

Your Worship Mayor Fontana and Members of Council:

I want to thank Council for the opportunity to present the London Police Service 2014 budget. It is very important that I take this opportunity to provide both Council and the public with facts that demonstrate the extent to which we provide adequate, effective and efficient policing for the citizens of this community. I want to underscore my comments today by acknowledging the current economic challenges facing London and other communities throughout our province. Notwithstanding these challenges, it is critical that I outline the pressures and demands for service, the resources required to meet these demands, and the risks associated to reductions to the operating budget.

Policing the City of London is not a static, or necessarily a predictable undertaking; rather, it has become an increasingly complex environment in which to service community needs. The environment as it currently exists, coupled with what will cause it to become more demanding, must be understood in the context of receiving the necessary operating funds to ensure that community well-being is not compromised.

It will become very clear through this presentation that frontline service delivery and investigative services are stretched to the point that personnel reductions in these areas are not an option. This means a review of the Community Oriented Response Unit, the Community Foot Patrol Unit, and the Community Services Unit. The human resources assigned to these areas are a result of responses to long-standing community demands and requirements. Reduction in personnel in these areas will have considerable impacts to community health and well-being. Further, a reduction in proactive areas will result in an increase to reactive frontline service delivery.

It is important to recognize that, on many levels, the London Police Service has an efficient and effective service delivery model, as is evidenced through an examination of the following statistics:

- *The Ontario Municipal Benchmarking Initiative (OMBI) tracks the operating cost per staff. In 2012, the LPS rated the second lowest of Ontario Municipalities who participate*
- *In comparison to the 17 largest police services in Ontario, the LPS had a lower than average number of police officers per population at 158, (the average is 160)*
- *The LPS had the second lowest per capita costs of all Tier 1 Ontario Municipalities (populations greater than 100,000 in 2012)*
- *Total expenditures as a % of property tax levy were the fifth lowest of all Ontario Tier 1 and Tier 2 Municipalities (2012)*

- *The LPS had the highest number of non-traffic criminal code incidents processed per officer when compared to 15 municipalities, which is a strong indicator of high officer workload*

Since 2012, we have continued to demonstrate that the London Police Service has experienced significant pressures to provide adequate, effective and efficient service delivery. There are a number of indicators, as we look to the future, all of which underscore the need to increase our uniformed presence on the streets of London. Many of these indicators were also present when 85 officers were added in a four-year period, from 2002 to 2006, based on the 2002 Workload Analysis to address staffing deficits. It is important to remember that the hiring and training of these officers was not fully accomplished until 2007, resulting in achieving a staffing level necessary for 2002.

Council is familiar with the recent comprehensive Workload Analysis completed in June 2011 with the assistance of Dr. Paul Whitehead that provided clear and convincing evidence that the London Police Service had a deficit, at minimum, of 30 front line positions. To counter this deficit, Council approved our 2012 budget that included the hiring of 15 front line officers. This, in conjunction with permanently re-assigning 24 other positions from investigative services and other areas to the front line, has addressed pressures on frontline response capacity.

We have already done what many police services are now doing in terms of realigning their resources to augment uniformed patrol staff. The addition of 15 officers placed three additional members per Patrol Section, an increase that has positively offset neighbourhood patrol shortages and assisted in providing necessary coverage for our community.

I also want to underscore that the Workload Analysis recommended a further increase of 16 police positions for 2013 and 14 positions for 2014. These positions have been deferred. In fact, of the 101.5 positions recommended in the Workload Analysis, 30.5 positions were filled through internal realignment, eliminating the need to hire more staff; however, 46 remain unfilled (40 sworn and 6 civilian). As a result, there have been accumulating increases to workload without a corresponding increase in human resources.

The recommendations were based on workload demands up to 2009 and do not account for the emerging trends that have since been identified related to cybercrime, human trafficking, and the continued escalation of calls for service related to mental health. This is resulting in a deterioration of service delivery and organizational wellness. Further, re-allocating positions just shifts service demands from one area to another.

Looking towards the future, and in particular the developing core and old east village, increased population estimates vary from between 3,000 to 6,000 more citizens living in these areas. As critical partners in this process, police staffing will need to be adjusted accordingly in terms of increased traffic, pedestrian activity, and calls for service.

As a community, we are looking to invest heavily into our core areas and as Chief of Police, and a strong civic partner, I must ensure that development is matched with a safe and secure environment. This is a critical partnership that ensures that investment opportunities are not abandoned due to concerns for public safety and quality of life issues.

Despite the foregoing, we have begun to see improvements in our service delivery in terms of response times, overtime costs, neighbourhood patrol vacancies, and missed lunch breaks as a result of additional front line resources. These improvements would be reversed if there were reductions to sworn positions.

From 2008 to 2012 there was a noticeable increase in our average response time to answer calls, for example:

- Emergency calls for service, such as break and enter or robberies in progress and injury accidents increased by 40 seconds from 4 min 51 sec to 5 min 31 sec (2013-to Nov 30 - 5min 10sec)
- Urgent calls for service, such as assaults in progress, mental health occurrences, and suspicious persons increased by 6 minutes and 28 seconds from 18 min 37 sec to 25 min 5 sec) (2013-to Nov 30-22min 14 sec)
- Less urgent more routine calls for service, such as thefts, noise complaints, traffic, and property damage increased by 41 minutes and 52 seconds from 67 min 44 sec to 109 min 36 sec (2013 to Nov 30-94 min 18 sec)

All of these response times have decreased during 2013 – directly related to available staff resources inclusive of the 2012 increase approved by the Board and Council and the reassignment internally of members to frontline services.

In addition:

- The total missed lunch periods for 2013 year to date were 9,283 compared with 11,536 for the same period in 2012
- The total number of officers hired on at overtime rates to fill vacant neighbourhood patrols in 2013 was 47.5 compared with 237 for the same period in 2012
- The total actual neighbourhood patrols left without a patrol officer in 2013 was 390 compared to 1424 for the same period in 2012, providing increased visibility

*These improvements have been achieved through continuous review, re-assignment of staff, and the increase in staff approved by the Board and supported by Council in the*

*2012 budget. A decrease in sworn complement will erode these improvements and reverse this progress.*

Uniformed patrol officers respond to over 250 call types, averaging 125,000 calls annually, resulting in a complicated and extremely busy work environment. Calls for service drive the day-to-day operations and are managed through our regular patrol section complement.

In addition, we respond to and address significant and varied service requests from community neighbourhoods, businesses, and associations. These complaints, concerns, and issues would not be addressed effectively and efficiently if they were added to the calls dispatched to already stretched regular patrols. We rely heavily on our Community Oriented Response Unit, Community Foot Patrol Unit, and School Resource Officers to augment our uniformed resources and, in turn, mitigate the perpetual community wellness issues that are best addressed through a focused approach rather than ongoing dispatch of various patrol officers.

As Councillors, some of you will engage the work of these units more often than others due to the geographic location of your wards. Wards that comprise the downtown and surrounding neighbourhoods typically produce a higher volume of service needs, as do wards experiencing significant off-campus housing. In 2013, the COR Unit undertook 423 files, with 45 currently being actively investigated. In addition, 21 special projects were conducted, including New Year's Eve, Project Learn, St. Patrick's Day, Devil's Night, and Homecoming, to name a few. Again, I must emphasize that there is no capacity for this work to be handled by any other unit or section should there be a need to reduce or eliminate segments of our Community Policing response, including units such as COR, due to insufficient operating funds.

*A reduction in staffing would result in:*

- *The lack of a coordinated approach to chronic community issues and investigation*
- *A longer and less focused response time for patrol officers responding to issues more readily*
- *Project plans and deployments would be severely compromised and become more reactive and less proactive*

The Community Foot Patrol Unit was created as a stand-alone unit to ensure that the core areas of our city would have a continued presence, given the uniqueness of these areas in terms of business and commercial properties, calls types, and population density. In addition to their community policing activities, during 2013 the Foot Patrol Unit conducted 14 problem-oriented projects, investigated 936 occurrences, and spent 1,347 hours responding to protests, rallies, and marches. *Reductions to this area would result in reduced visibility and response times to business and property owners, decreased safety and security in the core, old east, Hamilton Road, and SOHO areas.*

*Even now, there is no ability to provide consistent, regular foot patrols to all of these areas. Finally, there would be a noticeably reduced interaction with our community partners as these liaisons occur through our community policing members.*

Council has supported the Downtown Master Plan and, as a significant community partner, the London Police Services Board recognizes that a vibrant city will attract business and build capacity for growth. We have already experienced growth in the Old East Village with the construction of two multi-occupancy buildings, resulting in 684 units. There are other projects on the horizon that could see population increases from 1900 to in excess of 3000 persons.

The Downtown Master Plan includes “Building a Great Neighbourhood Section”, which will include changes in traditional traffic flows, pedestrian walkways, and increased development including high-rise apartments. The Plan encourages the construction of a variety of dwellings, consisting of both low and high rise built form. Within the plan, it is acknowledged that it is necessary to focus on crime prevention and that an increased police presence could be an outcome of this development. This begs the obvious question as to what the impact would be to police resources and, as Chief, I am advising that there will be an increased need for a highly visible police presence. We are already struggling to meet community needs and expectations now with our current operating funds.

Recently, Fanshawe College opened its first downtown campus, which will enhance the downtown community. This is a good news story that Council has supported through the provision of twenty million dollars towards the project. Recent media articles have indicated, through interviews with downtown representatives, that there is a strong indication that the core will attract more students, faculty, and spin off businesses. We are witnessing a transformation of the downtown core, which has been a key driver in this process. All of this is good news, but what of the requirements to address the associated impacts to provide strong and sustainable policing?

During this past fall, the London Police Services Board hosted three public consultations with key stakeholders, including education, community groups, business owners, and business improvement areas. The consultations were held to elicit the concerns and issues associated to the current and future levels of policing provided to these key community representatives. I can indicate that from those in attendance who represented large segments of the community, there were no calls for reduced policing services and there was a consistent demand for enhanced services. This was especially evident among the business and BIA representatives for areas outside of the downtown core.

Business owners, while appreciative of the Foot Patrol and COR Unit, expressed concerns over any reduction to services to the extent that one long-time downtown business owner advised that they had reached a tipping point as to whether their business will remain in the core. Further, that the consistent presence of the Foot Patrol officers was a major consideration for them to remain open in their downtown location.

This was followed by others indicating that a potential domino effect would occur among businesses. The need for an ongoing “*investment in policing*” was identified by the stakeholders, indicating that a strong police presence ensures that community safety remains a priority.

Our Community Services Unit is a vital component of our Service that provides important outreach to our community through a number of means. Our Crime Prevention Unit members are engaged in over a dozen programs and events geared towards the promotion of a safer community. We offer programs such as the Citizens Academy that have long waiting lists and have received tremendous endorsements from those who have participated and graduated. The Auxiliary Program is managed within the Community Service Unit. Auxiliary members are volunteers who provide considerable assistance at public functions such as parades and gatherings requiring a police presence. In addition, they participate in a variety of crime prevention initiatives. In fact, the hours volunteered equate to 5 full-time police positions. Reductions to staff in the Community Services Unit would put this program at risk.

Our Secondary School Resource Officers provide a valuable service to the students, families of students, teachers, and school administrators in our school boards. We also provide several high value programs within our public schools, educating our children on conflict resolution, the dangers of drugs and alcohol, the Values, Influences and Peers Program, and the list goes on.

We have been present within our London schools for more than three decades. There are numerous examples where life-altering outcomes have occurred as a result of police involvement within our schools. A police presence in our schools proactively contributes to the growth of our children into responsible citizens. Just as the business and neighborhood associations value the COR and Foot Patrol Units, the school-based programs similarly provide equal value to the tens of thousands of students, families, faculty, and staff involved.

Notwithstanding my comments relating to the COR Unit, Foot Patrol and Community Services Units, I need to re-emphasize that providing policing to this community is complicated and front line patrol is an integral part of our response. The majority of work associated to a police service emanates from the front line patrol officer. A reduction in operating funds will significantly alter our ability to manage our day-to-day work.

Front line patrol is primarily responsible for answering calls for service; however, there is a continual need for special projects to address emerging criminal trends and patterns throughout the city. By way of example, since 2011 five major street gang projects have been conducted to stem the number of gang-related shootings that were on the rise. These projects resulted in 215 arrests, 436 criminal charges, and the seizure of 34 weapons. Front line patrol contributed 7,115 hours of time to these projects.

Due to the sensitive nature of these projects they are not generally made public until they have been concluded, but what is of importance is the fact that while the projects

were in place there were no gang shootings or violence. It needs to be emphasized that a reduction in patrol operation staffing would negatively impact these projects from being as effective as they have been. *Further, reductions in proactive policing efforts are a regressive approach that will increase the demand on reactive frontline policing.*

Recent events in our city have highlighted that the potential for violence is increasing and police resources are imperative, not only to work towards interdicting the commission of these offences, but also to quickly respond and arrest the responsible parties. And while I have never linked our resource requirements to crime trends, or patterns, this disturbing escalation has been noted for the last several years as criminal connections between London and other large urban areas, most notably the GTA, have clearly been established. We have had to reallocate resources to meet this very serious criminal threat, as well as engaging in local partnerships with the RCMP to jointly combat the gun and drug activity associated to gangs.

In addition, criminal activities occur that require an immediate response due to the level of threat presented to the public. By way of example, during 2013 a serial sexual predator who preyed upon lone females was investigated, requiring the transfer of significant additional resources. Members were utilized from the Community Services Unit and the Community Foot Patrol Unit, resulting in the apprehension of the suspect. Without the ability to utilize resources from areas other than patrol, the quick resolution of these criminal occurrences would not be possible.

Unlike most municipal services, policing is extremely fluid and unpredictable. There must be internal capacity to temporarily redirect resources on short notice to address immediate needs. *A reduction in the sworn complement would severely and negatively impact this capacity and result in risks that I cannot support as acceptable to the safety and well-being of our community.*

Turning to our 2014 operating budget submission and notwithstanding the very clear need for supporting human resources, within the 3.3% budget are funds necessary to support the ongoing operations of the Service and these are critical, including: fuel, utilities, overtime, prescriptive training, equipment, and legal costs. A 3.3% target, given the costs associated to personnel, provides for no margins, and the risk for a deficit position is increasingly evident given our projections. The assumption that a decreased budget will cover working agreement costs and the operations of the service is incorrect and is not based on an actual, detailed cost analysis, as was presented to the Board by the Administration. The assumption that a lower percentage can be managed is completely arbitrary and does not represent an accurate assessment as to the real costs of our operations.

As Chief of Police, and in direct consultation with the London Police Service Board, I must emphasize that we have carefully studied and determined what level of service is required to ensure that our city is safe and secure and the community receives the programs that it has indicated are necessary and it wants to continue. An approved amount less than 3.3% is only achievable at the risk of creating a larger deficit budget

situation, the loss of long-standing community policing programs, and an inability to address visibility, crime interdiction, crime prevention and arising community demands that have been clearly articulated.

As the majority of our service delivery is provided through the application of human resources, it is very important to ensure that we do so in a cost-effective manner; however, I must maintain and develop the resources that will meet future growth and the challenges that have arisen within our municipality. We are the 11<sup>th</sup> largest municipality in Canada and we must understand and recognize that large city policing is far more complicated than what is experienced in smaller centres. Population density alone contributes to the need for a comprehensive approach in order to address calls for service. In fact, our staffing model has been reviewed by other organizations seeking to improve their own service delivery efficiencies as we have long been recognized for our effective and efficient approaches to staff deployment. This is attributable in no small part to the relationship we have with our London Police Association and our members who work our current schedules.

Considering that 95% of the 2014 budget increase relates to personnel costs, it is challenging to mitigate increases; however, we have worked co-operatively with the Board and City Administration to arrive at a tax impact of \$14.90 for the average London tax payer.

First of all, the funding required for the London Police Service has been reduced by \$528,252 in 2014 through a recommended draw from the unfunded liability reserve. The Board is very much aware that the draw from the reserve fund is a short-term fix - not a long-term strategy, as reserves are very limited and although the draw from this reserve account will mitigate the increase in 2014, it will result in subsequent increases in future years. The monies contained in the reserve fund were previously designated for operational contingencies associated to potentially protracted investigations, which could be impacted as a result of this draw.

Secondly, a portion of the Assessment Growth has been approved by the City Treasurer, Chief Financial Officer. This equates to a further reduction of \$900,000. For 2013, all civic departments, boards and commissions that incur costs to provide an extension of core services specifically related to a growing, expanding city were entitled to submit a business case to request an allocation of property tax related to assessment growth. Although other city departments have had assessment growth assigned in previous budget years to offset their budget increases, prior to this year the London Police Service has not explored this funding source, although many other Ontario police services regularly receive a portion of the assessment growth. Consistent with the Council-approved assessment growth policy, policing costs due to the growth of the expanding City should be funded from assessment growth funds. As a result, a business case was submitted that will allow the London Police Service to continue to operate programs at the same levels in the expanding city, recognizing that there is a deficit of positions currently.



The application of the draw from the reserve fund for \$528,000 and the assessment growth funding of \$900,000 results in a 2014 tax-supported budget increase of 3.3%, or \$2,974,000 towards London Police operations. It is important to understand that the proposed 2014 budget is a risk-based budget, with short-term risk quantified as high as \$1,000,000. This is related to aggressive estimates for attrition, assumptions that provincial funding ending March 31, 2014 will continue, Workplace Safety Insurance Board expenses that are underfunded, and revenue that could fluctuate from estimates --- all of which have the potential to further impact our budget projections negatively.

The longer-term risks still remain, with a needed response to emerging issues such as human trafficking, complex cybercrime, fraud investigations, and upgrades to our communications system to allow us to receive text and video messaging from the public. In addition, there still continues to be an increasing demand on police services to address mental health related calls for service.

In the area of mental health, we have worked diligently with our community partners to apply more appropriate resources, including access to crisis care workers, to reduce officer engagement; however, we have experienced a 20% increase in mental health calls for service in 2013, thereby negating the gains made.

I must also advise Council members that there are legislative provisions that preclude a reduction in police complement without the approval of the Ontario Civilian Police Commission. A reduction in complement must not contravene the *Police Services Act* and, in particular, the provision of adequate and effective policing within the community. Furthermore, the Board must be satisfied that the budget established for it by Council is sufficient to maintain an adequate number of police officers.

The London Police Services Board, in conjunction with the Chief of Police, is responsible for ensuring that adequate and effective police service is provided within the City of London. Within the proposed 2014 budget are funds required and necessary to support the ongoing programs, services, and operations of the Service.

*It is very clear that a reduction in the amount requested for 2014 will result in a decrease in complement that will negatively impact service levels, leading to the reduction or elimination of programs and services. This is not an outcome that I support as Chief of Police.*

I note that the City of London's 2011 to 2014 Strategic Plan is aligned with my responsibilities as Chief and the statutory obligation that the Board has in terms of community safety. Here are extracts from the City's plan found under the heading "A Caring Community":

- Invest in *efficient and effective public safety services*
- Engage *businesses, residents and community groups* in keeping our city safe
- Promote *safety* in all neighbourhoods
- Implement comprehensive *public education programs*

- Promote *public awareness* through *prevention programs*

Together, we have a responsibility to ensure community safety and well-being. We are conjoined in this approach and I urge you to consider the consequences to budget reductions. The 2014 police budget is already risk based, as I have outlined in this presentation. A reduction to the budget will not result in efficiencies; rather, it will create deficiencies in service delivery.

As Chief, I must prioritize our service delivery based on the available operating budget. Reductions to the budget will impact my ability to address the myriad of community needs and issues that continue to impact this city.

I understand the issue of sustainability as it relates to the salary and benefits associated with costs for emergency services. The London Police Services Board and the London Police Association were among the first to negotiate a four-year contract that reduced the annualized increases from 3% to 2.6% in 2014. There is still much work to be done and to that end, Mr. Paul Paolatto has been advocating at the provincial level with the Ontario Association of Police Service Boards to collectively establish more reasonable and consistent salary negotiations. His work has been supported by the members of the London Police Services Board, recognizing this is a critical undertaking.

Notwithstanding this very important work, as Chief, I remain responsible for the deployment of police personnel to meet the safety and security challenges facing our community. Policing is extremely complex and most impacts to service delivery are caused or influenced by world events, emerging trends, judicial decisions, legislative changes, and technology --- all beyond the control of the police service, yet requiring a police response to maintain community safety and well-being.

My purpose today has been to outline pressures and risks, to highlight that our organization is effective and efficient when compared with other police services and we are seeing improvements in service delivery; however, future impacts loom large and we must be prepared to meet them. A reduction to the Board approved 3.3% budget will have significant consequences for the workload of the members of the London Police Service and to the services that our citizens have clearly indicated they require and expect.

Our budget is based upon a clear business case detailing our deployment of resources and I urge Council to consider this in your deliberations. A reduction of operating funds could negatively impact our legislative requirement to provide adequate and effective police service delivery and will, in fact, create a deficient model of policing for the City of London.

Bradley S. Duncan, O.O.M.,  
Chief of Police

