



The following *draft* Minutes of the meeting of the Toronto Police Services Board held on September 15, 2016 are subject to adoption at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

The Minutes of the meeting held on August 18, 2016, previously circulated in draft form, were approved by the Toronto Police Services Board at its meeting held on September 15, 2016.

MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING of the Toronto Police Services Board held on **SEPTEMBER 15, 2016** at 1:00 PM in the Auditorium, 40 College Street, Toronto, Ontario.

PRESENT:

Mr. Andrew Pringle, Chair
Mr. Chin Lee, Councillor & Vice-Chair
Ms. Marie Moliner, Member
Mr. John Tory, Mayor & Member
Mr. Ken Jeffers, Member

ABSENT:

Ms. Shelley Carroll, Councillor & Member
Dr. Dhun Noria, Member

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. Mark Saunders, Chief of Police
Mr. Karl Druckman, City of Toronto - Legal Services Division
Ms. Deirdre Williams, Board Administrator

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

#P208. VICTIM SERVICES TORONTO

The Board was in receipt of correspondence dated August 15, 2016 from Bobbie McMurrich, Associate Executive Director, Victim Services Toronto, regarding Victim Services Toronto. A copy of the correspondence is appended to this Minute for information.

Ms. McMurrich and Ms. Bonnie Levine, Executive Director, Victim Services Toronto, were in attendance and delivered a presentation to the Board about Victim Services Toronto and, specifically, the new Family Access Services Toronto (F.A.S.T.) program. A copy of materials provided to the Board regarding Victim Services Toronto is on file in the Board office.

The Board received correspondence and presentation.

Moved by: M. Moliner
Seconded by: C. Lee

Toronto Police Services Board August 15, 2016

Re: September 15, 2016 Victim Services Toronto deputation

Dear Chair Pringle, Mayor Tory and Directors,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a deputation during the September 15, 2016 board meeting.

Victim Services Toronto and the Toronto Police Service have worked in close partnership for over 25 years. During that time our organizations have strived to evolve with the ever changing needs and vulnerabilities of the diverse community we serve.

Our organizations are linked by the common goal to ensure that victims, witnesses and their families receive support and assistance. During the September 15, 2016 Toronto Police Services Board meeting Bonnie Levine, our Executive Director and I will present on the emerging and vital vision of Victim Services Toronto; to increase access for victims and witnesses. Further, it is our intention to outline our largest program, the Victim Crisis Response Program which is essential to the recovery of individuals and families in the city of Toronto victimized by crime or sudden tragedy and the F.A.S.T Program, our centralized case management model for victims of domestic violence.

The Victim Services Toronto deputation content:

1. The 24/7 Victim Crisis Response Program: The **only** 24/7 program of its kind in the city of Toronto. The largest of Victim Services Toronto programs, The Victim Crisis Response Program responds immediately by phone or on scene to requests of assistance for victims or witnesses of crime or sudden tragedy and their families. It is an exceptionally fast paced program that requires extraordinary skill and knowledge. Its function is to provide urgent safety and practical assistance to victims and their families immediately following the crime or sudden tragedy and refer or link victims to resources and services in the community. Additionally, this program triages particularly vulnerable and marginalized clients to the Victim Services Toronto's centralized case management programs. The vast majority of individuals and families are referred by the Toronto Police Service primary response units, divisional and specialized unit detectives however; victims may self-refer and other organizations may refer. The Victim Crisis Response Program consists of two social workers and two trained community volunteers. One social worker is paired with a volunteer to respond on scene to an incident. This allows for a second team of one social

worker and one volunteer to be available to respond on scene to another situation or to remain at the office providing follow up calls to existing clients.

2. Family Access Services Toronto (F.A.S.T.) Funded by the Department of Justice Canada:

While the VST case management programs are centralized, located out of TPS HQ responding city-wide, F.A.S.T. is a localized case management model currently being replicated in 23 Division. F.A.S.T. is the second phase of The Scarborough Family Justice Initiative, a pilot project that was operational in 41 Division from 2012 to 2014.

Phase 1: The Scarborough Family Justice Initiative (S.F.J.I.) funded by the Department of Justice Canada
November 1 2012-October 31 2014:

The vision of the S.F.J.I was to deliver an innovative model of service delivery that would bridge justice and social service sectors for victims of domestic violence and their families. The objective was to increase access to justice and social service sectors for vulnerable and marginalized communities and increase system efficiencies.

The Toronto Police Service (TPS) and Victim Services Toronto (VST) were the lead organizations in collaboration with justice and social service partners for the S.F.J.I. The project operated in Toronto Police Service's 41 Division and the comparator (or control division) was 43 Division. The threshold for victim admission to the project was that the offender must have been charged with a criminal code offence (or a warrant is sought for the offender), in a domestic violence event. Each victim and their children were introduced to an Advocate (two social workers employed by Victim Services Toronto) by the investigator after their statement was taken. The two Advocates hours mirrored the Youth and Family Violence detectives Monday to Friday 7am to 10pm for ease of access for the detectives to refer and for the victims to receive timely assistance. After hours victims were referred to the Victim Crisis Response Program for immediate assistance and the Advocates took over the cases the next business day. The Advocate assumed all social work functions and coordinated services with a multidisciplinary team of professionals.

Project Evaluation:

Research was conducted pro bono by Dr. Susan Silver, Social Work Department, Ryerson University. Project evaluation was conducted by Jonquil Eyre, an independent consultant. Interim findings demonstrate the following:

- The Project created system efficiency for TPS & partners that did not previously exist thus increasing capacity for all justice partners
- An increase in engagement of the victims in the criminal investigation
- Cases in which the client has taken up the service have resolved 30% faster in the criminal court
- Clients are more successfully achieving their goals as a result of the S.F.J.I.
- Over 60% are newcomers & 68% were identified as racialized
- Interviews of victims who conducted by Dr. Susan Silver of victims

Phase 2: F.A.S.T. November 1, 2014 ~ March 31, 2017

The Department of Justice Canada approved funding for Phase 2 for the period of April 1 2015 to March 31, 2017. Victim Services Toronto is incredibly grateful to the Toronto Police Services Board for providing bridge funding for the period of November 1, 2014 to March 31, 2015. It is because of your generosity the continuity of the project was maintained and we were able to retain the two incredibly skilled Advocates.

F.A.S.T. is currently operational in 23 Division. The vision and victim admission are the same as they were for the S.F.J.I. In addition, F.A.S.T. implements lessons learned during the F.S.F.I. such as the necessity of a mobile response to increase access for vulnerable victims.

Interim Evaluation Findings:

- F.A.S.T. increases capacity for all partner organizations including the TPS, social services, and the Criminal Courts
- The F.A.S.T. flexible and mobile response is critical to clients engaging in services and the criminal justice system
- F.A.S.T. reduces barriers to accessing services and increases access to up to date information regarding the criminal court process
- F.A.S.T. results in clients and their children's safety being "managed" more effectively
- As a result of F.A.S.T. clients are receiving critical services such as safety planning faster

- F.A.S.T. bridges the client to services by helping to reduce stress and increase comfort when meeting new service providers
- Services are better informed about each other's roles and challenges which helps identify and address service gaps

Phase 3: F.A.S.T. Expansion April 2017

In keeping with the demonstrated effectiveness of this model of service delivery VST proposes to expand F.A.S.T. to five TPS districts and expand to include victims of crimes most significant in each area in addition to victims of domestic violence and their families. Additionally, we would like to explore the feasibility of this model with the Sex Crimes Unit and the Homicide Unit.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this information at the September Board meeting.

With appreciation,
Bobbie McMurrich
Bobbie McMurrich
Associate Executive Director
Victim Services Toronto

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P209. CHIEF'S ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION INTO THE CUSTODY
INJURIES TO THOMAS VARDEN**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 18, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police:

**Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody
Injuries to Mr. Thomas Varden**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Board receive the following report.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

Background / Purpose:

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) is notified of an incident involving serious injury or death, provincial legislation directs that a chief of police shall conduct an administrative investigation.

Ontario Regulation 267/10, Section 11(1) states:

"The chief of police shall also cause an investigation to be conducted forthwith into any incident with respect to which the S.I.U. has been notified, subject to the S.I.U.'s lead role in investigating the incident."

Section 11(2) of the Regulation states:

"The purpose of the chief of police's investigation is to review the policies of or services provided by the police force and the conduct of its police officers."

Section 11(4) of the Regulation states:

“The chief of police of a municipal police force shall report his or her findings and any action taken or recommended to be taken to the board within 30 days after the S.I.U. director advises the chief of police that he or she has reported the results of the S.I.U.’s investigation to the Attorney General, and the board may make the chief of police’s report available to the public.”

Upon conclusion of their investigation, the S.I.U. provides the Toronto Police Service (Service) with a letter. The S.I.U. does not provide the Service with a copy of the report that was provided to the Attorney General.

Discussion:

On September 16, 2015, at approximately 0746 hours, uniformed officers from 14 Division Primary Response Unit responded to a call for service at an address on Fort York Boulevard, for “*Unknown Trouble*”. Initial information indicated that two males were engaged in a possible domestic assault. Further information indicated that one male, who was naked, may have ingested crystal methamphetamine and was acting in a bizarre, violent and delusional manner. The naked male had made his way out onto the balcony and the second male had secured the balcony door, preventing him from re-entering the apartment.

The naked male, who was later identified as Mr. Thomas Varden, began scaling the adjacent balconies along one of the upper floors and throwing things to the ground below. Mr. Varden then entered one of the units via an unlocked balcony door and made his way through the apartment before exiting into the hallway.

Officers arrived on scene and initiated tactical communication with Mr. Varden in an attempt to de-escalate the situation. Upon being advised he was being apprehended, Mr. Varden became combative towards the officers, flailing his arms and then grabbing the butt of the firearm belonging to one of the officers. Fearing that she was going to be disarmed, the officer punched Mr. Varden in the face with a closed fist causing his nose to bleed profusely. Both officers were then able to take him to the ground where the struggle continued until the arrival of other officers who assisted in handcuffing Mr. Varden.

The male was displaying the characteristics of excited delirium and was eventually sedated by Toronto Paramedic Services before being transported to hospital for examination. At 1354 hours, it was determined that Mr. Varden had sustained a bilateral fracture to his nasal bone (broken nose).

The S.I.U. was notified and invoked its mandate.

In a letter to the Service dated May 18, 2016, Director Tony Loparco of the S.I.U. advised that this investigation was complete, the file had been closed and no further action was contemplated.

Summary of the Service's Investigation:

The Professional Standards Support Unit conducted an investigation pursuant to *Ontario Regulation 267/10*.

The S.I.U. had designated two officers as subject officers in its investigation and eight additional officers as witnesses and the Professional Standards Support Unit examined the use of force and the injury sustained in relation to the applicable legislation, Service procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The Professional Standards Support Unit investigation reviewed the following Service procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest)
- Procedure 06-04 (Emotionally Disturbed Persons)
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies)
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Procedure 13-17 (Memorandum Books and Reports)
- Procedure 15-01 (Use of Force)
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury / Illness Reporting)
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System)

The Professional Standards Support Unit investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- *Police Services Act* Section 113 (Special Investigations)
- *Ontario Regulation 267/10* (Conduct and Duties of Police Officers Respecting Investigations by the Special Investigations Unit)
- *Ontario Regulation 926* Section 14.2 (Use of Force Qualifications)

The Professional Standards Support Unit investigation determined that Service procedures associated with the applied use of force were found to be lawful, in keeping with current legislation and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

Acting Deputy Chief Richard Stubbings, Operational Support Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board members may have regarding this report.

The Board received the foregoing report.

Moved by: J. Tory
Seconded by: C. Lee

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P210. CHIEF'S ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION INTO THE ALLEGED
SEXUAL ASSAULT BY COMPLAINANT 2016-E**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 18, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police:

**Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Alleged
Sexual Assault Complainant 2016-E**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Board receive the following report.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

Background / Purpose:

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) is notified of an incident involving serious injury or death, provincial legislation directs that a chief of police shall conduct an administrative investigation.

Ontario Regulation 267/10, section 11(1) states:

"The chief of police shall also cause an investigation to be conducted forthwith into any incident with respect to which the S.I.U. has been notified, subject to the S.I.U.'s lead role in investigating the incident."

Section 11(2) of the Regulation states:

"The purpose of the chief of police's investigation is to review the policies of or services provided by the police force and the conduct of its police officers."

Section 11(4) of the Regulation states:

"The chief of police of a municipal police force shall report his or her findings and any action taken or recommended to be taken to the board within 30 days after the S.I.U. director advises the chief of police that he or she has reported the results of the S.I.U.'s

investigation to the Attorney General, and the board may make the chief of police's report available to the public."

Upon conclusion of its investigation, the S.I.U. provides the Toronto Police Service (Service) with a letter. The S.I.U. does not provide the Service with a copy of the report that was provided to the Attorney General.

Discussion:

On July 26, 2015, at 0006 hours, police officers from 14 Division Primary Response Unit responded to a radio call at Toronto Western Hospital for a report of a Sexual Assault.

Once on scene, they met with a case worker who reported that one of her patients, Sexual Assault Complainant 2016-E (2016-E), had reported that she had been sexually assaulted by police officers.

The officers spoke with 2016-E in the company of her case worker. She told the officers that she had been at College Park in an atrium area on July 24, 2015, after consuming alcohol and crystal meth in another area of the city.

2016-E had been told to leave by security personnel and did not do so. She said police attended, pinned her to the ground and sexually assaulted her. She remembered being placed in restraints and transported to the Toronto Western Hospital.

The S.I.U. was notified and invoked its mandate.

A check of the Service database revealed that there was no record of police contact with 2016-E on July 24, 2015, or in the few days leading up to her allegation.

In a letter to the Service dated May 10, 2016, Acting Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised that this investigation was complete, the file had been closed and no further action was contemplated.

Summary of the Service's Investigation:

The Professional Standards Support Unit conducted an investigation pursuant to Ontario Regulation 267/10.

The Professional Standards Support investigation examined the use of force in relation to the applicable legislation, Service procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The Professional Standards Support investigation reviewed the following Service procedures:

- Procedure 05-05 (Sexual Assault)

- Procedure 06-04 (Emotionally Disturbed Persons)
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies)
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Procedure 15-01 (Use of Force)

The Professional Standards Support investigations also reviewed the following legislation:

- *Police Services Act* section 113 (Special Investigations)
- *Ontario Regulation 267/10* (Conduct and Duties of Police Officers Respecting Investigations by the Special Investigations Unit)
- Ontario Regulation 926 section 14.2 (Use of Force Qualifications)

The Professional Standards Support investigation determined that Service procedures associated with the applied use of force were found to be lawful, in keeping with current legislation and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined procedures required modification.

Acting Deputy Chief Richard Stubbings, Operational Support Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board members may have regarding this report.

The Board received the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: M. Moliner

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P211. CHIEF'S ADMINISTRATIVE INVESTIGATION INTO THE ALLEGED
SEXUAL ASSAULT BY COMPLAINANT 2016-F**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 18, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police:

**Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Alleged
Sexual Assault Complainant 2016-F**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Board receive the following report.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

Background / Purpose:

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) is notified of an incident involving serious injury or death, provincial legislation directs that a chief of police shall conduct an administrative investigation.

Ontario Regulation 267/10, section 11(1) states:

"The chief of police shall also cause an investigation to be conducted forthwith into any incident with respect to which the S.I.U. has been notified, subject to the S.I.U.'s lead role in investigating the incident."

Section 11(2) of the Regulation states:

"The purpose of the chief of police's investigation is to review the policies of or services provided by the police force and the conduct of its police officers."

Section 11(4) of the Regulation states:

"The chief of police of a municipal police force shall report his or her findings and any action taken or recommended to be taken to the board within 30 days after the S.I.U. director advises the chief of police that he or she has reported the results of the S.I.U.'s

investigation to the Attorney General, and the board may make the chief of police's report available to the public."

Upon conclusion of its investigation, the S.I.U. provides the Toronto Police Service (Service) with a letter. The S.I.U. does not provide the Service with a copy of the report that was provided to the Attorney General.

Discussion:

On December 30, 2014, at 0115 hours, police officers from 31 Division Primary Response Unit attended the address of 705-5 Needle Firway, Toronto, in regards to a See Ambulance call. A male had called seeking assistance to get up from the ground.

The officers arrived on scene with Toronto Paramedic Services (Paramedics) and located an obviously intoxicated male, later identified as Sexual Assault Complainant 2016-F (2016-F), on the floor of the lobby. He was medically cleared by Paramedics and upon confirming his identity it was revealed that 2016-F had a recognizance not to be near that residence.

2016-F was arrested for Fail to Comply with Recognizance and was transported to 31 Division where he was held for a Show Cause Hearing. Due to 2016-F's past history, a Level 3 search was authorized and conducted. He was charged and later pled guilty to the offence of Fail to Comply with a Judicial Order.

On July 24, 2015, the Service was notified that 2016-F was alleging that he had been sexually and physically assaulted by arresting officers during the search.

The S.I.U. was notified and invoked its mandate.

In a letter to the Service dated May 10, 2016, Acting Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised that the investigation was complete, the file had been closed and no further action was contemplated.

Summary of the Service's Investigation:

The Professional Standards Support Unit conducted an investigation pursuant to *Ontario Regulation 267/10*, section 11.

The Professional Standards Support investigation examined the use of force and the injury sustained in relation to the applicable legislation, Service procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The Professional Standards Support investigation reviewed the following Service procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest)

- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons)
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody)
- Procedure 05-05 (Sexual Assault)
- Procedure 06-04 (Emotionally Disturbed Persons)
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies)
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Procedure 15-01 (Use of Force)

The Professional Standards Support investigations also reviewed the following legislation:

- *Police Services Act* section 113 (Special Investigations)
- *Ontario Regulation 267/10* (Conduct and Duties of Police Officers Respecting Investigations by the Special Investigations Unit)
- Ontario Regulation 926 section 14.2 (Use of Force Qualifications)

The Professional Standards Support investigation determined that Service procedures associated with the applied use of force were found to be lawful, in keeping with current legislation and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined procedures required modification.

Acting Deputy Chief Richard Stubbings, Operational Support Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board members may have regarding this report.

The Board received the foregoing report.

Moved by: M. Moliner
Seconded by: K. Jeffers

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P212. CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION – TORONTO
POLICE SERVICE 2016 TO 2025 REVISED CAPITAL PROGRAM
REQUEST**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle,
Chair:

**Subject: CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL – TORONTO POLICE
SERVICE 2016 TO 2025 REVISED CAPITAL PROGRAM REQUEST**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Board receive this report.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the Board's consideration of this report.

Background/Purpose:

City Council, at its meeting on July 12, 13, 14 and 15, 2016 considered and adopted a recommendation from Executive Committee with respect to a request from the Toronto Police Services Board that the City of Toronto revise the Toronto Police Service capital program.

The motion is available at this link:

[Agenda Item History - 2016.EX16.42](#)

Discussion:

In considering this matter, City Council adopted the following:

1. City Council amend the Toronto Police Service 2016 Capital Budget by replacing \$1.000 million of approved debt funding with \$1.000 million of eligible Development Charge funding, for the 2016 Peer to Peer Additional Cost sub-project, in order to reduce 2016 debt from \$22.586 million to \$21.586 million, with no change to the Toronto Police Service Capital cash flow of \$39.320 million approved for 2016.

The Board received the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: M. Moliner

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P213. CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION – COMMUNITY
POLICING PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM (CPP) GRANT AMENDING
AGREEMENT**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle,
Chair:

**Subject: CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL – COMMUNITY POLICING
PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM (CPP) GRANT AMENDING AGREEMENT**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Board receive this report.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the Board's consideration of this report.

Background/Purpose:

City Council, at its meeting on July 12, 13, 14 and 15, 2016 considered and adopted a recommendation from Executive Committee with respect to authorizing the City of Toronto to enter into an amending agreement to the CPP Agreement between the Province of Ontario and the Toronto Police Services Board.

Under the CPP Program, the Toronto Police Service (Service) receives grant funding of up to \$7.53 million annually to cover a portion (\$30,000 per officer) of the salaries and benefits of up to 251 officers. Although the program has been on-going, a formal agreement is entered into every two years. This year, the Province has provided a commitment for a one-year agreement only, with no further commitment for funding under the program at this time. Revenue of \$7.53 million is built into the Service budget each year for the CPP grant program. In order to maximize the amount of funding received under this grant, the Service must maintain its uniform staffing levels at a pre-determined benchmark of at least 5,180 officers. Uniform staffing levels have been maintained above this benchmark every year since the inception of the CPP Program in 1998 and the uniform strength for the duration of this grant term, which ends March 31, 2017, is projected to continue to exceed the benchmark.

The motion is available at this link:

[Agenda Item History - 2016.EX16.44](#)

Discussion:

In considering this matter, City Council adopted the following:

1. City Council authorize the City of Toronto to sign the Amending Agreement to the Community Policing Partnership (CPP) Agreement with the Province and the Toronto Police Services Board, subject to approval as to form by the City Solicitor.

Conclusion:

I recommend that the Board receive this report.

The Board received the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: K. Jeffers

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P214. CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION – SAFER
COMMUNITIES 1,000 OFFICERS PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM GRANT
AMENDING AGREEMENT**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair:

**Subject: CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL – SAFER COMMUNITIES
1,000 OFFICERS PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM GRANT AMENDING
AGREEMENT**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Board receive this report.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the Board's consideration of this report.

Background/Purpose:

City Council, at its meeting on July 12, 13, 14 and 15, 2016 considered and adopted a recommendation from Executive Committee with respect to authorizing the City of Toronto to enter into an amending agreement to the Safer Communities 1,000 Officers Partnership Program Agreement with the Province and the Toronto Police Services Board.

Under the Safer Communities – 1,000 Officers Partnership Program, the Toronto Police Service (Service) may receive grant funding of up to \$8.75 million annually to cover a portion (\$35,000 per officer) of the salaries and benefits of up to 250 officers. Although the program has been on-going, a formal agreement is entered into every two years. This year, the Province has provided a commitment for a one-year agreement only, with no further commitment for funding under the program at this time.

Revenue is built into the Service budget each year for this grant program. In order to maximize the amount of funding received under the grant, the Service must maintain its uniform staffing levels at a predetermined benchmark of at least 5,510 officers. Due to declining numbers of uniform officers, with few or no replacements being made, the Service no longer meets the requirements to obtain full funding under the grant. With further separations of uniform members anticipated, and no plans to hire further uniform

recruits in 2016, it is expected that the claim for period of the Amending Agreement will be less than half of the \$8.75M funding available (amount claimed will vary depending on the number of uniform separations). However, discussions are ongoing with the Province to negotiate changes to the terms and conditions of the Agreement that would allow the Service to maximize the claim under the grant program.

The motion is available at this link:

[Agenda Item History - 2016.EX16.45](#)

Discussion:

In considering this matter, City Council adopted the following:

City Council authorize the City of Toronto to sign the Amending Agreement to the Safer Communities - 1,000 Officers Partnership Program Agreement with the Province and the Toronto Police Services Board, subject to approval as to form by the City Solicitor.

The Board received the foregoing report.

Moved by: M. Moliner
Seconded by: C. Lee

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P215. QUARTERLY REPORT: TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD
SPECIAL FUND UNAUDITED STATEMENT: APRIL TO JUNE 2016**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 23, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair:

**Subject: Quarterly Report: Toronto Police Services Board Special
Fund Unaudited Statement: April to June 2016**

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Board receive the report on the Toronto Police Services Board's Special Fund un-audited statement for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

Background / Purpose:

As required by the Toronto Police Services Board (T.P.S.B.) Special Fund policy (Board Minute #P292/10) expenditures for the Special Fund shall be reported to the Board on a quarterly basis. This report is provided in accordance with such directive. The T.P.S.B. remains committed to promoting transparency and accountability in the area of finance.

Discussion:

Enclosed is the un-audited statement of receipts and disbursements with respect to the Toronto Police Services Board's Special Fund for the period April 01 to June 30, 2016.

As at June 30, 2016, the balance in the Special Fund was \$1,414,670. During the second quarter, the Special Fund recorded receipts of \$34,430 and disbursements of \$463,603. There has been a net decrease of \$540,502 against the December 31, 2015 fund balance of \$1,955,172.

Auction proceeds have been estimated for the months of April to June 2016 as the actual deposits have not yet been made.

For this quarter, the Board approved and disbursed the following sponsorships:

Sponsorship	Total Amount
International Auxiliary Conference & 50 Anniversary	\$60,000
Community Police Liaison Committee (C.P.L.C.)	\$30,000
Toronto Crime Stoppers Symposium	\$25,000
Arts Etobicoke	\$12,000
United Way	\$10,000
Ontario Special Olympics	\$10,000
Cricket Across the Pond	\$10,000
Toronto Caribbean Carnival Kick off 2016	\$10,000
Annual Community Police Consultative Conference	\$8,500
One District Street Referral Pilot Project	\$7,000
National Aboriginal Day	\$5,000
Toronto Regional Board of Trade	\$4,000
Pride Reception 2016	\$3,000
Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer, (L.G.B.T.Q.) 2016	\$3,000
Toronto Police Service- Health & Safety Awareness	\$2,000
L.G.B.T.Q. Mural	\$2,000
Association of Black Law Enforcers	\$1,200

The following unused sponsorship funds were returned:

Unused Sponsorship Funds	Total Amount
Black History Month	\$159

In addition, the Board approved and disbursed the following:

Disbursed Funds	Total Amount
Transformation Task Force	\$237,773
Recognition of Service Members	\$2,845
Recognition of Community Members	\$2,411

Conclusion:

As required by Toronto Police Services Board Special Fund policy, it is recommended that the Board receive the attached report.

The Board received the foregoing report.

Moved by: K. Jeffers
Seconded by: C. Lee

Attachment A

The Toronto Police Services Board Special Fund 2016 Second Quarter Results With Initial Projections								
Particulars	Initial Projection 2016	January 01 to March 31, 2016	April 01 to June 30, 2016	July 01 to September 30, 2016	October 1 to December 31, 2016	January 01 to December 31, 2016 Totals	January 01 to December 31, 2015 Actual	Comments Relating To This Quarter
Recognition Of Service Members								
Awards	115,000	11,000	3,475	0	0	14,475	74,196	
Catering	25,000	0	1,343	0	0	1,343	37,357	
Return Of Unused Funding	0	0	(1,974)	0	0	(1,974)	0	Crossing Guard Long Service awards
Recognition Of Community Members								
Awards	5,000	889	1,258	0	0	2,147	1,884	
Catering	4,000	0	1,153	0	0	1,153	1,928	
Recognition Of Board Members								
Awards	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Catering	1,000	0	0	0	0	0	5,353	
Conferences								
Community Police Liaison Committees	8,500	0	0	0	0	0	8,500	
Ontario Association Of Police Services Board	7,500	0	7,500	0	0	7,500	0	Support for Spring Conference
Canadian Association Of Police Governance	10,000	0	5,000	0	0	5,000	7,500	Support for Annual Conference
Funds Returned - Conferences								
Community Police Liaison Committees	0	0	0	0	0	0	(992)	
Donations - In Memoriam	800	100	100	0	0	200	0	
Toronto Police Services Board and Toronto Police Association Retirement Dinner	10,500	0	0	0	0	0	6,101	
Dinner Tickets	6,000	0	0	0	0	0	4,050	
Professional Fees	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Internal Control Review Fee	7,042	0	0	0	0	0	7,042	
Other Expenses	780,000	0	237,773	0	0	237,773	29,268	K.P.M.G.- Transformation Task Force Production, Design & Printing of Transformation Task Force Interim Report
Total Disbursements	1,390,842	139,489	463,603	0	0	603,093	636,356	
Special Fund Balance	1,003,830	1,843,843	1,414,670	1,414,670	1,414,670	1,414,670	1,955,172	

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P216. NEW BOARD POLICY – PLACEMENT OF ATTEMPTED OR
THREATENED SUICIDE INFORMATION ON THE CANADIAN POLICE
INFORMATION CENTRE (CPIC) SYSTEM**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 22, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair:

Subject: New Board Policy – Placement of Attempted or Threatened Suicide Information on the Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) system.

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Board approve the attached policy entitled “Placement of Attempted or Threatened Suicide Information on the Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) system.”

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation in this report.

Background / Purpose:

In April 2014, the former Information and Privacy Commissioner, Ann Cavoukian, publicly released an investigative report entitled Crossing the Line: the Indiscriminate Disclosure of Attempted Suicide Information to U.S. Border Patrol via CPIC. This report was initiated by the Information and Privacy Commission (IPC) as a result of complaints from Canadians who believed they were refused entry to the United States because there was information on the Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) system that they had been apprehended by the Toronto Police Service (the Service) under the *Mental Health Act of Ontario* for attempting or threatening to commit suicide. At the time, this information was generally accessible to U.S. Customs and Border Protection through CPIC from the Special Interest Police (SIP) category.

In June of 2014, the IPC served a notice of application for judicial review to the Board and the Service to prohibit the disclosure of information pertaining to attempted or threatened suicide on the CPIC database, except in limited circumstances.

Following the release of the IPC report and its associated recommendations, the Service conducted a comprehensive review of current business practices related to SIP entries for attempt/threaten suicides on CPIC. The Service’s review resulted in a number of changes to its existing practices. Concurrently, the legal action prompted

numerous discussions between the RCMP, the IPC and the Service, with respect to this issue.

At its The Board considered the issue again at its meeting of August 20, 2015. (Min. No. P213/15 refers.)

At that time, the Board approved a number of Motions, including the following: that given that the Board was satisfied with the revised TPS practices with respect to this issue, “the Board endorse those practices and direct the Chair to develop a Board policy on the placement of attempted suicide information on CPIC, which incorporates the principles included in the above-noted report of the Chief.”

Discussion:

As a result, Board staff, in consultation with City of Toronto, Legal Services Division, have drafted a Board policy based on these principles. The development of the policy was delayed as legal negotiations continued. Further discussions between the IPC and the Service took place, resulting in additional amendments to and clarifications of the Service’s practices. As previously reported, one of the criteria for SIP entries is individuals who have been apprehended under s.17 of the *Mental Health Act* and a Form 1 issued. Legal Services advised the Board at its August 15, 2015 meeting that Form 1s are issued for a number of reasons, not only for attempted suicides. The TPS has since clarified, and advise that their practice is to only record Form 1 situations where an individual has attempted or threatened suicide. TPS has also clarified that one criteria for the renewal of a record is arrest for an offence involving the use of serious violence or harm in the two years proceeding when the record would otherwise have expired. In that case, the SIP record would be extended for another two years. These clarifications are reflected in the attached policy.

In May of this year, the IPC withdrew the judicial review application, as it was satisfied with the new process developed by the Service.

I am pleased with the new process that has been developed as I believe that it balances public safety with individuals’ privacy rights in an important and sensitive issue of public interest.

Conclusion:

Therefore, it is recommended that the Board approve the attached policy entitled “Placement of Attempted or Threatened Suicide Information on the Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) system.”

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: K. Jeffers
Seconded by: C. Lee



TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD

PLACEMENT OF ATTEMPTED OR THREATENED SUICIDE INFORMATION ON THE CANADIAN POLICE INFORMATION CENTRE (CPIC) SYSTEM

DATE APPROVED	July 20, 2001	Minute No: P198/01
DATE(S) AMENDED	November 15, 2010	Minute No: P292/10
DATE REVIEWED	November 15, 2010	Minute No: P292/10
REPORTING REQUIREMENT		
LEGISLATION	<i>Police Services Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.15, as amended, s. 31(1)(c). Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.56, s. 31(1)(f). Mental Health Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. M.7</i>	
DERIVATION		

It is the policy of the Toronto Police Services Board that:

1. The Chief of Police will develop procedures to ensure that suicide information recorded in the Special Interest Police (SIP) category on CPIC is entered and disclosed only when it meets the criteria as detailed in this policy.
2. With respect to disclosure to U.S. CPIC users, the Chief of Police will develop procedures that ensure that disclosure is restricted to only those entries that meet one of the following four suicide-related SIP criteria:
 - a) The suicide attempt/threat involved the threat of serious violence or harm, or the actual use of serious violence or harm, directed at other individuals; or
 - b) The suicide attempt/threat could reasonably be considered to be an intentional provocation of a lethal response by the police; or
 - c) The individual involved had a history of serious violence or harm to others; or
 - d) The suicide attempt occurred while the individual was in police custody.
3. With respect to disclosure to Canadian CPIC users, the Chief of Police will develop procedures that, in addition to the four criteria listed above, also include the following additional suicide-related SIP criterion; the individual who has

attempted or threatened suicide has been apprehended under Section 17 of the *Mental Health Act* and a Form 1 has been issued.

4. The Chief of Police will develop procedures regarding the renewal of SIP attempted suicide records. Such procedures will provide for the renewal of records to be considered every two years, based upon the criteria set out in paragraphs 2 and 3 above and upon the passage of time, the age of the person at the time of the incident and other relevant and material information. The procedures will ensure that if the subject has been arrested for an offence involving the use of serious violence or harm in the two years preceding when the record would otherwise expire, the SIP is to be extended for another two years.
5. The Chief of Police will develop a clear and transparent process to seek the removal of any information on CPIC-related to a threat of suicide or attempted suicide. Such a process will take into account the criteria as set out in paragraphs 2 and 3 above, as well as the age of the incident, the age of the applicant at the time of the incident, all information available to the Toronto Police Service that relates to the applicant, details of the incident and any relevant information provided by the applicant or his/her representative.

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P217. CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION – 2017 BUDGET
PROCESS – BUDGET DIRECTIONS AND SCHEDULE**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 24, 2016 from Andy Pringle,
Chair:

**Subject: CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL – 2017 BUDGET PROCESS-
BUDGET DIRECTIONS AND SCHEDULE**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that

1. the Board forward this report to the Chief of Police for information,
2. the Board convene its Budget Committee comprised of Chair Pringle, Councillor Carroll and any interested Board Members, to consider proposed operating and capital programs from the Toronto Police Service, Toronto Police Services Board and Parking Enforcement Unit; and,
3. the Board forward a copy of this report to the City's Budget Committee, the City Manager and the Chief Financial Officer and request that they accept the submission of the Board's approved budget estimates following the Board meeting scheduled for October 20, 2016.

Financial Implications:

The City's motions establish an operating budget reduction target for the Toronto Police Service, the Toronto Police Services Board and the Parking Enforcement Unit in the amount of -2.6% net below the 2016 approved net operating budgets. The implications for the Service, Board and Parking budgets will be considered during the Board's Budget Committee deliberations in late September and by the Board during its consideration of the proposed 2017 budgets at its meeting on October 20, 2016.

Background/Purpose:

City Council, at its meeting on July 12, 13, 14 and 15, 2016 considered and adopted an item with respect to the 2017 budget process including the Council's targets for all City programs and agencies.

The motions are available at this link: [Agenda Item History - 2016.EX16.37](#)

Discussion:

In its motions, Council establishes a schedule and guidelines for all City Agencies to follow in order to submit their operating and capital estimates for 2017. Among other motions the City approved the following:

2. City Council direct that all Agencies submit their respective final Board-approved 2017 Operating Budget and 2017 – 2026 Capital Budget and Plan requests no later than October 1, 2016.

3. City Council adopt an across the board budget reduction target of -2.6 percent net below the 2016 Approved Net Operating Budgets for all City Programs, Agencies, Toronto Community Housing Corporation, and Accountability Offices, and that strategies including but not limited to the following strategies be used to achieve the -2.6 percent target:

a. fund any new or enhanced services from within existing budgets, and review for impact on staff time and planned service delivery any new or enhanced services with a "net zero" funding impact;

b. continue to control expenditures through cost saving measures;

c. explore all services for efficiency savings including opportunities from business process reengineering, streamlining, transformation and innovation to service delivery including from:

i. service delivery rationalization and restructuring;

ii. opportunities for alternative service delivery, including contracting out; and

iii. opportunities for public service delivery where alternative service delivery has not met stated savings objectives or met Council policy objectives;

d. review service levels and outcomes for relevance, value and impact, focussing on non-public facing services first;

e. maximize user fee revenue by reviewing full cost-recovery where applicable, review existing fines and permit fees and identify new fines and other user fees where appropriate;

f. provide a thorough justification for any new Full-time Equivalents; and

g. avoid "offloading" expenses to other City Programs and Agencies.

4. City Council direct that City Programs and Agencies submit their 2017 - 2026 Capital Budget and Plans requiring that:

a. Capital Plan submissions adhere to the debt levels approved by Council for the 2017 - 2025 Capital Plan as part of the 2016 Budget process, and projects be added in the new tenth year, 2026, that can be accommodated within current affordability targets;

b. annual cashflow funding estimates be examined to more realistically match cashflow spending to project activities and timing, especially in the first 5 years of the Capital Plan's timeframe; and

c. unfunded capital project estimates and timing be refined and submitted for prioritization.

Conclusion:

I recommend that the Board forward this report to the Chief of Police for information, that the Board convene its Budget Committee comprised of Chair Pringle, Councillor Carroll and any interested Board Members, to consider proposed operating and capital programs from the Toronto Police Service, Toronto Police Services Board and Parking Enforcement Unit; and, that the Board request the City's Budget Committee, the City Manager and the Chief Financial Officer to accept the submission of the Board's approved budget estimates following the Board meeting scheduled for October 20, 2016.

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: M. Moliner
Seconded by: C. Lee

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P218. CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION – CITY-WIDE
REAL ESTATE REVIEW**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle,
Chair:

**Subject: CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL – CITY-WIDE REAL ESTATE
REVIEW**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended:

1. that the Board refer this report to the Chief of Police and request that he participate in City's transition strategy and implementation plan for a centralized real estate operation; and,
2. that the Board forward a copy of this report to Executive Committee for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the Board's consideration of this report.

Background/Purpose:

City Council, at its meeting on July 12, 13, 14 and 15, 2016 considered and adopted an item which provided an update on Council's direction to undertake a City-wide real estate review and which outlined the City Manager's advice to Council related to the opportunities identified through the review process.

The motion is available at this link:
[Agenda Item History - 2016.EX16.4](#)

Discussion:

In considering this matter, City Council adopted the following:

3. City Council request the Boards of relevant agencies and corporations listed in Table 1 of the report (June 13, 2016) from the City Manager to participate in the development of the transition strategy and implementation plan, and provide information as required.

4. City Council request that the City's affected City agencies and corporations listed in Table 1 of the report (June 13, 2016) from the City Manager, during the development of the real estate transition strategy and implementation plan, co-operate and coordinate with the transition team, when undertaking any real estate transaction or development work of significance (whether in dollar value, City building potential, size of site, or otherwise).

Conclusion:

I recommend that the Board refer this report to the Chief of Police and request that he participate in City's transition strategy and implementation plan for a centralized real estate operation.

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: M. Moliner

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P219. CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION – MEMBER
MOTION – 911 TEXTING**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle,
Chair:

**Subject: CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL – MEMBER MOTION – 911
TEXTING**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended

1. that the Board refer this report to the Chief of Police and request that, as part of the report recommending approval of the capital program, the Chief include a summary of the status of Next Generation 911; and.
2. that the Board forward a copy of this report to City Council for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the Board's consideration of this report.

Background/Purpose:

City Council, at its meeting on July 12, 13, 14 and 15, 2016 considered and adopted a motion from Councillor Norman Kelly.

The motion is available at this link:

[Agenda Item History - 2016.MM20.13](#)

Discussion:

In considering this matter, City Council adopted the following:

1. City Council request the Toronto Police Services Board to review the possibility of introducing 911 texting.

Conclusion:

I recommend that the Board refer this report to the Chief of Police and request that, as part of the report recommending approval of the capital program, the Chief include a summary of the status of Next Generation 911.

The Board was also in receipt of a written submission dated September 14, 2016 from Kris Langenfeld with regard to this report. A copy of Mr. Langenfeld's correspondence is on file in the Board office.

The Board approved the foregoing report and received Mr. Langenfeld's written submission.

**Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: J. Tory**

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

#P220. CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION – INFORMATION SHARING PRACTICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF TORONTO, TORONTO POLICE SERVICE (TPS) AND TORONTO COMMUNITY HOUSING CORPORATION (TCHC)

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair:

Subject: CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL – INFORMATION SHARING PRACTICES BETWEEN THE CITY OF TORONTO, THE TORONTO POLICE SERVICE (TPS) AND THE TORONTO COMMUNITY HOUSING CORPORATION (TCHC)

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended

1. that the Board refer this report to the Chief of Police for consideration and any necessary response to the City Manager; and.
2. that the Board forward a copy of this report to the City Manager for information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the Board's consideration of this report.

Background/Purpose:

City Council, at its meeting on July 12, 13, 14 and 15, 2016 adopted an item with respect to information sharing between the City of Toronto, TPS and TCHC. This motion arose, originally, as a recommendation in a report considered by Council in June 2016 with respect to developing a strategic response to gun violence over the summer of 2016.

The motion is available at this link:

[Agenda Item History - 2016.CC20.12](#)

Discussion:

In considering this matter, City Council adopted the following:

1. City Council request the Toronto Community Housing Corporation and the Toronto Police Services Board to expedite efforts to develop and implement a Memorandum of Understanding to allow for more efficient information sharing between the Toronto Police Service and Toronto Community Housing Corporation, and for Toronto Community Housing Corporation to report to the City Manager on the status of the Memorandum of Understanding by September 1, 2016 and direct the City Manager to report to the October 5 and 6, 2016 City Council meeting.

Conclusion:

I recommend that the Board refer this report to the Chief of Police for consideration and any necessary response to the City Manager

Mr. Kris Langenfeld was in attendance and delivered a deputation to the Board with regard to this report. Written materials provided by Mr. Langenfeld and which he referenced in his deputation are on file in the Board office.

The Board requested that Chief Saunders consider the comments made by Mr. Langenfeld when he provides his response to the City Manager.

The Board approved the foregoing report and received the deputation.

**Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: J. Tory**

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P221. CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION –
ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTY SYSTEM FOR PARKING VIOLATIONS**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair:

**Subject: CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL – ADMINISTRATIVE
PENALTY SYSTEM FOR PARKING VIOLATIONS**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended:

- 1.that the Board refer this report to the Transformational Task Force for its consideration in the preparation of its final report; and,
- 2.that the Board forward a copy of this report to the Government Management Committee.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the Board's consideration of this report.

Background/Purpose:

City Council, at its meeting on July 12, 13, 14 and 15, 2016 adopted an item with respect to the governance and administrative requirements to establish an Administrative Penalty System for parking violations that will include an Administrative Penalty Tribunal to create a fair and equitable dispute resolution process for parking disputes. The motion is available at this link:

<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2016.GM13.12>

Discussion:

In considering this matter, City Council adopted the following:

13. City Council forward this Item to the Toronto Police Services Board, with a request that it direct the Transformation Task Force to consider and review opportunities for efficiencies and associated savings in parking enforcement from the implementation of the proposed Administrative Penalty System, and include any necessary recommendations in its Final Report in advance of the 2017 budget cycle.

Conclusion:

I recommend that the Board refer this report to the Transformational Task Force.

The following were in attendance and delivered deputations to the Board:

- **Derek Moran**
- **Kris Langenfeld**

Written materials provided by Mr. Langenfeld and which he referenced in his deputation are on file in the Board office.

The Board approved the foregoing report and received the deputations.

Moved by: J. Tory
Seconded by: C. Lee

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P222. CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION – PROPOSAL
FOR EMERGENCY MEN’S SHELTER AT 731 RUNNEMEDE ROAD**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle,
Chair:

**Subject: CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL – PROPOSAL FOR
EMERGENCY MEN’S SHELTER AT 731 RUNNEMEDE ROAD**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Board forward this report to the Chief of Police for
information.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the Board’s consideration of this report.

Background/Purpose:

City Council, at its meeting on July 12, 13, 14 and 15, 2016 considered and adopted an
item with respect to the opening of an emergency men’s shelter to be operated by the
City at 731 Runnymede Road.

The motion is available at this link: [Agenda Item History - 2016.CD13.1](#)

Discussion:

In considering this matter, City Council forwarded a copy of this item to the Toronto
Police Services Board for its information or appropriate action.

Conclusion:

I recommend that the Board forward this report to the Chief of Police for information.

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: J. Tory
Seconded by: C. Lee

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P223. REQUEST FOR FUNDS: TORONTO POLICE SERVICE 2017 PEARLS
IN POLICING CONFERENCE**

The Board was in receipt of the following report September 01, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police:

**Subject: Request for Funds: Toronto Police Service 2017 Pearls in
Policing Conference**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that, as an exception to its policy governing the Special Fund, the Board approve an expenditure of up to \$200,000.00 from the Board's Special Fund to host the Pearls in Policing Conference in June 2017.

Financial Implications:

The Board's Special Fund would be depleted in the amount of \$200,000.00 less the return of any funds not used.

Background / Purpose:

The Pearls in Policing Conference (Pearls) is an international think tank where law enforcement executives (Commissioners and Chiefs) meet to identify emerging challenges in policing and develop collaborative solutions to real issues facing police today. These challenges are such that they can no longer be dealt with on a national level and their solutions require international input.

The responsibility for hosting the conference is alternated annually between the Netherlands and one of the participating guest nations and Pearls has requested that the Toronto Police Service (Service) host the 2017 conference. This will be the first time that the conference will be held in Canada.

Discussion:

Pearls is an invitation only conference launched in 2007 and is comprised of:

- The International Action Learning Group (I.A.L.G.)
- An academic forum
- Working groups
- Peer-to-peer consultations
- The annual conference

The 2017 conference will be the 11th annual conference and will run from Monday, June 5th through Tuesday, June 13th. The theme for this conference is 'Fragile States, Fragile Communities'.

Each year, based on the discussions and their assessment of the most important issue facing them collectively, delegates attending the annual conference choose the main topic for discussion at the following year's conference.

The I.A.L.G. and academic forum will develop potential solutions for these topics. The I.A.L.G. comprises senior police leaders nominated by their Commissioner/Chief. They meet three times during the year and their findings are presented at the annual conference and discussed by the police leaders in attendance. Additionally, as these issues are fluid and continually evolving, the I.A.L.G. is in constant contact and communication throughout the year as they formulate and develop their solutions. This approach brings a world-wide lens to these global issues.

In preparation for the 2017 conference, the I.A.L.G. will meet in Brussels in October 2016, Hong Kong in March 2017, and Toronto in June just prior to the conference. Their goal is to create 'shock-resistant' police organizations: flexible, agile and networked police organizations that are able to rapidly integrate lessons from international experience and emerging best practice, plan effectively for the future and establish partnerships and strategies with private sector to achieve these goals.

The academic forum is a small group of internationally renowned academics who focus on the same assignment as the I.A.L.G. and who collaborate with the I.A.L.G. resulting in a separate presentation at the annual conference.

In the peer-to-peer portion of the conference, selected delegates present the conference with individual professional dilemmas which are discussed in small groups. The delegates consider the problem from various angles and provide the presenter with additional ideas and suggested solutions.

The working groups are research opportunities for individual Commissioners/Chiefs to delve into a particular issue. At the 2016 conference there were three working groups which focused on the following: integrated strategy to protect the most vulnerable, striking a balance between hard and soft policing, and vision on international policing co-operation.

Of particular interest to the Board is a proposal I have made for the 2017 session. I have sponsored a working group that will research the manner in which police agencies deal with persons in crisis. Police interaction with persons with a mental illness is a significant world-wide issue and I want to explore all aspects of how police provide service to this segment of society and develop best practice solutions. The Service will drive this research and already several other agencies have indicated an interest in participating as this issue affects all law enforcement agencies. A large part of the research will centre on partnerships in the community. This will afford the

Toronto Police Service a unique opportunity to learn how other policing agencies, across the globe, approach this subject both theoretically and operationally. This supports my relentless efforts in developing our Service as a world leader in zero harm resolutions involving persons in crisis.

The Iacobucci Report was ground-breaking for the Service in our approach to interacting and mitigating situations with people in crisis, and this Pearls research will develop solutions and approaches that will add another layer of expertise to enhance and further our mission to be the best in class. In addition to the direct benefits to the Service, there is great potential for added public trust as these solutions are applied by our members in their daily interactions with all community members.

There are two other working group topics that will be presented at the 2017 conference: 'Weathering the Political and Media Storm', and 'Quantifying Prevention and Invisible Success'.

At the conclusion of the conference, there will be a working paper produced and published, both in hard copy and on line, detailing the issues discussed and proposed solutions.

Value for attending/hosting a Pearls conference can be found in one of last year's subject matters, which, in light of recent events in Europe, highlighted the critical issue of radicalization and the importance of information sharing in countering terrorism. In August of 2016, these information sharing principles were applied by the Toronto Police Service, and partnering law enforcement agencies, resulting in the timely intervention of a credible, potential terrorist event in southwestern Ontario.

This conference is also an opportunity to showcase the Toronto Police Service and the communities we serve, and how, working together, we are one of the safest cities in North America. The Toronto Police Service is a proud reflection of this incredibly diverse and culturally rich city.

The Pearls Secretariat operates a website (<http://www.pearlsinpolicing.com/>) where you can access information on the past 10 conferences – from conference materials to conclusions and conference output.

There are several responsibilities that the Service would undertake to support this conference. As host, we are responsible for the following:

- The conference/hotel venue
- Breakfast, lunch and dinner for the participants
- Transportation during the conference
- Airfare/travel cost for the academics
- Organization costs (staff, equipment, logistics etc.)

Conference participants, with the exception of academics, pay their airfare and are expected to pay for any days they stay in excess of the 3 days of the conference. In 2016 the participants numbered 35 which is the maximum allowed at the conference.

The Pearls Secretariat has 10 years of experience in this model. I am committed to providing a high level conference for CDN \$200,000.00. In addition to Board support through the special fund, I will be looking to other sources for further funding if required.

This conference is now less than a year away. I have a team established that are already working with the Pearls Secretariat on the details of the conference. I propose to bring further specifics back to the Board in November 2016 including a projected budget.

Conclusion:

Pearls is a global think tank involving top law enforcement executives that review problems facing policing agencies internationally, and develops effective strategies.

Hosting this conference will develop real, innovative, sustainable solutions to critical issues facing policing organizations around the world, while providing an opportunity for global networking.

Former Chief Blair attended Pearls in 7 of his 10 years as Chief, and last year I attended the conference in Copenhagen. In 2016, the Toronto Police Service was represented by Acting Deputy Chief Richard Stubbings. I will be attending in 2017, and will give diligent and meticulous care in choosing the best candidate to represent the Toronto Police Service at the International Action Learning Group.

Toronto is a world class city with international issues and concerns, and this is an opportunity to utilize the expertise of these leaders and academics to best develop the Toronto Police Service for the future.

I will be in attendance to answer any questions the Board may have regarding this report.

Mr. Kris Langenfeld was in attendance and delivered a deputation with regard to this report.

Written materials provided by Mr. Langenfeld and which he referenced in his deputation are on file in the Board office.

The Board approved the foregoing report and received the deputation.

Moved by: J. Tory
Seconded by: C. Lee

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

#P224. SPECIAL CONSTABLES: UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO: RE-APPOINTMENTS

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 12, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police:

Subject: Special Constable Re-Appointments

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Board approve the appointments of the individuals listed in this report as special constables for the University of Toronto, subject to the approval of the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

Background / Purpose:

Under Section 53 of the *Police Services Act of Ontario*, the Board is authorized to appoint and re-appoint special constables, subject to the approval of the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services. Pursuant to this authority, the Board now has agreements with the University of Toronto (U of T), Toronto Community Housing Corporation (T.C.H.C.) and Toronto Transit Commission (T.T.C.) governing the administration of special constables (Min. Nos. P571/94, P41/98 and P154/14 refer).

The Service has received a request from the University of Toronto to re-appoint the following individuals as special constables:

#1. [Table 1Name of Agency and Special Constable Applicant](#)

Agency	Name
University of Toronto, St. George Campus	John Bongers
University of Toronto St. George Campus	Deborah Fritz

Discussion:

The special constables are appointed to enforce the *Criminal Code of Canada*, *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act*, *Trespass to Property Act*, *Liquor Licence Act* and *Mental Health Act* on their respective properties within the City of Toronto.

The agreements between the Board and each agency require that background investigations be conducted on all of the individuals who are being recommended for appointment or re-appointment as special constables. The Service's Employment Unit completed background investigations on these individuals and there is nothing on file to preclude them from being appointed as special constables for a five year term.

The University of Toronto has advised the Service that the above individuals satisfy all of the appointment criteria as set out in their agreement with the Board. The agency's approved strength and current complement is indicated below:

#1. [Table 2 Name of Agency, Approved Strength and Current Number of Special Constables](#)

Agency	Approved Strength	Current Complement
University of Toronto, St. George Campus	50	30

Conclusion:

The Toronto Police Service continues to work together in partnership with the agencies to identify individuals who may be appointed as special constables who will contribute positively to the safety and well-being of persons engaged in activities on T.T.C., T.C.H.C. and U of T properties within the City of Toronto.

Deputy Chief of Police, James Ramer, Specialized Operations Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have with respect to this report.

Insp. Stu Eley, Chief's Office, and Sgt. Carolann Rock, Public Safety Operations, were in attendance and responded to questions about this report.

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: M. Moliner

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P225. SPECIAL CONSTABLES: TORONTO COMMUNITY HOUSING
CORPORATION: INCREASE IN APPROVED STRENGTH**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 30, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police:

**Subject: Special Constables: Toronto Community Housing
Corporation, Increase in Approved Strength**

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Board approve the request from the Toronto Community Housing Corporation (T.C.H.C.) to increase their approved authorized strength of special constables from 83 to 112.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

Background / Purpose:

Under Section 53 of the *Police Services Act of Ontario*, the Board is authorized to appoint and re-appoint special constables, subject to the approval of the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services. Pursuant to this authority, the Board now has agreements with the University of Toronto (U of T), Toronto Community Housing Corporation (T.C.H.C.) and Toronto Transit Commission (T.T.C.) governing the administration of special constables (Min. Nos. P571/94, P41/98 and P154/14 refer).

T.C.H.C., Community Safety Unit is requesting that the Board increase their approved strength from 83 to 112 special constables.

T.C.H.C. is the largest social housing provider in Canada. Their portfolio includes nearly 60,000 residential units in 2,100 buildings. T.C.H.C.'s Community Safety Unit serves more than 110,000 people across 50 million square feet of residential space

throughout the year by delivering safety programs to residents, securing their buildings and providing corporate security.

T.C.H.C. special constables are comprised of Constables, Field Supervisors and District Managers. They are appointed to enforce the *Criminal Code of Canada*, the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act*, the *Trespass to Property Act*, the *Liquor License Act* and the *Mental Health Act* on T.C.H.C. properties within the City of Toronto.

They are charged with the responsibility of securing the T.C.H.C. facilities while ensuring the safety and security of their communities. In 2015, the T.C.H.C.'s Community Safety Unit responded to 57,735 incidents pertaining to requests for service and investigations relating to events on or near T.C.H.C. properties.

Discussion:

In response to a recommendation in the interim report of the Mayor's Task Force on Toronto Community Housing, the Community Safety Unit implemented a new deployment model in 2015. This model assigns each of its officers to one of the 20 patrol zones across the city. This enables the same officers to have a frequent and consistent presence in that community. Increasing the approved complement of special constables will assist the Community Safety Unit in achieving the goals they have set through this new deployment model.

Since 2008, when the current authorized strength of 83 special constables was set, the number of T.C.H.C. residents, staff and facilities have increased significantly. With the additional officers the Community Safety Unit will be able to meet the growing demands placed upon them.

T.C.H.C. advises that no new hires are contemplated as a result of this request. It would be a process of having current Community Safety Unit members appointed as special constables.

#1. [Table 3 Name of Agency, Approved Strength and Current Number of Special Constables](#)

Agency	Approved Strength	Current Complement
Toronto Community Housing Corporation	83	82

Conclusion:

The Toronto Police Service continues to work together in partnership with the agencies to identify individuals who may be appointed as special constables who will contribute positively to the safety and well-being of persons engaged in activities on T.T.C., T.C.H.C. and U of T properties within the City of Toronto.

The Toronto Police Service Special Constable Liaison Office is in support of the request from the Toronto Community Housing Corporation to increase their approved authorized strength of special constables from 83 to 112. We are confident that T.C.H.C. can manage this increase and it would be beneficial to both the T.C.H.C. and the Toronto Police Service.

A representative from T.C.H.C. and Deputy Chief of Police, James Ramer, Specialized Operations Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have with respect to this report.

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: K. Jeffers

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P226. SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT: WRITE-OFF OF UNCOLLECTIBLE
ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE BALANCES: JANUARY TO JUNE 2016**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 31, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police:

**Subject: Semi-Annual Report 2016: Write-Off of Uncollectible
Accounts Receivable Balances, January to June**

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Board approve the write-off of disallowed costs relating to the Pan American/Parapan Games (Games) in the amount of \$212,467 not covered by the Security Cost Contribution Agreement (Agreement).

Financial Implications:

The write-off amount of \$212,467 requiring Board approval was allowed for in 2015 as part of the fiscal year-end adjustments to the Allowance For Doubtful Accounts (A.F.D.A.). The write-off is the result of certain expenditures being deemed ineligible by the Ministry auditors, the reasons of which are outlined later in this report. As part of the 2015 year end process, an A.F.D.A. relating to the Pan Am Games was provisioned for \$2,115,500, representing 5% of the outstanding receivables at that time. After the write-off is approved and applied, the net adjustment to the 2016 A.F.D.A. will be \$1,903,033. This amount will be taken into income in 2016.

The \$212,467 being recommended for write-off is very small (0.5%), relative to the \$42.5 Million (M) billed to the Province for the Games. In addition to the write-off being recommended for the Games, an additional amount of \$2,149 was written off in the first half of 2016. This amount was provisioned in the A.F.D.A. As such, there is no direct impact on the Service's 2016 operating budget.

The write off of \$2,149 represents 0.008% of 2016 revenues to date of \$28M (Games and Grants excluded). Industry standards dictate that 0.065% of total sales is considered low while 0.2% of total sales is considered ideal. The Service's record of written off accounts is significantly lower than the industry standard.

Background / Purpose:

At its meeting of May 29, 2003, the Board approved Financial Control By-law 147. Part IX, Section 29 – Authority for Write-offs, delegates the authority to write-off uncollectible accounts of \$50,000 or less to the Chief of Police and requires that a semi-annual report be provided to the Board on amounts written off in the previous six months (Min. No. P132/03 refers).

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board with details on the amounts written off (during the period of January 1 to June 30, 2016) and to request approval to write-off \$212,467 relating to disallowed expenses from the Games.

Discussion:

External customers receiving goods and/or services from Toronto Police Service (Service) units are invoiced for the value of those goods or services. The Service's Accounting Services unit works closely with divisions, units and customers to ensure that some form of written authority is in place with the receiving party prior to work commencing and an invoice being sent, and that accurate and complete invoices are sent to the proper location, on a timely basis. The work performed by the Accounting Services unit is intended to ensure that invoiced amounts are recorded in the Service's financial accounts and will ultimately be collected.

Accounts Receivable Collection Process - Paid Duty Customers

In March 2014, the terms of payment for paid duty customers were changed as a result of the implementation of the Paid Duty Management System (P.D.M.S). Most customers are required to secure a deposit or pre-pay in advance of the paid duty event for the entire cost. Deposits are recorded in the Service's financial records, monitored and drawn down as services are provided. Deposits are replenished by customers as needed, based on future dated requests for paid duty services.

Long standing customers that have a good credit history with the Service are invoiced and not required to pre-pay. These customers, which represent less than 20% of the paid duty receivables portfolio, include City of Toronto's ABCD's (City), other government partners, and several large private sector organizations with a solid credit history.

Accounts Receivable Collection Process - Non-Paid Duty Customers

Customers other than those requesting paid duties are given a 30 day payment term for all invoices and receive monthly statements showing their outstanding balances if the 30 day term is exceeded. In addition, they are provided with progressively assertive reminder letters for every 30 days their accounts remain outstanding. The Accounts Receivable team makes regular telephone calls requesting payment from customers. Customers with large outstanding balances have an opportunity to make payment arrangements with Accounting Services to ensure collection is maximized. In addition, the Service offers several payment options, including paying through VISA and MasterCard, to facilitate the payment process for customers.

Customers are sent a final notice when their accounts are in arrears for more than 90 days. They are provided with a ten day grace period, from receipt of the final notice, to make payment on their account before the balance is sent to an outside collection agency. The Service's collection agency, obtained through a joint competitive process with the City, has been successful in collecting many accounts on behalf of the Service. However, in situations where amounts are small, company principals cannot be located,

organizations are no longer in business or circumstances indicate that no further work is warranted, the collection agency will recommend write-off.

Request to approve the Games write-off (\$212,467):

Accounting Services, in consultation with the Pan Am Project team, took a conservative approach in submitting the cost recovery invoices related to the Games. Given the province-wide cost recovery negotiations that occurred, some cost recovery invoices were finalized according to the full cost recovery standards used for other customers before the Agreement was fully executed.

Appendix A shows additional information regarding the billings to the Ministry and payments received by the Service.

The Ministry of Community Safety & Correctional Services (Ministry) commissioned PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) to independently audit the eligible expenditures incurred by the Service and submitted for reimbursement to ensure all costs were eligible, based on the final Agreement. Through this audit which was concluded in April 2016 and after the Service's year-end closing, PwC determined that the following expenditures were considered ineligible:

Vehicle maintenance and equipment	\$131,858
Salary cost for part time planning staff	\$75,911
Miscellaneous items	<u>\$4,698</u>
Total	\$212,467

Vehicle maintenance and equipment: The Service claimed for the maintenance costs of its own fleet in addition to the costs of vehicle rentals, mileage and gasoline. The Ministry determined that the maintenance costs of \$131,858 were ineligible for reimbursement because they were not incremental costs, while the costs of vehicle rentals, mileage and gasoline were fully reimbursed.

Salary cost for part time planning staff: In the absence of the final Agreement at that time of invoice preparation, the Service claimed for salary costs of part-time planning staff and part time Subject Matter Experts. The Ministry determined these costs as ineligible. The Agreement covered only regular salaries, overtime and benefits of full time resources dedicated to the planning team of the Games.

Miscellaneous items: 50% of the costs for surveillance equipment and camera for \$3,192 were disallowed by the Ministry; as well as small items such as extra text charges, phone air cards, etc.

The total recovery received from the Ministry was \$42,258,085 compared to \$42,470,552 invoiced, the difference being \$212,467. The Service is in a position to take \$1,903,033 into 2016 income. An initial allowance of \$2,115,500 was set up in 2015 at 5% of the outstanding receivables, which was considered a reasonable amount,

given the claims made prior to a signed Agreement. However this amount is considerably lower than the 15% allowance for G20 costs in 2010.

The adequacy of the A.F.D.A. is analyzed annually as part of the year end accounting process. As such, this allowance was included in the Service's year-end audit by PwC in conjunction with all Service and City balances.

Amounts written off during the January 1 to June 30, 2016 period (\$2,149):

During the six month period of January 1 to June 30, 2016, three accounts totalling \$2,149 were written off, in accordance with By-law 147. The write-offs related to marihuana grow operation clean-up recovery fees, paid duty fees and false alarm recovery fees. Additional information on the accounts written off is provided in the sections below.

Marihuana Grow Operation recovery fees (\$1,820):

The amount written off consists of one account, representing the original cost recovery amount and associated interest. In this case, responsibility for the grow operation was determined to lie with the tenants of the establishment in which the grow operation was located. Based on the Drug Squad Unit Commander's authority under the by-law, the tenants were invoiced the cost recovery amount. Unfortunately, the balance could not be collected by the City through property taxes, as the residence was not owned by these individuals. The Service's collection agency was unable to locate these individuals, all collection efforts were exhausted, and the amount was considered too small to warrant legal action.

Paid Duty fees (\$194):

This write-off was the result of an unauthorized extension of one hour for two paid duty officers and one vehicle. In May 2015, the customer prepaid the cost of the paid duty for a wedding reception on a Saturday from 8:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m. While on site, the host requested a one hour extension to the paid duty to 2:00 a.m. However, when the additional costs were being processed, the credit card on file was declined. Further investigation revealed that the couple moved to another province. All collection efforts were exhausted by Accounting Services and the Service's collection agency.

False Alarm fees (\$135):

The Service's false alarm customer is a U.S. based company who lost 4,500 accounts and went out of business in September 2015. The central monitoring station status, alarm identification number and all alarmed locations in the Alarm Unit's database have been updated to "Closed". All correspondence, invoice, and dunning statements (reminders) sent from the Alarm Unit and Accounting Services were undelivered and returned back to the Service. All collection efforts were exhausted by Accounting Services and the Service's collection agency.

Conclusion:

In accordance with By-law 147, Section 29 – Authorization for Write-offs, this report provides information to the Board on the \$2,149 of accounts receivable written off by the Service during the period from January 1 to June 30, 2016, and requests approval to write off \$212,467 relating to disallowed expenses from the PanAm/Parapan Games.

Mr. Tony Veneziano, Chief Administrative Officer, Corporate Services Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions from the Board.

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: M. Moliner

Appendix A: Billing and Remittance information

Billing Period	Billing Date	Payment Date	Invoice Amount	Remittance
April 2014	December 2014	August 2015	\$292,044	\$291,872
May 2014	December 2014	August 2015	\$342,357	\$331,766
June 2014	December 2014	September 2015	\$330,869	\$316,360
July 2014	April 2015	April 2016	\$355,853	\$348,123
August 2014	April 2015	February 2016	\$339,369	\$332,662
September 2014	April 2015	February 2016	\$381,385	\$370,201
October 2014	April 2015	February 2016	\$518,650	\$503,310
November 2014	April 2015	February 2016	\$367,912	\$366,375
December 2014	April 2015	April 2016	\$440,596	\$431,116
January 2015	August 2015	May 2016	\$421,850	\$421,850
February 2015	August 2015	April 2016	\$412,105	\$412,105
March 2015	August 2015	May 2016	\$454,940	\$454,773
April 2015	August 2015	April 2016	\$524,687	\$524,687
May 2015	August 2015	April 2016	\$746,066	\$746,066
June 2015	November 2015	April 2016	\$3,013,290	\$3,013,290
July 2015	November 2015	April 2016	\$20,299,763	\$20,299,763
August 2015	December 2015	April 2016	\$7,867,945	\$7,860,505
September 2015	December 2015	April 2106	\$3,976,030	\$3,848,420
October 2015	December 2015	May 2016	\$144,961	\$144,961
November 2015	December 2015	April 2016	\$675,938	\$675,938
December 2015	December 2015	April 2016	\$548,870	\$548,870
2015 Senior Officers Retro	May 2016	June 2016	\$15,072	\$15,072

Billing Period	Billing Date	Payment Date	Invoice Amount	Remittance
Salary adjustments				
Total			\$42,470,552	\$42,258,085

Ineligible expenditures

\$212,467

Significant dates:

April 1, 2014	Effective date of the Agreement
December 31, 2014	First invoice sent to the Ministry
June 17, 2015	Signing of the Agreement
August 6, 2015	First remittance received from the Ministry
December 31, 2015	Toronto Police Service – year-end closing
April 14, 2016	Ministry's completion of audit by PricewaterhouseCooper

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P227. CIMA CRICKET ACROSS THE POND TOUR TO TRINIDAD AND
TOBAGO**

The following were in attendance and delivered a presentation to the Board on the results of the 2016 CIMA Cricket Across the Pond Tour to Trinidad and Tobago:

- Ranil Medis, Director, CIMA Canada
- Martin Buckle, Vice Chair, CIMA Canada
- Cody Antoine, Member of the CIMA Cricket Team

Written materials provided to the Board and which were referenced in the presentation are on file in the Board office.

Mr. Buckle extended appreciation, on behalf of CIMA, for the financial contribution that was previously made by the Board which assisted the cricket team with its costs as a result of participating in this event (Min. No. P127/16 refers).

The Board received the presentation.

Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: K. Jeffers

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

#P228. EVALUATION OF THE BODY-WORN CAMERA PILOT PROJECT

The Board was in receipt of the following report September 13, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police:

Subject: BODY WORN CAMERA PILOT PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT

Recommendation:

It is recommended that:

- (1) The Board approve the inclusion of a body worn camera system project in the Toronto Police Service's 2017-2026 capital program, in the amount of \$500,000, to cover the cost of a fairness commissioner and other external expertise required to effectively oversee, manage and analyse the body worn camera non-binding Request for Proposals process, including the evaluation of proposals.

Financial Implications:

Cost of Body Worn Camera Pilot Project:

The Toronto Police Service (Service) allocated \$495,000 to fund the requirements of the Body Worn Camera (BWC) pilot project. The actual cost of the pilot was \$432,000. This cost was funded from the Service's operating budget, and covered the cost of cameras and other required infrastructure (e.g. servers for storage of videos).

Estimated Cost of Body Worn Camera Rollout:

The estimated cost of operating the program, using on-premise storage, varies depending on the number of officers that will be deployed with the cameras. If the Service were to equip all frontline uniform officers, the cost which includes cameras, servers, workstations, licence fees, integration software, infrastructure upgrades, would be \$85 million over ten years. These costs were validated by an independent reviewer.

It should also be noted that the above estimate is based upon on-premise storage, since cloud based solutions were not available in Canada when the pilot started. They are now available in Canada and would be considered as part of the non-binding Request for Proposals (RFP). Preliminary research suggests a potential for savings over on-premise storage.

Other hard and soft costs that must be considered:

While the most significant cost is the storage of videos, it is important to note that the cost of the cameras (one-time and replacement) and servers represent a significant expenditure. Furthermore, there are costs to support and maintain the system, and redact and retrieve videos that are required for investigative and court purposes.

Costs are also associated to a number of administrative and support positions necessary to manage, administer, and support BWC program, for example, front-line supervisors, professional standards investigators, criminal investigators, video technicians, and Freedom of Information analysts. These costs are not included in the \$85 million dedicated to the BWC system referenced above.

Officers equipped with the cameras spent as much as two hours per shift performing administrative functions. These functions were necessary to upload, classify, and redact the videos. Performing these functions meant that officers were not available on the road to perform their primary mandate. The opportunity cost of an officer performing these administrative duties amounts to as much as \$20,000 per officer annually. This issue becomes even more important as the Service reduces its uniform strength, as part of the implementation of the transformation task force recommendation to reduce the uniform officer establishment.

Cost of the Request for Proposals:

The implementation of BWCs will be a large and complex project, requiring a significant investment with many factors and issues that must be properly addressed. The Service, therefore, will issue a non-binding RFP for a BWC solution.

To ensure that the RFP process is open and fair to all qualified vendors, the Service will engage a fairness commissioner.

Other resources (e.g. financial analysis) may also be required to assist with the analysis and other components of the RFP. These resources will be hired if necessary as the process is rolled out. The estimated cost of the RFP phase is \$500,000. The Board will be advised if any additional funds are required as the project progresses.

Purpose:

The Board at its meeting of April, 2016 approved the motion:

- (1) That the Chief provide the final evaluation report on the Body Worn Camera Pilot Project to the Board for its September 2016 meeting. (Min. No. P68/2016 refers).*

This report responds to the Board's request and provides the findings and conclusions from the BWC project.

Background:

In February 2014, the Service decided that in keeping with its commitment to maintain public trust, to provide professional and unbiased policing, and be a world leader in policing, it would conduct a pilot project to test, evaluate and report on equipping front line officers with BWCs.

The Service started the project by consulting with the Information and Privacy Commission, the Human Rights Commission, and the Ministry of the Attorney General, to address potential privacy, human rights and evidentiary issues associated to the use of police BWCs.

An external group of advisors was also established for the pilot project and included: the Ministry of the Attorney General, the Information and Privacy Commission, the Human Rights Commission, the Office of the Independent Police Review Director, the Special Investigations Unit, the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police, mental health consumers, the Chief of Police Consultative Committees, the Community Police Liaison Committees, the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police, Police and Community Engagement Advisory group, and the Toronto Police Services Board.

An internal working group included: the Toronto Police Association, Operational Support Command, Freedom of Information, Legal Services, Information Security, Information Technology, Specialized Operations Command, Video Evidence Section, Toronto Police College, Intelligence Unit, Court Services, TAVIS, D43 CRU, D55 PRU, Traffic Services Motor Squad, and Community Safety Command.

A requirements document was produced as a result of the internal and external consultations. From this list of requirements, a RFP was issued to solicit vendors who could provide an on-premise solution for body worn cameras which included cameras, storage, and infrastructure. Two vendors were selected.

In February of 2015, the Service started a 12-month pilot project to explore the benefits, challenges, and issues surrounding the use of BWC in Toronto.

The pilot project tested two vendor's cameras and storage. The BWCs are designed to capture and record on-duty officer interactions with the community. These cameras are small compact military grade devices. They were mounted to the officer's outerwear at chest level.

The BWC pilot was governed by a pilot policy and according to a set of objectives. Those objectives included:

- Enhance public trust and police legitimacy;
- Enhance public and police officer safety;

- Enhance the commitment to bias free service delivery by police officers to the public;
- Provide improved evidence for investigative, judicial and oversight purposes; and
- Provide information as to the effectiveness of Service procedures and training.

The Pilot Project consisted of three phases:

- Training,
- Field testing, and
- Evaluation.

The Service's evaluation was assisted by an external Evaluation Advisory Committee, comprised of evaluation and data specialists. This independent panel of experts who provided advice on and monitored the quality of the evaluation were:

- Mr. Harvey Low – City of Toronto
- Dr. Flora Matheson – St. Michael's Hospital
- Dr. Sara Thompson – Ryerson University

On May 18, 2015, field testing started with designated officers in the following units:

- 55 Division - "D" platoon,
- 43 Division - Community Response Unit,
- Traffic Services – Motor Squad,
- Toronto Anti Violence Initiative Rapid Response Team – Blue Team 2.

These units were selected so that the cameras and systems could be assessed in a variety of conditions, circumstances and situations.

On Thursday March 31, 2016, the pilot project concluded.

Discussion:

This section of the report provides the results of the pilot project and important considerations learned. It is important to note that the technology has progressed since the beginning of the pilot, and continues to evolve.

Did the BWC pilot project meet its objectives?

The majority of the community canvassed said that they felt that BWCs would help make the community safer. Most people felt that the cameras would make the police more accountable and improve public trust in the police. Many officers felt that the cameras helped deter assaults against police and make people less confrontational.

Those community members canvassed also felt that BWCs could provide an unbiased account of interactions between people and the police, and could help ensure that

officers treated everyone fairly and impartially. Officers said they were more likely to clearly articulate reasons for an interaction.

There was no evidence that the BWC pilot had an effect on the rates of public complaints, officer conduct, or Special Investigations. However, six public complaints were made during the pilot but with the assistance of the camera none were substantiated. In addition, two Special Investigative Unit files were opened but again with the assistance of the camera, the officers were cleared. Finally, three potential complaints were resolved before they were submitted, in part because of the cameras.

To date there have been few cases where BWC evidence was used in court making it difficult to assess its usefulness. However, investigators in the pilot divisions agreed that videos from BWCs were a valuable tool for them.

Finally, officers were generally positive about both the Procedure and training. Officers were particularly positive about the scenario training that gave them hands-on experience with the cameras before they had to use them in the field.

With respect to the technical aspect of the pilot, neither vendor's solution met the needs of the Service. In the main, the limitations were associated to battery life, hardware and software stability, and data corruption.

Overall, though, there was strong community support for the BWCs, with people believing that the cameras will make the police more accountable, improve public trust in police, and help to ensure professional service. Officers too, became more supportive of the cameras over the pilot project.

Was cloud storage considered for the pilot?

Until recently, BWC cloud storage solutions did not exist in Canada. Now they do, and could potentially mitigate storage costs.

Conclusion/Next Steps:

The BWC final evaluation provides an assessment of our use of the technology, the sentiments of the community and officers, and the challenges moving forward. The evaluation demonstrated that BWCs could be a benefit to the Service.

The Service recognizes that the decision to implement BWCs will require a significant investment and must therefore be made carefully. The pilot concluded that BWCs were strongly supported by the community as well as our officers. However, there are issues of cost and how the administrative processes (uploading, classification and tagging of videos) impact an officer's public safety responsibilities and productivity.

Given the benefits identified in the evaluation and the fact that cloud storage solutions are now available in Canada, the Service will issue a non-binding RFP. Due to the fact

that the RFP will be large and complex, the Service believes it would be prudent to engage a fairness commissioner to oversee and advise on the RFP.

At the request of the Board, a presentation will be made at the Board's meeting in September 2016. Chief Mark Saunders will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

The following were in attendance and delivered a presentation with regard to this report:

**Deputy Chief Mike Federico, Community Safety Command
Insp. Michael Barsky, Communications Services
Carrol Whynot, Strategic Planning**

A copy of the presentation slides in on file in the Board office.

Chair Pringle stressed the importance of the Board reviewing a detailed evaluation of the pilot project and expressed particular interest in receiving information about the experience that other jurisdictions have had with respect to body-worn cameras.

The Board approved the following Motions:

- 1. THAT the Board receive the presentation; and**
- 2. THAT the Board refer consideration of the foregoing report to the October 20, 2016 meeting for the purpose of receiving deputations on this matter.**

**Moved by: J. Tory
Seconded by: C. Lee**

Later in the meeting, the Board was advised that the TPS had publicly released a copy of the TPS Body-Worn Cameras evaluation report (dated June 2016) and, therefore, approved the following Motion:

THAT the Board re-open the foregoing matter.

**Moved by: J. Tory
Seconded by: C. Lee**

Copies of the evaluation report were provided to the Board.

The Board agreed to receive the evaluation report and refer it to the October 2016 meeting for consideration in conjunction with the report noted in Motion No. 2 above.

Moved by: J. Tory
Seconded by: C. Lee

The full evaluation report is available on the Board's website at www.tpsb.ca or can be viewed by [clicking here](#).

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

#P229. ONTARIO ASSOCIATION OF POLICE SERVICES BOARD SURVEY

The Board was in receipt of the following report September 13, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair:

Subject: Ontario Association of Police Services Board Survey

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the Board complete the appended survey and forward it to the President of the Ontario Association of Police Services Boards.

Financial Implications:

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation in this report.

Background / Purpose:

The Ontario Association of Police Services Boards (OAPSB) has requested that, no later than September 30, 2016, each police services board in Ontario complete the appended survey and forward the results to the OAPSB.

Discussion:

OAPSB President Eli El-Chantiry, in a communication to the Association's membership has advised:

"The aim of this survey is confirm the needs and expectations of the OAPSB membership regarding the rewrite of the Police Services Act (PSA)—otherwise known as the "Strategy for a Safer Ontario". The survey is based on the submissions from: Durham Region PSB, London PSB, Peel PSB, York PSB, Toronto PSB, Temiskaming Shores PSB, and OAPSB. These submissions are posted at:
http://www.oapSB.ca/psa_rewrite_member_submissions/.

Each member board is requested to involve all their board members in completing the survey, and **submit one (and only one) response per board**.

Board identification is requested for auditing purposes only, and will not be disclosed.

The survey results will inform our PSA re-write advocacy efforts this Fall and Winter, 2016, on behalf of all members. To this end, **your input is critical!**

Thank you in advance for your continued service and support.”

I have populated the survey with proposed responses and would request that the Board review and determine whether it wishes to accept or alter the responses. I will forward the Board-approved results to the OAPSB to assist in its advocacy efforts.

Conclusion:

It is recommended that Board complete the appended survey.

The Board considered the proposed responses of the Chair and recommended a few amendments.

The Board approved the survey responses, as amended, and agreed to forward a copy to the President of the OAPSB.

Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: M. Moliner

A copy of the amended survey is attached to this Minute for information

**Ontario Association of Police Services Boards
Police Services Act Survey**

A. Generally speaking, rank in order of importance the following priorities for PSA legislative reform (1 is most important, 5 is least important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
1 Strengthening police governance	x					
2 Facilitating alternate service delivery options, including outsourcing				x		
3 Mandating police cooperation with other health and social agencies			x			
4 Improving police oversight (OIPRD, OCPC, SIU)		x				
5 Modernizing labour relations (for example: arbitration, suspensions without pay, etc.					x	

B. Please specify your Board's views on these proposals for PSA legislative reform:

	Agree	Disagree	N/A
1 The safety of our communities should be legislatively recognized as a foundation for social wellbeing and economic prosperity.	x		
2 Engaging the public and community groups on an ongoing basis should become a more entrenched feature of police governance.	x		
3 The Police Services Act needs to instill a greater degree of public representation into governance processes.	x		
4 The Police Services Act must provide greater precision and clarity regarding the roles of Boards and Police Chiefs.	x		
5 There should be mandatory training for new Board members on what is expected of them, and what constitutes misconduct.	x		
6 There should be mandatory training for Boards on how to govern as a team.	x		
7 There should be performance standards for Boards.	x		
8 Boards should be evaluated against governance performance standards (rather than today's Adequacy Standards for Boards).	x		
9 OPP cost estimates/budgets should be approved by Section 10 Boards who then submit them to the municipal government.			x
10 The majority of Board members should continue to be appointed by the local municipality (rather than the Provincial Government.)	x		

11	All appointments to Police Boards should be subject to a background check that provides evidence of suitability (standards of which must be established province-wide.)	x		
12	The Police Chief should be able to suspend, without pay, Officers charged with egregious offenses/misconduct.	x		
		Agree	Disagree	N/A
13	<u>Processes</u> regarding police officer misconduct need to be simplified and more reflective of general labour practices in Ontario.	x		
14	<u>Penalties</u> for officer misconduct, up to an including dismissal, need to be simplified and more reflective of general labour practices in Ontario.	x		
15	Post secondary education (i.e. college and/or university) should be a prerequisite to becoming a police officer.	x		
16	Police Officers should be professionally accredited, like lawyers, accountants, engineers, etc.)			x
17	Today's generalist model of police organization (general patrol, general investigation) needs to become more specialized, in order to address new and emerging threats such as cybercrimes.		x	
18	Police Board decision-making needs to be evidence-based, and Boards must be ensured the timely provision of relevant decision information.	x		
19	Outcome-based performance metrics for police need to replace today's process/resource/activity-based/Adequacy Standards.	x		
20	Police Boards should have the authority to lay-off police and civilian employees, not OCPC.	x		
21	The government must specify what police functions must be performed by a police officer, and only a police officer. Police Boards must be legislatively authorized to determine who will fulfill non-core functions in their community.	x		
22	Human Resources, Finance and Legal advisors should be excluded from bargaining unit (Association) membership, like Chiefs and Deputy Chiefs.	x		
23	All uniformed and civilian police management should be excluded from bargaining unit (Association) membership, like Chiefs and Deputy Chiefs.	x		
24	Boards should be <u>allowed</u> to delegate the bargaining process to professionals not on the Board.		x	
25	Boards should be <u>expected</u> to delegate the bargaining process to professionals not on the Board.		x	

26 Arbitrators should be compelled to consider non-police comparators, such as a municipality's non-police employee groups, in their determinations.	x	
--	---	--

	Agree	Disagree	N/A
27 Arbitrators should be compelled to explain how and to what extent mandatory factors were considered in rendering their decisions, and mandated to duly consider all legislated decision factors.	x		
28 Police Boards should approve bargaining mandates and ratify collective agreements; collective bargaining itself should be conducted by (police) management, with external assistance as required (like every other sector in Canadian society).		x	
29 Police Boards, through community engagement and surveys, should be determining the strategic outcomes and limitations for policing in the community; police chiefs should be developing action plans to achieve those outcomes within those limits.		x	
30 Police Board member selection should be based on fulfillment of required governance competencies as determined by the Ministry.		X	
31 Police Board member selection should be based on fulfillment of required governance competencies as determined by each police board.		x	
32 Police recruits should complete an accredited post-secondary program prior to selection as a police recruit (like teachers, nurses, etc.)		x	
33 Mandatory board training should be the responsibility of the provincial government.	x		
34 The provincial government should accredit and fund Board training developed and delivered by OAPSB on the government's behalf.		x	
35 Board members must have sufficient understanding of public safety issues to collectively make decisions regarding strategic direction for the police service.	x		
36 Progression through the constable classes (4th, 3rd, 2nd, 1st) needs to be slowed down, and not just based on "time served".	x		
37 Boards should appoint special constables within their jurisdiction, rather than just 'recommend' for Provincial Government approval.	x		
38 Boards should have the flexibility and authority to select a composite of service providers from a variety of suppliers - police and non-police, public and private sector-based.	x		
39 There should be a standardized MOU between a special constable employer (e.g. college, transit system, etc.) and the police board that appoints them.	X		

40	Oversight of special constables should be similar to oversight of police officers, as both may use force against other people in certain circumstances.	x		
----	---	---	--	--

	Agree	Disagree	N/A
41 Board roles must be clarified before prescribing board composition, member competencies, training, etc.)	x		
42 Boards exist to govern resources, not manage them; human resource management should be delegated to the Chief/Detachment Commander.	x		
43 Board policies need to specify what the police service/detachment is to achieve, not how it functions.		x	
44 Boards need to evaluate how well the overall police service performs, not just the Chief.	x		
45 Police budgeting needs to reflect programs, not "lines", in order to be able to show the value to the community.		x	
46 Boards need to be larger, in order to perform all their governance duties, and better reflect community diversity.		x	
47 Board training needs to be developed and delivered by people that understand governance, and can teach.	x		
48 Boards must have direct access to the information and independent expert assistance/advice they need to fulfill their roles and responsibilities.	x		
49 Reading legislation to new Board members is not adequate training.	x		
50 Board training needs to develop critical thinking, analysis and decision-making skills.	x		
51 OPP Boards should have a say in the Provincial Government's mandate for OPP collective bargaining.	x		
52 "Coordinated" bargaining amongst police employers should continue.	x		
53 Bargaining police collective agreement should be "centralized" in Ontario			x
54 Section 10 (OPP) Boards should be amalgamated at the county/district level, and larger, for greater influence, to best serve the community.			x
55 Section 10 (OPP) Boards should be amalgamated at the Detachment level, to simplify oversight for the Detachment Commander.			x
56 Geography should be a key factor in determining whether or not to amalgamate Section 10 (OPP) Boards, especially in Northern Ontario.			x
57 Board members need to be compensated in accordance with the importance and gravity of their roles and responsibilities.			x

C. Are there any additional Police Act issues that you think needs to be addressed?

--

D. Please verify that your entire Board participated in this survey, as requested.

Yes they did
No they did not.

x

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

#P230. SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF UNIFORM SWEATERS

The Board was in receipt of the following report July 14, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police:

Subject: The Supply and Delivery of Uniform Sweaters

Recommendation:

It is recommended that:

1. The Board approve Universal Safety Inc. to provide the Toronto Police Service (Service) with uniform sweaters for a three year period to commence upon approval; and
2. The Board authorize the Chief of Police to execute the remaining two optional years of the existing contract on behalf of the Board, subject to satisfactory performance by and no concerns with the vendor.

Financial Implications:

Universal Safety Inc. has proposed to supply the Service with uniform sweaters at an approximate cost of \$371,000 (including taxes) for the initial three-year term of the contract with an additional \$251,000 (including taxes) for the two, one-year optional terms, if approved. The total value of the contract including the option years is \$622,000, including taxes. Funds for this purpose are provided for in the Service's annual operating budget. These estimates are based on current Service requirements. However, there is no contractual obligation to purchase any minimum quantities, therefore allowing for budgetary reductions without penalty.

Background / Purpose:

Purchasing Services issued a Request for Quotation process on behalf of the Police Cooperative Purchasing Group (P.C.P.G) for the supply and delivery of uniform sweaters (RFQ 1164121-16) which closed January 28, 2016.

Discussion:

Submission samples were reviewed by members of the Service along with two representatives from the P.C.P.G. Based on this review, it was determined that Universal Safety Inc., was the lowest bid meeting specifications.

Conclusion:

It is therefore recommended that the Board approve the award of the contract for the supply and delivery of uniform sweaters to Universal Safety Inc., for an initial term of three years with the option to extend for an additional two one-year terms, at the Chief's discretion.

Acting Deputy Chief Richard Stubbings, Operational Support Command, and Tony Veneziano, Chief Administrative Officer, Corporate Services Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions the Board may have concerning this report.

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: J. Tory

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P231. TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD – 2016 OPERATING BUDGET
VARIANCE REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING JUNE 30, 2016**

The Board was in receipt of the following report August 31, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair:

**Subject: Operating Budget Variance Report for the Toronto Police
Services Board, Period Ending June 30, 2016**

Recommendations:

It is recommended that:

1. the Board receive this report; and
2. the Board forward a copy of this report to the City of Toronto's (City) Deputy City Manager and Chief Financial Officer for information and for inclusion in the variance reporting to the City's Budget Committee.

Financial Implications:

At this time, the Board operating budget is projected to be \$25,000 underspent by year end.

Background / Purpose:

The Board, at its October 19, 2015 meeting, approved the Toronto Police Services Board's 2015 operating budget at a net amount of \$2,299,400 (Min. No. P2722/15 refers). Subsequently, Toronto City Council, at its February 17, 2016 meeting, approved the Board's 2016 operating budget at the same amount. When Council approved the 2016 Operating Budget, an unallocated reduction of \$1.263 million was approved to be distributed among all agencies (other than Police Service and TTC, which were given specific amounts). It was also understood that all programs would receive a reduction, and that Council directed that it would be focused on discretionary expenditures. To ensure the allocation to all programs, whether or not the program met the directives concerning the reduction targets of the 2016 budget process was also taken into consideration in the development of allocations. However, there was no specific direction as to how these reductions should be applied by agencies, other than it is to be considered an ongoing base budget reduction.

A report was submitted to Budget Committee on this matter for its May 13th agenda, accompanying the 1st Quarter variance reports. For the Police Services Board, a reduction of \$36,500 has been assigned. This reduction brings the approved Board budget down to \$2,262,900.

The Board, at its May 19, 2016 meeting, requested the approval of a transfer of \$39,000 to the Toronto Police Services Board 2016 net operating budget from the City's Non-Program operating budget, with no incremental cost to the City, to reflect the salary and benefit impact on Excluded staff of the now-ratified contract with the Senior Officers Organization (Min. No. P121/16 refers).

As a result of the foregoing adjustment, the Board's net operating budget increased to \$2,301,900.

The purpose of this report is to provide information on the Board's 2016 projected year-end variance.

Discussion:

The following chart summarizes the variance by category of expenditure.

Expenditure Category	2016 Budget (\$000s)	Actual to Jun 30/16 (\$000s)	Projected Year-End Actual (\$000s)	Fav/(Unfav) (\$000s)
Salaries & Benefits	\$1,002.2	\$464.5	\$977.2	\$25.0
Non-Salary Expenditures	\$1,299.7	\$700.7	\$1,299.7	\$0.0
Total	\$2,301.9	\$1,165.2	\$2,276.9	\$25.0

It is important to note that expenditures do not all follow a linear pattern and therefore year-to-date expenditures cannot be simply extrapolated to year-end. Rather, the projection of expenditures to year-end is done through an analysis of all accounts, taking into consideration factors such as expenditures to date, future commitments expected and spending patterns.

As at June 30, 2016, a favourable variance of \$25,000 is anticipated. Details are discussed below.

Salaries & Benefits

A small favourable variance is expected due to the resignation of one staff member effective in the latter part of the year, resulting in a projected savings of \$25,000.

Non-salary Budget

The majority of the costs in this category are for arbitrations/grievances and City charge backs for legal services.

The Toronto Police Services Board cannot predict or control the number of grievances filed or referred to arbitration as filings are at the discretion of bargaining units. In order to deal with this uncertainty, the 2016 budget includes a \$610,600 contribution to a Reserve for costs of independent legal advice. Fluctuations in legal spending will be dealt with by increasing or decreasing the budgeted reserve contribution in future years' operating budgets so that the Board has funds available in the Reserve for these variable expenditures.

Initiatives focussed on efficiency and effectiveness:

Enhanced financial review and monitoring

In September 2015, the Board allocated funds to provide the Board with consulting expertise in budget review and financial accountability. On an "as needed" basis throughout 2016, the Board will have an enhanced ability to scrutinize budgets, review variance reporting, assess the utilization of the Board's Special Fund and monitor implementation of certain Board policies.

Automating the Board agenda and minutes process

The 2016 operating budget includes funds to initiate a competitive process to acquire software and hardware necessary to implement a fully electronic, "paperless" agenda and minute preparation and distribution process. This advancement will reduce paper, toner and courier costs but, more significantly, will create efficiencies for administrative staff, Board Members and senior members of the Toronto Police Service. It is also expected to improve the transparency of the Board's deliberations through more timely production of agendas and minutes. A Request for Proposals was issued on February 9, 2016 and a 5-year contract has been awarded to Diligent Corporation.

Data Collection and Analysis – Community Contacts

In the 2015 operating budget, the Board had approved the inclusion of \$250,000 to secure an external consultant or evaluator to determine what type of data should be collected, the retention period and the scope of the data required as a result of the Board's approval of the Community Contacts Policy (Board Minute P102/14 refers). During 2015, the Board amended its Community Contacts policy and later in the year, the province announced a Regulation made under the *Police Services Act* with respect to such contacts. Given these developments, the Board did not expend funds related to data collection in 2015. The 2016 operating budget includes a reduced amount of funding which will be used in support of the Board's policy response to the Regulation.

Communications

Funds were also allocated in the 2016 budget to procure communications advice for the Board on an as needed basis.

No variance is currently projected for expenditures related to the above initiatives.

Conclusion:

As at June 30, 2016, the Board operating budget is projected to be \$25,000 underspent by year end.

The Board approved the foregoing report.

Moved by: C. Lee
Seconded by: J. Tory

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P232. REQUEST FOR FUNDS – TRANSFORMATIONAL TASK FORCE FULL
DAY MEETING**

Chair Pringle advised the Board that the Transformational Task Force, including TPS members and Community members, is holding a full day meeting on September 24 at the Toronto Police College. In support of this initiative, he proposed the following Motion:

THAT as an exception to its Special Fund Policy, the Board approve an expenditure from the Special Fund, not to exceed \$600 to cover the cost of catering at this meeting.

The Board approved the foregoing Motion.

Moved by: J. Tory
Seconded by: M. Moliner

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

**#P233. TRANSFORMATION TASK FORCE – COMMERCIAL SECTOR
CONSULTATION DAY**

Chair Pringle read the following statement with regard to the work of the Transformational Task Force:

Commercial Sector Consultation Day

Before the meeting begins, I would like to provide some information with respect to a consultation session arising out of the important work of the Transformational Task Force.

Since the release of the Interim Report, we've been consulting with communities throughout Toronto to gauge whether we've got it right and if communities support our ideas. Now, we want to hear submissions from members of the commercial sector.

The Transformational Task Force will host a ***commercial sector consultation day*** on **Wednesday, October 5, 2016 from 10 a.m. to 6 p.m.** at the **Toronto Police College**, 70 Birmingham St.

The objective of this session is to ***hear from members of the private sector who may have concepts and ideas to share about the future of the Toronto Police Service.*** Specifically, we would like to hear what you have to say about our transformational goals and the 24 recommendations in our Interim Report.

It should be noted that specific services or products are not to be marketed, and no promises of future business relationships are being implied. Presentations should focus on ***ideas and concepts about how to modernize policing in Toronto.*** More information can be found at the Toronto Police Service website – The Way Forward.

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

#P234. IN-CAMERA MEETING – SEPTEMBER 15, 2016

In addition to the public meeting conducted by the Board today, a confidential meeting was held to consider a number of matters which were exempt from the public agenda in accordance with the criteria for considering confidential matters set out in s.35(4) of the *Police Services Act*.

The following members attended the confidential meeting:

Mr. Andrew Pringle, Chair
Mr. Chin Lee, Councillor & Vice-Chair
Ms. Shelley Carroll, Councillor & Member
Mr. Ken Jeffers, Member
Ms. Marie Moliner, Member
Mr. John Tory, Mayor & Member

Absent: Dr. Dhun Noria, Member

**THIS IS AN EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
TORONTO POLICE SERVICES BOARD HELD ON SEPTEMBER 15, 2016**

#P235. ADJOURNMENT

Andy Pringle
Chair