

# **Request for Review of ASE-Related Funding Claims and the 2026 Unanticipated pressures: Provincial change in Automated Speed Enforcement (\$99M)**

**Misrepresentation of ASE Funding and the 2026 ASE (99M) Shortfall**

**To: Toronto Budget Committee Toronto City Council The Premier of Ontario**

**From: James D Golding**

Address 11 Tedford Drive Toronto, On M1R 1L9

Email: [jamesdgolding@hotmail.com](mailto:jamesdgolding@hotmail.com)

Secondary Email: [firetablejames@gmail.com](mailto:firetablejames@gmail.com)

Home: 416-701-0747

Cell 437-994-7912

# Executive Summary

The City of Toronto justified the 2026 Traffic Safety Levy by stating that Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) fines funded school crossing guards and police traffic safety officers, and that the provincial ASE ban created a \$99-million shortfall.

**However, the City's own 2024 and 2025 budget documents show:**

- ASE revenue never funded these programs
- No ASE-funded program worth \$99M exists
- ASE revenue continued until November 2025, meaning no immediate funding gap occurred
- Taxpayers funded crossing guards and traffic officers before, during, and after the ban
- ASE revenue was deposited into the City's general operating revenues, not into Transportation Services or TPS
- ASE funds were never tracked, earmarked, or allocated to any specific program, making them indistinguishable from tax dollars

**Therefore:**

- The levy is not replacing lost ASE revenue, because no such revenue stream ever funded the programs in question
- The \$99M levy is new general operating revenue, justified using a premise contradicted by the City's own financial records

A formal review and correction of the public record are required.

# Part 1 — What the City’s Budgets Show

## 1. ASE revenue never funded crossing guards

### 2024 Transportation Services Budget Notes

The School Crossing Guard Program is funded entirely through the **tax-supported operating budget**.

No ASE revenue is listed as a funding source.

### 2025 Transportation Services Budget Notes

The same structure continues: crossing guards remain **tax-funded**.

No ASE revenue appears in any revenue table, note, or funding summary.

#### Conclusion:

There is no budget note, staff report, Council motion, or revenue line showing ASE funding crossing guards in 2024 or 2025.

## 2. ASE revenue never funded police traffic safety officers

### 2024 & 2025 Toronto Police Service Budget Notes — No ASE Revenue or Program Dependency

A review of both the 2024 and 2025 Toronto Police Service (TPS) budget documents confirms that Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) revenue did not fund any TPS program, including the 18 Traffic Safety Officers referenced in the Mayor’s 2025 statement.

Across both years:

- Traffic Safety Officers are funded through the **property tax levy**.
- No ASE revenue appears in any TPS operating budget table.
- No ASE revenue appears in any TPS revenue summary.
- No ASE revenue appears in any TPS program description or funding note.
- No Council motion redirected ASE revenue to TPS.

#### Conclusion:

ASE revenue did not fund police traffic officers in any documented year. All such positions were funded through taxpayer-supported operating dollars.

### **3. ASE revenue continued until November 2025**

ASE cameras operated from January to **November 14, 2025**.  
CBC reported **\$30.3M collected from January–August 2025**.

Revenue continued until the ban took effect.

#### **Conclusion:**

If ASE had been funding crossing guards, there would have been no immediate shortfall, because revenue was still flowing at the time of the Mayor's statement.

### **4. The Mayor's claim appears only after the ban**

In November 2025, the Mayor stated that ASE fines funded:

- 911 crossing guards
- 18 traffic safety officers
- Totaling **\$35.1M**

However:

- No pre-ban budget document supports this.
- No reallocation was approved by Council.
- No revenue line shows ASE funding these roles.

#### **Conclusion:**

This claim is not supported by any City financial document.

## **5. The 2026 budget introduces a \$99M “ASE pressure” with no basis**

The 2026 budget lists:

“Provincial change in Automated Speed Enforcement (\$99M)”

But:

- Claimed ASE-funded programs = **\$35.1M**
- ASE revenue in 2025 ≈ **\$45M**
- No program or division shows a **\$99M loss**
- No breakdown explains the remaining **\$63.9M**

### **Conclusion:**

The City cannot lose \$99M in ASE funding because ASE never funded \$99M in programs.

The levy is not replacing lost ASE revenue. It is new revenue, justified using an incorrect premise.

## **Part 2 — What the Levy Is Actually Funding**

### **1. Taxpayers never stopped funding crossing guards**

The 2024 and 2025 budgets show:

- Crossing guards = **tax-supported operating cost**
- No ASE revenue
- No ASE subsidy
- No reallocation
- No change in funding source

Taxpayers funded:

- All crossing guards
- All traffic safety officers

Before the ban, during the ban, and after the ban.

### **2. The \$99M levy is not funding ASE-related programs**

Because:

- ASE never funded crossing guards
- ASE never funded traffic officers
- ASE never funded \$99M worth of anything
- ASE revenue was still flowing until November 2025
- No \$99M shortfall exists in any budget document

#### **Conclusion:**

The levy cannot be replacing something that never existed.

### 3. Where the \$99M is actually going

Based on the 2026 budget structure, the \$99M is being used to cover **general operating pressures**, including:

- Inflation
- Salary increases
- Capital financing
- Transit pressures
- Shelter system pressures
- Policing pressures
- Road maintenance
- Winter operations
- General structural deficits

The City labeled these unrelated pressures as:

“Provincial change in Automated Speed Enforcement”

The budgets show this label is **not accurate**.

### 4. Why the ASE narrative was used

Politically, it is easier to say:

“The province banned ASE, so we need a tax.”

than to say:

“We have a \$99M structural deficit and need a new tax to fill it.”

The ASE ban became a political justification for a general tax increase.

## Part 3 — The Core Contradiction

If ASE funded crossing guards, the tax levy should have been freed up.

But the 2025 budgets show the tax levy never changed.

Therefore:

- ASE never funded crossing guards.
- ASE never funded traffic officers.
- The new \$99M levy is not replacing lost ASE revenue.
- It is new revenue used to cover unrelated budget pressures.

This conclusion is fully supported by the City's own documents.

## **Part 4 — Request for Council Action**

## **1. Conduct a formal review**

Of all ASE-related funding claims made in 2024–2026, including:

- The basis for the Mayor’s November 2025 statements
- Any internal reallocations not disclosed publicly
- The calculation of the \$99M ASE pressure

## **2. Provide a full public breakdown of the \$99M**

Identifying:

- Which programs it funds
- How much replaces actual lost revenue
- How much represents new spending

## **3. Reconsider, reduce, or remove the levy**

If the City cannot demonstrate that:

- ASE ever funded the programs claimed
- ASE ever generated \$99M
- The levy is a genuine replacement rather than new revenue

## **4. Correct the public record**

To reflect the actual funding sources for crossing guards and traffic safety officers.

# **Part 5 — Where ASE Revenue Actually Went**

A review of the City's financial structure shows that Automated Speed Enforcement (ASE) revenue was never earmarked, dedicated, or tied to any specific program. Instead, ASE fines were processed through the Provincial Offences Act (POA) system and deposited into the City's general operating revenues, alongside parking fines, red-light camera fines, and other bylaw penalties.

1. ASE revenue was not assigned to Transportation Services or TPS

**No City budget, revenue table, or staff report shows ASE revenue being allocated to:**

- The School Crossing Guard Program
- Toronto Police Service
- Traffic Safety Officers
- Any Vision Zero program
- Any specific operating division

There is no ASE account, reserve, or program envelope.

2. Once deposited, ASE revenue became indistinguishable from tax dollars

**General revenue funds:**

- Transit
- Roads
- Shelters
- Policing
- Parks
- Salaries
- Winter operations
- Capital financing
- Structural deficit coverage

ASE revenue was absorbed into this pool and cannot be traced to any specific expenditure.

3. This is why the City cannot show where ASE money went

**Because ASE revenue was never tracked separately, the City has no mechanism to identify:**

- Which services ASE revenue supported
- Whether ASE revenue offset tax levy costs
- Whether ASE revenue reduced operating pressures

The City cannot point to a line item and say, “This is where ASE money went,” because the funds were never isolated.

#### **4. Conclusion**

ASE revenue went into the City’s general operating budget and was used to support general City-wide expenses. It did not fund crossing guards or traffic safety officers, and therefore the \$99M levy is not replacing lost ASE revenue. It is new revenue being used to cover unrelated budget pressures.

## **Final Conclusion**

The City’s own financial documents and budget records show:

- **ASE did not fund crossing guards or traffic safety officers** in 2024 or 2025.
- **ASE revenue continued until November 2025**, meaning no immediate funding gap existed.
- **No \$99M ASE-related shortfall exists** in any City division, program, or revenue table.
- **The levy is not replacing lost ASE revenue**, because ASE never funded the programs the City claimed it did.
- **ASE revenue was deposited into the City's general operating revenues**, not into Transportation Services or TPS, and became indistinguishable from tax dollars.
- **The City cannot identify where ASE money went**, because it was never tracked, earmarked, or allocated to any specific program.
- **The justification used to approve the levy is contradicted by the City's own financial documents**, which show no ASE-funded program and no ASE-related budget pressure of \$99M.

**Conclusion:**

The \$99M levy is new general operating revenue, not a replacement for lost ASE funding.

A full review, public clarification, and correction of the record are required.