Attachment A: Special Event and BIA Users of Paid Duty Survey Results

An online survey of special event organizers, including Business Improvement Areas, was administered by City of Toronto staff. Event organizers were identified through a network supported by the Economic Development and Culture Division. The survey asked a combination of closed and open-ended questions about the events they organize and their use of paid duty officers to support the events, and was active in May and June, 2015. This document provides a summary of survey responses.

Respondent and Event Profile

A total of 43 special event organizers responded to the survey. Respondents self-identified that they had organized a special event in Toronto, supported by paid duty police officers, between 2013 and 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Size/Type</th>
<th># Respondents</th>
<th># of Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A (infrequent, unlimited venues, over 200K attendance)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B (usually annual, up to 5 venues, 20K to 200K attendance)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C (can be annual, up to 5 venues, 10K to 50K attendance)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category D (can be annual, one location, 2K to 5K attendance)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street and Community Event (can be annual, one location, less than 2K attendance)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents organized a wide range of event sizes and types across the City. These events included all categories of special events established by the City, including local street events to large events with over 200,000 attendees.
• Total expenditures for these events ranged from $5,000 to $28 million.
• Expenditures on paid duty to support these events ranged from $400 to $630,000.
• Spending on paid duty as a proportion of the total event budget also varied. The largest group of respondents (45%) spent less than 5% of their event budget on paid duty. Thirty-eight per cent of respondents spent between 5 and 15% of their event budget on paid duty, and 17% spent over 15% of their event budget on paid duty.

**Use of Paid Duty**

### Why did you use paid duty?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>% Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet traffic control requirements</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet City permit requirements</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective traffic/pedestrian control</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate response in emergency situation</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase public confidence in event security</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of alcohol/drug consumption</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet insurance requirements</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPS requirement</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue requirement</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Meeting traffic control (72% of respondents) or City permit requirements (63% of respondents) were the most common reasons for employing paid duty officers to support their event. In total, 81% of respondents cited at least one of these reasons (data not shown).
• Meeting other requirements set by insurance, TPS and/or host venues were additional reasons given for using paid duty.

• For two-thirds of events (63%), the paid duty was filled as requested.
• For one-fifth of events (21%), more than the requested number of paid duty officers showed up for duty. These extra officers presumably had to be compensated for their duty.
• For one-sixth of events (16%), the requested paid duty was partially filled. These cases may have been due to officers arriving late for their duty, leaving early, or the requested number not showing up for duty.
• In no cases did no paid duty officers show up for duty.

How was your request for paid duty filled?

- As requested, 63%
- Partially filled, 16%
- With more PDOs than requested, 21%

What were the challenges with using paid duty?

- No guarantee that request will be filled: 58%
- Service was too expensive: 56%
- No ability to set number of paid duty officers: 33%
- Payment required in full up front: 30%
- Unable to direct actions of paid duty officers: 28%
- Complicated request process: 19%
- Other: 14%
- None: 5%

% respondents
• Over half of respondents (58%) indicated having no guarantee that their request for paid duty would be filled was a challenge in using the current system.
• Similarly, over half of respondents (56%) felt the service was too expensive.
• One-third (33%) of respondents were frustrated by their lack of ability to set the number of paid duty officers they thought they needed.
• Only 5% of respondents said they had no challenges with the current system.

![Were paid duty requirements warranted?](image)

• More than half (55%) of respondents felt the paid duty requirements set for their event were warranted.
• One-fifth of respondents (19%) felt that the requirements set were not warranted for their event.
• One-quarter (26%) of respondents felt the requirements were warranted in some respects but not in others, or they were unsure.

**Suggestions for Minimizing Cost**

When asked how the costs of paid duty for special events could be minimized, respondents had a number of suggestions.

**Alternative Service Delivery**

• Forty-five per cent of respondents suggested that the ability to replace some paid duty officers with private security, peace officers, volunteers or crossing guards would reduce costs. Some respondents expressed that TPS does not take into account the presence of private security in setting their requirements, and have experienced challenges coordinating duties and responsibility between various service providers including security and the TPS. Others suggested that police and private security have worked well together.
• Respondents suggested private security and volunteers should be permitted to direct traffic and close roads in some situations without officers present.

• One respondent stated that, compared to private security, TPS delivers better service and gets more respect from the public.

Setting Requirements

• Many respondents expressed that the number of paid duty officers required by TPS had resulted in more paid duty than necessary. They felt that TPS should give more consideration to input from City staff and event organizers, experience with prior events, knowledge of the participants and community when determining what should be required of TPS. Further, scheduling of paid duty should factor in the varying attendance levels during an event and set-up/close down activities, and officers should be permitted to be sent home early if not required (and the event not charged for their time). Finally, they suggested that the number of paid duty officers at an event should be capable of initiating an emergency response, but not fully addressing an emergency.

• Many respondents suggested that the requirement for a sergeant for every four officers added unnecessary costs as sergeants do not carry out traffic control or security functions directly. They suggested eliminating the requirement, changing the ratio, or enabling the sergeant to carry out direct service.

Cost Structure

• Respondents suggested that reducing the hourly paid duty rate for officers, eliminating the 3 hour minimum charge and using on-duty officers would reduce their costs.

• A number of respondents suggested that in-kind services or reduced rates for charity and non-profit events should be considered, along with the benefit these events contribute to the city.

Suggestions for Service Improvement

When asked how paid duty services for special events could be improved, respondents had a number of suggestions.

Administrative Practices

• A number of respondents said that they did not have any concerns about TPS or paid duty services, that the cost and administration processes were reasonable and worked for their purposes.

• Other respondents expressed frustration and concerns about increased risk to their event due to the lack of communication and short notice of confirmation that their paid duty requests would be filled. They suggested confirmation more than two days in advance of an event would improve paid duty service.

• Respondents suggested that critical paid duty assignments should be identified and prioritized. Respondents suggested that TPS should be able to guarantee a minimum
number of paid duty officers to fill a request, particularly since requestors are required to pay in full in advance of the event.

- Respondents suggested that application process for paid duty could be streamlined.
- Respondents noted a concern in managing multiple relationships with TPS to fill a paid duty request, including Central Paid Duty Office, the TPS divisional planner, the TPS Special Events Office, and the officers to work the paid duty assignment.
- Regarding payment for paid duty, respondents suggested moving to a deposit requirement or flexible payment options instead of full payment up front. Further, respondents reflected that they do not think they should be paying officers directly for their service.

Planning and Setting Requirements

- Regarding the setting of paid duty requirements, respondents suggested a consistent approach and better communication between event organizers and TPS divisions about needs and expectations for support, before and during the event. They suggested that TPS planners could do a site visit before the event, and that the justification for the number of officers should be provided to organizers. Some respondents called for consideration of the use of private security in setting requirements, and others were satisfied with the balance of paid duty officers and private security used for their event.
- Respondents suggested improving the process to get assignment-specific information from organizers to paid duty officers in advance of event. They suggested that an opportunity to brief paid duty officers before the event would be helpful.

Clarify Expectations and Provide Consistent Service

- Respondents commented that they felt that planning for paid duty at their event and what happens during the event is disconnected.
- Related to communication during the event, respondents suggested that a contact number be provided in the case where there are issues with the paid duty not being filled, or with the officer. Further, that the Central Paid Duty Office should be accessible during their event (which may be outside of business hours). Also, a suggestion was made that a point person be on site to coordinate paid duty officers supporting their event.
- Respondents expressed that paid duty officers are sometimes unclear about their role or what event they are supporting, or that they see their role as very limited. Respondents felt that it should be clear to officers that they are expected to enforce law and by-law as part of their paid duty, and be responsible for moving barriers in the closing of roads. Further, respondents suggested that officers should take some direction from event organizers, and they should be held more accountable for their performance while on paid duty.
- Respondents suggested consistent service levels would be an improvement. They suggested that paid duty assignments should be filled with officers with the appropriate skills/experience, the punctuality of officers showing up for paid duty could be improved.
so that the event is not delayed. For example, one respondent identified a problem with bagging and signing parking meters for street events before the event.

- Respondents suggested that activities that contribute to the non-professional appearance of police officers while on paid duty should be restricted. Further, it was suggested that officers on paid duty should have to follow the same rules as the public when parking their personal vehicles.

- Respondents suggested that the creation of a unit specifically for road closures should be considered.