

Food Secure City

Toronto Food Policy Council Submission to the Toronto Official Plan

Toronto Food Policy Council
Sean Cosgrove
Tel: 416-392-1107

February 18, 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Toronto Food Policy Council Recommendations	4
Executive Summary	8
1.0 Introduction	10
1.1 The Toronto Food Policy Council	10
2.0 Food Policy and Urban Systems Planning	10
2.1 The Goal of this Document	11
2.2 Long-Range Vision	11
2.3 Urban Planning Conceptual Frameworks	12
2.4 Sustainable Development	12
2.4.1 Full Cost Accounting	12
2.5 Healthy City Planning Model	13
2.6 Ecosystem Planning	14
2.7 Social Planning	14
3.0 Regional Planning in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA)	15
3.1 Strategic Regional Planning	16
3.2 Think Regionally, Act Neighbourly	17
4.0 Urban Intensification	18
5.0 Emergency Measures Planning/Emergency Preparedness	19
6.0 Prime Agricultural Land Preservation	20
6.1 Provincial Scale	20
6.1.1 Agroclimatic and Land Base Situation	20
6.1.2 The Economic Situation for Ontario Farmers	21
6.1.3 Planning Situation	21
6.2 Regional Scale – The Greater Toronto Area	21
7.0 Urban Agriculture	22
8.0 Food Retail Access and Community Planning	23
8.1 Retail Shopping Streets and Areas	23
8.2 Food Access as an Essential Service	24

9.0	Housing and Hunger	26
9.1	Housing and Urban Social Design: Institutional Services for Children, Seniors and Specialty Housing	26
9.2	Communal Kitchens in Social Housing	27
9.3	Congregate Dining	27
10.0	Economic Development and Ecological Infrastructure	27
10.1	Industrial Ecology	28
10.2	Food Waste Recovery	28
10.3	Urban-rural nutrient waste management partnership	29
10.4	A Virtuous Cycle might have some elements of the following	29
10.5	Biosolids Application in Agriculture and the Sewer Use - by-law	31
11.0	Community Gardening	31
12.0	Conclusion	32
	Appendix 1: The Challenges facing GTA Agriculture	33
	Appendix 2: Food Retail Planning Transportation and Food Access Issues	
	Appendix 3: Urban Agriculture	36
	ENDNOTES	37

Toronto Food Policy Council (TFPC) Recommendations

1. The City will adopt the principles of Agenda 21 as a core planning principle and with the expertise of the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives undertake a local Agenda 21 audit.
2. All City reports going to standing committees and Council will include, in the Financial Implications and Impact Statement, the accounting of full costs for all actions. Reports that do not have this section should not go forward.
3. The City will have a model of full cost accounting developed and adopted by the end of the year 2000 and this recommendation should be immediately implemented.
4. The Healthy City Model will be a core planning principle of the Official Plan. The expertise of the Healthy City Office and the national Healthy Communities movement should be used in our Official Plan development.
5. Ecosystem planning will be a core planning principle of the Official Plan. This is another holistic planning framework that has been applied in the Toronto region in groundbreaking fashion. We have received international accolades for suggesting and using this sustainable planning approach. We should deepen our use of this tool.
6. Social planning will explicitly be integrated into the Official Plan. Toronto has been world famous for the success of community planning of Metro, and in this spirit all community planning should include a social planning dimension.
7. The inequitable taxation of tenants, most of who are low-income earners, will be rectified.
8. A Greater Toronto integrated plan will be prepared, setting out a broad regional framework and objectives for the management of urban growth, infrastructure investment, economic development, and environmental quality. We would like to see any new regional plan accommodate all growth inside the existing officially planned urban envelope.
9. In our opinion the Greater Toronto Services Board should be politically reformed and eventually be responsible for planning and operation of: Waste Management, Water & Sewage, Economic Development & Tourism, Transportation & Transit, Regional Planning, Environment and Conservation Authorities, and a GTA Agriculture Commission.
10. There will be no expansion of water and sewage systems in the GTA until a minimum density of 5,000 persons per sq. km. is achieved in each Area plan.
11. There must be implementation of a regional transit plan for the entire GTA by the year 2002 and this plan must emphasize sustainable, healthy transportation and reduce CO2 and ground-level ozone

- generation. There should be no expansion of the 400 - series highways considered in the GTA until a policy review in 2021.
12. The political and economic leadership of the GTA will organize strategic assessments of world leading city-regions by visiting these regions and educating themselves on a regular basis. No City of Toronto strategic visits to world leading city-regions should take place unless accompanied by GTA political and other leaders and vice-versa.
 13. We ask that the City and the Province implement full cost accounting for all urban development in the City and the GTA. The full cost accounting model developed by the end of 2000 should account for the full costs of development before planning approval is requested.
 14. We will have as population density goals and standards for new in-fill commercial and residential development and re-development of 5,000 people per square kilometer.
 15. The Toronto Food Policy Council supports the Central Growth Option for GTA growth on the condition it can achieve population densities of 5000 persons per km², to support an efficient transit system¹.
 16. The Province should allow Toronto City Council to introduce user fees on private vehicles, including a user fee on gasoline. Revenues generated from these user fees should be dedicated to transportation and transit infrastructure.
 17. The City of Toronto will include in its Emergency Measures Planning exercises an estimation of how much food is needed to feed the City, and how much of this is produced, processed and stored locally.
 18. The City of Toronto as part of its Emergency Measures Planning will undertake a long-range planning exercise considering food supply disruptions. It will develop an integrated response to several time horizons and scenarios (e.g., one week, two weeks and one-month).
 19. Toronto and the GTA will have an agricultural land preservation policy, much like Seattle Washington and investigate legislative mechanisms to help preserve agro-ecosystems. This investigation should include an array of land conservation techniques; agreements, leases, purchase-saleback, creative development, purchase of land and development rights, conservation real estate, land designation or dedication. The city should consider community and conservation land trusts (private and public), purchase of conservation easements on title, and accepting donations for tax credit as per the Ontario Heritage Foundation.
 20. The 1996 Provincial Policy Statement Section 1.1.1c ought to be eliminated and no growth allowed on prime agricultural lands.
 21. Ready access to quality grocery stores or alternate food sources for all Toronto citizens will be maintained and enhanced in the new Official Plan. Lower transit fares will be supported as a public policy goal to keep low-income citizens mobile and increase their food access choices.

22. Stakeholders in Business Improvement Associations will be supported as strong partners in promoting commercial vitality throughout the City. Independent and ethno-racial business associations should be considered as partners in ensuring food retail access for all citizens. Public investment decisions in providing public facilities should continue to be made with a preference to supporting strong Retail Shopping Streets and Areas.
23. The City of Toronto will conduct a long-range planning exercise that will consider the optimal size, location, and transportation connections, labour force conditions and training, appropriate technology and sustainable infrastructure for the Ontario Food Terminal. This study should consider the Food Terminal as the keystone of the City's food distribution network and look for economic and ecological upstream and downstream connections that contribute to over-all system efficiency.
24. The City of Toronto Urban Development Services will assess options that could increase the food access of the lowest-income Torontonians in the areas most at risk of poor food retail service.
25. If a lack of food retail outlets is evidenced in any neighbourhood, if there are no food retail spaces planned, or no hope of attracting quality food retail to a neighbourhood, the City will take steps to remedy the situation through mandatory food provisioning practices. This means that quality food retail is a vital service, an essential component of community planning.
26. We endorse the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force 1999 report and especially draw attention to the recommendations outlined in our section 9.0.
27. The City will plan for the expansion and on-going evaluation of congregate dining food programs. The City will study the integration of these programs into the study of communal kitchens in social housing above.
28. The City of Toronto will do a study on requiring new multi-unit housing to include useable community food areas. This study should especially consider the needs of the nutritionally vulnerable citizens in social housing complexes.
29. Toronto will completely capture its food wet waste stream. We should have a principle of no net loss of urban nutrient resources.
30. We propose that the City establish a natural cycling process called a "Virtuous Cycle", outlined in 10.4.
31. The City will investigate a wet waste resource recovery strategy that includes urban-rural nutrient waste management partnerships.
32. We support the proposed draft 1999 City of Toronto Sewer-use by-law as a stepping stone to higher quality bio-solid recovery. However, we note that the federal 1999 organic agriculture standards will not yet permit municipal bio-solids to be applied on organic farms. We take this as an

indicator that municipal bio-solids are not yet of sufficient environmental quality to be used in sustainable food production, so we do not support their application to agricultural lands until they meet the federal 1999 organic agriculture standards.

33. The City of Toronto will conduct a strategic and comprehensive regeneration program for the redevelopment of brownfield sites. The use of city-recovered compost should be investigated for its soil rehabilitation and remediation qualities. There should be a pilot project evaluation of several technologies to do this.
34. The City will continue to support community gardening in all its forms (school, seniors', rooftop, neighbourhood, and ability gardens) as a quintessential Healthy City activity. The 1999 Community Garden Action Plan should only be considered a beginning of City support for this activity.
35. The City will have a formal partnership for delivery of community greening services with the Toronto Community Gardening Network and its member gardens and agencies.

Executive Summary

The new City needs a new Official Plan (OP) in 2000. Current City planning tends to forget that food system is an important component of the urban system. We want the city to adopt a holistic approach to improving our food security over a 50-year time span. Increasing access to healthy, nutritious food improves the urban system through lower health care costs and greater human productivity will be an economic reinvestment in our future. We recommend that the city adopt full cost accounting (economic, environmental and social) as the primary evaluation tool for all City planning projects.

The GTA is expected to be home to 7 million people by 2021. As our urban population increases, so does our distance from the land that nourishes us. The need to protect our foodlands and reinvest in environmental services becomes more apparent. Here are five key areas to improving our food security discussed in the report.

(1) Urban Intensification, Agricultural Land Preservation

Fifty percent of Canada's class 1 soils are in Ontario. To have this much excellent agricultural land in and near a city is a great and sustainable legacy. In the Greater Toronto Area, however, we are losing irreplaceable farmland at a rate where, in the period 1976-2026, there will be a 40% reduction. We need to halt urban sprawl with better urban design, denser use of expensive urban infrastructure and a sound agricultural land preservation policy. While farmland preservation is largely in the power of provincial governments, the municipality can do its part in preserving the farmland that exists within the city limits.

(2) Further Develop Urban Agriculture Initiatives

We recognize the importance of urban agriculture in reducing the city's exposure to global change events. Efforts to re-localize a greater proportion of the food system is important for emergency planning, as well as providing employment and contributing to the local economy. We should support local farmers through marketing assistance or economic incentives and develop programs to help new farmers take over from retiring ones. The FPC also supports urban greenhouses and other technology to produce food in the city. As well as providing incentives for local food production, the FPC wishes to put more emphasis on the promotion of local food consumption. This can be attained through local labeling schemes, as well as the promotion and further development of community shared agriculture programs and farmer's markets.

(3) Make Quality Food Retail an Essential Service

The presence of affordable retail outlets should be seen as an essential service and the city should make this a key element in neighbourhood development planning. Supermarkets tend to locate in areas to serve higher income earners, and mixed class neighbourhood planning, in the past supported by senior governments housing policies, have helped food accessibility for all. If economic polarization continues, however, low-income citizens, the most likely not to have cars, may lack any access to good food stores. In this case, the Food Policy Council supports making food provisioning programs like the Good

Food Box, mandatory as an essential service in neighbourhoods, which do not have quality food retail access.

The FPC also suggests doing everything we can to reduce transit fares, hopefully including provincial and federal government support, to low income families as a way of improving physical access to food. We can also plan for cleaner air and reduced greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging traditional retail and community food services close to where people live.

(4) Develop an Affordable Housing Policy

Toronto's housing crisis directly leads to hunger. Two-thirds of all food bank recipients in the GTA are paying more than half of their limited income on shelter. The lack of affordable housing is driving people to food banks. While the federal and provincial governments have helped create this condition, the municipality bears the immediate weight. Collaborative strategies are needed to involve all levels of government to develop an affordable housing policy. We support government programs in support of social housing projects.

(5) Integrate Ecology into the Urban Infrastructure

The TFPC suggests that the food economy sector needs an ongoing development strategy. However, we want to shift the food system from having so many negative environmental consequences. We seek an integrated resource management strategy to build an ecological infrastructure. This should link with new practices of Industrial Ecology (eco-industrial networking) where the 'waste' or byproducts of one firm become inputs into the production process of another. We should have a principle of no net loss of urban nutrient resources and establishing a "Virtuous Cycle" producing animal feed, compost, mulch, and biogas energy for urban agriculture, community gardening and brownfield remediation.

1.0 Introduction

The Toronto Food Policy Council (TFPC) wants Toronto to be the world's urban exemplar of food security and sustainable development. We should be the most food secure and sustainable city on Planet Earth. We believe in the Oath of the Athenian city-state "We will strive for the ideals and sacred things of the city, both alone and with many...we will transmit this city not only, not less, but greater, better and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us²".

1.1 The Toronto Food Policy Council

The Toronto Food Policy Council was established in December 1990 by the Toronto City Council. We operate as a sub-committee of the City of Toronto Board of Health. Our members include City Councillors, and volunteer representatives of business, farm, consumer, labour, multicultural, anti-hunger advocacy, faith community, and community development groups. Our mission is to end hunger and the need for food banks in Toronto and to work with all sectors to establish a food system that is just and ecologically sustainable. We use a food security analysis to help implement our mission. Food security is defined as:

- a) The availability of quality foods - a variety of nutritious foods are available to residents in sufficient quantity and in accessible locations.
- b) The assured ability to acquire personally acceptable food - residents have sufficient resources to acquire those foods that they wish to consume.
- c) The assurance of a viable and sustainable food production system - farmers are able to produce food in a manner that assures both an adequate income and the long-term sustainability of the resources required for food production.

2.0 Food Policy and Urban Systems Planning

This is the response of the Toronto Food Policy Council (TFPC) to the call for contributions to the City of Toronto Official Plan (OP). The City of Toronto has an historic interest in the role of food as an important component of a healthy urban environment. Food, along with air and water, is one of the basic biological life systems. Because of the complexity of modern systems, municipalities all over the world are finding it necessary to coordinate their responses to issues of hunger, health, food quality, safety, production, processing, distribution and ensuing environmental issues, such as agro-ecosystem sustainability. The food system has major impacts on urban employment, waste management, transportation, health and well being, and the larger ecosystem. No modern municipal planning should omit the question of food policy. We must use our environmental reinvestment lenses to recognize the interconnections between our food system and our urban and natural environment.

2.1 The Goal of This Document

In the OP framework document, Urban Planning and Development Services notes that there are several planning exercises underway in the new City.

“The Corporate Strategic Plan will lay the groundwork for departmental priorities and multi-year program plans. The Social Development Strategy will set social program priorities and the Economic Development Strategy will guide programs for growing Toronto's economy. Beyond these departmental projects, the Environmental Task Force is developing an Environmental Plan”

The TFPC is concerned that in trying to integrate and co-ordinate all these planning exercises, after they are completed, the Corporation is working at cross-purposes and in a fragmented fashion. Instead, we should have a process that works from core conceptual frameworks and planning vision and principles. We submit this document as our integrated thinking on all of the above five planning processes. We will continue to submit ideas to the individual planning processes, but these will be more detailed action suggestions. This document should be considered the contextual framework and vision statement for all the plans. We use a systems approach to inform our thinking on the challenges ahead, responding to the call in the OP framework document to be visionary and think of where we want Toronto to be in 50 years.

2.2 Long-Range Vision

Too many cities ignore the role of food in their economy, environment and society. “A major socio-cultural consequence of urbanization is that people are first spatially and then psychologically distanced from the land that supports them. To many urban dwellers, food, that most vital of basic needs, is increasingly dissociated from its origins in the sun and soil”³. This situation often leads urbanites to adopt a mental image of food abundance where “urban residents are lulled into a false sense of security; from their perspective there is little cause for concern since the food system basically works and works fine. It fails to convey the problematic nature of the food system from economic and environmental standpoints. It offers no sense of the many linkages that exist between parts of the food system and other systems. Above, all it fails to outline the food systems as an important urban system”⁴.”

An historic exception to this urban unconcern with the food system is the 1929 book by W.P. Hedden, Chief of the Bureau of Commerce of the Port of New York Authority *How Great Cities are Fed*. In it he discusses urban planning context of the transportation, distribution, marketing, processing, health and waste management issues involved in getting food into cities. He also pioneered the use of the comprehensive term, ‘foodshed’⁵ to denote the distance food travels.

Heddens’ work has not been updated enough, however, Philadelphia, a major food growing, distribution and warehousing centre, has estimated that the food economy employs from 20-25% of the workforce of that region, generating \$21 billion in direct local revenues and five billion in payroll⁶. A profile of Madison, Wisconsin food economy has noted similar impacts⁷.

The Toronto Food Policy Council has found that our City's food economy is a stable, successful sector, representing 10% of all employment and 14% of all businesses⁸. And this is just considering the economic impact not the social and environmental food system connections. A long-range vision would see an improvement in the accessibility of healthy and nutritious food as an economic and environmental investment, lowering health care costs and improving human productivity.

2.3 Urban Planning Conceptual Frameworks

We want to begin with the importance of appropriate conceptual frameworks and planning methods to our long-term future. We want to include integrative and holistic approaches as tools to use in the task ahead. We have identified Sustainable Development, Healthy City Planning, Ecosystem Planning, and Social Planning as planning models that should be baseline principles. These models, several of which Toronto is famous for pioneering, share common values. The TFPC wants to see the City use these models and methodologies to ensure a sustainable future for our region.

Let's prevent problems rather than trying to fix problems after they occur. This is the opposite mind-set from "end-of the pipe" solutions for trying to solve problems downstream that we could have prevented with good planning upstream. We believe that these models provide the criteria against which major planning decision must be made.

2.4 Sustainable Development

Our society is shifting to a new paradigm of thought that reintegrates environment and economics in an overall sustainable system. This is called Sustainable Development (SD). Sustainable development as outlined in the Brundtland Report "demands that some options for renewable resource development be retained for future generations". This means that our decision making must incorporate socio-environmental considerations such as inter-generational equity, and global effects of our actions. Development policies should be integrated between different government levels and other stakeholder sectors.

Cities around the world have embraced Agenda 21, the United Nations Rio Declaration on sustainable development and have integrated this process into their physical, social and environmental plans. Three-fourths of Sweden's municipalities have allocated special funding for their response to local Agenda 21⁹. The City of Toronto, of course, proudly sponsors and hosts at City Hall one of the key global actors in this effort, the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives. We should use the expertise of ICLEI to the utmost in our Official Plan.

2.4.1 Full Cost Accounting

A core function of sustainable development is to re-value the costs and benefits of our actions to future generations. This holistic re-evaluation of economics is sometimes called "ecological economics", with the intent of going beyond neoclassical economic models such as standard cost-benefit accounting. A subset of this is "full cost accounting" an attempt to internalize ecological costs that standard accounting

now names as “externalities”. The costs of "externalities" on the environment are now either not counted or it is assumed that each economic actor attempts to “cost-shift” the burden onto another actor or the biosphere itself. For example, energy use in agriculture is counted as only the direct fuel costs paid, and any contributions to global climate change or any other pollution effects from this activity are not considered as economic costs.

Full cost accounting is one six principles of Sustainable Development agreed upon by the Ontario Round Table on Environment and Economy.¹⁰ We endorse this principle as a goal for all Toronto’s planning and operating endeavours. It’s imperative that we enshrine this accounting method into all our decision and cost-benefit exercises. We realize that this is not yet an easy equation, however economists are making great strides towards calculating true costs.

TFPC Recommendations:

1. The City will adopt the principles of Agenda 21 as a core planning principle and with the expertise of the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives undertake a local Agenda 21 audit.
2. All City reports going to standing committees and City Council will include, in the Financial Implications and Impact Statement, full cost accounting for all actions. Reports that do not have this section will not go forward.
3. The City will have a model of full cost accounting developed and adopted by the end of the year 2000 and this recommendation should be immediately implemented.

2.5 Healthy City Planning Model

Sustainability planning is exemplified in the Healthy City Planning Model, developed here in Toronto, that puts individual health results in the centre of a matrix of economy, community and the environment. The model was well documented for planning purposes by the Office of the GTA in their 1992 vision reports¹¹. The Official Plan framework document states:

“The quality of life enjoyed by this city cannot be taken for granted. It needs nurturing and it needs reinvestment on the part of both the public and the private sectors. Reinvesting in our quality of life will be an organizing theme of the new Plan. The Plan will address social, economic and environmental objectives for reinvestment, and give direction to Council in its capital budget deliberations”.

By identifying these three objectives and considering them as key quality of life indicators the City is expressing the exact letter and spirit of the Healthy City Model. Toronto has pioneered and extensively used this Healthy City Model and we have also learned from its application in other Western nations. This knowledge should go into our planning processes.

TFPC Recommendation:

4. Healthy City Planning will be a core planning principle of the Official Plan. The expertise of the Healthy City Office and the international Healthy Communities movement should be used in our Official Plan development.

2.6 Ecosystem Planning

The “ecosystem approach” planning concept has been promoted and refined through the work of the Canada-US International Joint Commission over the past decade and through the efforts of the Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront¹². Ecosystem planning holds that decisions and actions in one area affects the whole society and ecology. The ecosystem planning approach includes the whole system, not just parts of it, while focusing on the interrelationships among natural elements. It understands that humans are part of nature, not separate from it, recognizes the dynamic nature of the ecosystem and incorporates the concepts of carrying capacity, resilience and sustainability. It believes that there should be limits to human activity, uses a broad definition of environments - natural, physical, social and cultural and encompasses both urban and rural activities.

Ecosystem planning is based on natural geographic units such as watersheds, rather than political boundaries, embraces all levels of activity - local, regional, national and international and emphasizes the importance of species other than humans and of future generations. Finally it is based on an ethic in which progress is measured by the quality, well being, integrity and dignity accorded to natural, social and economic systems.

TFPC Recommendation:

5. Ecosystem planning will be a core planning principle of the Official Plan. This is another holistic planning framework that has been applied in the Toronto region in groundbreaking fashion. We have received international accolades for suggesting and using this sustainable planning approach. We will deepen our use of this tool.

2.7 Social Planning

The Food Policy Council is very concerned that the Official Plan effectively integrates social planning with land-use and other planning dynamics. For example the continued reliance on, and expansion of, the emergency food distribution system by governments at all levels has results in the institutionalization of foodbanks as an unjust, degrading, malnourishing, inefficient and desperate response to hunger and public health.

The conditions associated with hunger and insecure access to food have worsened in Toronto since the early 90s. Sixteen percent of Canada’s poor families now reside in Toronto, even though the City accounts for only 7% of the nation’s population. Roughly 20% of Toronto residents do not have sufficient income to meet all their basic expenses and have enough left over for a health-promoting diet.

With half of the GTA population, Metro Toronto has 75% of the GTA's welfare caseload. Most of the GTA foodbanks are located in the City of Toronto. Foodbank demand, which had declined from serving 150,000 people per month in 1994, to 115,000 in 1995, has bounced back up 135,000 in 1999.

Recent studies offer evidence that hunger is coming to the critical point where there will be serious health impacts on those who must chronically do without nutritious food on a regular basis. A 1998 study of women in families using food banks in Toronto showed that they experienced significant nutrient inadequacies.¹³ Another 1998 report documents the correlation between hunger and poor health amongst mothers and children in low-income families.¹⁴ The burden of hunger falls disproportionately on children, accounting for 39% of all people assisted by food banks¹⁵. This cannot be considered effective community planning.

It is time to understand that social and physical planning is inseparable. The Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto points out that community planning must include “a social planning dimension to perform such important functions as: policy development of human services, definition of standards and guidelines for social services, and to carry out research¹⁶”.

The importance of this planning dimension is outlined by Anne Golden who notes that, “Toronto’s success was founded, in part on the principle of sharing costs across the region for both infrastructure needs, like sewers and schools, and social costs. Indeed, Metro was originally created primarily so that the resources of the City could be used to help the developing under-resourced suburban municipalities. This sharing principle applied too, to social costs and began with distribution of social housing across Metro, thereby spreading the welfare burden more evenly¹⁷”.

TFPC Recommendations:

6. Social planning will explicitly be integrated into the Official Plan. Toronto has been world famous for the success of community planning in Metro, and it is in this spirit that all community planning should include a social planning dimension.
7. The inequitable taxation of tenants, most of who are low-income earners will be rectified.

3.0 Regional Planning in the Greater Toronto Area (GTA)

The GTA is Metropolitan Toronto and the four surrounding regional districts of Durham, York, Peel, and Halton. In the last 50 years the population of the area has increased from 1 to 4 million people and is expected to rise to 6 or 7 million by 2021. The regions are growing faster than the City. Political dialogue rests with the Greater Toronto Co-ordinating Council, (GTCC) which consists of representative of all municipalities. We believe that the 1992 GTA vision documents¹⁸ set the basic goals for a regional plan, noting that “consensus was reached of a vision for an urban structure that focussed on higher density, mixed use nodes and linking corridors in order to better balance transit and automobile use.”¹⁹ In 1999 there is a new GTA Services Board with responsibility for the regional co-ordination of only transportation.

3.1 Strategic Regional Planning

Toronto is a globally competitive at the present time, according to a 1996 Fortune magazine ranking as the top North American City in which to do business. Where will we be in 2021? What are the strategic issues that will keep us competitive? Urban sprawl is a key strategic planning issue. It is economically and ecologically unsustainable, yet it contains key driving forces that puts the City on a tight-rope. On one hand, we are always being pushed into degrading our environment and society to produce as cheaply as imaginable for a global commodity market. On the other hand, we keep our gaze on competitor regions that protect their high quality of life amenities while producing cutting-edge technologies and services that bring them high revenues.

We cannot count on USA regions to divide and distract themselves easily in the future. Regional planning is witnessing an important re-evaluation in the USA, as the economic health of whole regions, not just the suburbs, is considered strategically²⁰. New city-states such as the urban agglomeration of Chicago, have begun to stir. They have undertaken several new regional planning initiatives, often spurred by the fact that their individual non-compliance with the US Clean Air Act threatens to limit commercial, residential and manufacturing development region-wide. The expense of each political jurisdiction raiding each other for one new development with no sense of regional co-ordination has finally caught up with this formidable region. Some of the strongest supporters of a Chicago regional plan, Metropolis 2020, are in the business community²¹.

The city of Portland, Oregon is equally a trading partner and a fierce competitor with other world cities and has adopted a strategy of good planning to keep their quality of life. This includes the strategic regional planning issues we think of as important: rural land conservation, regional transportation, and medium density urban residential development that have strong urban containment boundaries²².

The North American challenge on regional quality of life is not going away and we cannot stand in place. The report from Urban Strategies, Re-investing in Toronto: What the Competition is Doing, a UPDS background report for this Official Plan, clearly analyses the trends we have discussed here. To summarize, if USA cities achieve better regional planning and quality of life benchmarks, and, if we in turn allow our city and region to deteriorate and become more congested, polluted and with fewer amenities, will this not mean that we lose some of our comparative advantage over them? We are a safe, clean, wealthy and dynamic place to live and do business. It is imperative that we have strategic regional planning to meet our sustainable development goals.

Since we are an exemplar city, we must ask what world leader city would not have a regional planning strategy. Take the case of the Stockholm County Council in Sweden²³. This elected body is responsible for Regional Planning, public health, medical and dental health, and regional transportation. By integrating these important macro processes, they are able to understand that the optimal health of the population is partly based on their physical environment and processes, as well as research and levels of medical intervention. The Stockholm County Council, which has taxing powers, works in a regional context where they must get constituent municipalities to adopt and implement regional priorities for the

benefit of the whole region. This process is democratic, needs consensus and has proved to be very effective.

Stockholm must compete with world regions in terms of economics and quality of life and urban re-investment. That city-region is formidable by almost any measure, and we compete with them. Let us also learn from them. Public Health and urban planning originally intertwined in North America and we would do well to look to our roots when we imagine city-building in the 21st century.

3.2 Think Regionally, Act Neighbourly

The TFPC is dedicated to balancing the urban and rural character of our region in a long-term sustainable manner. We consider that the lynch pin of regional sustainable development is the combination of agricultural land preservation and well designed urban intensification to get better return on ultra-expensive urban infrastructure. The GTA is the regional goose that helps provides our golden eggs. The city of Toronto is the dynamic centre of the region. In order to save the goose, we must think as a region, even if our official planning powers only extend to the borders of the new city and even if not all of our regional partners are thinking along the same lines. Many are thinking regionally, of course, and we must work with them and plan together for our mutual benefit.

In 1996, the Golden Report used the best urban and regional research to date to consider the best possibilities for a winning regional future. All these studies pointed to the need to preserve rural lands and encourage compact development, linked by efficient transit. We should press hard for a comprehensive regional plan and certain integrated regional operations that draws on the excellent research of the past 10 years.

This document boldly pushes for a regional planning approach and hopes to be quite contentious and provocative in doing so. We do not believe that the City of Toronto can plan as an island in its own region. We submit this document as a challenge for comprehensive GTA planning. Our recommendations should of course be applied within the boundaries of the new City, but our thinking is not limited to its boundaries. This is the epitome of the so-called Smart Growth paradigm that is now so debated in the USA. Toronto has out front and innovative before its time. We were a “Smart” City, and must remain so to compete.

TFPC Recommendations :

8. A greater Toronto integrated plan will be prepared, setting out a broad regional framework and objectives for the management of urban growth, infrastructure investment, economic development, and environmental quality. We would like to see any new regional plan accommodate all growth inside the existing officially planned urban envelope.
9. In our opinion the Greater Toronto Services Board will be politically reformed and eventually be responsible for planning and operation of: Waste Management, Water & Sewage, Economic Development & Tourism, Transportation & Transit, Regional Planning, Environment and Conservation Authorities, and a GTA Agriculture Commission.

10. There will be no expansion of water and sewage systems in the GTA until a minimum density of 5,000 persons per sq. km. is achieved in each Area plan.
11. There must be implementation of a regional transit plan for the entire GTA by the year 2002 and this plan must emphasize sustainable, healthy transportation and reduce CO2 and ground-level ozone generation. There should be no expansion of the 400 - series highways considered in the GTA until a policy review in 2021.
12. The political and economic leadership of the GTA will organize strategic assessments of world leading city-regions by visiting these regions and educating themselves on a regular basis. No City of Toronto strategic visits to world leading city-regions should take place unless accompanied by GTA political and other leaders and vice-versa.

4.0 Urban Intensification

The FPC supports greater urban intensification, well planned with good urban design, to help stop regional sprawl. Multi-functional, compact, urban neighbourhoods offer an alternative to urban sprawl, which devours prime farmland and infrastructure finances. Our goal is to get optimal use and maximum payback from existing urban infrastructure. Low-density residential land-use is now simply too expensive to sustain. Even with hidden subsidies and without accounting for economic externalities, the sheer magnitude of sprawl is so financially wasteful that we must design for greater density. Ultra-expensive infrastructure such as expressways that are clogged in gridlock are not efficient, while excellent rapid transit is efficient but needs enough population density to function optimally and obtain enough fares to help pay for itself²⁴

- The Greater Toronto Area Task Force (Golden Report) estimated that there was 4,500 hectares of developable land in the present City of Toronto. If even the modest average densities of the former Metro were maintained in re-urbanising this land, then 200,000 more citizens could be housed and 100,000 jobs could be created ²⁵.
- The 1995 study, The Economics of Urban Form²⁶, showed that: "if the low density, greenfields (often farmland) development that is currently undertaken in the GTA now continues in the future, it will consume \$90 billion of capital over the coming 25 years". This Golden Report study noted that over one billion dollars could be save annually if even modestly more compact development density standards were implemented, leading to a potential capital and operations savings of \$35 billion²⁷.
- Compact urban form saves money by reducing unit cost of infrastructure. If the infrastructure is re-designed, through alternative development standards, additional costs are saved²⁸. This saves the cost of buying the land itself for streets, water and storm sewers. Single family lot sizes could be reduced to receive more use from existing or new infrastructure. The savings cascade throughout the system to lower unit costs on ultra-expensive urban infrastructure.

- There are clearly existing subsidies to low density urban development. "The current property tax system is not likely to accurately reflect maintenance costs related to lot width." Also the practice of all citizens paying for expensive expressways that low-density dwellers use the most, "is a clear subsidy to residents of conventional suburbs."

To be accurate, cost associated with urban development needs to go beyond capital, operating, maintenance and replacement and extended to full costing of social and environmental losses, (negative externalities) such as the loss of prime agricultural lands. The Economics of Urban Form report analysed GTA growth options and scenarios and conservatively estimated that the transportation and hard services (sewer, water, open space) operating costs in a twenty year period varied greatly between the Spread (\$13 billion) and the Central growth scenarios (\$9.2 billion). Annual externality costs of automobile use in pollution, injury and congestion is \$1.5 billion greater in the Spread scenario than in the Central growth scenario²⁹.

TFPC Recommendations:

13. We ask that the City and the Province implement full cost accounting for all urban development in the City and the GTA. The full cost accounting model developed by the end of 2000 should account for the full costs of development before planning approval is requested.
14. We will have as population density goals and standards for new in-fill commercial and residential development and re-development of 5,000 people per square kilometer.
15. The Toronto Food Policy Council supports the Central Growth Option for GTA growth on the condition it can achieve population densities of 5000 persons per km², to support an efficient transit system.
16. The Province will allow Toronto City Council to introduce user fees on private vehicles, including a user fee on gasoline. Revenues generated from these user fees should be dedicated to transportation and transit infrastructure.

5.0 Emergency Measures Planning \ Emergency Preparedness

In planning strategically for the future of a great metropolitan area, many possible emergency situations present themselves. It is our duty to have a short-term Emergency Measures Plan in place to ensure our food supply. The average North American City only has a three-day food supply. Recently, we have seen the collapse of fisheries on both our coasts, ice storms shutting cities in Central Canada, floods everywhere and the rise in food prices due to the low Canadian dollar. Earth systems are in flux, the weather among them, and our food system is dependent on the weather. It is also completely dependent on fossil fuels, especially oil, for fertilizer and pesticides, farm machinery, storage, and transportation.

Energy and food are basic commodities, and "basic commodity prices are subject to enormous political and economic swings³⁰". We have just experienced a scenario were the price of a barrel of oil has been

cut in half and then tripled in one year. We should not discount the impact of these system swings on our food supply lines, or foreclose on our options to produce food in and near the City.

TFPC Recommendations:

17. The City of Toronto will include in its Emergency Measures Planning exercises an estimation of how much food is needed to feed the City, and how much of this is produced, processed and stored locally.
18. The City of Toronto as part of its Emergency Measures Planning will a will undertake a long-range planning exercise considering food supply disruptions. It will develop an integrated response to several time horizons and scenarios (e.g., one week, two weeks and one-month).

6.0 Prime Agricultural Land Preservation

Ontario's agricultural heritage stretches back thousands of years through the First Nation's stewardship societies³¹. The Toronto Food Policy Council is dedicated the preservation of prime Ontario agricultural land as a key issue to ensure Ontario's long-term food security³². Farmers must be able to farm to ensure our food security. They can cover their costs when producing on good land. The TFPC is interested in rewarding active farmers for agriculture production. We believe that:

- A) Land should not be treated as a mere commodity: The heart of this issue is the question of how to separate land ownership from (1) the right to control all aspects of what happens to the land, and (2) the right to secure livelihood from products or processes of the land.
- B) If we want a secure food supply, urban consumers have to act on ways to support it. Buying locally from Ontario as much as possible and supporting Ontario food processing, distribution and retail businesses are part of this equation.

6.1 Provincial Scale

The provincial government's position is that Ontario has limited its losses to about 2% of agricultural land per year. However, a 2% loss per annum over 20 years adds up to a 33% total loss³³. Ontario's progress in agricultural land preservation was advanced by the work of the Ontario Commission on Planning and Development Reform. We do not feel that the present Planning Act (Bill 20) is adequate to protect high quality irreplaceable farmland. In particular the 1996 Provincial Policy Statement Section 1.1.1c could be construed to allow expansion onto prime farmland if growth outran designated development areas in each municipality. This is the anti-thesis of quality regional planning. Prime farmland should be protected on its own merits without exception, and it should be done in large contiguous areas.

6.1.1 Agroclimatic and Land Base Situation

- Ontario has Canada's highest quality farmland and longest growing season³⁴.
- One-half of Canada's Class I soils are in Ontario³⁵.
- Across Canada, Ontario has consistently converted the highest amount of prime agricultural land by area and by percentage of all converted land.
- While the proportion of Class 1, 2, and 3 agricultural land converted to non-agricultural uses (of all agricultural land converted) in Ontario in the 1970s was about 70%, this figure had risen to 85% by the mid-90's, in spite of the Foodland Guidelines³⁶.

6.1.2 The economic situation for Ontario farmers

- About 30% of Ontario farmers rely on off-farm income to survive financially.
- While capital value of farms has not changed from 1991-1996, total outstanding farm indebtedness has risen 8.5%.
- Between 1992-6, farm cash receipts went up 8.3%, but farmer's total net income fell by 41.6%, largely as a result of a 12.5% increase in farm operating costs after rebates³⁷.
- Fertilizer costs were higher by 23%, pesticides by 20%, and commercial feed by 32.5%³⁸.
- Total gross farm receipts measured in 1995 constant dollars have actually decreased by 39% between 1981 and 1996.
- Ontario had annual food deficit in fruits and vegetables of \$3 billion in 1998, up from \$2 billion in 1992. 50% of these crops could be grown here if storage issues were resolved. In Toronto between 50-60% of all produce consumed is imported, mostly from Florida, California and Mexico³⁹.

6.1.3 Planning situation

The present economic system does not pay for the services it receives for nature and agro-ecosystems. This fact and the lack of accurate cost-benefit studies that result from it seriously undervalue the importance of prime farmland.

6.2 Regional Scale – The Greater Toronto Area

We are extremely concerned with the trends in the loss of prime agricultural land in the GTA. They are a non-renewable resource, "once farmland is converted to other uses it is unrealistic to assume that it can be reclaimed"⁴⁰. The soils and climate of the GTA is the very best in Canada for agriculture. The farm economy in the region is large, varied and vigorous, accounting for \$1.3 billion direct and indirect annual gross sales, 3% of the entire GTA economy. It is the primary production base for the entire food sector, which contributes 10% of all the employment in both the City and the GTA. To have this much excellent agricultural land near a city is a great and sustainable legacy⁴¹. It must be protected.

- Approximately 50% of the GTA lands were rural (5600 km²) in 1991. Over 80% of this was prime agricultural land.

- Agriculture employs 1.6% of workers in the GTA, in comparison to 5% of all Canadians. The GTA lost 850 farms between the last censuses, yet total farm cash receipts rose from \$391.8 million in 1986 to \$425.5 million in 1996⁴².
- Despite these advantages, the GTA lost 62,000 hectares of farmland between 1976-1996⁴³. Two thirds of this loss has taken place in the more urbanized areas of the GTA.
- Another 40,000 hectares have been designated for development, and it seems to us that rapid urbanization is taking place 1996-2001.
- At the present pace of development, the loss of 7,500 ha. per year⁴⁴, the GTA chapters of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture (OFA) believes that we could lose another 85,000 ha. of farmlands by 2026. This would mean the GTA would have lost 40% of its agricultural land in a fifty-year period⁴⁵.

Farmlands now “protected” in regional Official Plans account for 36% of the land area of the GTA,⁴⁶ but they are still subject to massive urban development pressure. For instance, if the 407 eastward expansion goes ahead, it will cut through prime contiguous farmland and spawn the very problems of scattershot housing and commercial emplacement that has been the bane of GTA farmers. Even though there is right to farm legislation, breaking up farmland in this manner means farmer’s unit costs rise because they must work around the new neighbours, however accepting these residents are⁴⁷. Also the fragmentation of farms reduces the beneficial effect of service clusters that supply the agricultural economy. These services can be quite high tech and specialized, as in the dairy and equine industries and they need a critical mass of customers. These are the economic synergies that are at risk in “hollowing out” the farm sector⁴⁸.

Please refer to Appendix 1 for further discussion on issues in GTA agricultural land preservation.

TFPC Recommendations:

19. Toronto and the GTA will have an agricultural land preservation policy, much like Seattle Washington and investigate legislative mechanisms to help preserve agro-ecosystems. This investigation should include an array of land conservation techniques; agreements, leases, purchase-saleback, creative development, purchase of land and development rights, conservation real estate, land designation or dedication. The city should consider community and conservation land trusts (private and public), purchase of conservation easements on title, and accepting donations for tax credit as per the Ontario Heritage Foundation
20. The 1996 Provincial Policy Statement Section 1.1.1c ought to be eliminated and no growth allowed on prime agricultural lands.

7.0 Urban Agriculture

The TFPC is forwarding the entire document *Feeding the City from the Back 40: An Urban Agriculture Development Strategy* as this section for inclusion in the Official Plan. It was originally

requested as a policy document from the Environmental Task Force and was submitted to them in November of 1999. The document is attached as Appendix 3.

8.0 Food Retail Access and Community Planning

Food security for all demands that access to quality food retail stores or alternate programs be available to everyone. Access to food is a basic prerequisite to health. We are concerned that weaknesses in the Toronto food retail system leads to reduced food access for nutritionally vulnerable sub-populations, especially people living in poverty, children, people with disabilities or illness, seniors, refugees, first nations citizens, pregnant women, and the homeless. These citizens can live in areas that are the least well served by the dominant retail food system. They also are the least likely to have access to cars to travel to more competitive food retail areas. They are dependent on accessible local food retail stores.

Toronto food retail stores come in many different formats, from convenience stores to large warehouse-style emporiums. Green grocers dot commercial retail strips. Complimenting these are ethnic specialty retail strips, drugstores, department stores, gas-bars and others increasing their share of the food dollar⁴⁹. The presence of the Ontario Food Terminal is absolutely key to the support of Toronto's green grocers, with its access to reasonably priced wholesale food. We have many more green grocers than the average USA City.

Because our Canadian public policies have helped preserve intact, mixed-income, livable neighbourhoods, Toronto's food retail system presently functions better than that of most USA cities, especially in our central core. This situation is now at great risk due to the downloading of social and financial responsibilities from senior to the City government.

Supermarket chainstores locate to serve the higher income earners and also to help keep potential competitors from gaining a foothold for suburban expansion. This in turn provides some food access to lower-income citizens, but it is a precarious situation. Good planning principles that have helped us promote intact downtown neighbourhoods have also allowed us to retain with local shopping areas (strip retail), and this situation helps low-income citizens food access. Strategically speaking, the dominant Canadian supermarket chain stores have preponderant market power and can come and go on to an area on a whim, and not be easily replaced.

TFPC Recommendations:

21. Ready access to quality grocery stores or alternate food sources for all Toronto citizens will be maintained and enhanced in the new Official Plan. Lower transit fares will be supported as a public policy goal to keep low-income citizens mobile and increase their food access choices.

8.1 Retail Shopping Streets and Areas

Toronto's commercial food retailers, large and small, help get food to our diverse population,. Many jobs and much commerce are involved supplying green grocers and ethno-racial specialty food stores adding great vitality to the City as they do so. The former City of Toronto's planning priorities have supported these areas. This support includes help with urban design to ensure attractive public

amenities (e.g. street furniture, landscaping and parking) and co-ordinating partnerships with the local Business Improvement Associations to publicize the services of their respective areas. We need a new term that encompasses the shopping streets and mini-plazas of the former suburban municipalities, and we need policies that help retain them as active and economically viable shopping streets and areas.

We want Toronto's Official Plan to protect and enhance commercial retail strips and areas as an important element in land use decisions on efficient food retail access for residential neighbourhoods.

TFPC Recommendations:

22. Stakeholders in Business Improvement Associations will be supported as strong partners in promoting commercial vitality throughout the City. Independent and ethno-racial business associations should be considered as partners in ensuring food retail access for all citizens. Public investment decisions in providing public facilities should continue to be made with a preference to supporting strong Retail Shopping Streets and Areas.
23. The City of Toronto will conduct a long-range planning exercise that will consider the optimal size, location, and transportation connections, labour force conditions and training, appropriate technology and sustainable infrastructure for the Ontario Food Terminal. This study should consider the Food Terminal as the keystone of the City's food distribution network and look for economic and ecological upstream and downstream connections that contribute to over-all system efficiency.

8.2 Food Retail Access as an Essential Component of Community Planning

We do not wish to see a situation where an entire neighbourhood was planned or re-developed without quality food retail outlets. This is such an important food security issue that we believe that Toronto should make food provisioning (the presence of quality food retail outlets or their substitutes) a vital service and essential component of community planning throughout the City. We propose that the City consider the location of good quality, competitively priced food retail outlets (supermarkets) be included as a key element of neighbourhood development or re-development plans before any approval is granted.

If a lack of food retail outlets is evidenced in a neighbourhood, and there is no hope of attracting quality food retail to that neighbourhood, the City should take steps to remedy the situation through mandatory food provisioning practices considered to be a vital service essential to the community. These mandatory practices could be delivered through any combination of private, co-op, non-profit or public mechanisms or partnerships. For example, alternative food distribution systems, such as the Field-to-Table program, and other partnerships up to and including municipally owned food outlets are potential programs. This action should be considered a community service and be sited in city-controlled facilities.

A civic food provisioning strategy would begin with a need assessment. Feasibility planning would need to be undertaken. There are, however, examples of innovative civic partnership initiatives for comparison⁵⁰. Models from other cities including "Bulk", "Big Bag", and "Staples Stores", should be

considered. A business plan for a program of several stores with evaluations of store planning, purchase, lease, inventory, organization and management, training, and marketing should be undertaken. Options for operation by the City, by management agreement with a non-governmental organization, or any other partnership model should also be considered.

TFPC Recommendations:

24. The City of Toronto Urban Development Services will assess options that could increase the food access of the lowest-income Torontonians in the areas most at risk of poor food retail service.
25. If a lack of food retail outlets is evidenced in any neighbourhood, if there are no food retail spaces planned, or no hope of attracting quality food retail to a neighbourhood, the City will take steps to remedy the situation through mandatory food provisioning practices. This means that quality food retail is a vital service, an essential component of community planning.

9.0 Housing and Hunger

The TFPC is especially concerned that affordable housing be available to alleviate the housing crisis because it directly leads to hunger⁵¹. We support the concept of social housing as appropriate and desirable in all neighbourhoods. It is abhorrent that only 20 units of social housing has been built in the entire GTA in the last three years. This inaction by senior governments condemns many to hunger.

A June, 1999 study notes that 85% of food bank recipients are paying more than the Canadian norm for their shelter. One third of these citizens are paying more than 50% of their income for shelter and another third are paying almost all the income, more than 75% for shelter⁵². It is clear that the lack of affordable social housing is driving people to food bank dependency.

According to Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force⁵³, in 1999, 82% of social assistance recipients pay market housing rents and 106,000 households already can't afford their housing. In the next 5 years the City could easily lose 25-50,000 low rent private apartments a year as rents rise, (a total of 125-250,000 in that period). There could be 60,000 households on the waiting list for social housing in 2004⁵⁴.

The federal and provincial governments have helped create the conditions for household food insecurity. However, municipalities bear the immediate weight of these problems. Consequently, collaborative strategies are required, involving all levels of government⁵⁵. We would also like to see housing development charges on density bonusing to support building more affordable housing. We know that and housing development charges are being renegotiated for the New City. We note that we are in competition to some degree with the rest of the GTA for housing. Their housing development charges vary but are all much higher than ours. We do use more bonusing than they do under Section 37 of the Planning Act. What is unique is that we request a look at the possibility that some dedicated part of these policy charges go to support affordable housing.

TFPC Recommendations:

26. We endorse the Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force 1999 report and especially draw attention to the following of their recommendations

- Shelter top-up - The shelter maximum for social assistance should equal 85% of median market rent for each local housing market. (A 20% increase in the GTA)
- A new shelter allowance program should be created targeted to working poor families as a first priority and to working adults if feasible. The Province should pay this for.
- The City should fund and administer a rent bank with a \$500,000
- The City should develop a housing first policy for municipal land to make suitable sites available for affordable housing (while retaining City interest in the sites).
- The GTSB should extend the present pooling of regional resources for social housing to pool resources to ensure affordable housing throughout the region. The GTSB should allocate rent supplements for new affordable housing across the GTA. This subsidy must be at least \$7 million in the City in 1999.
- The City should implement the Main Streets Intensification Program.
- The City should make the provision of low-income housing a high priority in any density bonusing in the new OP.
- Council should harmonize condo conversion polices consistent with the "no net loss of affordable housing" goals.
- Second suites (basement apartments) should be legalized throughout the City with certain conditions.

9.1 Housing and Urban Social Design: Institutional Services for Children, Seniors and Speciality Housing

Urban social design for food security means improved access for all to institutional food services; school food programs, nutrition education, food access services. This concentrates on social settings, such as congregate dining, and school nutrition programs. We recognize the past importance of city funding for upgrading and installation of kitchens in many schools, through the Food Access Program and Board of Health funding. This financing has aided the development of accompanying successful school nutrition programs. These now extend into academic, after school, vacations, and healthy food buying, packaging programs. Children can learn if they and can obtain healthy food and should be educated in the basics of good nutrition.

9.2 Communal kitchens in social housing

Social housing in Scandinavia, especially specialty housing for seniors, includes well-appointed kitchen\cafeteria areas, designed for quality food programming in the buildings. There, housing planners try to animate social housing buildings by providing common meeting space. Social housing developers are trying to create a positive image for seniors social housing and money has been spent to break

down social isolation. The common kitchen\eating area needs to be beautiful and attractive, visible, easy to understand and use. This is a social animation model that should be investigated for use in Toronto.

TFPC Recommendation:

27. The City of Toronto will do a study on requiring new multi-unit housing to include useable community food areas. This study should especially consider the needs of the nutritionally vulnerable citizens in social housing complexes.

9.3 Congregate Dining

Toronto has a serious problem with the dietary intake of the nutritionally vulnerable. For example, many of our senior population, 50% of people aged 55 and over, are at risk of poor nutrition, leading to reduced health outcomes. One way public health and social service agencies try to address this challenge seniors is through congregate dining food programs in various communities and locations.

One impetus of the programs is to break down and the social isolation that both causes and contributes to poor food and nutrition amongst, for instance street youth or isolated senior citizens. In congregate dining programs, participants plan menus, help buy food, sometimes help cook and always eat and socialize together. Most locations are in churches and community centres.

TFPC Recommendation:

28. The City will plan for the expansion and on-going evaluation of congregate dining food programs. The City will study the integration of these programs into the study of communal kitchens in social housing above.

10.0 Economic Development and Ecological Infrastructure

Caveat

“It is difficult for cities to act in isolation. Serious dilemmas face any city authority that seeks to better meet its global responsibilities for ecological sustainability. Any programme by a single city to improve its performance by reducing resource use and wastes and greenhouse gas emissions may impose financial penalties on its residents and businesses that threaten the city’s economic prosperity. One of the most difficult challenges facing societies in the North is how to define the financial, institutional and legislative framework that is needed at national and international level to encourage and support the achievement of sustainable development in cities⁵⁶.”

The TFPC suggests that the food economy sector, with 10% of the jobs in the new City, and a very large over-all economic impact, needs an ongoing development strategy. It is a key manufacturing and business motor, especially the food processing sub-sector. However, we want to pay attention to helping shift the food system form having so many negative environmental consequences. A recent

environmental impact model developed in Canada, ecological footprint studies, has estimated that food system accounts for 25% of the Toronto ecological footprint⁵⁷. At the moment in Toronto, an army of polluting freight vehicles hauls thousands of tonnes of food into this city, passing on their way a second army of polluting trucks hauling food waste out of the city. We import foods, from all over the planet. Between 10 and 15 calories of energy are required to deliver 1 calorie on the dinner plate⁵⁸, and the North American average food molecule travels 3000km⁵⁹.

10.1 Industrial Ecology

To counter the negative environmental impacts of the food system and to gain economic efficiency, as much as possible we would like to see our food economic development strategy link with the development of an integrated resource management strategy. This plan could be linked with the concept of an ecological infrastructure based on Industrial Ecology or an eco-industrial network. This is defined as: "a community of businesses that cooperate with each other and with the local community to efficiently share resources (information, materials, energy, infrastructure, and natural habitat), leading to economic gains, improvements in environmental quality and equitable enhancement of human resources and the local community⁶⁰."

In an eco-industrial network, the 'waste' or byproduct resources of one firm become inputs into the production process of another. The cost savings and improved revenues that can be obtained drive the establishment of by-product exchanges. Current eco-industrial networks involve both greenfield and brownfield industrial and commercial sites⁶¹. To fuel Industrial Ecology, the City should completely capture its food wet waste stream. We should have a principle of no net loss of urban nutrient resources⁶², meaning establishing a natural cycling which produces feedstock for urban agriculture, community gardening and brownfield remediation. These processes can include animal feed, compost, mulch, and biogas energy. Compost can also remediate certain brownfield sites.

10.2 Food Waste Recovery

An ecosystems approach to food waste management could contribute to maintaining the ecological integrity and carrying capacity of our region⁶³. In addition, Industrial Ecology can be powered by recovering wet wastes. Ontario municipalities have responsibility to plan for sustainable waste management policies. Toronto Works Department numbers indicate that food waste makes up 15.3% of the solid waste stream. Other reports put the figure at 20%⁶⁴. A provincial document, "Diverting Organic Wastes to Agriculture" notes that the compost market for horticultural, greenhouse and landscaping industries is not met by the existing supply⁶⁵.

This eco-infrastructure must be planned for. A small start has been made. According to the Composting Council of Canada, the City of Toronto will be conducting trials at the Dufferin Transfer Station using an anaerobic digestion process that could turn 100,000 tonnes of mixed wastes into compost and biogas that could be sold as steam or electricity. This should be considered a full-scale project and it is a prototype of industrial ecology. Our concern, however, is that many mixed wastes facilities have not worked out in the long run and we do not know why this is to be a mixed waste facility. Halifax has proven that wet waste source separation by citizens is very possible.

The Toronto Food Policy Council has requested, through the Environmental Task Force, that a report be prepared by Toronto Works on the feasibility of using excess energy generated from burning methane at the Beare Rd and Keele Valley landfill sites for electricity. This energy would be used to heat food producing greenhouse or aquaculture operations that would be run by non-profit or for profit operators under an agreement with the City. We believe that the energy from other processes such as the Dufferin Transfer Station and the Toronto Hydro\Boralex cogeneration project could potentially be used for food production. We have discussed this in our report Feeding the City from the Back 40, an Urban Agricultural Strategy for Toronto, attached as Appendix 3.

An Ontario composting industry is developing expertise in the area of mid-scale wet-waste resource recovery. The province has conducted 30 experiments at provincial prisons, hospitals and institutional cafeterias. In the ICI sector, restaurants and mass catering food businesses need incentives and an infrastructure to recover food wastes properly and comprehensively.

10.3 Urban-rural nutrient waste management partnerships

The City should host the wet waste resource recovery infrastructure and supply its own farms and industries first. Properly done however, total resource recovery should still leave nutrient supply for rural areas. To market this product the City should investigate establishing urban-rural nutrient waste management partnerships such as are now established in Europe and we may be able to learn from their experience. European partnership agreements can be quite specific regarding acceptable levels of nutrients and trace minerals on a farm at any one time. Schedules are worked out years in advance. For example, a farmer might only receive deliveries of certain nutrients one-year in four. Swedeplan, Sweden's national planning agency, has done studies that envision the recovery of urban nutrient resources could have a major impact on nitrogen fertilizer sources in that country⁶⁶.

10.4 A Virtuous Cycle might have some elements of the following:

1. Use Toronto Urban Organic Agriculture as a Carbon sink.

There is mounting evidence that agricultural lands that are farmed organically represent a carbon sink that is very effective in tapping CO₂, the major climate change causing gas⁶⁷. City Farms can be more effective than city trees in trapping greenhouse gases. In addition to the carbon sink equation, energy use in sustainable agricultural systems may be reduced by up to 60%, depending on the region and production method⁶⁸, thereby producing less CO₂ to begin with.

2. Food Import substitution cuts off greenhouse gas

City farms produce food that can displace imported food, thereby cutting down on the massive environmental impact of the food transportation system. If we began to cost account for the climate change impacts of importing so much food from so far, we could compare the ensuing greenhouse gas emission reduction to our international Kyoto commitments.

3. Stop Methane Gas and Toxic Leachate release

The practice of dumping food wastes into landfills is a major contributor to the release of methane gases, the most potent climate change gas. Food wastes are also a major problem in providing a liquid base for toxic landfill leachate. If we can prevent food waste from going to landfill in the first place, then we limit a lot of methane released to the atmosphere, and save money on toxic leachate prevention and treatment. We could even lengthen the life-spans of expensive landfills.

4. Food Waste Composting

The annual cost of soil degradation (erosion) in Ontario associated with food production is over \$500 million⁶⁹. Composting can help reduce this cost. Besides avoiding the production of methane gas, we can obtain a valuable soil amendment by recycling food waste into a composted nutrient resource. By composting locally, we can also save money, energy and reduce harmful atmospheric emissions by not transporting food waste too ever more distant locales.

5. Use the Compost Here in the City

Organically farmed lands need organic inputs. Studies consistently show that farmers do at least as well financially, if not better, following the transition to sustainable agriculture⁷⁰. This is primarily due to reduced input costs, and sometimes premium prices for their products. City farmers could use city compost and contribute sustainably to our economy. Some cities are paying farmers for stewardship services. In Wessex UK⁷¹, and Munich Germany, the city is paying a subsidy for farmers to farm organically to preserve water quality.

6. Food is Health

Consumption of local organic food may result in better health of the population⁷², which could save tax-funded medical costs. City agencies and schools might become as institutional buyers of certified organic City grown food.

Return to Step 1.

TFPC Recommendations:

27. Toronto will completely capture its food wet waste stream. We should have a principle of no net loss of urban nutrient resources.
28. We propose that the City establish a natural cycling process called a “Virtuous Cycle” outlined in point 10.4.

29. The City will investigate a wet waste resource recovery strategy that includes urban-rural nutrient waste management partnerships.

10.5 Biosolids Application in Agriculture and the Sewer Use - by-law

The Toronto Food Policy Council is pleased that the City is planning to recover its bio-solid nutrients from its sewage treatment systems. We feel that to maintain the quality of the resource, however, it is imperative that the draft 1999 Sewer Use By-law is passed and enforced. Unless the recovered bio-solids are extremely clean we cannot support their use on Ontario agricultural lands. Agricultural land application should be the cleanest pinnacle in a hierarchy of bio-solids re-use.

TFPC Recommendations:

30. We support the proposed draft 1999 City of Toronto Sewer-use by-law as a stepping stone to higher quality bio-solid recovery. However, we note that the federal 1999 organic agriculture standards will not yet permit municipal bio-solids to be applied on organic farms. We take this as an indicator that municipal bio-solids are not yet of sufficient environmental quality to be used in sustainable food production, so we do not support their application to agricultural lands until they meet the federal 1999 organic agriculture standards.

31. The City of Toronto will conduct a strategic and comprehensive regeneration program for the redevelopment of brownfield sites. The use of city- recovered compost should be investigated for its soil rehabilitation and remediation qualities. There should be a pilot project evaluation of several technologies to do this.

11.0 Community Gardening

Because of its many sided benefits, the TFPC has always promoted community gardening in the city and notes with pride the tripling of community gardens between 1989 and 1999. We are pleased to endorse the Community Garden Action Plan that the Commissioner of Economic Development, Culture and Tourism proclaimed on January 31, 2001 to increase the area of the City devoted to community gardening and the number of participants in community gardens. 1999 also saw the birth of the Toronto Community Gardening Network, chaired by FoodShare Toronto, to help co-ordinate relations between the gardeners and the City, conduct joint training and leadership development, develop a communications strategy and promotion of community gardening and obtain horticultural inputs together.

There are also joint urban agriculture community gardening experiments ongoing in such as the Seeds of Our City program which seeks to catalogue the bio-diversity of seeds held by Toronto community Gardeners for agricultural and horticultural research and sustainability. Our community gardening sector is now large enough to undertake projects like this and we are better linked with Canadian and international community gardening associations.

TFPC Recommendations:

32. The City will continue to support community gardening in all its forms (school, seniors', rooftop, neighbourhood, and ability gardens) as a quintessential Healthy City activity. The 1999 Community Garden Action Plan should only be considered a beginning of City support for this activity.
33. The City will have a formal partnership for delivery of community greening services through the Toronto Community Gardening Network and its member gardens and agencies.

12.0 Conclusion

Food is life and the food and agriculture systems are complex. With the advent of sweeping globalization, instead of depending on senior governments, municipalities all over the world are finding it necessary to address issues of food access, hunger, health, and agro-ecosystem sustainability for their success.

Food is a commodity, but it is one that we ignore at our risk. The City of Toronto has very long food supply lines. Canada is a food debtor nation. Our present agricultural, processing and distribution practices are having a negative impact on environmental quality, and on resource availability and use, contributing to deterioration in human health. Can we continue to assume that there will be no food shocks in the future⁷³? Our future food security must be included in emergency, strategic and official planning. In the next millenium, the food and agriculture system will be recognized as a basic urban life system and its environmental footprint must be reduced.

Health challenges due to the non-integration of food and health policy are now apparent and there are new challenges, like genetically modified foods are emerging. In urban areas like ours, where poverty tends to concentrate, the disconnection between the food and health systems is costing us greatly. We cannot wait for other governments to understand that cities are the nexus where environment, economy and society meet and culture is generated. A healthy city will plan for success in ensuring a healthy, safe, culturally appropriate and environmentally sustaining food system for all its citizens.

Appendix 1: The Challenges Facing GTA Agriculture

Agriculture near metropolitan regions is often referred to as peri-urban agriculture. To ensure agricultural land preservation in this context, investment in agricultural production needs to be promoted to counter-act the "urban shadow effect". This investment shadow falls where farmland is expected to be valued for future urban uses and is left fallow or leased for periods of time too short to allow for the investments needed for high value agricultural (dairy, orchard, greenhouse) that could take the greatest advantage of their location near the City. Below we summarize discussion of the needs of the GTA agricultural system from different reports.

A 1.0 Greater Toronto Area Chapters of the Ontario Federation of Agriculture

Using 1999 figures the GTA produces \$585 million directly in agriculture annually, 7.5% of Ontario's total. This should be doubled to take in the indirect economic effect resulting in an \$1.3 Billion total economic impact. The 4,621 census farms are split roughly into thirds, one-third in large livestock (dairy, beef, pork) one-third in field and vegetable crops and one-third in speciality (greenhouse, equine, mushroom) agriculture.

A .1 Ontario Roundtable on Environment and Economy

The FPC supported the report of the *Ontario Roundtable on Environment and Economy, Agriculture and Food Sectoral Task Force* which called for agricultural land use preservation tools such as land trusts and conservation easements for sustainable agricultural stewardship, and which requested that all governments:

- Identify, account for and incorporate the full costs and benefits that derive from all land uses -stop subsidising environmentally harmful activities and account for environment benefits of rural lands. Recognise that seemingly insignificant, incremental costs of urban sprawl eventually cross long-term thresholds. i.e., fragmentation of farmland prevents production, lack of production hurts local food processing plants.
- Recognise that farmland embodies more than simply the capacity to grow food. Agricultural land is part of an ecosystem and must be managed as such for optimisation of its many roles.
- Recognise the economic costs those urban sprawl places on urban centres and citizens.

A3.2 The Royal Commission on Toronto's Waterfront

The TFPC supports the promotion of agricultural activity on farmlands in the GTA. We endorsed *The Royal Commission on Toronto's Waterfront* which stated, "It is time to consider direct aid to farmers

- whether in the form of land-stewardship programs, conservation deeds to farm certain lands in perpetuity, land banking for future agricultural needs, or tax relief -- which will keep farming and rural-based industries viable at the city's edge."

A3.3 Office of the Greater Toronto Area Provincial-Municipal Countryside Working Group.

We need to be creative in forming policies to protect our food security and agricultural heritage. In 1993, *The Office of the Greater Toronto Area* accepted the report of the *Provincial-Municipal Countryside Working Group*. This group identified specific challenges for agriculture in the GTA including: loss of productive prime agricultural land through subdivision and severance, and the prevalence of scattered development (industrial, commercial, unserviced fringe, and 'rural estate') resulting in fragmentation of agricultural land base. This means that:

Farmers report that land subdivision can make operations more difficult to perform. There are land use conflicts with farming practices (noise, odour, dust, trespass, vandalism, pesticide) these conflicts increase the farmer's costs to mitigate them. Rural residential development can be a type of "rural sprawl" that, if left unchecked, could lead to significant negative impacts on the agricultural industry and land base. The amount of severance of farms is not quantified in the land use data and its cumulative effect is unknown. Depending on the requirements of lease agreements, GTA farmers could be discouraged from the type of investments necessary to maintain good agricultural stewardship practices. This contributes unnecessarily to environmental degradation of land and water.

In 1993, the Office of the Greater Toronto Area formed the Provincial-Municipal Countryside Working Group which promoted the recognition of GTA agricultural land base as a non-renewable essential resource that must be protected. The TFPC believes that the City should work on the recommendations of the OGTA Countryside Working Group that:

- Agricultural land protection be required of upper-tier municipalities.
- Cumulative impact analysis of agricultural land resources should be a required component of municipal planning.
- Priority Agricultural Areas be identified and designated on land use schedules;
- Policies that require the municipality of the development proponent to justify the need for urbanisation of agricultural land;
- Policies to restrict rural estate development (generally one or two hectare lots on individual sewer and water systems), that limits denser residential development options;
- Prohibit scattered housing cluster development served by communal septic systems;
- Policies to direct growth to identified settlement areas; prohibit scattered development in agricultural lands.
- Maintain a rural land use database to update soils surveys, agro-ecosystems mapping and agricultural statistics.

- Establish demonstration farms and agricultural education programs to promote environmental stewardship and resource conservation role of GTA farmers.
- Senior governments must develop programs and partnerships to allow GTA agriculture to compete.
- Establish an interministerial committee, with municipal involvement, to develop strategy on the marketing of local produce in the urban areas of the GTA.

Appendix 2: Food Retail Planning, Transportation and Food Access Issues

It is now considered that “the market” now does food retail planning. Planners only intervene if it can be proved that new retail stores would kill presently located food retail stores. Planners have been wary of more intervention, due to Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) direction to not interfere in the retail market. The OMB has stated, "Cautiously, careful always to avoid becoming involved in the apportionment of market share or the regulation of commerce, this panel is assiduously conscious that these are not the objectives of the Planning Act"⁷⁴.

However, new decisions by the OMB may give planners more leeway in defending the necessity of quality food retail for the nutritionally vulnerable. The OMB still believes its role in food retail location disputes is to concentrate on the soundness of the planning issues and design of projects. But it will consider two categories of retail impacts. One is when commercial concentration will cause blighting of existing commercial areas, jeopardizing the properly planned function of land use and commercial structure. In the second instance the Board acknowledges the plight of citizens who do not have food retail facilities.

"For many - such as the elderly, single parents, the poor, or those in one-car families - proximity to a shopping facility is not a simply a question of convenience... when a shopping facility closes, it can be distressing for many who rely on that nearby store. When battles over market share result in the large scale closure of community grocery stores within walking distance of, say, an elderly couple's apartment...then what benefit has competition been to them? Multiply this by hundreds and perhaps thousands of people affected by such closures and it becomes clear that there is an important public interest that warrants protection. It has therefore become an accepted practice to protect a certain level of service offered by commercial facilities and to ensure a convenient distribution of facilities throughout the existing community as well as the community that is being planned and developed"⁷⁵.

In the US there are now performance incentives for regional transportation planning authorities to reduce transportation demand, rather than build new transportation infrastructure. One of the strategies is residential in-filling. A second strategy is to provide services closer to where people live so that there is less need for cars, or the car trips are shorter. US data shows that only 25% of car trips are for work, and 75% for non-work activities, mostly for shopping and recreation. Many of those shopping trips will be for food. Providing traditional retail and community food services close to where people live is part of emerging transportation strategy. This is more efficient and healthier for citizens. We can plan for cleaner air and reduced greenhouse gas emissions by ensuring that food retail access or its equivalent is available in our City. Once again compact urban form saves money, energy lessens pollution and promotes health.

Appendix 3: Urban Agriculture

Please refer to the document Feeding the City from the Back 40: An Urban Agriculture Development Strategy for Toronto as this appendix.

ENDNOTES

¹ IBI group, Greater Toronto Area Urban Structure Concepts Study, 1991. Of the three possible generalized GTA future urban form scenarios, derived from we note that under the worst-case model (Spread), in the year 2021, 34% of total GTA land base would be urbanized, an area one and a half times the size of Metro. The Central Growth Option uses least amount of farmlands.

² McIntosh, J. Planning for Healthy and Sustainable Communities, Report of the **UBC Task Force**, Vancouver, 1992.

³ Rees, W. Why Urban Agriculture for the IDRC Development Forum “**Cities Feeding People: A Growth Industry**”, Vancouver, BC. 20 May, 1997

⁴ Pothukuchi, K., & Kaufman, J., “Placing the food system on the urban agenda: The role of municipal institutions in food system planning”. In: Agriculture and Human Values, 16:213-224, **Kluwer**, Netherlands, 1999.

⁵ Dahlberg, K., "Foodsheds, Food Systems and Food Security" unpublished paper, **University of Western Michigan**, 1997.

⁶ Koppel, R. Agenda for Action: the Impact of Food, Horticulture and Agriculture on the Economy of the Delaware Valley **Philadelphia Food and Agriculture Task Force**, 1988.

⁷ Pothukuchi, K., & Kaufman, J. op. Cit.

⁸ Toronto Food Policy Council, “A Wealth of Food: A Profile of Toronto’s Food Economy” Sept. 1998.

⁹ Westman, B. Local Agenda 21 in Sweden, in Swedish Planning: towards Sustainable Development, Guinchard, C.G. ed. **Swedish Society for Town and Country Planning**, Gavle, 1997.

¹⁰ Ontario Roundtable On Environment and Economy, Restructuring for Sustainability, Toronto, 1992. Report calls upon all sectors of society to implement the principle of full cost accounting.

¹¹ Office for the Greater Toronto Area, GTA 2021- The Challenge of our Future, 1992.

¹² Crombie D. , Regeneration , Final Report of the **Royal Commission on the Future of Toronto’s Waterfront**, Queen’s Printer, Toronto, 1992.

¹³ Valerie Tarasuk et al, “Nutritional Vulnerability and Food Insecurity Among Women in Families Using Food Banks,” **National Health Research and Development Program**, March 1998.

¹⁴ Lynn McIntyre et al, "A Glimpse of Child Hunger in Canada," Applied Research Branch, Strategic Policy, **Human Resources Development Canada**, October 1998.

¹⁵ Daily Bread Food Bank. 1998. How do the children grow? Aug. 20, 1998.

¹⁶ Social Planning Council of Metro Toronto, The GTA Report: Implications for the Social Sector, Social Infopac, vol. 14, #2, April 1996.

¹⁷ Golden, A. "The Ecstasy and the Agony", **Plan Canada**, Nov. 1998.

¹⁸ "GTA 2021- The Challenge of our Future" by **The Office of the Greater Toronto Area**, 1992 and "Shaping Growth in the GTA - Commentary Report," by the **Greater Toronto Co-ordinating Committee**, 1992.

¹⁹ Gorys, J, Miller, M., & Macquarie, M. "The Greater Toronto Area Urban Structure: Analysis of Progress Towards a Preferred Vision of Development", *Transportation Quarterly*, Vol. 52, #2, Spring, 1998.

²⁰ Bernstein, S. "Community Based Regionalism Key to Sustainable Future", **The Neighbourhood Works**. Vol 20, #6, Dec., 1997.

²¹ Pierce, Neal R. "Chicago Regional Initiatives: National Model in the Making". **Washington Post**, December 13, 1998.

²² O'Meara, Molly, "More livable cities -- how did they do it?" **The Worldwatch Report**. December 28, 1998.

²³ Westman, B. op cit.

²⁴ **Urban Densities Compared Persons per sq. kilometre (ppkm²)**

Toronto City	6,000 ppkm ²
Metro Toronto	3,500 ppkm ²
Urban 4 Regions	2,100 ppkm ²
Urban GTA	2,700 ppkm ²
Greater London	5,630 ppkm ²
Singapore	8,320 ppkm ²
Target density for high quality transit = 4,000 ppkm ²	<u>from: Greater Toronto Area Urban Structures Concept Study by the IBI Group, Toronto, 1990.</u>

²⁵ Golden, A., Greater Toronto, **GTA Task Force**, Queens Printer, 1996.

²⁶ Blais, P., The Economics of Urban Form, **GTA Task Force**, 1995. Dr. Blais used a recent update of the Urban Structures Concept Study referred to in endnote #1 by the IBI Group, and other recent studies to prepare this.

²⁷ Ibid. "if the low density, greenfields (often farmland) development that is currently undertaken in the GTA now continues in the future, it will consume \$90 billion of capital over the coming 25 years. This capital investment will require more operating maintenance and replacement expenditures...between \$700 million and one billion per year could be saved in the GTA by accommodating future growth in more efficient urban patterns... by adding congestion, land and parking costs the potential saving rise to \$1.4 billion per year ... choosing a compact, efficient, in-fill re-urbanization based urban form represents a 25 year total saving of \$35 billion dollars.

²⁸ Ibid. ssubsidisation of low-density suburban sprawl means: More expensive land costs itself for buying streets. CMHC estimates that capital costs are one-quarter total life cycle costs of infrastructure in conventional and alternative plans. Capital, operation, maintenance and replacement costs 65-68% (operating and maintenance costs).

²⁹ IBI group op cit, 1991. Of the three possible generalised GTA future urban form scenarios, derived from IBI group Urban Structure Concepts Study (USCS), we note that under the worst-case model (Spread), in the year 2021, 34% of total GTA land base would be urbanised, an area one and a half times the size of Metro. The Central Growth Option uses least amount of farmlands. We support maintaining a high level of central city housing, where every dwelling reduces inbound peak travel by 1.2 trips.

³⁰ Romm, J.J., & Curtis, B.C., "Mideast Oil Forever?" **The Atlantic Monthly**, April, 1996.

³¹ Crombie op cit.

³² Agricultural land in and near large metropolitan areas is being rapidly urbanized throughout North America. The agricultural reserves zoned by the BC and Quebec governments are the most successful preservation programs on the continent. US counties are increasingly innovative, however, in using conservation easements, land trusts, and integrated farm support policy to preserve agricultural lands.

³³ Chung, Colin, Planning Department, **City of Brampton**. Personal communication with Vijay Cuddeford, May 28, 1998. In 1987, Brampton included 23,513 acres of prime agricultural land. The Brampton Official Plan calls for preservation of 5,835 acres of that land until the year 2021. This represents a loss of almost 18,000 acres (76%) at a conversion rate of 523 acres of prime agricultural land or 2.2% per year.

³⁴ OMAFRA, "An Agricultural Land Protection Program for Ontario". Discussion paper, April 1992.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Gilmour, Brad, Ted Huffman, Andy Terauds and Charles Jefferson, Incentive Problems in Canada's Land markets: Emphasis on Ontario, in **Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics**, 1996, 9(1), 16-41.

³⁷ Changes in net income between 1996 and 1998 (forecast) are not included because of different methods of calculation.

³⁸ Organic farmers do not have these input costs, and their production is increasing.

³⁹ McCarney, M, The Distribution of Toronto's Fruit & Vegetable Supply, **Ryerson Centre for Studies in Food Security**, Toronto, Aug. 1998.

⁴⁰ A Vision for the Countryside, Report of the Provincial-Municipal Countryside Working Group to the **Office of the Greater Toronto Area**, 1994.

⁴¹ About 30% of Ontario farmers rely on off-farm income to survive financially. While capital value of farms has not changed from 1991-1996, total outstanding farm indebtedness has risen 8.5%. Between 1992-6, farm cash receipts went up 8.3%, but farmers' total net income fell by 41.6%, largely as a result of a 12.5% increase in farm operating costs after rebates.

⁴² Office of the Greater Toronto Area, op cit.

⁴³ Rural GTA Working Group for the Greater Toronto Co-ordinating Committee. "A Vision for the Countryside: A Progress report". Also Stein, D.L., "Caledon is fighting the good fight on greenbelt" *Toronto Star*, Aug. 19, 1999.

⁴⁴ Walton, M., Greater Toronto Area Agricultural Impact Study, GTA Federations of Agriculture, Nov. 19, 1999.

⁴⁵ Southworth, N, "Farmers feel under siege as cities close in" *Globe & Mail*, November 25, 1999.

⁴⁶ Office of the Greater Toronto Area, op cit.

⁴⁷ Walton, M. Op cit.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ "Annual Market Survey", **Canadian Grocer**, June, 1996.

⁵⁰ After the energy crisis in 1973, oil dependent Boston, Mass. found it difficult to get affordable heat to low-income residents. An innovative private company, with wide public partnerships, called Citizen's Energy Inc., bought bulk oil and insulated the residences of low income citizens. Sao Paulo, Brazil faces great difficulty feeding its low-income citizens. As a creative measure to aid both urban low-income dwellers and the farm sector, "Big Bag Stores" were set-up by the municipality and private entrepreneurs acting collaboratively to market produce in bulk in the poorest areas of the city. Farmers sell their excess production to the stores, and in turn customers fill their bags by the kilo for very low prices. The stores have been a great success. Izmir, Turkey faced a situation somewhat parallel to Toronto in the sense that their major food store chains dominated the food market. In order to encourage competition, the civic government created their own "Staple Stores" to market bulk basics, such as olives and oil, spice, grains, bread, rice and pasta. This was successful in bringing the prices for the staples in the dominate chain stores down.

⁵¹ Daily Bread Foodbank, *Still Hungry for Change: Fifteen years of Daily Bread*, Toronto, 1999.

⁵² Husbands, W., *Hungry for a Home*, **Daily Bread Foodbank**, Toronto, June, 1999.

⁵³ Mayor's Homelessness Action Task Force, *Taking Responsibility for Homelessness: An Action Plan for Toronto*, 1999.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ The federal government has advocated this collaborative approach in its Action Plan for Food Security, **Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada**, October, 1998.

⁵⁶ Satterwaite, D. "Sustainable Cities" *Resurgence*, vol. 167.

⁵⁷ Krause, E. The Ecological Footprint Questionnaire Pilot Study, 1998 **City of Toronto Works and Emergency Services**, Environmental Division. Also, Ecological Footprints, Climate Change and Sustainable Development in the Greater Toronto Area, 1997.

⁵⁸ Steinhart, J. - Energy use in US food system, *Science* 1974. 1/3 production, processing, 1/3 in transportation, 1/3 in local marketing, refrigeration and cooking

⁵⁹ Hendrickson, J. "Energy Use in the US Food System: a Summary of Existing Research and Analysis". **Sustainable Farming**, Fall 1997. In the 1960's the average US food molecule travelled 2000 km. Recent UK research indicates that food miles travelled per molecule increased by 50% to 1800 km in 1997. A 50% increase in US food miles travelled would mean average food molecule travelled 3000 km in 1997.

⁶⁰ Eco-Efficiency Task Force Report, **US President's Council on Sustainable Development**, Washington, 1996.

⁶¹ Peck, S., *Eco- Industrial networks: Devising practical tools for success*, Web proceedings, Toronto, 1998.

⁶² Toronto Works Department figures indicate that food waste makes up 15.3% of the solid waste stream, 1991.

⁶³ Weedon, J.K. and Lovell, B. "Diverting Organic Wastes to Agriculture", **OMAFRA**, November 27, 1993. "Diverting Wet Wastes from Disposal: Progress and Action", by the Strategy Team for Wet Waste Reduction, a multi-stakeholder group convened by the **MOEE**. 1993.

⁶⁴ Physical and Economic Dimensions of Municipal Solid Waste in Ontario, **MOEE**, 1991.

⁶⁵ Areas to be investigated would include waste volume audits, tenders for the appropriate technology systems, labour standards and safety, true-cost accounting analysis, potential markets studies and partnership operating agreements.

⁶⁶ Blucher, G. Director General Boverket, **Swedish National Board of Housing, Building and Planning**. Personal Communication, 1994.

⁶⁷ Canada's National Action Plan on Climate Change includes measures currently being taken by agricultural producers that either reduce GHG emissions or increase carbon fixation in soils. These measures include use of conservation tillage practices, reductions in summer fallow, increased lands in forage production and higher crop yields. Current estimates suggest that the sector will be able to reduce Canada's GHG emissions by an estimated 14 million tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent by the year 2000.

⁶⁸ Many producers use older, sometimes rare, crop cultivars and animal breeds because they find them more appropriate in their production systems. Diversified crop production systems, windbreaks, and the more diversified landscape associated with sustainable agriculture systems often contribute to improved and varied wildlife habitat.

⁶⁹ Task Force Report on Agriculture and Food, Ontario Round Table on Environment and Economy 1992. Reports that soil erosion, soil degradation and organic matter loss in agricultural soil is a serious concern. It calls for addition of compost to build the living soil resource.

⁷⁰ Lambkin and Panel. 1994. The Economics of Organic Farming.

⁷¹ "Wessex Water to launch organic 'grant scheme'", *New Farmer & Grower*, Bristol, UK Issue 58, Summer, 1998.

⁷² Kirby, A. "Organic food 'proven' healthier" **BBC News**, 3 January, 2000, London, UK.

⁷³ Rees, W.E., "Ecological Footprints and the Imperative of Rural Sustainability" in: Ivonne Audirac (ed.) *Rural Sustainability in America*. New York: **John Wiley and Sons**. 1997.

⁷⁴ **Ontario Municipal Board Review**, "Brampton Official Plan (208)" case I 09100173;R9100553208. Report 30-1, 1993.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*