making a determination

[18] As a general proposition, a Complainant who alleges that a Member of Council has contravened the Code must establish the allegations asserted in the complaint and bears the onus of proving that the breaches put forward in the complaint took place.

[19] In making a determination of findings of the facts brought forward, I can accept all of the information brought forward, some of the information or none. I may also draw reasonable conclusions based on the information that I accept.

[20] The Office of the Integrity Commissioner has its authority set by by-law and the rules set out in the *Municipal Act*. Duties of the Integrity Commissioner include providing written and oral advice to Members of Council about their own situations under the Code and other policies and protocols governing ethical behaviour of Council. It is entirely appropriate for the Integrity Commissioner to make recommendations based on investigation findings that enhance and ensure Members of Council comply with ethical guidelines.

Contravention of rules of the Code

Rule 1 (b), (c), (d), (g), (h)

[21] Section 1 of the Code requires a Member of Council to respect the approved policies of the City of Vaughan, not participate in activities that grant, or appear to grant, any special consideration, treatment or advantage to an individual which is not available to every other individual, avoid any interest in any contract made in his/her official capacity, adhere to the City's purchasing policies.

[22] I find that, based on the facts and information that was provided to me during this investigation, Regional Councillor Frustaglio did not breach Rule 1 of the Code in her actions involving the February 2009 purchase of business cards. During the current investigation, I was obliged to take into consideration the rules of the Code that came into force on November 2, 2009. Vaughan City Council created this office and adopted the current Code to ensure that the public's expectations of the highest standards of conduct from the Members that it elects to local government, are met. The premise of this Code and the rules of the Complaint Protocol form a common understanding among Members of Council and an expectation by the public, that from November 2, 2009 going forward, in carrying out their official duties, Members will adhere to the rules of ethics contained in the new Code.

I would be remiss, if I did not state that had the current Code been in force in 2003, the purchase at that time by Regional Councillor Frustaglio to which she commented and was quoted in the April 2009 article in the Star, would constitute a contravention of rule 1(c), (d) and (g) of the current Code of Ethical Conduct. However, to be clear, the current Code was not in place in 2003 and I do not have the authority nor does the current Complaint Protocol allow the rules of the Code to form the subject of an investigation regarding decisions made at that time.

Rule 7

[23] Rule 7 of the Code requires a Member of Council to abstain from using their position as an elected official to fetter the approved decision-making authority of the City administration.

[24] I understand the complainant's assertion is that in 2003 the Member used her position as an elected official to direct taxpayers funds to a company owned by a family member. It is my position that such action would be deemed improper and a violation under the current Code rule 1(c), (d) and (g).

[25] Rule 7 refers to a Member of Council using their position to improperly direct the actions of City staff and I have found no such violation in relation to the purchase by Regional Councillor Frustaglio in 2009, subject of this investigation.

Rule 9

[26] Rule 9 of the Code requires Members of Council to follow City approved by-laws, policies and various statutes and court decisions when making decisions and conveying Council business. This rule requires Members of Council to be clear and open in the steps that they take in conducting Council business and that all decisions must be based on approved City policies, by-laws or governing statutes.

[27] Based on the information that I have obtained from interviews during this investigation, it seems as though the current City of Vaughan purchasing policies do not prohibit the submission or receipt of bids from relatives of Members of Vaughan City Council, nor do they set a corporate standard for the type of business cards that a Member of Council may purchase.

[28] As a result, I find that Regional Councillor Frustaglio did not contravene rule 9 of the Code in the purchase of magnetic business card in February 2009.

Rules 15 and 17

[29] Rule 15 of the Code deals with discreditable conducts of Members and requires elected officials of the City of Vaughan to behave in their official capacity in an exemplary manner. Although it is my position that Regional Councillor Frustaglio's purchasing decisions in 2003 are not governed by the current Code, I have already stated above that had the actions taken place under the current Code regime, they would have constituted a breach of the above-noted subsections of rule 1 of the Code. However, the facts and information that I have obtained to date do not, in my view, demonstrate that Ms. Frustaglio's behaviour in 2003 was discreditable as she was acting within the parameters of the City's purchasing policies. Generally speaking, under the current Code, utilizing the services of a relative in purchasing office supplies would demonstrate poor judgement in the management of a Councillor's office budget.

[30] Rule 17 of the Code reiterates the requirement for Members of Council to adhere to the City of Vaughan's Hiring and Nepotism policy. Policy No.05.5.17 states that "favouritism" is the unjust preference and selection based on factors other than merit." Further the above-noted policy states in its purpose that "this policy is to ensure that employment related decisions concerning existing or potential City employees are free from any real or perceived improper influence or conflict of interest and to maintain confidence in the integrity of the City's hiring and employment practices. The City of Vaughan will not favour nor will it inhibit any process relating to the employment and management of relatives who wish to apply for employment with the Corporation."

[31] Throughout this investigation, I have identified what appear to be the consequences of the fact that the City of Vaughan grew from being a small town to a one of the fastest growing municipalities in Ontario in just over a decade. However, good intentions and well-meaning actions are not the foundation for good governance and fiscal accountability. In creating the Office of the Integrity Commissioner, Vaughan City Council has made a commitment to ensure that integrity forms the basis of all City decisions. Integrity has many definitions; however the Code of Ethical Conduct for the City of Vaughan requires that Members of City Council carry out their duties with impartiality and equality of service to all, recognizing that as leaders of the community, they are held to a higher standard of behaviour and conduct.

[32] I find that although actions contained in this complaint in relation to Regional Councillor Frustaglio's 2003 purchase of magnetic business cards would have resulted in a finding of a breach of rule 1 (c), (d) and (g), if the current Code had been in force, I do not have the authority to investigate actions of that time. I find that the February 2009 purchase of magnetic business cards that is subject of this complaint and for which I have authority to rule, is not in contravention of the Code.

[33] In making a final determination on this complainant, I have taken into consideration the fact that, although there was a previous Code of Ethics, prior to the adoption of the current Code of Ethical Conduct, Members were not bound by the rules of the current Code until November 2, 2009.

[34] The current Code provides for penalties in the event of a finding of non-compliance with the rules. The Complaint Protocol provides for a determination by the Integrity Commissioner that a complaint is sustained in whole or in part, as well as, a finding that the complaint is not sustained.

[35] At the conclusion of a complaint investigation, the Integrity Commissioner may make recommendations on sanctions to Council. The sanctions that may be imposed are a reprimand or suspension of the remuneration paid to the Member of Council.

[36] The Integrity Commissioner also has the authority to find that although a breach of the Code may have taken place, “*a contravention occurred that was trivial or committed through inadvertence or an error of judgment made in good faith*”. Such a finding may be accompanied by appropriate recommendations pursuant to the *Municipal Act*.

[37] I find that Regional Councillor Frustaglio did not contravene the rules of the current Code in her 2009 purchase subject of this complaint. It is beyond the mandate of this office to make a determination on whether the 2003 actions constitute a breach of the current Code. However, it is my responsibility to advise Members of Council on adherence to the Code and the rules of ethical behavior therein. Education is a key component to the role of this office and works for the benefit of Members of Council and the public. It is for the above-noted reasons that I feel it is appropriate to provide contextual comment on the 2003 actions included in the current complaint.

[38] By way of comment, Regional Councillor Frustaglio’s stated that her motives for carrying out business in the way that she did in 2003 were in an effort to save taxpayers money and were in compliance with City policies of that time. Rules of the current Code of Ethical Conduct require a Member of Council to abstain from participating in activities that grant or appear to grant any special consideration, treatment or advantage to an individual which is not available to every other individual. Further, the current Code requires that Members avoid using their office in the discharge of their official duties, to extend preferential treatment to family members in which they or their family members have a pecuniary interest. I accept Ms. Frustaglio’s position that she was attempting to “be fiscally responsible and trying to save taxpayers some money”, however, had the current Code regime been in force in 2003, her actions would have been in violation of rule 1 of the Code. Although Ms. Frustaglio’s actions took place prior to November 2, 2009, and the actions of 2003 can certainly be construed as an error of judgment if measured against the current rules, her actions were fully in compliance with the existing rules at that time. I believe that Ms. Frustaglio is fully cognizant of her responsibilities under the current rules and supports the new Code of Ethical Conduct approved by Vaughan City Council.

[39] Throughout this investigation, I have heard time and time again, what has now come to be a mandatory requirement of government leaders : elected officials are being held to a higher standard of accountability and scrutiny in the management of the City’s financial assets. The City of Vaughan’s Integrity Commissioner website states:

At any level of government, the public’s perception of ethical government decision-making is critical to its reputation and to the level of public trust and engagement. This perception shapes the public’s opinion about government officials’ personal integrity, honesty and ultimately, the government’s performance. it can overshadow all other values of a government organization, including competence, experience and expertise.

The existence or absence of stringent procurement rules should not stand in the way of ethical decision-making. Of note, is the fact that the most recent review conducted by the City's Internal Auditor, has seen his office make recommendations and suggestions on corrective actions that will improve the effectiveness of risk management, control and governance processes at the City.

[40] Public policy dictates that procurement should be fair, ethical and transparent. There is an increasing dissonance between the hard work and years of public service in government of many public officials and current public perceptions. Recently, Vaughan City Council has moved to address this gap and restore confidence in public sector spending through the review of many of its processes and the institution of the Code of Ethical Conduct.

[41] In 2005, Madame Justice Bellamy released the Toronto Computer Leasing Inquiry report, a nine-hundred page multi-volume background paper that focused on procurement practices, conflict of interest, lobbying and municipal governance. One of its key recommendations was the need to clarify appropriate delegation rules for government procurement staff and "arms length" policies for elected officials.

[42] I am pleased to see the most recent report by the City's Internal Auditor in relation to the City purchasing policies. It is my recommendation to City Council that the requirements for Members of Council contained in the Code will be achieved through implementation of the Internal Auditor's recommended amendments to the current City purchasing policies and this implementation will facilitate more transparent procurement processes.

Suzanne Craig
Integrity Commissioner
The City of Vaughan

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 14, 2009

Item 1, Report No. 4, of the Audit and Operational Review Committee, which was adopted without amendment by the Council of the City of Vaughan on December 14, 2009.

1 INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT OF BUILDING AND FACILITIES DEPARTMENT

The Audit and Operational Review Committee recommends:

- 1) That the corrective action recommendations contained in the following report of the City Auditor, dated November 25, 2009, be implemented and that a further report be provided on the implementation of the recommendations;
- 2) That the Internal Auditor's recommendations with respect to the signing of all invoices be referred back to the Auditor so that he can meet with the Director of Financial Services to ensure that the appropriate internal controls are balanced against operational efficiency;
- 3) That the Commissioner of Legal and Administrative Services/City Solicitor, along with appropriate staff, investigate through looking at other municipalities whether a policy should be implemented relating to relatives obtaining work through the City; and
- 4) That the deputation of Mr. Richard Lorello, 235 Treelawn Blvd., P.O. Box 927, Kleinburg, L0J 1C0, and written submission dated November 25, 2009, be received.

Recommendation

The City Auditor recommends:

That the Internal Audit Report of Building and Facilities department be received.

Economic Impact

The recommendations suggested by the auditor and the implementation of corrective actions in the audit report, will improve the effectiveness of risk management, control and governance processes of the department. Some impact will be economic and will be measurable in dollar terms, while others will provide intangible benefits which may not be measurable. Other benefits will be an improvement in the efficiency and effectiveness in the operations of the department. Internal Audit adds value to all areas of City activity which are audited.

Communications Plan

The audit report will be posted on the web by the Corporate Communications department.

Purpose

To present to the Audit and Operational Review Committee, the Internal Audit Report of Building and Facilities department.

Background - Analysis and Options

The audit was part of the 3 year risk-based Internal Audit Work Plan which was approved by the Audit and Operational Review Committee.

A special request was also made by the City Manager to do this audit with a Terms of Reference as follows:

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 14, 2009

Item 1, Audit & Oper Rev Report No. 4 – Page 2

TERMS OF REFERENCE

To review for 2008 (with some review back to 2004), expenses and revenue of each cost centre with supporting documentation to verify whether:

- 1) adequate supporting documentation are available to support the expense/revenue
- 2) proper signed approvals were obtained to purchase the services/goods
- 3) services/goods were received and signed for on the Packing slips, Invoices or Field Purchase Orders/Purchase Orders
- 4) the Invoices were reviewed and signed to verify their correctness and approval to pay
- 5) there were correct allocation of the expenses to the appropriate accounts
- 6) Purchasing policy was followed in terms of the Field Purchase Order or Purchase Order limits
- 7) the Purchase Order was circumvented by using multiple FPO's
- 8) total purchases exceeded \$100,000 for the year whereby Bid documents should have been issued, and if so, to verify that the contracts were adhered to.
- 9) (1) to (8) above is also adhered to for SLF General Contracting Inc. and Vitriflex Surfaces Inc in comparison to other contractors and to note if there are any noticeable differences in treatment.
- 10) Internal Control, Corporate Governance and Risk Management can be improved and to make recommendations
- 11) department resources are used effectively and efficiently and whether department processes can be improved for greater efficiency and effectiveness
- 12) department assets are protected and safeguarded from loss

The internal audit report is provided as an attachment. The report explains the definition and objective of internal auditing as well as the scope of internal audit work. The report includes, for all deficient items, (1) the observations of the auditor, (2) the implications, (3) the auditor's recommendations, (4) the commissioner's response for corrective actions and (5) the auditor's response to the corrective actions.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council and the necessary resources have been allocated and approved.

Regional Implications

Not applicable

Conclusion

1. The Executive Summary in the report highlights the findings of the audit.
2. The commissioner and director of the department/operation audited, have responded favourably to all observations and recommendations in the Internal Audit Report.
3. When all corrective actions are implemented, (1) internal controls will be improved, (2) the quality of performance in carrying out assigned responsibilities will be enhanced, (3) the department/operation will operate more effectively and efficiently and (4) the Internal Audit department will have added value to the organization and assisted members of the organization in the effective discharge of their responsibilities.

Attachments

Internal Audit Report of Building and Facilities Department

CITY OF VAUGHAN

EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 14, 2009

Item 1, Audit & Oper Rev Report No. 4 – Page 3

Report prepared by

Michael Tupchong, CA, CIA, CPA, CFE
City Auditor

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

**CITY OF VAUGHAN
POLICY MANUAL**

SECTION: FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES	POLICY NO.:05.2.03
--	---------------------------

CNL.01.04.30

DEPARTMENT: PURCHASING	SUBJECT: PROFESSIONAL FEES POLICY
-----------------------------------	--

Council resolved:

- 1) That notwithstanding existing general policies and procedures for the acquisition of professional services, that legal, audit and real estate external professional services may be retained on an as required basis, up to a maximum of \$10,000 per retainer without any further approvals being required and without the requirement for obtaining quotes, provided the funds are included in the approved operating budget;
- 2) That the Direct Purchase of Goods and Services ceiling within the Purchasing Policy be raised from its existing \$500 to \$3,000 under which goods and services can be purchased with a Field Purchase Order;
- 3) That the Directors of Engineering, Building and Facilities, Urban Design and Public Works be authorized to sole source capital project surveying, soil investigation and general testing services up to the limit of \$10,000. per discipline within any one project;
- 4) That Council re-affirm its position of October 19, 1999 respecting sole sourcing of capital project consulting services on the understanding that there would be a \$35,000. upset limit per project and that prior to retention it be determined that existing internal resources are being fully utilized:

the authority provided to senior staff (City Manager, Deputy City Manager & City Solicitor and Commissioners) to single-source appropriate and relevant consultants in each of the above specialized fields on the understanding that such consultants are required solely for the design implementation and overseeing of capital projects through to a positive conclusion in the year 2001; it being pointed out, however, that the retention of consultants to complete capital projects in a timely fashion will have the effect of marginally increasing the capital costs of each project assigned over and above budgeted estimates;

that authority be provided to senior staff (City Manager, Deputy City Manager & City Solicitor and Commissioners) to single-source appropriate and relevant consultants or specialists to undertake, in the interests of timeliness, ancillary activities that are also required of other Departments from time to time to support the timely completion of capital projects (i.e. real estate issues, R-plans, easements, additional surveying for engineering projects, etc.); and

**CITY OF VAUGHAN
POLICY MANUAL**

SECTION: FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES	POLICY NO.:05.2.03
--	---------------------------

CNL.01.04.30

DEPARTMENT: PURCHASING	SUBJECT: PROFESSIONAL FEES POLICY
-----------------------------------	--

- 5) That Clause 4, Item 1, Report No. 2 of the Budget Sub-Committee adopted by Council on January 29, 2001 be rescinded and that staff follow the recommendations approved in the April 30, 2001 Special Committee of the Whole – Professional Fees Policy and that the Commissioner of Planning & Urban Design bring forward to the first possible working session, the Urban Design Capital Budget Work Plan and in addition present the projects that require external consultants and demonstrate the need.