



Public Meeting

September 15, 2016

**Auditorium – Police Headquarters
1:00 PM**

Public Meeting - Agenda

Auditorium
40 College Street, 2nd Floor
Toronto, Ontario
www.tpsb.ca

Thursday,
September 15, 2016
at 1:00 PM

Opening of the Meeting

1. Declarations of Interest under the Municipal Conflict of Interest Act.
2. Confirmation of the Minutes from the meeting held on August 18, 2016.

Presentation

3. August 15, 2016 from Bobbie McMurrich, Associate Executive Director, Victim Services Toronto
Re: [Victim Services Toronto](#)

Presentation by: Bobbie McMurrich, Associate Executive Director
Bonnie Levine, Executive Director

Reports to be Received

4. August 18, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police
Re: [Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injuries to Thomas Varden](#)
5. August 18, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police
Re: [Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Alleged Sexual Assault by Complainant 2016-E](#)
6. August 18, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police
Re: [Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Alleged Sexual Assault by Complainant 2016-F](#)

7. August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair
Re: City of Toronto Council Recommendation – Toronto Police Service 2016 to 2025 Revised Capital Program Request

8. August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair
Re: City of Toronto Council Recommendation – Community Policing Partnership Program (CPP) Grant Amending Agreement

9. August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair
Re: City of Toronto Council Recommendation – Safer Communities 1,000 Officers Partnership Program Grant Amending Agreement

10. August 23, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair
Re: Quarterly Report: Toronto Police Services Board Special Fund Unaudited Statement: April to June 2016

Reports to be Approved

11. August 22, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair
Re: New Board Policy – Placement of Attempted or Threatened Suicide Information on the Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) System

12. August 24, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair
Re: City of Toronto Council Recommendation – 2017 Budget Process – Budget Directions and Schedule

13. August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair
Re: City of Toronto Council Recommendation – City-Wide Real Estate Review

14. August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair
Re: City of Toronto Council Recommendation – Member Motion – 911 Texting

15. August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair
Re: City of Toronto Council Recommendation – Information Sharing Practices Between the City of Toronto, Toronto Police Service (TPS) and Toronto Community Housing Corporation (TCHC)

16. August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair
Re: City of Toronto Council Recommendation – Administrative Penalty System for Parking Violations

17. August 26, 2016 from Andy Pringle, Chair
Re: City of Toronto Council Recommendation – Proposal for Emergency Men’s Shelter at 731 Runnymede Road

18. September 01, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police
Re: Request for Funds: Toronto Police Service 2017 Pearls in Policing Conference

19. August 12, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police
Re: Special Constables: University of Toronto: Re-Appointments

20. August 30, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police
Re: Special Constables: Toronto Community Housing Corporation: Increase in Approved Strength

21. August 31, 2016 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police
Re: Semi-Annual Report: Write-Off of Uncollectible Accounts Receivable Balances: January to June 2016

Next Meeting

Date: Thursday, October 20, 2016

Time: 1:00 PM

Members of the Toronto Police Services Board

Andy Pringle, Chair
Chin Lee, Councillor & Vice-Chair
Shelley Carroll, Councillor & Member
Ken Jeffers, Member

Marie Moliner, Member
Dhun Noria, Member
John Tory, Mayor & Member

Declarations of interest under the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act*.

Confirmation of the Minutes from the meeting held on August 18, 2016.



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



Toronto Police Services Board Report

September 7, 2016

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.
Chief of Police

MS:ck

File name: siuwardenpublic.docx



Toronto Police Services Board Report

September 7, 2016

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.
Chief of Police

MS:gp

Filename: siusexualassault2016-Epublic.docx



Toronto Police Services Board Report

September 7, 2016

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.
Chief of Police

MS:gp

Filename: siusexualassault2016-Fpublic.docx



Toronto Police Services Board Report

August 26, 2016

To: Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Conclusion:

I recommend that the Board receive this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Pringle
Chair



Toronto Police Services Board Report

August 26, 2016

To: Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Pringle
Chair



Toronto Police Services Board Report

August 26, 2016

To: Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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:

1. 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.

Conclusion:

I recommend that the Board receive this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Pringle
Chair



Toronto Police Services Board Report

August 23, 2016

To: Members
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Andrew 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.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Pringle
Chair
/LMR

A:\2016-second qtr sfr letter. Doc

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	January 01 to December 31, 2015	Comments Relating To This Quarter
Balance Forward	1,955,172	1,955,172	1,843,843	1,414,670	1,414,670	1,955,172	2,194,710	
Revenue								
Proceeds From Auctions	150,000	42,019	11,975	0	0	53,994	128,275	Auction proceeds for the second quarter are based on estimates. Overhead is at 27% of the proceeds.
Less Overhead Cost	(40,500)	(11,347)	(3,232)	0	0	(14,579)	(34,635)	
Unclaimed Money	330,000	0	23,288	0	0	23,288	305,893	
Less Return Of Unclaimed Money	(42,000)	(3,813)	(245)	0	0	(4,058)	(24,937)	
Interest	15,000	1,505	2,184	0	0	3,689	11,955	Interest income is based on the average monthly bank balance.
Less Bank Service Charges	(3,000)	(204)	(156)	0	0	(360)	(1,155)	
Others	30,000	0	616	0	0	616	11,422	
Total Revenue	439,500	28,160	34,430	0	0	62,590	396,818	
Balance Forward Before Expenses	2,394,672	1,983,332	1,878,273	1,414,670	1,414,670	2,017,762	2,591,528	
Disbursements								
Police Community Sponsorships for the Toronto Police Service								
Citizens Police Liaison Committee (C.P.L.C.) & Community Outreach Assistance	29,000	0	30,000	0	0	30,000	29,000	
United Way	10,000	0	10,000	0	0	10,000	10,000	
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Police Community Sponsorships for the community								
Victim Services Program	30,000	25,000	0	0	0	25,000	33,000	
Various Organizations	305,000	102,500	162,700	0	0	265,200	415,300	International Auxiliary Conference & 50th Anniversary and several Division Policing Support initiatives
Toronto Police Amateur Athletic Association Sponsorship	40,000	0	5,434	0	0	5,434	42,400	
Funds Returned - Sponsorships	(4,500)	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Volunteer Appreciation Night	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Black History Month	0	0	(159)	0	0	(159)	(801)	
Asian Heritage	0	0	0	0	0	0	(273)	
National Aboriginal Day	0	0	0	0	0	0	(416)	
Francophone	0	0	0	0	0	0	(568)	
Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer (L.G.B.T.Q.)	0	0	0	0	0	0	(548)	
Toronto Caribbean Carnival	0	0	0	0	0	0	(364)	
Citizens Police Liaison Committee & Comm. Outreach Assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	(7,636)	
United Way	0	0	0	0	0	0	(5,923)	
Victims Of Crime	0	0	0	0	0	0	(12)	
Chief Pride Reception	0	0	0	0	0	0	(2,176)	
Youth Justice	0	0	0	0	0	0	(300)	
Auxiliary Appreciation Evening	0	0	0	0	0	0	(13)	
Policing & Rights Education Video	0	0	0	0	0	0	(56,500)	

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	



Toronto Police Services Board Report

August 22, 2016

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.”

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Pringle
Chair



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.



Toronto Police Services Board Report

August 24, 2016

To: Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Pringle
Chair



Toronto Police Services Board Report

August 26, 2016

To: Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Pringle
Chair



Toronto Police Services Board Report

August 26, 2016

To: Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Pringle
Chair



Toronto Police Services Board Report

August 26, 2016

To: Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Pringle
Chair



Toronto Police Services Board Report

August 26, 2016

To: Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Pringle
Chair



Toronto Police Services Board Report

August 26, 2016

To: Members
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Andy Pringle
Chair

Subject: CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL – PROPOSAL FOR EMERGENCY MEN’S SHELTER AT 731 RUNNYMEDE 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.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Pringle
Chair



Toronto Police Services Board Report

September 7, 2016

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.
Chief of Police

pearlsconference2017.docx



Toronto Police Services Board Report

August 12, 2016

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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:

Table 1 Name 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:

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.
Chief of Police



Toronto Police Services Board Report

September 7, 2016

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Table 1 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.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.
Chief of Police



Toronto Police Services Board Report

September 7, 2016

To: Chair and Members
Toronto Police Services Board

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.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.
Chief of Police

/LR

January to June 2016 AR write-offs.docx

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 2016	\$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 Salary adjustments	May 2016	June 2016	\$15,072	\$15,072
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

Next Meeting: October 20, 2016
1:00 PM