



Media Release: Immediate

**Regional Municipality of Waterloo**  
**Consolidated**  
**Licensing and Hearings Committee**

**Agenda**

Wednesday, August 17, 2016

**Closed Session 5:30 p.m.**

**Waterloo County Room**

Regular Meeting 6:00 p.m.

Regional Council Chamber

150 Frederick Street, Kitchener, Ontario

---

\*Denotes Item(s) Not Part of Original Agenda

---

**1. Motion to Go Into Closed Session**

That a closed meeting of the Licensing and Hearings Committee be held on Wednesday, August 17, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. in the Waterloo County Room in accordance with Section 239 of the "Municipal Act, 2001", for the purposes of considering the following subject matters:

- a) receiving of advice subject to solicitor-client privilege related to a legal matter

**2. Motion to Reconvene Into Open Session**

**3. Declarations of Pecuniary Interest Under The Municipal Conflict of Interest Act**

**4. Delegations**

- 4.1** Prem Guruajan, RideCo

- 4.2 Brian Bazely and Luke Bazely, Driverseat
  - \* 4.3 Chris Schafer, Uber Canada
  - \* 4.4 Bill Chester and Peter Neufeld, Waterloo Region Taxi Alliance
  - \* 4.5 Tiho Popovic, City Cabs
5. **Reports – Planning, Development, and Legislative Services**
- 5.1 **PDL-CAS-16-13**, Taxi By-law Review - Finalization of Outstanding Issues and New By-law 4

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo direct staff to include the following provisions in the final by-laws for taxi and taxi type services as described in report PDL-CAS-16-13 dated August 17, 2016:

**In-vehicle Monitoring (Cameras)**

1. That a secured camera recording system be required in all taxis unless one of the following exceptions apply:
  - a. The taxi only provides pre-arranged taxi services (i.e. no hail services) through an on-line enabled application that provides safeguards in the form of driver identification, vehicle identification, and real-time GPS that is available to the broker and the passenger, real-time feedback that can be responded to 24/7 and the ability to forward passenger route information to a third party;
  - b. The taxi only provides pre-arranged taxi services (i.e. no hail services) through a written contract wherein the passenger expressly acknowledges that the taxi-cab is not equipped with a secured system to visually record the driver and passenger areas of the taxi; or
  - c. The taxi only provides pre-arranged taxi services (i.e. no hail services) for the purposes of a wedding, prom or other similar special occasion.
2. That staff undertake a review of these provisions within twenty-four (24) months of the passing of the by-law and report back to Committee to determine if further changes are required to the by-law.

**License Fees and Accessible Fees**

3. That the Region of Waterloo approve the proposed Licensing Fees as outlined in Appendix 'B' of Report PDL-CAS-16-13 dated August, 17, 2016; and
4. That staff be directed to review the Licensing Fees in twelve (12) months from the implementation of the by-law, to ensure that the fees collected offset Licensing & Enforcement operating and administrative costs.

**Vehicle Identification**

5. That the Region of Waterloo require Taxi-cabs to display two (2) decals, of a minimum size of two hundred (200) square centimeters each, in a location visible from the exterior of the Taxi-cab. The decals must display the name or trademark of the Taxi-cab Broker.

**6. Information/Correspondence****7. Other Business****8. Adjourn**



Report: PDL-CAS-16-13

**Region of Waterloo**  
**Planning, Development and Legislative Services**  
**Council and Administrative Services**

---

**To:** Chair Jane Mitchell and Members of the Licensing and Hearings Committee

**Date:** August 17, 2016

**File Code:** C13-30

**Subject:** **Taxi By-law Review - Finalization of Outstanding Issues and New By-law**

---

**Recommendation:**

That the Regional Municipality of Waterloo direct staff to include the following provisions in the final by-laws for taxi and taxi type services as described in report PDL-CAS-16-13 dated August 17, 2016:

**In-vehicle Monitoring (Cameras)**

1. That a secured camera recording system be required in all taxis unless one of the following exceptions apply:
  - a. The taxi only provides pre-arranged taxi services (i.e. no hail services) through an on-line enabled application that provides safeguards in the form of driver identification, vehicle identification, and real-time GPS that is available to the broker and the passenger, real-time feedback that can be responded to 24/7 and the ability to forward passenger route information to a third party;
  - b. The taxi only provides pre-arranged taxi services (i.e. no hail services) through a written contract wherein the passenger expressly acknowledges that the taxi-cab is not equipped with a secured system to visually record the driver and passenger areas of the taxi; or
  - c. The taxi only provides pre-arranged taxi services (i.e. no hail services) for the purposes of a wedding, prom or other similar special occasion.
2. That staff undertake a review of these provisions within twenty-four (24) months of the passing of the by-law and report back to Committee to determine if further changes are required to the by-law.

### **License Fees and Accessible Fees**

3. That the Region of Waterloo approve the proposed Licensing Fees as outlined in Appendix 'B' of Report PDL-CAS-16-13 dated August, 17, 2016; and
4. That staff be directed to review the Licensing Fees in twelve (12) months from the implementation of the by-law, to ensure that the fees collected offset Licensing & Enforcement operating and administrative costs.

### **Vehicle Identification**

5. That the Region of Waterloo require Taxi-cabs to display two (2) decals, of a minimum size of two hundred (200) square centimeters each, in a location visible from the exterior of the Taxi-cab. The decals must display the name or trademark of the Taxi-cab Broker.

### **Summary:**

The Region of Waterloo has been in the process of reviewing its Taxi By-law since August 2015. The review is now nearing completion and it is anticipated that a by-law will be passed either in August or September 2016 and to come into force on November 1, 2016

The Region, as the regulator, is faced with the challenge of recognizing that new technologies and associated companies are here to stay while at the same time continuing to acknowledge that taxis are a critical part of the public transportation network. The public wants both options - they want choice. This leaves the regulator to determine the appropriate amount of regulation required to provide public safety, accessibility and consumer protection. The By-law review has provided an opportunity for the regulator to think creatively in finding manageable, innovative solutions to a complex issue.

In April and June 2016, Committee provided direction on a policy framework on seven (7) key issues and detailed regulation. While not all of these policies were fully resolved in April and June, the direction provided created the opportunity to begin the final by-law drafting. Based on the discussions and decisions made there are two (2) major outstanding issues for Committee to resolve: In-vehicle monitoring (cameras) and licensing and accessibility fees. There is also one (1) minor issue related to 'vehicle identification' that was brought to our attention during stakeholder consultations. Regional staff has assembled five (5) recommendations on these topics. These recommendations will assist in finalizing the by-law and moving forward with the implementation. There are items in this report that will require further monitoring and revision as the market continues to evolve. Proposed next steps are also included in this report.

**Report:****Background**

At the Committee meeting of June 8, 2016, Committee resolved a number of items required for the development of the taxi by-law. At that time two (2) issues remained outstanding; passenger safety as it relates to cameras and applications and the actual fees to be charged for licensing.

As part of the final stages of this by-law review, a draft by-law was prepared and circulated to the stakeholders (limousines, taxi brokers, Uber, RideCo, Driver's Seat) in early July. Staff has received comments back from these stakeholders and have used this input to make the recommendations, provide some options for Committee and provide greater clarity on the issues. The details of these various changes are outlined in the sections below.

**In-Vehicle Monitoring (Cameras)**

There has been considerable debate on "in-vehicle" monitoring. The recommendation in this report is attempting to find a balance between the various types of service provided, especially in the auxiliary class (limousine, Uber, RideCo) and consumer protection.

**GPS is required in all vehicles**

For clarification, GPS monitoring is already an existing requirement for Brokers in the proposed by-law. GPS monitoring has been used by police and enforcement agencies as evidence in the past and will continue to be used in the future. Other monitoring features such as video monitoring/data exchange can also assist with any investigation.

**Cameras and on-line applications (apps) both provide for passenger safety**

Staff believe that cameras and on line booking applications both provide an adequate level of security to passengers. Staff are of the opinion that one does not out perform the other, as cameras can be tampered with e.g. camera angle adjusted or camera covered and applications do not provide actual video footage about the passenger/driver interactions. This is a risk that passengers must take into consideration before taking a ride in any vehicles e.g. "buyer beware". Passengers have clearly indicated that they want choice in service. In the recent surveys taken by the Region only thirty percent (30%) of the respondents believed cameras should be required in all vehicles. Forty percent (40%) believed the Region should not regulate the installation of cameras at all. As the regulator, the Region must balance the passenger's choice with measured risk. With the increased choices available for consumers, passengers will have a choice between a traditional taxi service that has in-vehicle monitoring/GPS over those that provide monitoring via application/GPS.

As outlined in previous reports there is also recognition that not all applications are created equally. It is staff's opinion that a good application provides the following information:

- driver and driver information including picture is made available to the passenger,
- The license plate number, make, and model of the vehicle is provided to the passenger,
- The application provides real-time GPS information to the passenger and Broker,
- The trip information is displayed on both the driver's and passenger's devices,
- A system that provides real time feedback that can be responded to 24/7,
- There is an ability to forward passenger route information to a 3rd party,
- Data in the hands of the broker is documented and can be provided to enforcement officials.

The recommendation contained in this report reflects these provisions.

### **RideCo – 3rd party trip information currently not available - Option to change the condition**

RideCo has recently informed the Region that it currently does not provide an application that offers a third (3rd) party with trip information. RideCo is currently working on a solution to develop this functionality, however, this solution will not be available at the time of by-law implementation. In order to accommodate this additional new entrant to the market, staff is not opposed to eliminating this requirement from the proposed recommendations.

### **Industry Scan – 7 of 8 municipalities surveyed will not require cameras in ridesharing vehicles at this time.**

To support the staff recommendation an industry scan was conducted with municipalities that have and are currently reviewing their by-law to include ridesharing services (Appendix A).

The following municipalities were polled: Toronto, Ottawa, Hamilton, Mississauga, Niagara Region, London, Sudbury and Edmonton.

The results show that seven (7) of the eight (8) municipalities do not currently have requirements for in-vehicle camera systems for rideshare providers. One (1) of the municipalities is only part way through their review process and a final determination on cameras has not yet been made by their Council. Ottawa and Toronto also have Council direction to continue to monitor the industry to determine if cameras should be installed some time in the future.

The results also show that five (5) of the eight (8) municipalities require in-vehicle cameras for metered taxis, three (3) do not require in-vehicle cameras for metered taxis.

One (1) municipality requires cameras for limousines.

One of the main reasons cited for not requiring in-vehicle cameras for rideshare providers is that the on-line application (app) provides a level of protection as both the both driver and passenger receive information about each other and the routes are identified.

**Stakeholder Consultation: RideCo, Uber and Limousines are all opposed to the installation of cameras**

One of the major concerns for the auxiliary taxi classification is in-vehicle cameras. A requirement for in-vehicle cameras for auxiliary taxis would prove to be detrimental to their business models, and in some cases, dissuade the business from operating in the Region.

Companies such as Uber and RideCo believe their application provides the passenger with information and access to data that helps to mitigate any risk to the passenger. Both services also provide a passenger rating system where passengers are provided with information that may assist in making an appropriate choice.

**Limousines and small auxiliary taxi companies – written contracts/special events**

In combining the various taxi by-laws (taxi, limousine and special transportation) into one by-law there has been some difficulty in trying to accommodate the various types of services/companies in the auxiliary class. Staff has reviewed this situation again and believe there is a way to accommodate limousines and small auxiliary brokers i.e. Driver's seat. With these companies, the broker usually operates in a more traditional business format and not in a cooperative arrangement like metered taxis. In some instances these companies operate as a sole proprietor (special transportation provider, some limousines). Many of the services undertaken by these companies is provided either through a written or verbal contract or the service is for a special occasion. With limousine, there is also an expectation that passenger privacy will be maintained. It should also be noted that staff have never received a complaint about the service provided by the existing limousine or special transportation service. The relationship that these existing providers have with their passengers is different than the metered taxi industry. Recently staff approached the limousine companies, Driver's Seat and our one (1) special transportation provider. None of these providers currently have in vehicle monitoring and only large limousine companies and Driver's Seat provide real time GPS monitoring. Driver's Seat does have a robust application system that allows for vehicle, driver identification, and the exchange of information with the passenger. Large and small limousine companies and the special transportation operator do provide written contracts. This allowed staff to put forward a recommendation that included the exemption as outlined.

**Staff will continue to monitor the use of cameras and applications and report back**

The use of cameras, on-line booking applications and contracts are very new provisions for taxi by-laws. Staff will continue to monitor what other municipalities are doing and the safety risk to passengers. Staff believe a review over the next twenty-four (24) months is appropriate however if Committee wants a report within one (1) year (when a review of the fees is undertaken) or three (3) years (when the taxi licence limits are reviewed) this can be accommodated.

**Recommendation:**

1. That secured recording systems be required in all taxis unless one of the following exceptions apply:
  - a. The taxi only provides pre-arranged taxi services (i.e. no hail services) through an on-line enabled application that provides safeguards in the form of driver identification, vehicle identification, and real-time GPS that is available to the broker and the passenger, real time feedback that can be responded to 24/7 and the ability to forward passenger route information to a third party;
  - b. The taxi only provides pre-arranged taxi services (i.e. no hail services) through a written contract where in the passenger expressly acknowledges that the taxi –cab is not equipped with a secured system to visually record the driver and passenger areas of the taxi; or
  - c. The taxi only provides pre-arranged taxi services (i.e. no hail services) for the purposes of a wedding, prom or other similar special occasion.
2. That staff undertake a review of these provisions within twenty-four (24) months of the passing of the by-law and report back to Committee to determine if further changes are required to the by-law.

**Alternative Option on in-vehicle monitoring (cameras) - Maintain the existing by-law and don't require cameras**

Based on information received from other jurisdictions, not all municipalities require in-vehicle monitoring (cameras). There are no regulations currently in our taxi by-laws. Committee could decide to uphold the existing by-law provisions wherein GPS would still be required but the use of in-vehicle camera monitoring would be determined by brokers as they deem fit. If there is no in-vehicle monitoring, brokers will still be required to have real time GPS. This option would treat both auxiliary and metered taxis the same. Staff is not opposed to this option.

## **License Fees and Accessible Fees**

Staff have conducted extensive research into licensing fees and reviewed feedback from the metered and auxiliary taxi industry. The fees being proposed are based on the costs of licensing and enforcement, previous historic rates and the streamlining of those rates and the review of rates in other jurisdictions. There are several unknown factors/issues in trying to establish the rates at this time. The best estimate, that seems fair and reasonable, was utilized to develop the fees. Staff will continue to monitor fees.

## **Ridesharing Concerns**

The ridesharing industry continues to recommend fees based on per trip models. Ottawa, Toronto, Sudbury and Niagara Region have all developed by-laws based on a per trip rate. Staff believe that this will prove difficult to audit in a way that ensures the information provided is accurate and the process is transparent. Staff continues to recommend a Fee Schedule based on number of vehicles licensed and number of drivers licensed.

## **Sliding Scale for Fees**

Staff have created a sliding scale for fees (Appendix B). The fees are broken into broker fees, accessible fees, owner/vehicle fees, driver fees and other fees. The fees are also scaled based on the size of brokerage, and whether the broker is going to issue the licences or leave this in the hands of the Region.

## **Brokers with 1 to 999 Vehicles**

For Brokers in the first category of 1 to 999 vehicles fees have been graduated based on the number of vehicles the Broker will operate. This will allow start-up services to establish themselves in the industry without experiencing a major financial impact. It also aligns the cost to existing Brokers to better represent the cost of administering the licensing program.

The schedule offers two (2) options for licence issuance:

1. Region issued licenses at the regular fee rate or
2. Broker issued licences at a reduced fee

The first option allows smaller operations, which do not have the capacity to issue their own licenses on the Region's behalf, to attend the Licensing office to obtain licenses.

The second option allows Brokers to issue licenses on the Region's behalf and collect the fees and remit them to the Region. These fees would be at a lower cost to reflect the reduced cost in the licensing process.

A typical metered taxi Broker would pay approximately \$20,000 if the licenses were

issued by the Broker and approximately \$39,000 if issued by the Region.

### **Brokers with 1000+ Vehicles**

The only broker that would currently fit into this category is Uber.

For Brokers in the second category, 1000+ vehicles, fees reflect a higher Brokerage fee due to volume of vehicles. A flat rate of \$50,000 would be charged to a Broker for 1000 to 2999 vehicles and fee of \$22 per vehicle for 3000 or more vehicles would be charged as a Broker fee. Brokers falling into this category would also be required to issue the Region licenses and collect and remit the fees to the Region.

The fees for Owner/Vehicle licenses and Taxi Driver licenses are greatly reduced to reflect this process. An Owner/Vehicle license would be \$40 and a Taxi Driver license would be \$10.

### **Fee in Lieu of Accessible Services**

One of the primary areas of concern for the industry is the fee in lieu of accessible service. Information used at the June 2016 meeting did not reflect the current number of vehicles being used by Uber or the vehicles available to RideCo. In establishing a fee in lieu of accessible service, staff wanted to ensure that there is enough money in a fund in order to make improvements to accessible service while at the same time trying to keep expectations realistic. Staff had originally believed that a fee of \$50.00 would generate \$50,000 to a fund. Committee agreed however to a \$100.00 fee with an understanding that the fund would receive \$100,000. With the updated vehicle count, a \$100.00 fee will generate a fund of more than \$240,000. This amount of money did not appear to be in keeping with the Committee intent and the ridesharing companies were concerned. To address this concern staff is proposing a revision to the previously Committee approved fee schedule:

- a. Fleet size 1 to 499 = \$100 per vehicle annually
- b. Fleet size 500 to 999 = \$75 per vehicle annually
- c. Fleet size 1000+ = \$50 per vehicle annually

Staff is proposing the fee be applied on a sliding scale. The volume of vehicles will still allow for a reasonable fee to be collected for not supplying accessible services.

### **Licence Fees for Accessible Vehicles and Drivers have been reduced**

In order to ensure existing accessible service is not diminished, the proposed fees reduce the owner/vehicle fee to \$0. Driver fees have not been reduced as the driver can drive for either accessible or regular service. Previously there was a fee to upgrade a regular driver licence to accessible, however, this fee has been eliminated.

### **Special Event or Short Term Licenses**

The schedule introduces a thirty (30) day licence for Taxi Drivers and Owner/Vehicles. Originally staff had proposed a ninety (90) day licence. This address concerns brought forward from the industry for short duration licenses for emergency coverage and special events. Driver's Seat has also asked to have the ability to create a pool of drivers. This pool may not ever be highly utilized. Rather than trying to establish a pool, staff has proposed fees at a nominal rate.

### **Review of Fee Schedule in 12 Months**

Due to the unknown costs associated with the increased number of taxi-cabs in the Region, staff is recommending that the Licensing Fees Schedule be reviewed in twelve (12) months. This will ensure that fees collected properly offset the cost associated with maintaining and administering the Licensing program. This will include staffing for both operational, administrative and audit functions, equipment and computer software and hardware.

### **Recommendation:**

3. That the Region of Waterloo approve the proposed Licensing Fees as outlined in Appendix 'B' of Report PDL-CAS-16-13 date August, 17, 2016; and
4. That staff be directed to review the Licensing Fees in twelve (12) months from the implementation of the by-law to ensure that the fees collected offset Licensing & Enforcement operating and administrative costs.

### **UBER Does Not Support the Per Vehicle Fees**

On August 10, 2016 staff were contacted by UBER representatives. UBER once again expressed their concern over a per vehicle licensing fee and how it does not reflect the current rideshare transportation service model. Once again they stated that most service providers are part time and the average service provider is only on the application platform for three (3) months. UBER still maintains they wish to provide licensing fee payments based on a per trip model. This would be in line with the payment process approved for the cities of Ottawa, Toronto, Sudbury and the Region of Niagara. UBER wishes to apply a similar license fee payment structure throughout Ontario. The same per trip fee model would also be suggested for the "Fee in Lieu of Accessibility Services".

UBER has suggested they will provide fee guarantees based on projected trips that would offset the cost of licensing activities and provide any audit mechanisms required by the Region.

UBER has indicated that having to provide for a per vehicle or per driver licence fee (current recommendation) would not be supported by the company. UBER has

expressed that they are willing to provide whatever fee value the Region establishes but require it to be based on a per trip model to keep in line with their Ontario and Canadian business model.

RideCo has also indicated that a per trip fee for licensing is their preferred method of fee payment.

### **Alternative Fee Option – A per trip fee model**

This option would provide for a standard Brokerage fee based on the number of vehicles as set out in staff recommendations. In lieu of an Owner/vehicle and Driver fees a \$0.11 per trip fee would be charged. There would be no direct fee for Owner/Vehicle or Diver licenses. An estimate of the fees (fee guarantee) would be paid in advance based on projected ridership figures and verified at the end of each calendar year. The minimum fee paid would be based on the projections. If the trip projections were higher, than the difference would be paid, if the trip fees were lower than projected no refund would be given. The Broker would provide access to trip data in order to audit the trip numbers supplied.

The same per trip fee model would also be applied to the “Fee in Lieu of Accessible Services”. The model would have a \$.07 per trip fee applied for the “Fee in lieu of Accessible Service”.

This type of fee model is being proposed for Ottawa, Toronto, Niagara Region and Sudbury.

Below is an example for how the fees would be applied.

Fee	Example #1	Example #2
Broker Fee	\$300 (100 vehicles)	\$50,000 (1000+ vehicles)
Per trip Fee	\$11,000 (\$.11 x 100,000 trips)	\$143,000 (\$.11 x 1.3 million trips)
Owner/Vehicle Fee	\$0	\$0
Driver License	\$0	\$0
Fee in lieu pf accessible service	\$7,000 (\$.07 x 100,000 trips)	\$91,000 (\$.07 x 1.3 million trips)

### **Vehicle Identification**

In its June 2016 report, staff recommended that a decal of nine hundred (900) square centimeters be required as a minimum for all Taxi-cabs. After receiving feedback from

the industry staff have reconsidered this recommendation. The trademark branding and size of decals should be a minimum of two hundred (200) square centimeters based on industry feedback. The Region will require the placement of two (2) such decals. As long as the name or trademark of the Broker is visible from the outside of the vehicle by passengers, public and enforcement agencies this requirement would be satisfied with the new size requirement. The actual placement of the vehicle identification will be up to the individual companies/drivers.

**Recommendation:**

5. That the Region of Waterloo require Taxi-cabs to display two (2) decals, of a minimum size of two hundred (200) square centimeters each, in a location visible from the exterior of the Taxi-cab. The decals must display the name or trademark of the Taxi-cab Broker.

**Next Steps**

The following are the next steps for staff:

- a) **Finalization of the By-law** – A by-law has been prepared based upon the recommendations contained within this report. If Committee approves the recommendations in this report the by-law will move forward to the August 17, 2016 Council meeting. If Committee modifies the recommendations the by-law will be placed on the Council agenda on September 21, 2016.
- b) **Implementation** – Originally the proposed implementation date for the by-law was October. Staff is now proposing an implementation date of November 1 in order to provide adequate time to complete of a number of tasks that will need to be undertaken. The current computer system is being upgraded, education/information is being prepared for release to the public and stakeholders and administrative and enforcement practices are being reviewed.
- c) **Accessibility Fund** – Staff begin the process of establishing a working group to discuss the use of the fees collected from the fee in lieu of accessible services. Recommendations will be brought forward to a future meeting of the Licensing and Hearings Committee.

**Corporate Strategic Plan:**

The taxi by-law review is included in the Corporate Strategic Plan under Focus area 5 - ensure Regional programs and services are efficient, effective and is aligned with Focus area 4 – Enhance community safety and crime prevention. The by-law review was also identified in the Region's Service Review.

**Financial Implications:**

Currently the Region receives approximately \$180,000 in revenue annually from taxi licensing. It is anticipated an additional \$150,000 of revenue may be generated annually through licensing the new market entrants. Given the evolving nature of the taxi industry and the need to re-evaluate licence fees within one year of implementation, caution needs to be taken in anticipating actual revenues. Staff will continue to monitor both expenditures and revenues in anticipation of budget preparations for 2017 and 2018.

**Other Department Consultations/Concurrence:**

Legal Services and Finance have been consulted in the preparation of this report.

**Attachments**

Appendix A – Municipal In-Vehicle Camera Comparison

Appendix B – Proposed Fees Schedule

**Prepared By:** **K. Fletcher**, Regional Clerk/Director, Council and Administrative Services

**A. Apfelbaum**, Manager, Licensing and Enforcement Services

**Approved By:** **D. Arnold**, Acting Commissioner, Planning, Development and Legislative Services

### Schedule A

#### Municipal In-Vehicle Camera Comparison

Municipality	In-Car Camera Required for Metered Taxis	In-Car Camera Required for TNC/PTC/Rideshare/Auxiliary Taxi
Region of Waterloo	Staff recommending that In-car cameras be required if metered taxis supply flag/hail or taxi stand service.	Staff are recommending that In-car cameras are not required if the vehicle has a GPS
Toronto	Yes – by-law requirement	No
Ottawa	Yes – by-law requirement	No – But staff have been directed by Council to research less expensive and simplified in-car camera options and to analyse PTC complaints to determine if cameras are warranted.
Hamilton	Yes – by-law requirement	No
Mississauga	Yes – by-law requirement, also defines system requirements and specifications.	This sector is not currently licensed. A Sub-Committee meeting on August 18, 2016 may establish the “Pilot Project” parameters including whether in-car cameras are required.
Niagara Region	No	No
London	Yes – by-law requirement and includes limousines	This sector is not currently licensed. A report was submitted to Council on July 26, 2016. Staff recommended cameras but Council removed the requirement.
Sudbury	No	No
Edmonton	No	No

**Schedule B****Proposed Fee Schedule**

The following fees apply to both metered and auxiliary taxi unless specifically stipulated.

Type of Fee	New Application	Annual Renewal
<b>Taxi-cab Broker Fees</b>		
Taxi-cab Broker Fleet Size		
1 to 50	\$150	\$150
51 to 100	\$300	\$300
101 to 150	\$600	\$600
151 to 200	\$1200	\$1200
201 to 500 vehicles*	\$2400	\$2400
501 to 999 vehicles*	\$4800	\$4800
1000 to 2999 vehicles*	\$50000	\$50000
3000 or more	\$22 per vehicle	\$22 per vehicle
Reinstatement of Suspended Taxi-cab Broker Licence	\$1000	N/A
<b>Fee in Lieu of Accessible Services</b>		
1 to 499 vehicles	\$100 per vehicle	\$100 per vehicle
500 to 999 vehicles	\$75 per vehicle	\$75 per vehicle
1000 plus vehicles	\$50 per vehicle	\$50 per vehicle

Type of Fee	New Application	Annual Renewal
<b>Taxi-cab Owner/Vehicle Fees</b>		
<b>Metered Taxi</b>		
<b>Region issued</b> Taxi-cab Owner/Vehicle Licence- Metered Taxi Fleet Size 1- 999 Vehicles	\$600	\$300
<b>Broker Issued</b> Taxi-cab Owner/Vehicle Licence - Metered Taxi – Broker Issued Fleet Size 1- 999 Vehicles	\$300	\$150
<b>Broker Issued</b> Taxi-cab Owner/Vehicle Licence - Metered Taxi – Broker Issued Fleet Size: 1000 plus Vehicles *Fee charged for individual licenses over 999	\$40	\$40
<b>Auxiliary Taxes</b>		
<b>Region Issued</b> Taxi-cab Owner/Vehicle Licence – Auxiliary Taxi Fleet Size 1- 999 Vehicles	\$300	\$150
<b>Broker Issued</b> Taxi-cab Owner/Vehicle Licence – Auxiliary Taxi Fleet Size 1- 999 Vehicles	\$150	\$75
<b>Broker Issued</b> Taxi-cab Owner/Vehicle Licence – Auxiliary Taxi Fleet Size - 1000 plus vehicles *Fee charged for individual licenses over 999	\$40	\$40

<b>Type of Fee</b>	<b>New Application</b>	<b>Annual Renewal</b>
<b>Accessible Vehicles</b>		
Taxi-cab Owner/Vehicle Licence – Accessible	\$0	\$0
<b>Special or Short term Licences</b>		
30 Day Taxi-cab Owner/Vehicle License (meter or auxiliary)	\$60	N/A
<b>Metered Taxi Spare Vehicles</b>		
Spare Vehicle– Metered Taxi-cab	\$200	\$100
Broker Issued Spare Vehicle – Metered Taxi-cab	\$100	\$50
<b>Other Vehicle Fees</b>		
Late Renewal Fee – Owner/vehicle	n/a	\$45
Reinstatement of Suspended Taxi-cab Owner/Vehicle Licence	\$200	N/A
Transfer of Sponsor – Taxi-cab Owner/Vehicle	\$45	N/A

<b>Type of Licence</b>	<b>New Application</b>	<b>Annual Renewal</b>
<b>Taxi-cab Drivers Fees</b>		
Region Issued Taxi-cab Driver Licence Fleet size 1 to 999 vehicles	\$120	\$100
Broker Issued Taxi-cab Driver Licence Fleet size 1 to 999 vehicles	\$60	\$50
Broker Issued Taxi-cab Driver Licence Fleet size 1000 plus vehicles *Fee charged for individual licenses over 999	\$10	\$10
<b>Accessible Fees</b>		
Taxi-cab Driver Licence Upgrade to Accessible	\$0	N/A
<b>Special or Short term Licenses</b>		
30 Day Taxi-cab Driver License	\$15	N/A
<b>Other Driver Fees</b>		
Late Renewal Fee – Taxi-cab Driver		\$45
Reinstatement of Suspended Taxi-cab Driver Licence	\$200	
Transfer of Sponsor or Additional Sponsor – Taxi-cab Driver	\$45	N/A

Type of Fee	New Application	Annual Renewal
<b>Other Fees</b>		
<b>Taxi-cab Meter Fees</b>		
Taxi Meter Test and Seal	\$45	N/A
Taxi Meter Re-Test and Seal	\$45	N/A
<b>Taxi-cab Permit/Plate Fees</b>		
Vehicle Permit/Plate	Cost plus 15% administration	
Replacement Vehicle Permit/Plate	Cost plus 15% administration	
Replacement documentation including driver, vehicle, driver licences	\$25	

\*Fees for new applications will be prorated based on 12 calendar months