

## Report to Council

<b>Report Title:</b>	Compulsory Joint Police Services Board		
<b>Prepared By:</b>	Sarah Johnson, Jr. Deputy Clerk and Fiona Hamilton, Clerk		
<b>Department:</b>	Clerk's		
<b>Date:</b>	June 22, 2021		
<b>Report Number:</b>	CLK2021-19	<b>File Number:</b>	C11CL, P16PO
<b>Attachments:</b>	Letter to Ministry of Solicitor General - Brockton Police Services Board Request under <i>Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019</i>		

### Recommendation:

That the Council of the Municipality of Brockton hereby receives Report Number CLK2021-19 – Compulsory Joint Police Services Board, prepared by Sarah Johnson, Jr. Deputy Clerk and Fiona Hamilton, Clerk and in doing so approves proceeding to submit a joint proposal under the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* with the South Bruce O.P.P. Police Services Boards prior to the June 2021 month-end extension deadline.

### Report:

#### Background:

On April 27, 2021, staff brought forward Report CLK2021-12 providing information on the *Community Safety and Policing Act, 2019* (CSPA) impact on Police Services Boards. Council passed a resolution approving sending a letter to the Ministry of the Solicitor General requesting an exemption under the CSPA to allow the Municipality of Brockton to maintain the Brockton Police Services Board as a singular Board as requested by the Brockton Police Services Board.

Staff proceeded to send a letter to the Ministry of the Solicitor General and copied MPP Lisa Thompson on April 29, 2021, as attached, and sent an additional follow-up email on May 13, 2021 requesting a response prior to the June 7<sup>th</sup> proposal submission deadline. Staff have not yet received a response from the Ministry, or MPP Lisa Thompson.

#### Analysis:

South Bruce, Huron-Kinloss, Arran-Elderslie Councils have all passed resolutions in favour of a joint South Bruce O.P.P. Board. The Municipality of Kincardine requested a meeting with MPP Lisa Thompson regarding the matter and further submitted a request to the Ministry of the Solicitor General to grant an exemption for all South Bruce O.P.P. Boards to extend the proposal deadline in order to allow additional time for consideration. The Municipality of Kincardine were successful in their request, and all South Bruce O.P.P.

Boards have been granted a proposal extension until the end of June (although it was expressed that no further extension would be forthcoming).

The Brockton Police Services Board held a regular meeting on May 20, 2021 and staff notified the Board that a response had not yet been received from the Ministry of the Solicitor General regarding their request under the CSPA; and further explained that the Municipality of Kincardine had received an extension for the South Bruce O.P.P. Board proposal submission until the end of June.

Staff had originally scheduled a meeting with Bruce County Clerk's in late May to review the joint proposal prior to the June 7<sup>th</sup> submission deadline; however, upon learning of the extension, the meeting will be postponed in order to obtain further direction and clarification on how to proceed.

The Municipality of Kincardine recently considered this matter on June 14, 2021 and Kincardine Council deferred the decision on whether to combine as one South Bruce O.P.P. Board or remain as a Kincardine Police Services Board until June 17, 2021 upon meeting with MPP Lisa Thompson.

#### Clarification on O.P.P. Billing or Service Agreements

The formation of a Detachment Board will have no impact on the O.P.P. Service Agreement the Municipality has with the Ministry of the Solicitor General. The Board is not responsible for reviewing and renewing service agreements. Municipalities will continue to be billed for O.P.P. services individually. The billing system is determined by the number of residents and businesses (property count) in the Municipality and calls for service. The Municipality would still be able enter into agreements for enhanced policing services under the CSPA; however, the Municipality is responsible for funding and implementing these enhancements, not the Detachment Board.

#### Future Role of the Detachment Board

The role of Detachment Board members will expand under the CSPA to include additional responsibilities not currently covered by Section 10 in the *Police Services Act, 1990*. Detachment Boards will be responsible for considering any community safety and well-being plans adopted by the Municipality. Boards will also ensure that local action plans prepared by the Detachment Commander address the objectives and priorities determined by the board.

Detachment Boards will enhance civilian governance and ensure that each municipality and First Nation receiving O.P.P. services have an opportunity to represent their local perspectives, needs, and priorities. This will also be an opportunity to collaborate with neighbouring municipalities on efforts to improve community safety, while still being able to advocate the Municipality's perspectives, needs, and priorities. A Detachment Board that consists of all the municipalities receiving policing from the South Bruce OPP will enhance the transparent, coordinated and efficient delivery of service.

Brockton Council adopted the Grey Bruce Community Safety and Well-Being Plan in December 2020. The Plan was established to develop strategies that address safety and well-being concerns identified as being high risk in Bruce and Grey Counties in a proactive and collaborative manner. Crime Prevention was one of five priority areas for action identified in the Plan. The Municipality of Kincardine, Township of Huron-Kinloss, the Municipality of South Bruce, and the Municipality of Arran-Elderslie also adopted the same Community Safety

and Well-Being Plan. The creation of a South Bruce O.P.P. Detachment Board will further enhance the implementation of the communication and collaboration initiatives that are identified in the Plan.

All Municipalities and First Nation communities receiving direct and/or supplemental services from an OPP detachment are required to submit one proposal per detachment. The proposal must include the desired composition of the board, if a municipality wishes to retain its own board, including the justification for this, and/or if the municipality is forfeiting its seat on the board.

The following is a list of options for Council to decide regarding the future of the Brockton Police Services Board. The list is in no particular order

### **Option 1: Forming One South Bruce O.P.P. Detachment Board**

Requirements of the board include:

- Minimum size of 5 members, no maximum size but the Ministry recommends a maximum size of 15 members.
- 20% Community Representation – the Province will appoint community representatives should municipal council fail to appoint representatives by joint resolution.
- 20% Provincial Appointees.

The proposal will require the municipalities to identify the number of seats each municipality will have on the board as well as the number of community representatives and provincial appointments. The names of the individuals that will be participating in on the Detachment Board are not required at this time.

The Detachment Board model is already in-use in several places in Ontario, including Lambton Group Police Services Board which represents nine different municipalities who receive police services from the Lambton O.P.P. Each municipality has a representative on the board.

As previously stated, Brockton has consulted with the South Bruce O.P.P. Clerks to discuss the proposal submission, and have advised that the Brockton Police Services Board requested to maintain its own Board; however, no response has been given by the Ministry of the Solicitor General.

The suggested board composition for joint Detachment Boards is as follows:

- One member from each participating municipality
- Two members from the community
- Two provincial appointees

The Councils of Huron-Kinloss, South Bruce, and Arran-Elderslie have all voted in support of this proposed framework.

The Ministry has acknowledged that as detachment boards are established and take on their new roles, there may be some boards that will require changes and the Ministry will assist with making those changes. If a proposal is not submitted or a consensus cannot be reached on the composition, the ministry will determine the composition of the detachment board.

## **Option 2: Confirm Request to Maintain a Separate Police Services Board**

Multiple boards per detachment are permitted, but the rationale for multiple boards and the composition of each additional board must be submitted as part of the detachment proposal. The Ministry has indicated the following factors as acceptable rationale:

- **Geography** - The total geographic area of the Detachment. For example, detachments in Northern Ontario can cover hundreds of kilometers and there is a significant distance between the detachment and the communities it serves, often requiring several hours of travel.
- **Variations in population size** - As of 2016 the population of the Municipality of Brockton was 9,461. The Municipality of Kincardine was 11,380, Arran-Elderslie's population was 6,803, the Municipality of South Bruce was 5,639, and the Township of Huron-Kinloss had a population of 7,069 in 2016. These are not considered significant variations in population size.
- **Number of municipalities and First Nations within an O.P.P. detachment** - There are currently five (5) municipalities in the South Bruce O.P.P. Detachment. The Wellington County O.P.P. Detachment already has one board for the whole detachment, which represents 7 towns and townships with population sizes ranging from just over 7,000 to almost 30,000. As previously mentioned, the Lambton Group Police Services Board represents 5 townships, 1 city, 1 village, and 2 towns.
- **Service demands** - The Municipality of Brockton had 1,861 calls for service in 2020, while the Municipality of Kincardine had 2,036. The Township of Huron-Kinloss, the Municipality of Arran-Elderslie, and the Municipality of South Bruce had just under 1,000 service calls each. All five municipalities share similar top 10 calls for service including: Motor Vehicle Collisions, Suspicious Persons, Theft under \$5,000, Domestic Disturbance, False Alarms, Mental Health Act, and Mischief.

Although a request was submitted to the Ministry of the Solicitor General on April 29, 2021 requesting that Brockton maintain its own Board (stating factors such as policing costs, the Walkerton Courthouse, our unique rural geography, variation in population size, and public interest in service calls) staff have yet to receive a response, and expect that the request may not be granted, certainly not in time to submit the proposal which is due by June 30, 2021.

## **Option 3: Forfeit a Seat on the Board**

The Municipality may also choose not to participate on a detachment board and forfeit their seat. If the municipality forfeits their seat on the detachment board, they will not be able to meet with the Detachment Commander on a regular basis and will not receive regular reports. The detachment boards will be responsible for governance of local OPP policing within the entire detachment area. If the Municipality does not participate on a detachment board, the board will still be responsible for input into policing of that area and will be making decision regarding local policies for communities that choose not to participate.

The forfeiture of the seat needs to be indicated on the proposal.

## Brockton Police Services Board Update

The Brockton Police Services Board met on June 17, 2021 and confirmed its original position to request to remain a separate Board.

Since this is the last Council Meeting in June 2021, and the proposal extension is due at the end of the month, staff seek direction from Council at this meeting in order to proceed with the proposal submission.

### **Sustainability Checklist:**

What aspect of the Brockton Sustainable Strategic Plan does the content/recommendations in this report help advance?

- |   |     |
|---|-----|
| • Do the recommendations help move the Municipality closer to its Vision? | Yes |
| • Do the recommendations contribute to achieving Cultural Vibrancy?       | N/A |
| • Do the recommendations contribute to achieving Economic Prosperity?     | Yes |
| • Do the recommendations contribute to Environmental Integrity?           | N/A |
| • Do the recommendations contribute to the Social Equity?                 | Yes |

### **Financial Impacts/Source of Funding:**

- Do the recommendations represent a sound financial investment from a sustainability perspective? Yes

N/A

### **Reviewed By:**



**Trish Serratore, Chief Financial Officer**

---

### **Respectfully Submitted by:**



**Sarah Johnson, Jr. Deputy Clerk**



**Fiona Hamilton, Clerk**

### **Reviewed By:**



**Sonya Watson, Chief Administrative Officer**