

City of Winnipeg

Community Safety Strategic Action Plan

Pre-Planning Report

August 2019

PREPARED BY

MNP LLP



Table of Contents

1 Introduction 1

2 Phase 1 – Approach and Methodology 2

3 Community Safety Defined 3

4 The Existing Community Safety Environment in Winnipeg 6

4.1 Winnipeg Crime Rates 6

4.2 Winnipeg Police Service Calls for Service 9

4.3 Municipal Policies 12

4.4 Municipal Departments and Their Services 13

4.5 Stakeholders 43

4.6 Municipal Granting Criteria and Processes 54

4.7 Funding of Services 56

4.8 Other Related Services 60

4.9 Summary Conclusion 66

4.10 Map 67

5 What Other Jurisdictions are Doing 86

5.1 Community Safety Centres of Responsibility 86

5.2 Other Models 89



5.3 Leading Practices 93

6 Moving Forward 100

6.1 Rationale for Change 101

6.2 Strategic Directions for Consideration 101

6.3 Governance and Structure 101

6.4 Concept for Consideration 103

Appendix A – Master Stakeholder List 104

Appendix B: References 105


1 Introduction

A citizen's, business owner's and visitor's perception of their safety and security is key to the health and continued growth of a city. Community safety is complex and difficult to define. The factors that contribute to safety and security are equally as complex, requiring a multi-faceted and integrated approach. The City of Winnipeg wants to execute a collaborative, broad-scaled and complete approach to safety and security in Winnipeg, resulting in healthy, crime-free neighborhoods.

More than 50 years of research confirms early interventions prevent crime. The Canadian Municipal Network on Crime Prevention (CMNCP) has published numerous documents demonstrating the benefits of investment in effective solutions, such as youth and family services, enriched pre-school and parenting programs and revised school curricula. One such study cited a return of $7 for every $1 invested.

However, increasing policing budgets is a routine response to crime. According to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, municipal expenditures on public safety are unsustainable. It is critical to find different solutions. Having said that, it is very difficult to redirect policing funding to "upstream" interventions because it often takes years to achieve desired outcomes.

MNP has been retained to work with the City of Winnipeg and key stakeholders in the development of a practical, integrated community safety strategic action plan supported by a restructured municipal community safety and well-being policy and the appropriate governance and structural framework. The following is a report intended to inform the development of the strategic action plan.



2 Phase 1 – Approach and Methodology

MNP designed this engagement in two phases. Phase 1 involved project initiation and planning and a current state assessment of the community safety environment in Winnipeg. To begin our work, we needed to identify all stakeholders and categorize them in a manner that reflected their role in community safety. This required a broad perspective of community safety, inclusive of initiatives and activities focused on ensuring "at risk" individuals do not become involved in disorderly behaviour and/or criminal activity.

MNP identified "core" and "support" community safety stakeholders. We used lists of stakeholders provided to us by the City of Winnipeg, including those who have participated in past community safety tables and/or conferences as well as those receiving community safety grants. MNP supplemented these lists with identified stakeholders from other work we have completed in this area. We preliminarily defined these stakeholders as:

Core	Those directly providing services to address individual and area safety
Support	Those providing services to 'at risk' individuals that prevent them engaging in disorderly or criminal behaviour and/or becoming a victim of it.

MNP conducted interviews with many of the core partners including representatives from the Community Services, Planning, Property and Development and Public Works Departments as well as the Winnipeg Police Service. We conducted secondary research in all other stakeholders, creating a master list and identifying, as much as possible, their mandate, target client, services, geographical reach and funding services.

MNP also conducted primary and secondary research in Community Safety Centres of Responsibility as well as community safety granting practices in Winnipeg and other jurisdictions. The following sections detail our findings and analysis to date.

3 Community Safety Defined

In 2018, Dr. Chad Nilson was commissioned by the Community Safety Knowledge Alliance (CSKA) to write a report about the concept, current practices and policy alignment efforts surrounding the emerging community safety and well-being movement in Canada. Based on his extensive literature review, he concluded there is no accepted or standardized definition of 'community safety'.

Based on internet research, we found the following definitions of differing forms of community safety:

Crime Prevention	•No standard definition •Focuses on efforts to prevent crime before it occurs •Uses resources within justice in collaboration with social, health, education… •4 primary prevention strategies: social development; community; situational; criminal justice
Community Safety	•Originates out of England and Wales in 1986 •Concept of community-based action to inhibit and remedy cases and consequences of criminal, intimidatory and other anti-social behaviour •Multi-agency partnerships between public, private and volunteer sectors •Introduce and formulate community-based measures against crime
Community Safety and Well Being	•Broader human service system achieved through collaborative generation of pragmatic solutions, evidence-based innovations and shared community outcomes •Premise is that elevation of risk leads to increases in vulnerability and harm which, if not mitigated, cycles back to re-elevate risk •Relies on multi-sector collaboration of human services designed to address risk and vulnerability before harm occurs. When harm occurs, collaboration is used to mitigate the impact of that harm on further elevations in risk.

For the purposes of our assessment and the development of a strategic action plan and future state model, we defined:

- Community safety service
- At-risk
- Community Safety Centre of Responsibility

Community Safety Service: Directly provides activities, processes and outputs designed to support children, youth and adults 'at risk' of becoming involved in crimes or becoming victims of crimes.

- These services assist in ensuring safety and security in internal and external environments and/or addressing the root causes of crime while working towards wellness and productivity.
- These services can be publicly or privately funded but there cannot be a cost charged to the 'client' for the service.

At Risk: Is defined based on the World Health Organization Model for understanding risk factors for crime at the individual, relationship, community and societal level:

Individual	• Personal and psychological characteristics • Substance abuse	• History of violence
Relationship	• Poor parenting • Violence between parents	• Low income • Delinquent peers
Community	• Poverty • Unemployment • High crime	• High mobility • High density • Drug trade
Societal	• Gender and income inequality • Norms supportive of violence	• Policies re school expulsion • Low prosecution of offenders

Community Safety Centres of Responsibility: Is defined as an organization:


- Administered directly by the municipality or region, or by an entity that maintains a direct funding and/or reporting relationship to the municipal or regional government for which it serves
- Administered, at least partially, by paid employees
- Primarily dedicated to supporting community efforts to address community safety through the office's direct or indirect provision of services

- Administratively exclusive (no direct reporting relationship with the police service)
- Services a population of 50,000 or more

MNP concludes that there is actually a community safety continuum of services. Understanding what organizations provide services along this continuum and acknowledgement that each service and organization plays a role in community safety is important.

Figure 1: Community Safety Continuum

3.1.1 Community Safety Continuum



4 The Existing Community Safety Environment in Winnipeg

4.1 Winnipeg Crime Rates

Violent and property crime rates in Winnipeg have been above the six- year average (2013-2018) since 2016. Specifically, violent crime piqued in 2017 when it was ten (10) per cent higher than the six-year average; while property crime piqued in 2018 at twenty-seven (27) per cent higher [i] [ii] [iii] [iv] [v] [vi] (Figure 4 and Figure 6). Overall, violent and property crime rates in Winnipeg have been higher than the rest of Canada since 2013 (Figure 1 and Figure 3). However, in 2018 Winnipeg had only a 1% increase in violent crime compared to a 3% increase for the rest of Canada. Although, Winnipeg had a 14% increase in property crime compared to a 2% increase in the rest of Canada (Figure 2 and Figure 4).

4.1.1 Violent Crimes

Figure 2: Violent Crime Rates (per 100,000 population) Between 2013 and 2018 for Winnipeg Including a Six-Year Average





Figure 3: Violent Crime Rates (per 100,000 population) for Winnipeg Compared to Canada between 2013 and 2018




4.1.2 Property Crime

Figure 4: Property Crime Rates (per 100,000 population) Between 2013 and 2018 for Winnipeg Including a Six-Year Average



Figure 5: Property Crime Rates (per 100,000 population) for Winnipeg Compared to Canada Between 2013 and 2018



4.1.3 Crime Severity

In 2018 there was a decrease in the violent crime severity index by 3% in Winnipeg compared to an increase of 2% in the rest of Canada. Alternatively, due to the overall increase in property crimes in Winnipeg e.g. 77% increase in theft under $5,000, the total crime severity index increased by 14% in 2018 compared to only 2% in the rest of Canada (Figure 6).

Figure 6: Violent Crime Severity Index Score for Winnipeg Compared to Canada Between 2013 and 2018





Figure 7: Total Crime Severity Index Score for Winnipeg Compared to Canada Between 2013 and 2018




Winnipeg has had a higher Total Crime Severity Index Score and Violent Crime Index Score since 2012.

4.2 Winnipeg Police Service Calls for Service

Since 2013 there has been an increasing number of emergency and non-emergency calls received by the WPS (Figure 7) [vii] [viii] [ix] [x] [xi] [xii]. Between 2013 and 2018, the largest annual increase in terms of total calls was 37,013 from 2015 to 2016. However, the total number of calls received by the WPS in 2018 is the highest percentage above the 6-year average between 2013 and 2018 at (9) per cent. These results would suggest that the WPS is handling more calls for service over time with one of the busiest years to date being 2018.

Figure 8: Total Number of Calls Received by the WPS Annually Between 2013 and 2018 Including a Six-Year Average



However, in spite of the increasing number of calls received by the WPS, the total number of dispatched events (calls for service where WPS sent their members) decreased for the first time since 2013 by 927 from in 2018 (Figure 9).

Figure 9: Total Number of Events Responded to by the WPS Annually Between 2013 and 2018 Including a Six-Year Average





Figure 9 below provides more detailed information about dispatched events by separating the total number of dispatched events into either proactive, police-initiated events e.g. traffic stops, targeted patrols in high crime areas, and citizen generated events e.g. 911 calls. Specifically, figure 9 shows that there was a decrease of 5,220 police-initiated events from 2017 to 2018; while there was an increase of 5,293 citizen generated events. Therefore, the WPS responded to fewer events in 2018 in addition to conducting fewer proactive policing activities.

Figure 10: Total Number of Police-Initiated and Citizen Generated Dispatch Events Between 2013 and 2018



Considering the seemingly contradictory finding of an increasing number of calls received by the WPS and a decreasing number of dispatched events, one possible explanation would be that the majority of the increasing number of calls received by the WPS do not require a response by a sworn officer. To this

point, Figure 11 provides a break down of the total dispatched events between 2013 and 2018 by three levels of severity including: emergency, urgent, and non-urgent. All three severity level groups have been defined by the WPS and correspond to specific priority levels that are assigned to all calls received by the service (Table 1).

Figure 11: Total Number of Emergency, Urgent, and Non-Urgent Dispatch Events Annually Between 2013 and 2018





Table 1: Dispatch Event by Severity Level Including the Corresponding Priority Level

Dispatch Event Severity Level	Priority Level
Emergency Dispatch Events	**Priority 0** – Major Disaster; Officer in need of assistance
	Priority 1 – Danger to life or grievous bodily harm
	Priority 2 – Impending danger to life or grievous bodily harm
Urgent Dispatch Events	**Priority 3** – Urgent person incident
	Priority 4 – Urgent property incident
Non-Urgent Events	**Priority 5** – Non-urgent person incident
	Priority 6– Non-urgent property incident
	Priority 7 – Low risk or threat
	Priority 8 – Telephone response
	Priority 9 – Planned Response

With regards to the three severity levels, between 2017 and 2018 there was a decrease of 1,712 emergency and 3,110 non-urgent events attended to by the WPS and an increase of 4,895 urgent calls for service. With violent crime unchanged between 2017 and 2018, the increase in urgent dispatch events would primarily be explained by the 14% increase in property crime within the city leading to an increase in urgent property incidents. Despite these year-over-year changes in 2018, between 2013 and 2018 the proportion of emergency, urgent, and non-urgent dispatched events on average has been relatively stable at 8%, 36%, and 56% respectively.

4.3 Municipal Policies

Safety and security have been a component of all recent City of Winnipeg master plans. The OurWinnipeg plan, the City's long-term vision, incorporates safety and security as a strategic priority.



***LiveSAFE* in Winnipeg – An Interconnected Crime Prevention Strategy**

Since 2008, the city of Winnipeg has had an overarching policy related to crime prevention. A summary excerpt from this policy document is as follows:

*The intended goal of the proposed **LiveSAFE** in Winnipeg policy is to provide a clear and inclusive vision for an integrated crime prevention strategy for Winnipeg that is focused on collective action. A strategic action framework is included and which is premised upon interconnected and cross-sectoral partnerships with citizens, neighbourhoods, community organizations, business and other levels of government.*

The strategic action framework identifies the networking initiatives and partnerships related to crime prevention that the City of Winnipeg is currently involved with, including the Winnipeg Committee for Safety. In addition, a LiveSAFE in Winnipeg Working Group in partnership with other levels of government, business and the community is proposed in order to identify specific and integrated crime prevention strategies with a particular focus on vulnerable families, seniors, children and youth in Winnipeg.

The proposed LiveSAFE in Winnipeg policy statement identifies the following five guiding principles which recognize that crime prevention must involve long term action that is responsive to short term needs.

1. *Prevention*
2. *Leadership and Coordination*
3. *Interconnectedness and Partnerships*
4. *Sustainability*
5. *Accountability*

Our efforts must be measurable, both in the short and long term, to ensure accountability and progress towards the overall goal of a safe, vibrant and thriving Winnipeg.

Based on our discussions with City of Winnipeg representatives, it is perceived that although the policy is relatively strong, the execution of the strategy has been relatively weak and the appropriate structure and processes have not been established to ensure successful implementation.

4.4 Municipal Departments and Their Services

The City of Winnipeg is both a service delivery organization and funder in the development of a safe and healthy city. As such, they must determine if the organizations they fund are part of their 'service delivery model'. In addition, key to future success is a shared philosophy (City Council and administration) that they believe in the holistic view that addressing the root causes of crime (and investing in initiatives that do just that) is just as important as enforcement once crimes have been committed. The following is a snapshot of municipal departments and services and their primary role on the community safety continuum:

Service Delivery Department/Division	Community Safety Continuum						
	Prevention				Response		
	Assessment	Design	Education	Intervention	Deterrence	Enforcement	Intervention
Community Services Department							
• Strategic Management and Business Support Services Division	●						
• Community Development and Recreation Services Division			●	●			
• Aquatic Services Division			●	●			
• Library Services Division			●	●			
• Community By-law Enforcement Services Division			●		●	●	
Planning, Property and Development	●	●					
Indigenous Relations			●	●			
Winnipeg Committee for Safety			●	●			
General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres			●	●			
Winnipeg Police Service			●		●	●	●

4.4.1 Community Services Department


Mission
Working together to build strong communities.

The Community Services Department (CmS) is comprised of several divisions providing a wide range of programs and services to the citizens of Winnipeg. The overall focus of the department is on providing efficient, responsive and innovative community-based services that promote healthy and safe neighbourhoods and meets the communities' diverse cultural, recreation and information needs. The mission of the Community Services Department supports the broader view of community safety and wellness. It suggests that a healthy community:

- Provides a lot of options for use of personal and family leisure time
- Promotes community member gathering
- Offers educational and development opportunities outside the traditional education system
- Is clean, free of hazard and aesthetically pleasing
- Offers amenities, products and services appropriate to the character of the community

The ability to access these services is a critical consideration in investment decisions. The City of Winnipeg has a significant investment in physical assets across Winnipeg. A 'one taxpayer view' would suggest that an ongoing and comprehensive assessment of the usage and demand for space in City-owned assets, school and post secondary institution facilities as well as private facilities should inform future development decisions and, if coordinated, could optimize usage and reduce costs.

At a glance, CmS is responsible for the following:



4.4.1.1 Aquatics Division

The Aquatics Division is responsible for programming and delivery of various educational (learn to) programs related to water safety and water sports. Aquatics facilities include indoor, outdoor and wading pools as well as spray pads. Some of the pools contain, are either attached to or within larger complexes which offer additional services such as fitness facilities, fitness programs, gymnasiums, meeting spaces, tracks, courts or other sports-specific facilities. The Division coordinates aquatic and land-based fitness programs, including seasonal camps, in partnership with the Community Development and Recreation Services Division. The aquatic and land-based fitness programs are promoted through leisure publications and the website with admission ranging from drop in through to registration or purchase of active living passes. Subsidized facility passes and programming are available to residents meeting the criteria. The Division also coordinates facility usage and rental, where applicable, of all aquatic facilities in the City. The rentals may be for the pools, fitness or sport specific facilities or for general meeting spaces. Facility renters represent a broad spectrum of groups ranging from sports clubs, recreation, fitness, educational, health or cultural groups. Services are delivered in-house.

The facilities represent pivotal community bases from which the CoW's aquatic programs and services are delivered as well as other non-aquatic programs or services potentially offered by other divisions or through facility rental by outside groups. For those pools within larger complexes who offer more than the pool itself, it is not uncommon to have participants use the open or common spaces for their own recreation without being a direct participant in any of the programs or services offered by the facility. The facilities with common spaces for gathering are often used for purposes not directly related to the facility's primary function of being a pool as they are viewed as a haven for shelter from the environment or from other safety-related challenges. As many of the facilities have extended hours from early morning to late evening, they have become part of the network of safe places for youth, newcomers or the homeless who need a safe place to rest, sleep or use public washroom facilities.

The facilities with common spaces for gathering are often used for purposes not directly related to the facility's primary function of being a pool as they are viewed as a haven for shelter from the environment or from other safety-related challenges.

The facility staff are 'connectors'.

The facility staff often develop strong relationships with the local community residents and service providers who either use the facilities themselves or use the space for their own service delivery. Facility staff often play the role of liaison or conduit between the services they offer and those of other service providers by helping connect community residents to the services they need. These informal partnerships supplement the direct services offered by the facilities and are positively viewed as important components to community safety and crime prevention.

With respect to community safety, the Division sees itself as playing a significant role both as an educator of water safety and water sports as well through the open access and availability of its facilities. Admission criteria is in effect for much of the 'learn to' programming unless a subsidy has been granted. Drop-in programming generally does not require paid admission however may have other criteria related to age or water safety competency. The majority of programming is not targeted to specific 'at risk' stakeholder groups however there is some drop-in programming targeted to youth and the need for targeted programming to newcomer groups is seen as an area which may need more attention, particularly as it relates to water safety. With respect to the subsidy program, it is felt to be valuable however awareness is believed to be low and the application and admission requirements too stringent for the majority of people to whom it is intended. Increasing awareness and access to the subsidy are departmental priorities. It is often the youth who desire the programming but they cannot influence or support their caregivers to provide the requested information, leaving them detached from the programming because of the eligibility criteria. Efforts to address these barriers and extend the benefits of participation are ongoing, such as through the recent introduction of a subsidized 12-month active living pass.

The Division is funded by the City of Winnipeg and does not provide funding to other programs or services.

4.4.1.2 Libraries

The Library Services Division strives to enrich the lives of all Winnipeg citizens and their communities by providing high quality, responsive and innovative library services. It provides equitable opportunities for learning, leisure and community connections. The Division serves all of Winnipeg and some surrounding communities through traditional material lending, online lending of e-materials, audio books and other materials as well as educational and recreational programming. The library offers considerable innovative and culture-based programming options such as writing festivals or workshops, writer in

residence program, concerts, technology skills training, home programs and other language-specific programs. There is a small team who focus on outreach and targeted programming to vulnerable communities and to people with mobility problems through a 'shut-in' program. Services are delivered in-house out of the 20 branches as well as through outreach and online forums. Most of the on-site programs are focused on literacy and education such as computer or software usage as well as other life-skills related to health or safety. The social engagement or leisure-related programming is often targeted to specific stakeholders for whom programming is often focused on social connection, inclusion or recreational interests. Some of the services are delivered directly by Library staff while the balance is delivered through partnerships with community partners.

The Division is affiliated with the Manitoba Library Association who coordinate and provide supports for advocacy as well as professional development across the province. The Association, amalgamated in January 2018 from the Manitoba Library Trustees Association and the Manitoba Association of Library Technician, is comprised of a Trustees Division and a Library Technician division. The Association plays an important role with professional development and continuing education programs and raises awareness and coordinates responses to issues that relate to the broader library community through their advocacy work and interaction with political representatives.

The Division is governed by a 16-member Winnipeg Public Library Board comprised of citizen members appointed by City Council, two Councillors, the Manager of Library Services and one non-voting representative from the Province. The Board works in consultation with the Manager of Library Services to make recommendations about library policy and budget, deal with significant policy or service implications for the library system and develop long range plans for the library system. The Board reports to City Council's Standing Policy Committee on Protection and Community Services and also hears from the Library Advisory Committee members who sit on the City's five Community Committees.

As with Aquatics, Libraries has physical facilities devoted to its primary mandate of delivering innovative library services however it also serves as a gathering place and safe refuge. The Division works through a strategic planning process and develops a strategic plan to guide its programming efforts. Programming is most often focused on literacy, safety and recreation and all programming is seen as supporting social development with much of it targeted towards newcomers, Indigenous peoples, children and youth. Programming is coordinated with various partners and delivered in-house, through outreach as well as online. Programming needs are assessed in relation to services offered by existing community organizations with the goal of avoiding duplication. There is a mix of intentional programming, related to a specific need observed or requested and planned into their calendar well in advance, as well as organic programming which is more ad-hoc. To increase attachment to libraries and in support of literacy, the Division conducts outreach activities in various communities deemed 'at risk' or 'in need', or with newcomer groups, at local festivals or gatherings, to promote awareness and attachment to libraries and, subsequently, to literacy as a pillar of social development. Libraries staff regularly attend classrooms to do presentations and support English Language Arts programming, particularly where there is a high newcomer population. There is programming offered in traditional native languages as well. The programming budget is deemed quite limited therefore the Division seeks to leverage the strengths of its partners who have similar mandates and can support achievement of the objectives as outlined in the Libraries' strategic plan. Some of these partners charge a fee for their services or, wherever possible, the library offers 'in-kind' funding to help off-set the cost. Wherever possible and appropriate, library staff themselves deliver training programs to extend the small programming budget.

With respect to the programming and services offered, the Division is very mindful of 'specialist' courses or services offered by other providers. An environmental scan is conducted for potential new programs to verify alignment with the libraries' programming statement, to determine if the subject is offered elsewhere, its fee structure as well as the scope of information provided. The libraries' programs and services are purposefully focused on introductory-level information and are not meant to provide a full scope of training on any particular subject.

Libraries receives its funding from the City of Winnipeg, through an annual operating grant from the Province, as well as some program-specific funding from the Government of Manitoba. The Winnipeg Public Library Board created the Winnipeg Library Foundation as a separate advocacy, community awareness and fundraising entity to raise funds for major capital projects for the Winnipeg Public Library. The Foundations' purpose is to develop public support and manage fund raising on behalf of the Winnipeg Public Library and is an independent philanthropic organization committed to supporting the library through partnerships with corporations, other foundations and individuals.

The Friends of the Winnipeg Public Library are a volunteer charitable organization and an important partner of the Winnipeg Public Library. Through their fundraising coordination of donations and corporate supports and management of the gift shop at the Millennium Library, they raise funds for all 20 libraries to support projects and programs. other partner organizations, such as universities or private organizations, support specific events (e.g. concert events). To supplement their budget, Libraries may also apply for grants aligned with specific programming (e.g. Literacy for Life through the Winnipeg Foundation).

Libraries are providing gathering and safe spaces and are functioning as 'connectors' for vulnerable individuals

All programs and services are free with eligibility limited to having a library card to borrow materials. Attendance in programming does not require a library card however is often by registration as a means of managing attendance. There may be a fee involved for some programming as it may be related to actual costs, such as with the IdeaMill for 3-D printing, where coverage for consumable fees is required. It is felt that a fee-based structure completely changes the dynamic of how libraries are viewed and utilized, thus having a negative impact on usage in general but specifically for those deemed at risk or vulnerable. The current eligibility structure is seen as instrumental to facilitating positive connections to literacy, education and society as a whole.

Measures used to track success are activity-based include attendance, program and service volumes. Some programs are formally evaluated by participants and results tracked through an in-house system which provides ratings or opinion on the presenter, space, topic, etc. Certain programs, such as the adult literacy program, have very specific criteria linked to funding (e.g. GED).

Libraries sees itself in a supporting role for community safety through access to its physical spaces and programming in support of safety and literacy. Its programming supports social development through all stages and contributes to general well-being through the social interactions it helps facilitate. With respect to stakeholders deemed 'at risk' or 'in need', there is specific programming targeted to newcomers, youth, Indigenous peoples and children as well as geographically influenced programming decisions. Much like some of the larger aquatic complexes, libraries are seen as a haven where eligibility is not a barrier. Traditional library services are accessible to anyone and non-traditional 'services and supports' associated with a safe space are equally accessible.

In addition to its programming targeted to stakeholders deemed 'at risk' or 'in need', Libraries employs two (2) community crisis workers to work directly in the libraries. These individuals are trained social workers who have regular attendance / hours at some libraries, primarily Millennium Library, and circulate

to others per a defined schedule or as requested. The addition of the community crisis workers originated from the growing realization that many people spent time in the libraries looking for help or answers to complex social questions or had social needs that were outside the scope of and training of library staff to provide. These staff members proactively reach out to individuals who may be in need or upon an individuals' request to help connect them with necessary information or other service providers. As libraries are viewed as safe havens, the community crisis workers are coming into direct contact with people who are vulnerable and in need of services to keep them safe as well as potentially help improve their social situation. Considered a best practice, the community crisis workers are encountering clients where they find themselves rather than expecting clients to find them. The community crisis workers make connections with clients at the library, establish trust, and then work with the client to address their needs by helping them connect with service providers. They track the number of clients with whom they work, the frequency of interactions as well as the resulting action. It is openly questioned whether this service, which all agree to be valuable, is within the 'core' mandate of libraries however it is well understood that libraries, through their physical infrastructure and accessibility to learning, have evolved into something more than what their original intent may have been.

The community crisis workers have also established strong relationships with community-based service providers to better understand the services they provide, and further help connect clients to them. Community service providers are regularly invited to the libraries to improve the social workers awareness of their services and thus their own effectiveness in meeting their mandate. Similarly, and informally, other support workers have often used libraries as a main venue from which to offer their services, such as in Ontario where neighbourhood settlement workers are commonly working out of libraries or seniors' resource workers are establishing their "offices" in libraries to help connect seniors to services. Some of these practices have been formally put in place while others have informally developed over time between individual service providers and their community libraries.

Sharing library space with other recreational-based service providers is another best practice which has seen some success. Having libraries adjacent to or located within larger complexes, such as with the Cindy Klassen Recreation Centre and the Harvey Smith library, can help extend awareness and usage of both services. It is viewed that a distinction around space that is common vs dedicated is important to allow each 'resident' service provider to manage their space, and ultimately its use, without potential competition. Co-location with access centres, homeless shelters or cultural centres is viewed positively and could be done through lease or pop-up libraries rather than the investment required of a stand-alone facility.

Library staff are 'eyes and ears' in their community and play the role of a referral network. Formally and informally, they help connect people to services they may need. Though not formally trained in social work or intervention, they often find themselves in situations requiring a great deal of empathy and judgement. Having access to specialist social and support services within the libraries is a best practice which provides immediate benefit to library staff as well as to the clients.

Library staff represent much of the cultural dynamic in the City and often liaise or provide services in languages other than French and English. Signage representative of the community's demographic as well as access to materials and services through e-lending in multiple languages is a best practice which is strongly recommended and which the libraries provide as much as possible, though the practice is mostly informal and more fortuitous than planned.

4.4.1.3 Community By-Law Enforcement Services


Community By-law Enforcement Services is responsible for Property and Neighbourhood Standards and Licence Services. Community By-Law Enforcement Services regulates the maintenance of properties and other aspects of neighbourhood liveability in order to develop and maintain safe, orderly, viable and sustainable communities and to promote and maintain the health, safety and well being of residents.

In this role, they provide education and awareness of by-laws and expectations associated with them, act as mediators to help resolve problems associated with the by-laws and consequently enforce compliance. They hold property owners accountable for maintenance to prevent the existence of objects and conditions that pose health, safety, fire or accident hazards to people, animals or neighbouring properties.

The 'Broken Window Theory', originating in New York, states that visible signs of crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour can encourage additional disorder and crime on an increasingly aggravated scale. Addressing visible signs of disrepair, dumping or derelict maintenance standards is believed to help create and support the perception and existence of order and stability, thereby having a positive influence on curbing further crime. By helping maintain and enforce standards, the community environment is better controlled which contributes to mitigation of more serious crime.

Within their mandate is the following:

Property and Neighbourhood Standards



Illegal Dumping Surveillance Program

In an effort to curb illegal dumping, a pilot project using high-resolution closed-circuit televisions (CCTV) was launched at various locations throughout the city in order to address illegal dumping activities. The projects' primary purposes are to identify and help prosecute those who commit illegal dumping and deter the number of illegal dumping incidents at the target locations.

Through use of the CCTV, it is expected that vehicles and/or persons that are illegally dumping will be identified and appropriate legal steps taken. CCTV cameras are moved between the priority sites identified in consultation with community stakeholders, CoW departments, and enforcement officers.

Service orders are generally received through 311 central intake. Relationships developed with community organizations are often a supplementary source of service requests whereby the service may be educational or related to conducting an assessment or attendance at an upcoming community meeting to discuss common interests. Service requests for 2018 ranged between 15,000 – 16,000 with majority being resolved on first visit.

In addition to receipt of service requests, By-Law Enforcement Services also conducts proactive audits through their involvement with local neighbourhood associations, 'Biz' and community groups. They have historically partnered with several of these groups on remediation (e.g. clean-up or problem area) projects along with other service providers such as police and fire / paramedic services. The frequency of proactive audits has reduced over time as relationships with neighbourhood organizations have become firmly established which has resulted in the association reaching out directly as issues arise or a specific initiative is being planned. The unit also regularly re-visits the by-laws to assess their ongoing relevancy and ensure they remain current with community needs.

As it relates to community safety, By-Law Enforcement Services plays a key contributory role in helping identify, maintain and / or address issues which detract from community safety. Their work often leads them to notice or observe issues outside of their jurisdiction which may need further investigation and intervention by other service providers, such as police, health or social-related assistance. Where a suspected need is identified, it is the individual by-law officer who takes the initiative to pass on the potential need. However, there are often challenges associated with directing the information to the right party. There is no centrally coordinated "referral" centre to which calls can be directed for investigation and appropriate follow-up. To their credit, by-law services is well connected to other service providers and often have a long-standing relationship. However, this is not formalized and is often dependent on an individual's level of knowledge and capacity to direct the call to the appropriate party. It was reported that jurisdiction is confusing and it is often not clear to whom calls for other services should be directed.

By-law Enforcement Services utilizes key performance indicators (KPIs) to measure their performance. Through this they continually assess their approaches to and potential shifts in types of requests as well as their own performance standards. The below are sample reports:

Table 2: Sample Draft Report Representative of Key Performance Indicators

COMMUNITY BY-LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICES	Draft				
Divisional Summary Report					
SERVICE INDICATORS	**QTR 1 2018**	**QTR 2 2018**	**QTR 3 2018**	**QTR 4 2018**	**2018**
Total Number of By-law Investigations	**1455**	**5473**	**4806**	**2744**	**14478**
Number of 311 Requests for Service Investigations	**1219**	**4778**	**4380**	**2498**	12875
Number of Internal Proactive CBEO Initiated Investigations	**236**	**695**	**426**	**246**	1603
Total Number of Properties Inspected for By-law Compliance					**8865**
Total Number of Infractions Cited	**1115**	**2038**	**4478**	**1895**	9526
Total Number of Properties Issued New Compliance Orders					**4439**
Total Number of Orders Issued	**917**	**1655**	**2764**	**1512**	6848
Total Number of Inspections Conducted	**4540**	**6327**	**9189**	**6413**	26469
ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES	**QTR 1 2018**	**QTR 2 2018**	**QTR 3 2018**	**QTR 4 2018**	**2018**
Common Offence Notices Served	**339**	**541**	**561**	**506**	**1947**
Remediation Action Taken	**93**	**214**	**700**	**227**	**1234**

Community Liveability				
Service Level Statistics				
Description	**2015**	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**
No. of Service Requests	14384	13963	12703	14478
No. of Service Request per By - law officer	633	616	652	712
No. of Property Standards inspections/Officer & By- Law Support Worker Visits [A]	29752	30769	24715	26469
No. of Vacant Buildings as at January 1	358	467	536	533
No. of Vacant Added to the List During the Year	289	301	235	199
No. of Vacant Buildings Removed from the List During the Year	180	232	235	265
No. of Vacant Buildings as at December 31	467	536	536	467
No. of Compliance Orders Issued [A]	6158	6081	4955	6848
No. of Common Offence Notices served (Tickets)	329	284	290	1950
No. of Property Clean-ups conducted by the Public Service	349	386	540	587

4.4.1.4 Strategic Management and Business Support Services Division

The Strategic Management and Business Support Services Division within CmS is responsible for the division's strategic plan, policy development, communications, strategic projects and initiatives. They often play a key role in policy development and projects involving inter-departmental coordination. They also manage key data and statistics for CmS. The Communications Branch works on community service-related publications (such as the Leisure Guide) as well as awareness and advertising of community services.

Though not a direct community safety service provider, they often work to gather data with other departments and grant recipients who are service providers to inform policy or support projects related to community safety.

4.4.1.5 Community Development and Recreation Services Division

The Community Development and Recreation Services Division (CDRS) is responsible for land-based programming, maintenance of City-owned facilities and the Leisure Guide as well as Leisure Online services. They also manage some City-owned or leased facilities.

Mandate	Mission
The City of Winnipeg is a leader in delivering recreation services that build healthy communities. The City's role as recreation and wellness leader and facilitator includes working together to address age, gender, ability and cultural barriers to participation	To contribute to the overall wellbeing of our community through the provision of needs based community development, recreation, leisure and neighbourhood support services.

The Division, in partnership with other CmS divisions and community-based service providers, provides high quality aquatics, recreation and leisure opportunities and programs in support of the safety and well-being of citizens in all neighbourhoods. They provide and / or help coordinate 'introduction to' programming as well as help to fill recreational and fitness-related gaps spanning the introduction of physical literacy through to long-term athlete development. They also coordinate a myriad of summer camps which offer half and full-day programming.

The Community Development and Recreation Services Division utilizes City-owned facilities as well as other leased facilities through their agreement with school divisions or other facility owners. In some instances, the Division is a facility manager while in others they are a tenant. Some of the City-owned buildings no longer meet the community's needs due to their age, condition or size. There are formalized joint use or master use agreements with schools or school divisions. A plan to review these is in early discussion with a goal of standardizing some of the usage guidelines and costs to help better support community-based programming and services.

Services are provided by a blend of City employees, many of whom are part-time / casual students, and partner service providers with whom the City works to coordinate and deliver programming or services. The Division works with community stakeholders to respond to their service requests and deliver programs, either through the Leisure Guide or through direct service providers. Much of the targeted community programming is request-based whereby neighbourhood or community organizations make specific requests for programming directed towards a target audience. The needs are reviewed, and the community coordinators work together with the community association to organize and deliver the program. In most instances it is outside parties who deliver the programming and the City coordinates the planning and preparation. Staff participate on Boards or Committees to hear about specific communities needs or community organizations contact the Division to make their requests. Needs assessments are generally a blend of formal and informal data collection.

The majority of services are delivered face to face as well as through outreach to target communities where City staff participate as committee members. There are assigned community development workers for the core area of the City who provide liaison and coordination services between the community and the City's recreation services. These workers liaise with community organizations to increase awareness of programs and services as well as assist with

responding to requests for targeted programming. As an example, Priceless Fun, a free drop-in program, provides multiple activities in different areas of the City and is targeted towards stakeholder with less financial means.

The subsidy program is also managed by this Division. The application process requires applicants to provide significant information about their personal characteristics and financial situation to determine eligibility. Any applications deemed not complete do not get considered and are therefore not even reviewed. Awareness, language barriers and general literacy issues are believed to be barriers which impact usage of the subsidy program. Applicants on employment income assistance (EIA) are generally always approved. Proof of income through copy of most recent Canada Revenue Agency (CRA) Notice of Assessment identifying annual family net income or copy of monthly statement of income from Canada Pension Plan (CPP) disability, as well as notice of assessment or income verification for spouse or partner, is required to confirm applicants' status in the low-income bracket.

Though the services are available to all City of Winnipeg residents, programming for Priceless Fun and the requested programs are generally targeted to specific communities or populations deemed 'at risk' or 'in need'. Stakeholders report that majority of targeted programming requests are received from Indigenous or newcomer groups and that more liaison is done with representative organizations such as Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization of Manitoba (IRCOM).

Statistical indicators related to participation or attendance are captured for the programming and services offered. The Division captures service requests through 311, customer feedback from formal and informal evaluations and formal corporate Citizen Satisfaction Survey results. The waitlists serve as a source of demand and are consulted prior to programming decisions. With targeted programming, there are also qualitative comments or statements captured through formal or informal evaluation as well as instructor feedback.

The Division views recreation services as an important element of crime prevention through its provision of upstream programs and services to help foster positive attachment to healthy activities and behaviours. Per the Framework for Recreation in Canada 2015 – Pathways to Wellbeing, the evidence on the benefits of recreation which the Division supports are:

- Enhanced mental and physical wellbeing
- Enhanced social wellbeing
- Helping to build strong families and communities
- Helping people to connect with nature
- Providing economic benefits by investing in recreation

Supplementary information related to recreation and business operations, involvement with community centres and community development remains pending.

CDRS Statistical Information

For this report, the CSRD provided MNP with frequency counts for 2018 registered and nonregistered programming, 2018 activity/facility passes sold, 2017 subsidized activity/facility passes provided, and an overview of the different types of facilities that the CSRD operates across the city. This section will provide the results of the statistical analysis conducted on the available data from the CSRD including the applicable limitations.

CSRD Programming

The CSRD records participants as registered (paid for) or non-registered (free). In 2018 there were 4 non-registered programs and 12 registered programs provided by the CSRD including:

Non-Registered Programs:


- Children's Free-Play
- Youth Drop-In
- Public Skating
- Other Free Programming

Registered Programs:

- Preschool – Birth to 5 years
- Children's – 6 to 12 years
- Youth – 12 to 17 years
- Adult Leisure
- Older Active Adults
- Persons with a Disability
- Services de loisirs en français
- Deer Lodge Tennis Club
- Learn to Skate
- Inline Skating
- Active Living
- Cartown


When considering all CSRD programming in 2018, approximately 84% (159,212 of 189,507) of participants were from the four non-registered programs. Specifically, figure 1 below shows that most non-registered programming participants were for the *Children's Free Play* and *Youth Drop-In*.

Figure 12: 2018 Non-Registered Program Participation Total



As for registered programming, most participants were engaged in the *Learn to Skate* and *Active Living* programs (Figure 13).

Figure 13: 2018 Registered Program Participation Total




Unfortunately, geographic information was not collected for participants of registered programming to establish what neighbourhoods/communities are most utilizing these programs nor was demographic information available to establish the ages of program participants. Similarly, demographic information was not collected for non-registered programs however, geographic information was collected for non-registered program participants in the 5 following categories:

- South and West – River Heights, St James, Fort Garry and Assiniboine South
- Downtown – No boundaries specified
- North – Point Douglas and Seven Oaks
- East – River East, Transcona, St. Vital, and St. Boniface
- City Wide – Programs that are offered throughout the city as opposed to in specific neighbourhoods/communities

The methodology for collecting geographic information for non-registered participants was based on the geographic location of the CSRD coordinator associated with the program as opposed to the geographic information of the participants themselves. In other words, the CSRD coordinator would record the neighbourhood which facilitated the program as well as the total number of programming hours provided, the total number of days the program was provided for, and the total number of attendees. Consequently, this analysis cannot definitively establish participation levels of CSRD programming by area of the city.

With this caveat as well as the assumption that individuals are most likely to attend programming close to their residence, the available geographic data for non-registered participants appears to suggest that individuals from the North End represent the largest portion of non-registered programming participants. Figure 2 shows that the majority of non-registered program participants were from the North End at 41% (65,510 of 159,212).

Figure 14: 2018 Non-Registered Participant by Area in Winnipeg



Using the same geographic information, Figure 3, 4 and 5 show that residents of the North End comprised the majority of *Children's Free Play*, *Youth Drop-In*, and *Other Free* programs.

Figure 15: 2018 Non-Registered Children's Free Play




Figure 16: Non-Registered Youth Drop-In





Figure 17: 2018 Non-Registered Other Free Programs



CSRD Facilities

With regards to activity/pool facilities usage, the CSRD records paid-for passes as well as subsidized passes and provided information on passes sold in 2018 and subsidized passes provided in 2017. Unfortunately, a comparison between paid-for passes and subsidized passes cannot be complete using the available data collected for separate calendar years. Demographic information was provided for paid-for passes however not for individuals who access CSRD activity/pool facilities by means of subsidized passes therefore a comparison cannot be made at this time. The demographic information available on paid-for passes was collected for forty-seven out of a total of fifty-three types of passes sold, therefore the demographic information presented below on paid-for passes is potentially not fully representative of all individuals who purchased a pass.

With an understanding of these limitations, Table 3 below provides a breakdown of the 3 types of subsidized passes provided by the CSRD in 2017.

Table 3: Types of Subsidized Passes Provided by CSRD in 2017

Single Admissions	18,214
Other Facility Passes (including Leisure Guide Program Registration)	6,660
Active Living Passes	453
Total	**25,327**

Pertaining to paid-for passes, Table 4 provides an overview of the 53 different types of passes as well as the number sold in 2018.

Table 4: Types and Number of Passes Sold by CSRD in 2018

Rec - Facility - Youth - 30 Visit	6
Rec - Facility - Youth - 3 Month	39
Rec - Facility - Youth - 20 Visit	6
Rec - Facility - Youth - 10 Visit	19
Rec - Facility - Senior - 3 Month	159
Rec - Facility - Family - 30 Visit	3
Rec - Facility - Family - 3 Month	34
Rec - Facility - Family - 20 Visit	3
Rec - Facility - Family - 10 Visit	3
Rec - Facility - Child - 30 Visit	11
Rec - Facility - Child - 3 Month	1
Rec - Facility - Child - 20 Visit	9
Rec - Facility - Child - 10 Visit	26
Rec - Facility - Adult - 30 Visit	135
Rec - Facility - Adult - 3 Month	565
Rec - Facility - Adult - 20 Visit	111
Rec - Facility - Adult - 10 Visit	180
Rec - Active Living - 30 Visit	24
Rec - Active Living - 3 Month	33
Rec - Active Living - 20 Visit	10
Rec - Active Living - 10 Visit	27
Peguis Trail Only - Youth - 1 Year	1
Peguis Trail Only - Senior - 1 Year	49
Peguis Trail Only - Adult - 1 Year	115
Peguis Trail Only - 1 Year - Family	13
Freight House Only - Adult - 3 Month	88
Freight House Only - Adult - 1 Month	126

CEWP - Facility - 6 Month	1525
CEWP - Facility - 1 Year	1536
Aquatics - Outdoor Pool - Youth Monthly	21
Aquatics - Outdoor Pool - Family Season	479
Aquatics - Outdoor Pool - Child Monthly	44
Aquatics - Facility - Youth - 30 Visit	42
Aquatics - Facility - Youth - 3 Month	131
Aquatics - Facility - Youth - 20 Visit	39
Aquatics - Facility - Youth - 10 Visit	143
Aquatics - Facility - Senior - 3 Month	1322
Aquatics - Facility - Family - 30 Visit	57
Aquatics - Facility - Family - 3 Month	316
Aquatics - Facility - Family - 20 Visit	31
Aquatics - Facility - Family - 10 Visit	90
Aquatics - Facility - Child - 30 Visit	469
Aquatics - Facility - Child - 3 Month	28
Aquatics - Facility - Child - 20 Visit	524
Aquatics - Facility - Child - 10 Visit	917
Aquatics - Facility - Adult - 30 Visit	1522
Aquatics - Facility - Adult - 3 Month	3058
Aquatics - Facility - Adult - 20 Visit	820
Aquatics - Facility - Adult - 10 Visit	2094
Aquatics - Active Living - 30 v	456
Aquatics - Active Living - 3 m	250
Aquatics - Active Living - 20 v	237
Aquatics - Active Living - 10 v	602
Total	**18549**


Based on the 47 paid-for passes that recorded demographic information, Table 5 shows that the majority were purchased by an adult at 64% (8,814 of 13,849) with youth/children, families, and seniors collectively representing 36% (5,035 of 13,849). Furthermore, the majority i.e. 41% of all passes sold are 3 months in duration contrary to the majority i.e. 72% of subsidized passes that are for single admissions. These results suggest that youth/children, seniors, and families are not as engaged with CDRS facilities in comparison to adults. Also, there appears to be a disparity in the time spent utilizing CDRS facilities when comparing registered and non-registered programs. Specifically, individuals who meet the criteria to receive subsidized passes may not be accessing CDRS facilities on an ongoing basis compared to individuals who pay for access.

Table 5: Number of Paid CDRS Passes by Demographic

	Child/Youth	Adult	Senior	Family	Total
10 Visit	1,105	2,274	0	93	**3,472**
20 Visit	578	931	0	34	**1,543**
30 Visit	528	1,657	0	60	**2,245**
1 Month	0	126	0	0	**126**
3 Month	199	3,711	1,481	350	**5,741**
1 Year	1	115	49	13	**178**
Other (Seasonal or Monthly)	65	0	0	479	**544**
Total	**2,476**	**8,814**	**1,530**	**1,029**	**13,849**


Lastly, the CDRS has 4 different types of facilities including: pool/fitness, indoor pool, outdoor pool, and fitness only (Figure 18).

Figure 18: Number of CDRS Facilities by Type



Using similar neighbourhoods as defined by the CDRS for non-registered programming, Figure 19 below shows that CDRS facilities are distributed relatively equally across the city with the exception of Downtown. Based on the 2018 non-registered participation data, the majority of participants for programming were in the North End and Downtown. However, these two areas of Winnipeg comprise approximately 25% of the CDRS facilities. In consideration of the limitations of this data, the findings suggest that CDRS facilities may not be established in the City based on participation rates or equal distribution.

Figure 19: Number of CDRS Facilities by Neighbourhood



Summary of Findings

Overall, 81% (189,507 of 233,383) of all recorded participants were from registered and non-registered CSRD programming as opposed to subsidized or passes sold to access CDRS facilities. These findings suggest that the majority of CSRD participants are interested in attending programming facilitated by the department as opposed to accessing CDRS facilities individually. Moreover, it appears that the majority of non-registered program participants were from the North End of Winnipeg at 41% (65,510 of 159,212) and attended the *Children's Free Play* program at 40% (63,888 of 159,212) as well as the *Youth Drop-In* 28% (43,930 of 159,212). Based on the participation rates of non-registered and registered programming, the majority of participants are youth under the age of 18. These results are in contrast to the results of the analysis on the available data for activity/facility passes sold with the majority i.e. 64% (8,814 of 13,849) being adults; while, youth/children, families, and seniors collectively representing 36% (5,035 of 13,849) of all passes sold. Furthermore, the majority i.e. 72% of subsidized passes were for single admissions to CDRS facilities as opposed to paid for passes with the majority i.e. 41% being for 3 month passes. Based on these results, it appears that there is a gap in time spent at CDRS facilities between individuals that qualify for a subsidized pass and individuals that pay for a pass. However, based on the limitations noted for CDRS data, no definitive conclusions are able to be established. Therefore, the results of this sections statistical analysis should be considered as possible areas for further investigation with additional data collection in the future.

Indigenous Relations The Indigenous Relations Division's (IRD) mandate is to provide leadership and experience from an Indigenous perspective to civic programs, services and initiatives. Its focus is on supporting and helping to address the needs of Winnipeg's Indigenous community. IRD works collaboratively with other CoW departments to create and improve civic practices and processes in support of greater accessibility for Winnipeg Indigenous citizens while also fostering and enhancing mutually beneficial relationships with the Indigenous community.

IRD is focused on the following priorities and advances these through their multiple stakeholder partnerships:

- Literacy and lifelong learning – To promote, support and encourage participation in lifelong learning opportunities for all ages
- Physical, culture and leisure – To ensure and promote participation in available and accessible opportunities in health and wellness activities
- Employment and employment development – To provide employment-based opportunities to participate in Winnipeg's economy
- Community connections – To support and assist with information and engagement efforts with the Indigenous community

4.4.1.6 Winnipeg Police Board

The Winnipeg Police Board (WPB) provides civilian governance and oversight of the Winnipeg Police Service (WPS). The Board is comprised of appointees by City Council and the Province and constitute a minimum of seven and a maximum of nine civilian members including the Chair and Vice Chair. The Board works to improve transparency and accountability in policing and sets out priorities and goals for the WPS. The Board's 2015-2019 strategic plan is focused on 'A Culture of Safety for All' with goals and strategies in the areas of:

1. Less crime and victimization
2. Engaged communities
3. Effective and efficient service
4. Healthy organization

Adoption and implementation of the Board's strategic plan is done through WPS annual business plans which are published and available for all to view.

4.4.1.7 Winnipeg Police Service

The Winnipeg Police Service (WPS) is a core community safety and crime prevention service provider.

Vision A Culture of Safety for All

Mission Build safe and healthy communities across Winnipeg through excellence in law enforcement and leadership in crime prevention through social development.

The Winnipeg Police Service has established four goals:

1. Less crime and victimization
2. Engaged communities
3. Effective and efficient service
4. Healthy organization

Manitoba's *Police Services Act* creates the statutory responsibilities of the Chief of Police, including enforcement of the law, prevention of crime and preservation of the public peace in Winnipeg. It also stipulates the duties of police officers including:

- Preserving the public peace
- Preventing crime and offences against the laws in force in the city
- Assisting victims of crimes
- Apprehending criminals
- Laying charges and participating in prosecutions

The Winnipeg Police Service believes it is responsible for a continuum of community safety from education to suppression to enforcement.

The vision and mission guide strategic and operational procedures and individual decision-making. Community safety is viewed as an intrinsic part of every person's role and responsibility. Each member strives to demonstrate the below values and beliefs in the performance of their duties:

Values
Integrity: We act in an open, honest and trustworthy way in all of our interactions with each other and the public.
Respect : we honour the diversity of individuals, showing understanding and acceptance for all people.
Citizens and Communities: We conduct ourselves in a professional manner at all times, are above reproach and demonstrate pride and commitment to the people and communities we serve.
Accountability: We make quality, ethical decisions that guide our individual and collective efforts and are responsible for our actions, use of resources and effectiveness.
Courage: Whether serving on the streets or providing leadership and support, we will make tough decisions and take decisive actions to valiantly protect people and communities.

Beliefs – We believe
• The safety and security of people, property and the community are a critical public interest. • In the rights of individuals and bias-free policing. • In the worth of each individual but in the reality that individuals and groups who engage in criminal behavior must face the consequences and society must be protected from them. • Significant strides in preventing crime will happen when the risk factors of crime are appropriately addressed. • We must work collaboratively with the community and other justice, social services, health and community agencies who contribute time, resources and support, if we are to prevent crime in the long-term. • Our success depends upon the professionalism, innovation, skill and compassion of civilian and sworn members of the police service. • In the health, protection, well-being and professional development of our membership. • Effective governance is critical to ensuring accountability and effectiveness in the delivery of policing services

Figure 20: Winnipeg Police Organizational Structure



The WPS is organized into services which are further sub-divided into Divisions which encompass smaller organizational structures called Units. The structure, vision and mission have been designed to empower each individual officer to form partnerships and to support a culture of collaboration with community. Senior leadership puts significant emphasis on the importance of collaborative working relationships and strives to empower each officer to live the vision, mission, values and beliefs.

The Winnipeg Police Service has numerous programs and services aimed at “at risk” populations.

4.4.1.8 Division 40 - Organized Crime

The unit has developed two key strategies focused on suppressing street gangs:

- Gang Suppression Strategy
- Illicit Drug Strategy

The Gang Suppression Strategy involves proactive intelligence-led enforcement focused on suppressing gang activity, a partnership with Manitoba Justice that works with gang member siblings and families focused on preventing entrance into gangs and gang exit strategies like Gang Action Interagency Network (GAIN), About Face and the Gang Reduction Intervention Program (GRIP).

The Illicit Drug Strategy involves proactive, intelligence-led enforcement focused on suppression and interventions in collaboration with the medical community and partner agencies like AFM.

4.4.1.9 Division 41 - Vulnerable Persons Unit

This unit is responsible for investigating crimes that have been or may be committed against people who are vulnerable to physical or sexual exploitation due to age, mental, physical or intellectual health or their social roles. Areas of responsibility include Child Abuse, Child Exploitation, Missing Persons, Vulnerable Persons, Sexual Abuse and Youth.

The Indigenous Women and Girls’ Safety and Protection Strategy has the following pillars: investigations, enforcement, prevention and intervention, community engagement and research. The WPS’ Counter Exploitation Team engages with people exploited in the sex trade at the street level and online through site visits. The purpose of these interventions is to build trusting relationships with individuals being exploited in the sex trade as well as to connect them with community resources should they need assistance in areas such as additions, housing and health care. Members of the Counter Exploitation Unit participate in the Winnipeg Outreach Network and Sexually Exploited Youth Coalition Committee.

4.4.1.10 Division 51 - Community Support

Notwithstanding the expectations of all members to positively influence and contribute to community safety, the WPS reports that many of the formal programs or services directly related to community safety reside in Division 51 Community Support.


Division 51 Community Support		
Cadet Unit Auxiliary force cadets	**School Engagement Unit** School Resource Officers School Education Officers	**Community Engagement Unit** Diversity and Crime Prevention Indigenous Partnerships Victim and Volunteer Services

Division 51 - Community Support is considered the primary outward-facing information and partnership interface with the citizens of Winnipeg. The Division provides information supports and services for partners such as citizen or community groups as well as facilitates community stakeholders and the WPS by coordinating assistance, partnerships and attendance at events. The Division is viewed as the navigational guide to connect community with the appropriate WPS connection point.

The objectives of the unit are:

- To improve public safety
- To encourage and develop sustainable solutions to community problems
- To identify and suppress crime through intelligence-led, evidence-based activities
- To establish and maintain community partnerships

One strategy of this division is the Centreline-Downtown Safety Strategy. This involves the strategic deployment of police resources within the downtown Centreline area. There is



continued engagement with downtown stakeholders with a focus on the Sports, Hospitability and Entertainment District (SHED) and surrounding corridors. Partners in the implementation of this strategy include Bear Clan, End Homelessness Winnipeg, Winnipeg Outreach network, Manitoba Justice's Public Safety Investigations Unit, Manitoba Public Health Inspectors and the Downtown Biz.

This division also provides direct support to uniform officers who identify or encounter difficult issues or problems while in their communities. In some areas, uniform officers are paired with community workers trained to deal with individuals who may be suffering with mental health or other challenges and/or families encountering significant dysfunction.

The Division is organized into 3 primary units:

Cadet Unit – The Cadet Unit is responsible to provide support and relief for WPS per the specific and designated duties assigned to them and as articulated in their Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). They are a visible presence to promote safety and security in areas throughout Winnipeg. They are used for specific response situations as well as for proactive activities often related to visibility or presence in specific areas, walking the beat, providing support to transit, community events as well as recruitment efforts. They often serve as ambassadors or participate in community events on behalf of the WPS. They are expected to build relationships between the WPS and the community. Their role and job description is strictly defined per the CBA.

School Engagement Unit – the Unit is made up of School Resource Officers (SRE) and School Education Officers (SEO). The SREs are positions funded in partnership with school divisions and the Government of Manitoba to connect with youth and foster a positive association with the police. These offices provide information and knowledge on youth safety issues as well as encouragement to stay in school and develop positive relationships. They do so through mentoring, role modeling and relationship-building. The SEOs are responsible for patrol programs, francophone services, information sharing, presentations and networking within the schools to establish a common language for safety planning. Though not responsible for the school's emergency preparedness preparations or performance, the SEO provides subject matter expertise ensuring consistent language for emergency situations is used to support the school's abilities to work efficiently and effectively with emergency responders. Both SREs and SEOs also provide, or assist to coordinate, extra curricular presentations in partnerships with school divisions about issues of importance related to youth safety.

Community Engagement Unit – The Diversity and Crime Prevention section is focused on outward-facing messaging and information sharing for all citizens. Through the use of face to face and the website portal, they regularly provide information on a variety of topics as well as offer a 'booking tool' for requesting police officer presence or information for specific events. The 'booking tool' is also used as a means of circulating requests to other appropriate parties if the response requires additional coordination. The Unit works with other Divisions to coordinate use of additional WPS expertise as required, providing all requests are in alignment with strategic objectives and resource availability. The Unit works closely with community organizations, of which newcomer and Indigenous groups are a focus, to provide in-depth presentations on a variety of safety matters, such as situational safety concerns (e.g. increased trends in an area), general and seasonal safety messaging. The Unit also coordinates training on culturally sensitive information with the Training Unit for Cadet and WPS sworn officers.

Victim and volunteer services, also within this Unit, have volunteers providing important services related to reference checks, helping triage calls and visits to police districts, and assisting as WPS representatives at community events. Victim services are comprised of several positions, many of which are shared with

Government of Manitoba, with expertise in social work or related professional services. These individuals proactively reach out to victims to provide services or connect victims to the network of victim support services available.

4.4.1.11 Role of the WPS

As the Winnipeg Police Board establishes strategic direction for the Service, they believe the WPS should be viewed only as a contributor to the Action Plan.

Feedback from the WPS suggests they believe their services and strategies span the continuum from prevention to intervention to deterrence to enforcement. Their current strategic plan says "We must work collaboratively with the community and other justice, social services, health and community agencies who contribute time, resources and support, if we are to prevent crime in the long-term". They stated that the Chief of Police is a strong advocate for and proponent of "community led, police supported" initiatives. It believes the city should focus its efforts on crime prevention through social development and addressing the root causes of criminal behaviour. Where there is an opportunity to align initiatives and programs, the WPS would be open to exploring partnerships and offering support.

4.4.2 Municipal Funding of Crime Prevention

The City of Winnipeg provides funding for crime prevention on an annual basis. Seventy-two (72) per cent of this funding is provided to the Winnipeg Police Service and twenty-eight (28) per cent to Public Works. No funding considered 'crime prevention' is directed to the Community Services Department.

To provide citizens with crime awareness and education, enhanced relationships with targeted neighborhoods and schools as well as to conduct proactive policing to prevent crime and disorder.

2019 Crime Prevention Budget


- Community Policing
- Street Lighting
- Crime Prevention Initiatives

Key Goals

- Promote positive interactions with neighborhoods and among cultural groups
- Reduce crime victimization
- Protect vulnerable persons
- Strengthen proactive policing
- Increase effectiveness of street lighting

Contributing Departments

- 72% Police
- 28% Public Works



4.4.2.1 General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres

The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC) is the central resource for community centres to facilitate cooperation and communication among and between the community centres and the CoW. The GCWCC provides leadership in governance, capital investments, operations and programming to Winnipeg community centres. They assist the community centres with expertise on by-law, policy and administrative directives, help facilitate the development and implementation of operational procedures and also help manage or oversee operations of smaller community centres where volunteerism is underrepresented. The GCWCC is responsible to create an accountability manual as well as monitor legal and business licenses for the community centres. They also coordinate and administer blanket license purchases with service providers to maximize cost efficiencies. With respect to funding, the GCWCC administers the grants from the CoW to the individual community centres who must follow an application process as well as comply with reporting requirements which the GCWCC oversees.

As it relates to programming, the GCWCC reports that each community centre decides on its own programming or services based on the input of their volunteer boards or informal needs assessment from stakeholder feedback. Currently, there is not a formal needs assessment nor a baseline level of programming or services that community centres are required to provide. A universal funding formula (UFF) provides direction and guidance over the distribution of the CoW funding however the UFF is under review. The current UFF considers the square footage, number of rinks and catchment populations as the criteria through which to assess funding needs; however, it does not recognize the level of programs and services offered as an equally weighted criteria. Funding is provided on an annual basis with each community centre receiving 60% of its funding at the start of the year followed by the remaining 40% approximately halfway through the year provided their reports have been submitted to GCWCC. There is a minimum of two programming reports required for compliance. Annual funding is both administratively challenging as well as difficult to work with when large (capital) projects are being considered. It is felt that the degree of administrative requirements of the City contribute to greater bureaucracy and inefficiencies in running the community centres and responding to stakeholders' needs and requests.

4.4.2.2 Winnipeg Committee for Safety

The Winnipeg Committee for Safety is a 15-member committee which acts as a conduit between communities and Mayor and Council. Volunteer citizens apply and are approved by Executive Policy Committee (EPC) and Council.

Their mandate is to support, assist, stimulate and mobilize the community. They are mandated to make policy recommendations to Council on safety concerns, develop an annual work plan and publish an annual report. Though not a direct service provider, they work with and support other service providers with programming aligned with their mandate and annual work plan. It is unclear why this level of governance is necessary.

The Committee often hears from service provider organizations about the services they provide or about the importance of supporting a particular initiative. As the conduit to Mayor and Council, the committee may bring forward recommendations to Council which originated from community service providers. They also offer support to service providers by helping them navigate City Hall and potentially connecting them with the right departments or other funding opportunities. The Committee may launch projects of its own (such as Slow Down signs in residential neighbourhoods) which are managed out of their annual operating grant. They have a small annual operating grant of $66,000 which is used to fund their own projects, pay the Coordinators' salary and provide small grants (such as seed monies) to other community safety service providers.

4.4.3 Planning, Property and Development

The Planning, Property and Development Department is responsible for the following:



The PPD department serves all City of Winnipeg residents directly or indirectly through the services they provide. With respect to community safety, they play an important role in the design, remediation or re-design of physical structures to ensure safety is considered and risk reduced through environmental design methods. They are responsible for the CoW Master Plan (Our Winnipeg) which is required to be refreshed every 5 years.

The majority of their services are delivered in face to face consultations, via their website for static information delivery or via email. The Department occasionally conducts outreach related to services such as changes to zoning bylaws or in partnership with specialized service providers where public consultation may be required or a study is being conducted.

The PPD works closely with many partners such as 'Biz' associations, universities and contractors to suggest or support projects and improvements to infrastructure. For example, PPD proposed a lighting program to the Downtown Biz and facilitated the grant application process to help improve lighting of

downtown businesses. Not a recipient of grants themselves, they do have the ability to offer programs and coordinate grant monies to further property improvements. Projects such as this are a component of the type of improvement opportunity which PPD puts forward however there is no formalized needs assessment or 'inventory' of issues to be addressed. Redesign or remediation of City-owned entities or infrastructure is therefore generally more reactive than proactive in that there isn't a defined inventory of issues or problem areas nor a prioritization process through which to determine potential changes to design and a plan, annual or longer-term, to address.

As with By-Law Enforcement Services, PPD may become aware of an issue to be resolved which is not in their jurisdiction and they work to pass it on; however, it is often difficult to confirm the best destination for the information.

4.5 Stakeholders

To fully understand the existing community safety environment in Winnipeg, you must be able to identify, define and quantify as much as possible:

- What organizations, committees and working groups are involved in the planning, governance and delivery of services on the community safety continuum?
- What are the primary mandates of these entities and is community safety one of them?
- Who is their primary client and what do they need?
- What services do they provide and what activities are conducted in the delivery of these services?
- How is success measured? What indicators do they use and to whom and how do they report results?
- What is the governance structure for each of these entities?
- Is there integration or co-ordination within and between these entities? What duplication and overlap exists?
- How are they funded? Are there clear expectations for this funding? Do the funders co-ordinate their funding?

In developing a stakeholder list, MNP found there are approximately 162 stakeholders involved in community safety. It is not possible to answer all the questions outlined above within the timelines and budget of this engagement. This is a very important exercise and should be completed and consistently updated as part of the strategy and future state model.

In addition to mapping the locations and type of client, MNP analyzed the master stakeholder list, identified the stakeholders who deliver service to clients, defined the types of service they provide and the target clients. Much more extensive analysis need to be done to ensure accuracy and clearly identify where there are over-servicing situations or gaps.

		Type of Service															Target Client		
#	Service Delivery Provider	Employment	Arts and Recreation	Sport	Health - Primary Care	Health – Mental Health	Health - Addictions	Shelter	Housing	Education	Connectors	Safety and Security	Community Beautification	Counselling / Consulting	Legal	Funder	Adult	Youth	Families
1	Mount Carmel Clinic																		
2	Main Street Project																		
3	SEED Winnipeg									Managing money									
4	United Way of Winnipeg																		
5	Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre Inc																		
6	Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs - Eagle's Nest																		
7	Siloam Mission																		
8	Winnipeg Centre Vineyard - Flatlanders Inn																		
9	Resource Assistance for Youth (RAY)																		
10	Daniel McIntyre / St. Matthews Community Association																		

		Type of Service															Target Client		
#	Service Delivery Provider	Employment	Arts and Recreation	Sport	Health - Primary Care	Health – Mental Health	Health - Addictions	Shelter	Housing	Education	Connectors	Safety and Security	Community Beautification	Counselling / Consulting	Legal	Funder	Adult	Youth	Families
11	Winnipeg Aboriginal Sport Achievement Centre (WASAC)																	 Indigenous	
12	Broadway Neighbourhood Centre																	 Indigenous	
13	Kanikanichih K																 Indigenous	 Indigenous	
14	Exchange District Biz Improvement Zone																		
15	Salvation Army																		
16	YMCA of Winnipeg																		
17	Ndinawema aganag Endaawaad Inc. (Ndinaawe)																		
18	Boys and Girls Club of Winnipeg																		
20	Indigenous Management Group																 Incarcerated ' women		
21	Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization of Manitoba (IRCOM)																 Immigrant	 Immigrants	 Immigrant

		Type of Service															Target Client		
#	Service Delivery Provider	Employment	Arts and Recreation	Sport	Health - Primary Care	Health – Mental Health	Health - Addictions	Shelter	Housing	Education	Connectors	Safety and Security	Community Beautification	Counselling / Consulting	Legal	Funder	Adult	Youth	Families
22	Mennonite Central Committee of Winnipeg																		
23	Rossbrook House																		
24	All Saints Anglican Church																		
25	New Life Ministries																		
26	Winnipeg Foundation																		
27	Downtown Biz																		
28	North End Neighbourhood Renewal Corporation																		
29	Thunderbird House																 Indigenous	 Indigenous	
30	Teen Challenge of Central Canada																		
31	Graffiti Art Programming Inc - Studio 393																		
32	Take Pride Winnipeg																		
33	Spence Neighbourhood Association																		

		Type of Service															Target Client		
#	Service Delivery Provider	Employment	Arts and Recreation	Sport	Health - Primary Care	Health – Mental Health	Health - Addictions	Shelter	Housing	Education	Connectors	Safety and Security	Community Beautification	Counselling / Consulting	Legal	Funder	Adult	Youth	Families
34	NEEDS Inc																 Refugees	 Refugees	
35	New Directions																		
36	Centre for Aboriginal Human Resource Development																 Indigenous	 Indigenous	
37	Aboriginal Health and Wellness Centre																 Indigenous	 Indigenous	 Indigenous
38	Bear Clan Patrol																		
39	NorWest Co-op Community Health - Blake Gardens									 Early learning									
40	John Howard Society																 Men		
41	Elizabeth Fry Society																 Indigenous women		
42	Onashowew in Justice Circle																 Indigenous		
43	Block by Block Initiative - Thunderwing																		

		Type of Service															Target Client		
#	Service Delivery Provider	Employment	Arts and Recreation	Sport	Health - Primary Care	Health – Mental Health	Health - Addictions	Shelter	Housing	Education	Connectors	Safety and Security	Community Beautification	Counselling / Consulting	Legal	Funder	Adult	Youth	Families
44	Citizens on Patrol and Neighbourhood Watch																		
45	Block Parents Program																		
46	Marymound Inc - Sexually Exploited Youth																		
47	Fort Garry Women's Resource Centre																Women		
48	Bravestone Centre (domestic violence)																Women	 Children	
49	Ikwe Widdjiitiwin (domestic violence)																Indigenous Women	 Indigenous	
50	Men's Resource Centre of Manitoba (domestic violence)																Men	 Male	
51	The Laurel Centre (domestic violence)																Women	 Female	
52	Willow Place Inc. (domestic violence)																Women	 Female	

		Type of Service															Target Client		
#	Service Delivery Provider	Employment	Arts and Recreation	Sport	Health - Primary Care	Health – Mental Health	Health - Addictions	Shelter	Housing	Education	Connectors	Safety and Security	Community Beautification	Counselling / Consulting	Legal	Funder	Adult	Youth	Families
53	North Point Douglas Women's Centre																Women residing in North End		
54	North End Women's Centre																Women		
55	Age and Opportunity																Over 55		
56	The Winnipeg Boldness Project (7 year social innovation program)																Point Douglas	Point Douglas	Point Douglas
57	Art City																		
58	Andrews Street Family Centre																		
59	Elmwood Resource Centre																		
60	Pan Am Boxing Club																Men		
61	Red Road Lodge																		
62	Big Brothers Big Sisters of Winnipeg																		
63	Gang Action Interagency Network (GAIN)																		

		Type of Service															Target Client		
#	Service Delivery Provider	Employment	Arts and Recreation	Sport	Health - Primary Care	Health – Mental Health	Health - Addictions	Shelter	Housing	Education	Connectors	Safety and Security	Community Beautification	Counselling / Consulting	Legal	Funder	Adult	Youth	Families
64	Immigration Partnership Winnipeg																		
65	Youth Agencies Alliance (YAA)																		
66	Manitoba Association of Newcomers Serving Organizations (MANSO)																 Immigrants	 Immigrants	 Immigrants
67	Charleswood Social Club -Charleswood Adult Day Club																 Seniors		
68	Immigrant Centre Manitoba Inc.																 Immigrants		
69	North Centennial Seniors Association of Winnipeg																 Seniors		
70	Winnipeg Repair Education and Cycling Hub (WRENCH)																 Immigrants	 Immigrants	 Immigrants
71	West Broadway Community Organization										V								
72	Canadian Centre for Child Protection																		

		Type of Service															Target Client		
#	Service Delivery Provider	Employment	Arts and Recreation	Sport	Health - Primary Care	Health – Mental Health	Health - Addictions	Shelter	Housing	Education	Connectors	Safety and Security	Community Beautification	Counselling / Consulting	Legal	Funder	Adult	Youth	Families
73	Child and Family All Nations Coordinated Response Network										Intake								
74	Anxiety Disorders Association of MB Inc.																		
75	Canadian Mental Health Association																		
76	Credit Counselling Society									Debt									
77	Eyaa-Keen Healing Centre Inc.																Indigenous		
78	Family Dynamics																		
79	JibStop																		
80	Klinic Community Health																		
81	Knox United Church - Knox Employment Entry Program (KEE)																		
82	Inner City Youth Alive (ICYA)																		X
83	Legal Help Centre															X			

		Type of Service															Target Client		
#	Service Delivery Provider	Employment	Arts and Recreation	Sport	Health - Primary Care	Health – Mental Health	Health - Addictions	Shelter	Housing	Education	Connectors	Safety and Security	Community Beautification	Counselling / Consulting	Legal	Funder	Adult	Youth	Families
84	Macdonald Youth Services (MYS)																		
85	Manitoba Schizophrenia Society																		
86	Opportunities for Employment (OFE)																		
87	Reaching E-Quality Employment Services																 Disabled		
88	The Factory Riverwood Church Community - Finding Freedom - REACT																		
89	Sara Riel Inc.																		
90	Society for Manitobans with Disabilities																 Disabled	 Disabled	
91	Taking Charge																		
92	West Central Women's Resource Centre																 Muslim Women		
93	Winnipeg Rental Network																		

		Type of Service															Target Client		
#	Service Delivery Provider	Employment	Arts and Recreation	Sport	Health - Primary Care	Health – Mental Health	Health - Addictions	Shelter	Housing	Education	Connectors	Safety and Security	Community Beautification	Counselling / Consulting	Legal	Funder	Adult	Youth	Families
94	Winnipeg Housing and Rehabilitation Corporation																		
95	Wolseley Family Place																		
96	Youth Employment Services (YES)																		
97	Altered Minds Inc (Entry Program)																 Refugees	 Refugees	 Refugees
98	Indigenous Family Centre																 Indigenous	 Indigenous	 Indigenous
99	Healthy Start for Mom and Me																		
100	Community Legal Education Association																		
101	West End Biz																		
102	South Winnipeg Family Information Centre																		
103	Thrive Community Support Circle																		
104	Marlene Street Community Resource Centre																		

		Type of Service															Target Client		
#	Service Delivery Provider	Employment	Arts and Recreation	Sport	Health - Primary Care	Health – Mental Health	Health - Addictions	Shelter	Housing	Education	Connectors	Safety and Security	Community Beautification	Counselling / Consulting	Legal	Funder	Adult	Youth	Families
105	Canadian Muslim Women's Institute																Muslim Women		
106	Mood Disorder Association of Manitoba - Black Eagle Transitions																		
107	Building Urban Industries for Local Development (BUILD) Inc.																		

4.6 Municipal Granting Criteria and Processes

Our internal stakeholder consultations identified three sources of municipal grants related to community safety including:

1) City of Winnipeg - $5,465,634
2) Winnipeg Police Service Endowment Fund - $37,814 in 2018
3) Winnipeg Committee for Safety - $66,000 (less the committees coordinator salary)

Based on our preliminary analysis, we have established that all three sources for community safety and support grants lack a common standardized application process/criterion, a central records management system, or formal evaluation requirement.

1) Without a common and standardized application process/criterion, it is difficult to ensure that all of the grant funding is being utilized to achieve the same or interrelated community safety goals. Generally, all three grant sources have a two-step grant application process with the first step involving the applicant completing an application form that contains basic information such as, but not limited to:

   - Legal name and contact information for the applicant
   - Program and/or project name and description
   - Program/project timeline
   - Program/project budget

- Amount requested
- Number of full-time positions the grant would support in the respective organization
- Confirmation and relevant information if the applicant has received funding previously from the City of Winnipeg

Subsequently, the second step involves the deliberation of a respective committee that utilize separate rationale and criteria to approve or deny a grant application. For instance, the Winnipeg Police Service Endowment Fund states a preference for projects that specify an alignment with the philosophy of Crime Prevention for Social Development; which is a criterion not shared among the other three funders. As a result of these independent grant funding sources applying separate processes and criteria, it is difficult to ensure that all available funding is being provided to achieve strategic community safety goals from year to year.

Table 6 below, depicts the formal processes and criteria utilized to approve or deny grants for each of the three respective sources of funding.

2) Since no central records system tracks community safety grants, the ability to definitively establish the amount of funding from year to year or how this funding has changed over time is challenging. For example, records provided by the Winnipeg Police Service Endowment Fund indicates that funding was provided to both the Block Parents and Age & Opportunity. These same two organizations have also been listed as receiving funding from the City of Winnipeg. Due to the separate records management systems of the Winnipeg Police Service Endowment Fund and the City of Winnipeg, ascertaining if these grants are both being provided by the Winnipeg Police Endowment Fund and simply recorded by the City of Winnipeg or being provided by the City of Winnipeg in addition to the Winnipeg Police Service Endowment Fund, is not clear. It may be that funding has been provided by both the WPS and CoW as a strategic decision however this is not clear from the data collected and would therefore require additional consultation and investigation. Additionally, investigation would have to be undertaken across both records management systems to determine the full envelope and funding trends over time as the information is not centrally shared.

3) Finally, there is not a formal or coordinated evaluation process of the organizations who request grant funding. Each of the three funders have their own approaches to evaluation to determine the likely impacts or outcomes and their alignment with strategic community safety goals. As it relates to measurable outcomes, all three grant reports are primarily limited to self-reported outputs as opposed to independently, verifiable outcomes and impacts. As a result, the City of Winnipeg has limited data to determine the impacts of their community safety grant funding from year to year or over time.

Overall, a noted benefit of a fairly simplistic grant application process is that the organizations applying do not have to utilize significant amounts of time to apply for grants because all four sources of grants are accessible to all types of community-based organizations. Due to the lack of standardization, central management, and evaluation requirements, there is not an easy way to align all grants and ensure all grant providers are aware of which organizations are receiving grant funding or the actual performance, in impacts or outcomes, of each grant recipient.

Table 6: Municipal Grant Criteria and Processes

	City of Winnipeg	Winnipeg Committee for Safety	Winnipeg Police Service Endowment Fund	General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres
Criteria	**Must be a program or project operated within City of Winnipeg boundaries**	The grant cannot be awarded to: 1. City of Winnipeg departments. 2. Projects/Programs that re primarily food-oriented. 3. Projects/Programs that are carried out beyond the City of Winnipeg geographical limits. 4. Projects/Programs that are of a religious nature. 5. Paid staff positions.	1. Must be a Winnipeg-based charitable or non-project organization that are requesting funding for projects within Winnipeg. 2. Must agree to a grant agreement with the City of Winnipeg. 3. Have not received a grant in the previous 12-months prior to the application. 4. Must not be for a project longer than 1 year. 5. Cannot be a capital project, renovation, or a project funded by a school, school division, or one of the three levels of government.	1. Must be a one of 63 Community Centres recognized by the City of Winnipeg/General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres (GCWCC) located within the City of Winnipeg boundaries. 2. Specific eligibility criteria does vary by the type of grant being applied for.
Process	**Step 1:** Fill out the City of Winnipeg Operating Program and/or Project Grant application form. **Step 2:** City council will deliberate and decide which applicants will or will not receive grants from the City of Winnipeg.	**Step 1:** Complete and submit the Community Grants Application form. **Step 2:** Upon successful completion of the application, complete and submit the WCFS Grant Terms and Conditions form. Step 3: Upon project completion, complete and submit the WCFS Final Report Form.	**Step 1:** Complete and submit the Winnipeg Police Service (WPS) Endowment Fund Grant Application form. **Step 2:** The WPS Endowment Fund Committee will deliberate and approve or deny the application.	**Step 1:** Complete and submit one of eight application forms depending on the purpose of the grant funding. **Step 2:** The GCWCC will approve or deny grant applications submitted by community centres based on the ability of the community centre to meet the criteria outlined for the respective grant.

4.7 Funding of Services

MNP consulted with City of Winnipeg representatives and conducted research from public sources to gather funding information about the stakeholders identified. There is limited information publicly available about revenue sources. Identifying all revenue sources as well as the expectations for its use needs to be part of the assessment process associated with public funding. Again, a 'one taxpayer' view, requires a fulsome understanding of how much public funding is being invested and what outcomes are expected.

MNP's research resulted in identification of 162 stakeholders who play a role in community safety, either as direct service providers (deemed as core) or support providers who provide services associated with or linked to community safety. Out of 162 community safety stakeholders identified by MNP, 34 received City of Winnipeg grant support in 2019 (Figure 21). Of these and based on data provided by the CoW, three of the 34 (9%) receiving grant funding in 2019 are current community safety partners of the City including:

- Winnipeg Harvest
- Immigration Refugee Community Organization of Manitoba (IRCOM)
- Winnipeg Public Library Board.

Based on these preliminary findings, this suggests that:

1) There is not a formal community safety partnership with 31 (91%) of the existing stakeholders receiving grant funding who provide either core or supportive community safety services;
2) There may be variation in how service providers are defined as community safety partners, given that the three organizations identified as partners provide services which support community safety.

Establishing an agreed upon definition of 'community safety' and requiring any public investment to 'clearly connect the dots' between their primary organizational mandate and services and community safety is critical moving forward.

Figure 21: Municipal Grants in 2019

34 Stakeholders Receiving CoW Grants in 2019

Entity	Grant Amount	Entity	Grant Amount	Entity	Grant Amount
General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres	$1,727,225.00	Kanikanichihk	$ 131,230.00	West End Biz	$40,500.00
Downtown Biz	$482,000.00	Age and Opportunity	$100,350.00	New Directions	$30,000.00
Broadway Neighbourhood Centre	$311,880.00	Art City	$100,000.00	Immigrant Centre Manitoba Inc.	$27,000.00
Rossbrook House	$256,339.00	Main Street Project	$96,000.00	Pan Am Boxing Club	$25,100.00
Take Pride Winnipeg	$250,000.00	Spence Neighbourhood Association	$83,150.00	Block Parents Program	$17,564.00
CentreVenture Downtown Development Agency	$241,597.00	Resource Assistance for Youth (RAY)	$82,745.00	Big Brother Big Sisters of Winnipeg	$12,000.00
Boys and Girls Club of Winnipeg	$201,148.00	Winnipeg Public Library Board	$79,315.00	Winnipeg Repair Education and Cycling Hub (WRENCH)	$10,000.00
University of Winnipeg - Institute of Urban Studies	$200,000.00	Exchange District Biz Improvement Zone	$76,150.00	Manitoba Families - Mediation Services	$10,000.00


Winnipeg Housing and Rehabilitation Corporation	$180,000.00	Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization of Manitoba (IRCOM)	$73,810.00	Red Road Lodge	$8,400.00
Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre Inc	$167,331.00	Ndinawemaaganag Endaawaad Inc. (Ndinaawe)	$51,000.00	Charleswood Social Club - Charleswood Adult Day Club	$1,600.00
Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs - Eagle's Nest	$146,500.00	Winnipeg Harvest	$50,000.00	**Total**	**$5,465,634**
End Homelessness - Winnipeg Poverty Reduction Council	$50,000.00	Andrews Street Family Centre	$45,700.00		

Our research further reveals that the CoW grant recipients align with some of the known categories of effective crime prevention programming and practices with most noting programming and services focused on youth. Specifically, a review of the mandates for the 34 grant recipients establishes the following:

- 17 out of 34 (50%) provide youth focused services and programming;
- 10 out of 34 (29%) provide either housing, neighbourhood renewal, or neighbourhood patrol services
- The remaining 7 (20%) recipients provide various services including food and social support for senior citizens.

With regard to effective crime prevention programs, the US Department of Justice has described and rated the effectiveness of 582 different types of crime prevention programs and 102 practices (CrimeSolutions.gov). Effective programs and practices were rated as such if there is credible and methodologically valid evidence demonstrating that a program achieves its intended outcomes. With this definition in mind, the US Department of Justice found 98 programs and 25 practices to be effective (18% of the 684 programs). Interestingly, out of the 18% of effective programs and practices, 64% do not involve the police or the courts. As the chart below indicates, the majority of the effective crime prevention programs and practices focus on youth, families, schools as well as addiction and mental health issues (Figure 22).

Figure 22: Number of Crime Prevention Programs and Practices by Type



Utilizing the data compiled by the US Department of Justice, the Canadian Municipal Network on Crime Prevention has separated effective crime prevention programs and practices into the following two broad categories: 1) social and community sector crime prevention; 2) law enforcement and justice sector crime prevention. Within each of these two broad categories are specific types of effective crime prevention programs and practices, as outlined in the table below:

Table 7: Crime Prevention Programs and Practices by Category

Social and Community Sector Crime Prevention	Law Enforcement and Justice Sector Crime Prevention
Family and Early-Childhood: These are programs and practices with a focus on preventing or stopping family violence, providing parenting skills as well as pre-school support that are based in the community, family home, or pre-school setting. **Youth Focused:** Generally, these are programs focused on youth between the ages of 6 to 24 that are outside of school that focus on developing the life-skills of youth by means of mentorship, tutoring, and career education. **School-Based:** These are pro-social behaviour, academic assistance, and life-skill based programs and practices that are situated within schools and facilitated by teachers or other educational staff members. **Physical, Mental Health and Addictions:** These are programs that help individuals with problematic addiction issues, mental health challenges, as well as problems stemming from victimization e.g. post-traumatic stress disorder.	**Situational Crime Prevention:** Any program or practice that increases the risk of crime, decreases the opportunity or crime, or reduce the benefits of crime in accordance with the crime triangle. In most cases this form of crime prevention relies on environmental design e.g. technological or architectural design. **Diversion Programs:** These practices and programs include restorative justice approaches, court diversion and support programs as well as police decisions to use lesser charges or refer/transport an individual they come into contact with to another service. **Enforcement and Sanctions:** Utilizing arrests and/or sanctions e.g. traffic tickets, to reduce criminal activity as well as prevent further victimization.

In reference to the effective crime prevention programs and practices outlined by Canadian Municipal Network of Crime Prevention, there appears to be a gap in the investment by the CoW in crime prevention programs focused on parenting and situational crime prevention based on the mandate and programs of the 34 organization receiving grants from the CoW (Figure 21). **Please note: a comprehensive gap analysis cannot be completed without understanding the full scope of programming delivered or funded by other levels of government as part of their mandate.** The table below highlights the 18 (53%) organizations that offer youth services with only 5 (15%) offering parenting programs and 4 (12%) programs providing some form of situational crime prevention. However, based on the available information, we cannot establish if the CoW grant funding is being applied directly to youth, parenting, and situation crime prevention programs offered by the identified organizations or to other programs/services offered by the respective organizations. This is an important finding as it suggests that the City of Winnipeg could shift some of its investment into crime prevention techniques focused on parenting and situational crime prevention to potentially reduce crime rates and increase community safety.


Table 8: Crime Prevention Programs Focused on Parenting and Situation Crime Prevention by Mandate

Youth Services	Parenting Services	Situational Crime Prevention
• Broadway Neighbourhood Centre • Rossbrook House • Boys and Girls Clubs of Winnipeg • University of Winnipeg – Youth United • Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre Inc. • Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs – Eagle's Nest • Kanikanichihk • Art City • Spence Neighbourhood Association • Resource Assistance for Youth • Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization of Manitoba • Ndinawemaaganag Endaawaad Inc. • Andrews Street Family Centre • Pan Am Boxing Club • Block Parents • Big Brothers Big Sisters of Winnipeg • Winnipeg Repair Education and Cycling Hub • New Directions	• Ma Mawi Wi Chi Itata Centre Inc. • Spence Neighbourhood Association • Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization of Manitoba • Andrews Street Family Centre • New Directions	• Spence Neighbourhood Association • Downtown Biz • West End Biz • Exchange Biz

4.8 Other Related Services

Based on our analysis identifying community safety stakeholders in Winnipeg, 150 out of 162 (93%) are external and not under the authority of the City of Winnipeg. Additionally, 122 out of 162 (75%) stakeholders provide direct, in-person services (Figure 23) with 35 of those 122 (28%) services being neighbourhood specific, meaning restricted to a particular catchment area.

Figure 23: All Identified Stakeholders in Winnipeg by Service Type



4.8.1 Provincial Programs and Services

The following represents a summary of provincial departments who provide programs and / or services in support of community safety. The principal mandate of the department is provided as well as a brief description of relevant community safety programming. This summary was compiled from publicly available information and may therefore not be fully representative of all programs and services offered.

4.8.1.1 Manitoba Health, Seniors and Active Living (including WRHA Crisis Response Centre)

Health, Seniors and Active Living strives "…to meet the health needs of individuals, families and their communities by leading a sustainable, publicly administered health system that promotes well-being and provides the right care, in the right place, at the right time." This is accomplished by providing strategic direction and leadership to the provincial health system.

- **WRHA Crisis Response Centre** - The Mental Health Crisis Response Centre in Winnipeg is creating a central point of access for adults experiencing a mental health crisis, accessible 24 hours a day, seven days a week within an atmosphere that promotes healing and recovery. This Centre of Excellence in crisis resolution ensures expert short term clinical treatment and support services are available through walk-in services, mobile services and scheduled appointment services, combined with planned linkage and referral to appropriate services and supports.

4.8.1.2 Manitoba Housing

Enhance the affordability of, and accessibility to, adequate housing for Manitobans, particularly those of low to moderate incomes or those with specialized needs in addition to maintaining and improving the condition of existing housing stock, ensuring there is adequate supply of housing stock in Manitoba, and stimulate the activities of the housing market to the benefit of Manitobans as a whole.

4.8.2 Manitoba Sport, Culture and Heritage

Contribute to a vibrant and prosperous Manitoba by celebrating, developing, supporting and promoting the identity, creativity, and well-being of Manitobans, their communities and their province.

Manitoba Families (Healthy Child, Family Violence Prevention Program, Mediation Services, Employment and Income Assistance)

In partnership with Manitobans, the Department of Families works to help keep children, individuals, families, and communities safe and secure, while supporting citizen development, self reliance, well-being and social inclusion.

- **Healthy Child** - Healthy Child Manitoba is the Government of Manitoba's long-term, cross-departmental strategy for putting children and families first. The Province of Manitoba, with its community partners, has developed a continuum of supports and strategies for children, youth and families.
- **Family Violence Prevention Program** - The Family Violence Prevention Program (FVPP) plans and develops community programs that help stop family violence. The program provides funding to community-based organizations that offer special services for abused women and their children and for men living with family violence.
- **Mediation Services** - In mediation, a skilled, professional counsellor helps parents make decisions about the ongoing care of their children after separation. It can help parents make decisions about: how the children will spend time with each parent on weekdays, weekends, holidays, and; how they will continue to make major decisions about education, religion, health care and activities.
- **Employment and Income Assistance** - Providing financial help to Manitobans who have no other way to support themselves or their families. This includes benefits from the Rent Assist Program that helps with housing costs. For people who are able to work, EIA will help them go back to work by providing supports to employment.

4.8.2.1 Manitoba Justice (Neighbourhood Alive, Lighthouse Initiative, Turnabout)

Manitoba Justice serves Manitobans by helping to provide a safe, just and peaceful society. The justice system supports equality, fairness, individual responsibility and respect. Effective programs and services make safer communities.

- **Neighborhood Alive -** Established in 2000, Neighbourhoods Alive! (NA!) is the Manitoba Government's long-term community development strategy. NA! represents a paradigm shift within the public sector. Rather than isolated programs being unilaterally administered to communities in distress, NA! uses a coordinated cross-departmental approach to address the complexity of community-defined priorities. NA! provides "seed money" to innovative pilot projects and longer-term funding to projects demonstrating best practices.
- **Lighthouse Initiative -** A community-based crime prevention program for young Manitobans, providing activities identified and organized by local youth. Partnerships between youth, police, justice personnel and communities are developed to promote opportunities for involvement in pro-social recreational, and crime prevention activities.

- **Turnabout -** Turnabout is a provincial prevention program that provides children under 12 years of age with the support and direction they need to avoid conflict with the law. Through a referral process, Turnabout responds to a child(ren) when s/he has been in trouble with the law or is at risk of coming into conflict with the law. The program works with families to deal with the underlying issues that may be causing the child to act in a criminal way. The goal is to connect the child(ren) and their families with appropriate community resources that will support the family. Examples of some services utilized include: free and/or subsidized recreational opportunities; clinical referrals; Elder support; mentorship opportunities; program-specific referrals (i.e. anti-gang programs); multi-systems planning meetings and advocacy support.

4.8.2.2 School Divisions

The following is a summary of safety related initiatives associated with school divisions. This information has been compiled from publicly available information and may therefore not be fully representative of all programs and services offered.

Manitoba Education

Safe Schools Manitoba is a partnership initiative made up of organizations committed to working together to enhance the safety of Manitoba's schools and communities. A website with initiatives and document resources is available to support safety of Manitoba schools and communities.

School Resource Officers

The five main goals of the School Resource Officer (SRO) program include:

- Strengthening relationships between police, community and particularly youth;
- Enhancing neighborhood safety by strengthening partnerships between and among police, schools and the community;
- Providing schools with more strategic crime prevention resources;
- Demonstrating effective, collaborative and proactive community-based crime prevention strategies; and
- Potential cost savings for justice, education and social service systems.

Anticipated outcomes of the SRO Program include increased safety in and around schools, increased perceptions of safety, improved police call response times, reduction in truancy, reduction in school related incidents and/or crime and disorder problems such as bullying, violence, gang and drug activities.

Reported outcomes per four (4) previously completed exploratory/qualitative evaluations (2005, 2007, 2010 and 2014) of the Winnipeg School Division SRO Program have demonstrated positive results. In addition, a 2012 exploratory/qualitative evaluation of the Pembina Trails School Division demonstrated similar positive results. Students report that[xiii]:

Schools feel safer:

- The SRO's are good resources for advice and mediations;
- Students feel safer and secure around police;
- Students' perceptions of police have become more positive;
- There is less bullying/violence; and
- There is less graffiti and damage to school property.

Community:

- There is less graffiti in the neighbourhoods;
- People in the community perceive SRO's as positive; and
- Parents and neighbours regularly contact the SRO's for assistance.

Police:

- Police can respond and resolve issues involving students more efficiently;
- Students' familiarity with SRO's enhances police credibility and resolution of issues;
- Parents utilize the SRO's to report and resolve issues involving their children, which is more cost effective to have SRO's resolve issues at the school rather than utilizing patrol officers; and
- Expanded community intelligence gathering abilities, community more responsive to SRO's and willingness to share information.

In Manitoba, the SRO program is cost shared through a partnership with the Province of Manitoba, the School Division and the Winnipeg Police Service. Statistics related to participating school divisions and number of officers have been requested of the WPS.

Safety Drills

- In a **Lock Down** drill, a simulation is presented whereby an unwanted intruder has entered the school building. All classrooms in the school are secured, and the students are kept inside the classroom with the lights off and away from the windows until classroom teachers are advised by School Administrators that the threat is over.
- In a **Hold and Secure** drill, unwanted individuals are outside the building trying to get in. All entrances to the school are secured and no one is allowed to enter or exit the building until the threat is over. During a Lock Out drill, signs will be posted at each outside entrance alerting anyone trying to enter the school, but classes inside the building will carry on as usual.

Winnipeg School Division

- Code of Conduct
- Safe school plans and programs
  - Safe school plan
  - Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS)
  - Effective threat assessment and crisis response plans
  - Safe School Handbook: Staff Guidelines including procedures for lock-down protocols
  - Integration of community resources (parental involvement, community agencies including Department of Education and WPS)
  - Digital floor plans are created and shared with WPS
  - School Resource Officers partnership with WPS

    - Bullying prevention fact sheet
    - Human rights / anti-homophobia initiatives fact sheet
    - Policies
- School Patrols
- Parental involvement
- Internet Safety

St James Assiniboia School Division

- St. James-Assiniboia School Division staff members are dedicated to making schools a safe place for students and all 26 schools have Safe Schools Committees where students and staff members work together to help create safe, inclusive and caring environments within our schools. The division also has policies on safety of buildings, grounds, buses and internet safety.

Seven Oaks School Division

- The Seven Oaks Division has multiple policies related to safety including that of infrastructure such as buildings, grounds as well as behavioural related to code(s) of conduct. There are also several policies related to student safety such as with student safety patrols, student travel, transportation, fire prevention and others.

River East Transcona School Division

- The River East Transcona School Division also has multiple policies related to safety as well as a safe school charter, crossing guards and school patrols and fire drills and lockdowns.


Pembina Trails School Division

- The Pembina Trails School Division has multiple policies related to safety including that of a general safety and health policy, duties and responsibilities of safety, emergency response planning, fire safety plans, street safety including street patrols and others.

Louis-Riel School Division


The Louis Riel School Division also has multiple policies in place to support safety of students and personnel. Investments were recently made to improve student safety to and from school with addition of new walking school bus routes and rapid rectangular flashing beacons at key intersections. Additional projects related to mental health and Indigenous engagement also received positive feedback.

4.9 Summary Conclusion



Based on these findings and MNP's experience in other work, there are a large number of services in Winnipeg being provided independently of one another without a cohesive, city-wide strategic plan that aligns efforts towards achieving mutually defined goals. A direct connection between need/demand and services funded as well as between services and expected outcomes does not exist. This is an issue both within and across service types as many issues are inter-related. For example, most addiction treatment facilities in Winnipeg require that individuals complete a detox program prior to entry however, there is limited detox service providers in Winnipeg. Consequently, a bottleneck for addiction treatment is often the result which perpetuates the addiction and time to treatment. This example highlights the negative impact of multiple service providers working independently from one another with no strategic oversight.


For any approach to be successful, 'systems thinking' must be adopted. Solid evaluation of the current state and the definition of a desired future state, requires the entire 'system' be considered. These interrelated and interdependent processes must be carefully planned and executed with upstream and downstream considerations. Below is an example of a 'system'.



4.10 Map

The following section includes a series of cartographic representations of data and analysis collected and conducted for this study. To help situate the spatial distribution of data across Winnipeg, a reference map has been included in Figure 24 which includes all three major waterways (Red, Assiniboine, and Seine Rivers), major roadways with key routes labelled, and the municipal boundary. For clarity of visualization, later maps only include the municipal boundary.

Figure 24: Reference Map of Winnipeg Study Area



4.10.1 Value of Spatial Analysis

Research shows that spatial analysis and mapping serve two key purposes that support a strategic approach to community safety. First, it allows decision makers to efficiently visualize the unequal distribution of criminality within the city. Second and more importantly, it provides objective information to guide decisions about how to distribute limited resources to address both crime and the underlying risk factors that lead to criminality and victimization[xiv] (Waller, 2014). With regards to the first point, our spatial analysis includes publicly available crime rate data from the WPS (Figure 25). Specifically, spatial data was downloaded from the WPS Crime Maps website for the 12-month period between February 1, 2018 and February 1, 2019. Unfortunately, the data available from the WPS is aggregated at the neighbourhood level as opposed to a more granular level of analysis e.g. census track, to avoid any privacy issues. Alternatively, risk factors of criminality and victimization are collected by census track and consequently provide richer data that increases the specificity of where risk factors are higher or lower. This is important because only particular sections of a neighbourhood may have high-risk characteristics. For instance, within the Fort Garry neighbourhood, there are low risk levels except for a particular section of the neighbourhood by the Jubilee and Pembina overpass. Without this level of detail, which is only provided by census track information, resources/services to address the identified risk factors may be incorrectly deployed within the neighbourhood and consequently inaccessible to residents that require them. For this project we utilized a risk factor index established by Statistics Canada for a study identifying neighbourhood characteristics and criminality in Winnipeg in 2001 (Table 9).

Figure 25: Annual Reported Incidents of Crime



4.10.2 Crime Mapping


The WPS provides public access to statistical data detailing reported incidents of crime through an online portal. Data was downloaded for the 12-month period between February 1, 2018 and February 1, 2019 on May 21, 2019. This data is provided at the neighbourhood level and is mapped to show the density of incidents (Figure 25).

4.10.3 Stakeholder Mapping

In order to understand the spatial distribution of stakeholders, known addresses were input into a stakeholder list and mapped using a Geographic Information System (GIS). This preliminary step was necessary to allow all further analysis relating to the strategic distribution of services across the City of Winnipeg. The stakeholder list has 164 individual entries representing organizations, government entities, and other groups identified through research and conversation with the City of Winnipeg steering committee. This dataset was further processed so that every unique location was accounted for with an address where available. This resulted in 203 individual entries, 174 of which had the necessary information to be mapped. The remaining 17 either had insufficient address information, confidential addresses, or were located outside of the city of Winnipeg (one in Headingley, MB and one in Oakbank, MB).

Stakeholders were sorted into Primary Service Categories based on the type or service or support they provide the community: Education and Employment; Health; Housing and Shelter; Family and Youth Support. Additionally, stakeholders that did not fall into one of those categories were sorted as 'other'. Administration offices or other locations that do not provide direct service or support to the community were

Figure 26: Map of Stakeholders by Primary Service Category



excluded from this analysis. The remaining locations were mapped to understand the spatial distribution of services by Primary Service Category (Figure 26). There is a noticeable concentration of service providers in and adjacent to the downtown core.


4.10.4 Service Area Analysis

To understand the implication of the spatial distribution of different service providers, it is important to understand the areas to which they are easily able to provide services. There is limited research on the distance people will walk to access necessary or life-improving/sustaining services, therefore we used research on food deserts and equitable access to supermarkets/home provisioning. In comparison to walking for recreation or transport, home provisioning is more similar in function and necessity. This research categorized locations within a half mile (~800 meters) of a supermarket as high quality. We have used this measure to determine service areas for service providers[xv] (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2009).

In order to understand service areas, a buffer of 800 meters was used to approximate the area that is well serviced by each stakeholder organized by the Primary Service Categories (Figure 27 through Figure 31). Figure 32 provides a summary of all stakeholder service areas to communicate the overlapping nature of services across Primary Service Categories.


The following five (5) maps illustrate the estimated service areas for all stakeholders by Primary Service Categories. These categories were chosen as a means to compare service type to the individual risk factors used to develop the socioeconomic risk index.

Figure 27: Employment Education Service Area




Stakeholders delivering education or employment support are concentrated in the core of the city with the service area covering most of downtown, Point Douglas, Lord Selkirk, and West Broadway. There are individual facilities services in small areas across the south and west of the city, as well as a pocket of services further north than the main concentration. The general concentration of education and employment services illustrates the necessity for mobility to access current service providers and could provide evidence for a need to distribute these services more evenly across the city.

Figure 28: Family Youth Service Area



Services focused on family and youth have a wider concentration within the core, and better distribution across the city. The main service area covers an geographic area from Wolseley to Point Douglas and further north on Main St. and west past Keewatin St. There are a number of isolated service providers in the west end, south east, and between Henderson Hwy. and Lagimodière Blvd.


Figure 29: Health Service Area



The downtown core from Point Douglas to River-Osborne and across to Wolseley and the West End are relatively well serviced by stakeholders focused on health, physical and mental. With the exception of a single facility, the rest of the city is seriously underserviced.

Please note: primary health organizations such as hospitals were note included in this analysis.

Figure 30: Housing Shelter Service Area



Similar to health and mental health, the service area for stakeholders addressing issues related to housing and shelter is concentrated in the urban core resulting in a shortage of service providers elsewhere in the city. This disproportionately impacts anyone struggling with housing and shelter who currently lives and/or works outside the urban core.

Figure 31: Other Service Area





Figure 32: Map of Stakeholder Service Areas (800m) by Primary Service Category



This map shows the concentration of services available in and around the downtown core as well as the dispersed or non-existent nature of service provision in other parts of the city.

4.10.5 Risk Index Justification and Support

A challenge with understanding the spatial distribution of crime is the level at which crime stats are provided for analysis. Using historical crime data focuses on past events and therefore makes efforts to address them reactionary by nature. A socioeconomic risk index utilizes census data to analyze underlying risk factors and provide a prediction of the spatial distribution of elevated risk – allowing for strategic resource allocation aimed at mitigating the underlying issues and therefore proactively addressing community safety.

The socioeconomic risk index is based on evidence showing that the layering and intersection of risk indicators has a compounding effect on communities. Elevated prevalence of a single risk factor does not necessary indicate that a population is at a higher risk of victimization or criminality, but the nexus and combination of factors has a multiplying effect. MNP has developed a socioeconomic risk index for the purposes of this report as well as future planning efforts. The five (5) risk indicators used to develop the Socioeconomic Risk Index are detailed in Table 9. The significance of identifying risk factors in addition to crime rates spatially, is being able to establish geographic areas that are at high-risk of criminality to help strategically allocate resources to these areas and prevent crime from occurring utilizing an appropriate crime prevention/reduction technique. However, the appropriate crime prevention/reduction techniques will require more than police resources including, but not limited to social, health, and educational services. Therefore, it is important to spatially identify not only the existing stakeholders in Winnipeg, but their catchment area.

Table 9: Socioeconomic Risk Indicators, Descriptions, and Source

Risk Indicator	Description	Census Data Used
Educational Attainment*	Proportion of the population that has not completed secondary education	Number of individuals (25 – 65 years old) with "no certificate, diploma, or degree" divided by the total population.
Unemployment*	Percentage of the labour force that was unemployed at time of census	Unemployment rate
Low Income	Proportion of the population that are expected to be required to spend 20% or more of after-tax income than average on food, shelter, and clothing	Prevalence of low income based on the low-income cut-offs, after tax
Lone-parent families	Proportion of families that are headed by a single parent	Total lone-parent families in private households divided by total number of census families in private households
Housing Tenure*	Proportion of renters	Total renters divided by total private households by tenure

Each risk factor is measured as a percentage of the total for each geographic unit. This is calculated for the smallest geographic and population unit with the necessary level of detail, which in this case is the Dissemination Area (DA). Statistics Canada divided the entire country into Dissemination Area's for analysis

of Census data. Each DA represents an average population of 400 to 700 people which leads to maintaining relatively stable boundaries between censuses, making them ideal boundaries for longitudinal analysis.


Census Data was processed so that values were represented as a decimal percentage for all five (5) risk indicators. These were summed to give a Total Risk Index value between zero (0) and five (5), with five (5) representing the highest possible level of risk. These values were calculated for every DA within the Winnipeg Census Division and that table was linked to the corresponding 2016 Census Boundary Files. The highest Risk Index value within the study area was 3.139, with 100% rental 78% lone parent families, 73% low income, 30% unemployment, and 33% of the population having low education attainment - located in the Burrows-Keewatin neighbourhood north of Selkirk Ave and the Canadian Pacific Railway (C.P.R.) Weston Shops. The average risk for the highest 25% (280 DAs) is 1.597. The Socioeconomic Risk Index was mapped and symbolized using Jenks Natural Breaks Classification, which is a cartographic data classification method that creates natural groups of similar values to maximize differences between classes while grouping similar values. This method resulted in five (5) data categories that are detailed in Table 10.

Table 10: Socioeconomic Risk Index Data Classification

Socioeconomic Risk Index Range	Socioeconomic Risk Level
Less than 0.464774	Low
0.464775 – 0.830090	
0.830091 – 1.293030	Moderate
1.293031 – 1.859049	
1.8859050 – 3.139111	High

By mapping Dissemination Areas categorized by the above-mentioned data classification method for socioeconomic risk, a clear pattern in the spatial distribution of risk is evident (See Figure 33). Risk appears to be concentrated in the downtown core and in adjacent areas. It appears to follow a mostly north-south pattern through downtown between Main St and Arlington St, with an east-west elongation that roughly follows the C.P.R. rail line and yards from the bridge over the Red River, through Point Douglas to Keewatin St.

Figure 33: Socioeconomic Risk Index Classified from Low to High




4.10.6 Gap Analysis

After establishing the level of risk for criminality across Winnipeg in addition to the services available to address the specified risks, we were able to identify specific geographic locations in Winnipeg that are moderate to high risk and underserved by existing services. To complete the gap analysis, first areas of moderate to high risk (0.830 and up) were mapped without the two lower categories (Figure 34). This map further illustrated the concentration of higher risk, while simultaneously highlighting the distribution of risk across the city. The majority of areas experiencing elevated levels of risk are located in the north half of the city (north of the Assiniboine river, or more specifically adjacent to or north of the C.P.R. yards running west from around Higgins and Main). There are clear pockets in Transcona, northern portions of St. James, St. Vital between St. Anne's and the Seine River and north of Bishop Grandin Blvd, as well as a series of pockets on either side of Pembina Hwy north and south of the University of Manitoba.

Stakeholder service areas were previously mapped to provide a reasonable assumption for the geographic extent of easy (high quality) access to each service provider. These service areas were then layered over a map showing moderate to high socioeconomic risk (Figure 35) and used to identify Dissemination Areas that do not have high quality, easy access to services (Figure 36). Figure 37 shows Dissemination Areas that are not within the estimated service area for any service provider listed as a project stakeholder. The key takeaway from this series of maps is that there are issues relating to equity of access to services. Individuals living further from the core service

Figure 34: Moderate to High Socioeconomic Risk



areas will have less ability to access necessary services that could reduce the impact of risk on future criminality or victimization. The neighbourhoods of Windsor Park, St. Boniface, Pembina Strip, Chevrier, Heritage Park, and Sturgeon Creek all experience elevated risk with limited access to potentially mitigating services.

Figure 35: Estimate Service Areas and Dissemination Areas with Moderate to High Socioeconomic Risk




Figure 36: Service Areas and Underserviced Dissemination Areas.






Figure 37: Underserviced Dissemination Areas



4.10.7 Community Facilities


It is understood that proximity to community facilities has the potential t
distribution of community facilities that have a direct impact on the area
libraries, community centres, fitness and leisure centres, indoor and out
relatively even distribution of community facilities across the city is a goo
support effort to mitigate socioeconomic risk factors.



4.10.8 Findings


Through overlaying historical crime data from the Winnipeg Police Service over the analysis of Socioeconomic Risk Index, we can see the concentration of incidents at or adjacent to moderate to high risk areas (Figure 39).

Figure 39: Incidents of Crime and Socioeconomic Risk Index



When looking at the density of incidents of crime overlaid on moderate to high risk areas that are underserviced by analyzed service providers, it becomes clear that certain areas of the city such as East Norwood/St. Boniface, Grant Park, Rossmere, Pembina Strip, or Sturgeon Creek may benefit from greater access to services (Figure 40)

Figure 40: Incidents of Crime and Underserviced Areas of Moderate to High Socioeconomic Risk



5 What Other Jurisdictions are Doing

5.1 Community Safety Centres of Responsibility

Irvin Waller is a leading researcher on Crime Prevention as well as Community Safety Centres of Responsibilities with much of his work providing the conceptual parameters for the Canadian Municipal Network on Crime Prevention (CMNCP). In accordance with Irvin Waller's research, the CMNCP defines a Community Safety Centre of Responsibility as an institution that facilitates strategic community-government relationships utilizing evidence-based crime prevention to optimize available resources in diagnosing, mobilizing, implementing, and evaluating crime prevention policies and programs.

The purpose of a Centre of Responsibility is to be the impetus for strategic investments and efforts to reduce victimization and improve community safety by facilitating public, private, and not-for-profit organizations. In most cases, the primary function of the Centre of Responsibility is to develop and sustain a strategic community safety plan through the following, cyclical and iterative process:

1) Collecting and analyzing data to define the problem(s) and determine the risk factors causing the problem(s).
2) Facilitate the collective action from available resources to solve the identified problem(s) in accordance with evidence-based practices.
3) Provide continuous oversight for the implementation of the determined solution.
4) Evaluate the implemented solution to provide feedback information for decision makers to establish success of the solution.

Over the past 20 years, there has been an increasing number of Community Safety Centres of Responsibilities across Canada that vary in their design and governance structure however predominately have the following characteristics:

- Administered directly by the municipality or region, or by an entity that maintains a direct funding and/or reporting relationship to the municipal or regional government for which it serves.
- Administered, at least partially, by paid employees.
- Primarily dedicated to supporting community efforts to address community safety through the office's direct or indirect provision of services.
- Administratively exclusive with no direct reporting relationship with the police service
- Services a population of 50,000 or more.

Generally, the increasing number of municipal Centres of Responsibility in Canada is due to the growing support and acceptance that:

1) Municipalities, as stable institutions, are strategically situated to take a leadership role in improving community safety by implementing and maintaining cost-effective measures that bring long-term solutions. Furthermore, municipal governments are the closest form of government to community level issues that provides them with key insights and access to local issues that are not always available to higher levels of government.

For instance, the City of Winnipeg has been able to work with and encourage community-based initiatives that lead residents to play a key role in maintaining their own neighbourhood and instilling a sense of ownership. A successful example is that of the Bear Clan Patrol.

2) Research has established that strategic, collaborative, and evidence-based crime prevention and community safety efforts are cost-effective and lead to desired outcomes and impacts. For instance, the auto-theft initiative in Winnipeg utilized a multi-faceted approach that reduced auto-theft by 76% over a three-year period and provided a return on investment of $5 for every $1.

   Research has also shown to effectively and efficiently implement programs/initiatives to prevent crime and increase community safety, Centres of Responsibilities should ideally:

   - Receive consistent funding from municipalities, in addition to provincial and federal levels of government.
   - Have the capacity, generally through a board of directors, to influence key municipal figures such as the chief of police, city managers and executive directors of community-based organizations.
   - Have a permanent and well-trained staff who utilize data collection and analytics to identify and evaluate collective efforts to prevent crime and improve community safety.
   - Become established as a 'backbone organization' as defined by a collective impact approach that leverages core resources to secure multi-stakeholder resources by forming a common agenda, establishing shared measurements of performance, aligning activities, and sharing information amongst strategic stakeholders.

5.1.1 City of Winnipeg Stakeholder Input on Community Safety Centres of Responsibility

Further to the secondary research conducted by MNP, stakeholders were asked to provide their input into a community safety centre of responsibility and how this model could be implemented in Winnipeg.

Stakeholders generally identified the lack of a comprehensive and collaborative needs assessment as input into programming and financial decision-making. It was suggested that a formalized needs assessment facilitated by the Community Safety Centre of Responsibility in collaboration with community representatives would provide grass-roots input by those closest to the communities, supported by expertise in data collection and analysis. This objective assessment, supported by a standardized approach to the data collection, would provide a more formalized approach to identifying needs at a holistic (City-wide) level while remaining balanced to the specific needs of each community.

Facilitation of such a needs assessment would require a clearly identified leader who would have the authority to collaborate and coordinate the various resources and partners required to carry out the assessment as well as take the next steps to prioritize the inputs and facilitate decision-making into a implementation or action plan. The governance structure for the Centre of Responsibility is one which, collectively, respondents identified as a key ingredient to "getting it right". Notwithstanding a role for municipal government, the majority of respondents recommended that the structure operate at arm's length from political direction and direct influence. As with a formalized needs assessment, the Mayor and City Council would provide their recommendations or strategic priorities to the Centre as inputs into the decision-making process. As Councillors represent their wards' interests, it is

expected that the local community-based assessment may augment the inputs provided by Councillors and serve as a means of validating consensus or common direction.

Stakeholders identified the need for formal partnerships to avoid duplication of services as well as providing for more leverage of service providers' reach into jurisdictions deemed high need or a fit for specific programs or services not currently offered. When asked to define 'formal', stakeholders identified the need to link funding to measurable outputs or outcomes as well as greater accountability over impacts and funding levels. It was expressed that the CoW is working towards improvement in accountability but that more change is needed to help coordinate services to identified need and ensure better (not necessarily more) reporting is undertaken. The administrative process associated with grant applications was also mentioned as at times very burdensome and cumbersome particularly for community centres. The level of bureaucracy was viewed as excessive with no additional value to the City for the extra time and effort required to comply with all administrative requirements.

As it relates to funding, all stakeholders agreed on the need to measure results however, also recommended, multi-year funding agreements. Stakeholders strongly expressed the challenges associated with the short-term nature of planning, often the result of annual grant funding practices. Larger capital or more complex programming or services cannot be undertaken due to the constraint associated with annual funding. Annual funding is viewed as a constraint which prevents some of the right programming or services from being offered because of the additional effort to plan and coordinate service delivery. It was expressed by some that the City invests in short-term funding only which was viewed as one of the reasons why so little progress on measurable outcomes is achieved. Long-term planning is neither encouraged nor supported with the current grant funding practices. The research supports that measurable outcomes are most difficult to quantify in part because they often require more time to achieve. The current approach to annual grants is seen as a significant constraint impacting service providers' abilities to either offer more or different services which could have a positive and lasting effect.

For those service providers who are not reliant on CoW funding, formal service agreements or partnerships were also identified as a means of ensuring collective and collaborative service delivery to clients. The client is, in many of these situations, common to the multiple service providers who respond or should be responding. Examples offered include the WPS or WFPS being the initial response to mental health or addictions issues followed by variable formalized responses by other service providers such as WRHA or the Government of Manitoba. The Centre of Responsibility model was viewed as an opportunity to effectively triage issues and coordinate a collective response of the most appropriate service providers. Stakeholders understood the different reporting bodies involved however strongly advocated for the right partnerships, memorandums of understanding or service level agreements to leverage service response. It was suggested that this would involve a shift in how the work was done rather than it being new work as, in most cases, service response is already being done except that it is being done at the individual service provider level rather than at the coordinated and multi-service provider level.



In addition to formal partnership agreements, stakeholders also identified the need for a formal terms of reference (TOR) with defined scope, roles and responsibilities to ensure expectations were clear. Means of ensuring accountability over service providers was also noted either through representation within the governance structure or other means. It was re-iterated by several stakeholders that the message was about 'delivering services better and not necessarily delivering more services'.

Finally, stakeholders noted the constraints to service delivery were often associated with lack of adequate facilities or venues. It was suggested that existing CoW facilities could be offered as space for other service providers to use for programming needs. Neighborhood schools were also identified as another option for venues which could be further leveraged to address potential shortage of appropriate facilities. The agreements with school divisions is expected to be undergoing some changes to how they are structured, which may help address this issue. As noted earlier, it is common in some jurisdictions to use library space for service providers' satellite offices. This practice exists informally in some locations and could be expanded further to deliver services to the client as well as increase attachment to libraries and, potentially, to literacy and education in general.

5.2 Other Models

Based on our internal consultations with the City of Winnipeg and secondary research, we have identified five leading Centres of Responsibilities in Canada:

- Crime Prevention Ottawa
- Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council
- Surrey Crime Prevention Society

- REACH Edmonton
- Thunder Bay Crime Reduction Council (Table 8).

Preliminary findings into these existing Centres of Responsibility in Canada indicate a spectrum related to the degree of separation between the Centre of Responsibility and the local government. One end of the spectrum illustrates not-for-profit organizations that are accountable to a Board of Directors while the other end of the spectrum demonstrates organizations that are accountable to their local government and governed by a municipally appointed board or council. Crime Prevention Ottawa and the Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council are both city councils staffed with municipal employees and consequently follow the protocols and procedures associated with the respective municipal governments. On the other end of the spectrum are places such as Surrey Crime Prevention Society and REACH Edmonton that are both not-for-profit organizations that are completely independent from the City of Surrey and the City of Edmonton municipal governments. An interview remains pending with the Thunder Bay Crime Reduction Council as the last identified leader with whom to consult.

Table 11: Existing Centre of Responsibility Centres in Canada

	Crime Prevention Ottawa (CPC)	Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council (WRCPC)	Thunder Bay Crime Reduction Council (TBCRC)	Surrey Crime Prevention Society (SCPC)	REACH Edmonton
Mandate	Contribute to crime reduction and enhanced community safety in Ottawa through collaborative evidence-based crime prevention.	Advice, recommend and stimulate action in order to facilitate the reduction and prevention of crime.	Develop a community safety and crime prevention strategy as well as annual work plan.	Provide leadership that promotes effective community partnerships through the development of education and initiatives designed to reduce crime and victimization.	In one generation, REACH Edmonton has a mandate to: significantly reduce crime rates in Edmonton; increase citizens' sense of safety; and engage the citizens of Edmonton in crime prevention activities.
Model	Municipally appointed board providing strategic direction to the CPC acted upon by an Executive Director that is accountable to City of Ottawa.	Regionally appointed board provides strategic direction to the WRCPC acted upon by an Executive Director that is accountable to the Region of Waterloo.	43 member council selected by municipal appointment, invitation, as well as virtue of position e.g. Metis Nation of Ontario and Chief of Police, that provide strategic direction acted upon by an Executive Director that is accountable to the City of Thunder Bay.	Not-for-profit organization governed by a board of directors selected by invitation that provide strategic direction to the SCPC acted upon by an Executive Director that is accountable to the board.	Not-for-profit organization governed by a board of directors that are elected by voting members and provide strategic direction, acted upon by an Executive Director that is accountable to the board.
Primary Activities	Funding crime prevention programs, conducting research, and developing educational material.	Conducting research, facilitating community engagement and mobilization, as well as	Interview Pending	Facilitating educational events for youth as well as organizing and managing community safety patrols.	As a backbone organization, REACH Edmonton provides: overall strategic direction with stakeholders; facilitates

	Crime Prevention Ottawa (CPC)	Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council (WRCPC)	Thunder Bay Crime Reduction Council (TBCRC)	Surrey Crime Prevention Society (SCPC)	REACH Edmonton
		advocating against discrimination and marginalization.			dialogue between partners; manages data collection and analysis; handles communication and community outreach activities/events; and identifies and coordinates the application for funding opportunities.
Operating Budget	Approximately $1.5 million dollars provided by the City of Ottawa for operations and funding services. In total there are 3 full-time staff that are all municipal government employees.	Approximately $727,000 provided exclusively by the Region of Waterloo Government. In total there are 6 full-time staff that are all municipal government employees.	Interviewing Pending	Approximately, $600,000 that includes municipal and provincial funding in addition to individual and corporate donations. In total there are 11 full-time staff that are employed by the SCPC.	Approximately, $4,000,000 that includes municipal, provincial, and federal funding. In total there are 12 full-time staff members and up to 5 project specific staff members (casual or part-time employees) that are employees of REACH Edmonton.

The benefits of an independent governance structure, such as REACH Edmonton and the Surrey Crime Prevention Council include:

1) Their not-for-profit status allows them to apply for provincial and federal grants which would otherwise not be available to them if they were a municipal government department/division.
2) Since they are not embedded within the municipal government, they are not required to follow polices and protocols that may inhibit their ability to pursue particular opportunities. For example, the strategic direction of the respective Centres of Responsibilities is set by a board of directors that includes private, public, community-based, and citizen representatives with an equal say in the goals/objectives that the organization pursues. Therefore, these organizations are not subject to the will of individual City Councillors. Furthermore, these organizations are able to pursue activities based upon the feedback they receive in real time, thus allowing these organizations to become more 'nimble' in comparison to municipally embedded organizations that are not able to deviate from their annual plan established by City Council even though other opportunities may become apparent to them over the course of a year.

A primary challenge encountered by REACH Edmonton was the required education about their crime prevention and community safety mandate and role to partner stakeholders such as the Edmonton Police Service and the Edmonton Police Commission. Resolution to this challenge was undertaken through representation on the Board of Directors by the Chief of Police and a Director of the Police Commission as well as significant outreach communication and reinforcement that the role of REACH Edmonton was to plan and coordinate community safety efforts in Edmonton. The perception of REACH Edmonton

being another competing community safety entity had to be re-framed. With sustained effort and a consistent mandate, REACH Edmonton has been able establish itself as a 'backbone' organization within a collective impact model. It must be noted, however that the ability for REACH Edmonton to act as a 'backbone' organization relies on continuation of the positive, professional relationships established by the Executive Director with key stakeholders. The absence of a formal mandate may put REACH Edmonton at risk with its key stakeholders to retain its position as a 'backbone' organization under a collective impact model.

The biggest challenge for the Surrey Crime Prevention Council has been securing operational funding as only part of their operating funds is being provided by the City. As a result, the Surrey Crime Prevention Council relies heavily on volunteers to ensure the delivery of their services and is limited by volunteer capacity to support community safety initiatives through grants, program oversight, or strategic development.

On the other end of the spectrum, Crime Prevention Ottawa (CPO) and Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council are municipal/regional government councils that are ultimately accountable to the respective governments. They are provided with strategic direction by a municipally/regionally appointed board. The primary benefit of being a city council is the secured, operating funds year over year that greatly improves the ability for the Board of Directors as well as the Executive Director to develop and execute long-term, strategic plans. Furthermore, due to the nature of the regional government in Waterloo and the municipal government in Ottawa, both Centres of Responsibility are better able to work with municipal/regional government departments. As a result, it is easier to align interdepartmental resources to address the risks associated with criminality under a community safety and well-being model. For example, CPO is able to work with the City of Ottawa departments that look after housing, health, social services, and/or education. However, based on our interviews, there is no guarantee of interdepartmental cooperation and alignment. Furthermore, this benefit is limited by the scope of services provided by the municipal government. To illustrate this potential constraint, health, housing, educational, and social services are under provincial jurisdiction in Manitoba and therefore not directly under the CoW's jurisdiction.

The optimal model for a Centre of Responsibility is dependent on clarification of its mandate being either crime prevention, community safety, or community safety and well-being. The mandate essentially helps determine the necessary strategic partnerships as well as the required role and resources to achieve its goal(s). Selection of the Executive Director and Board/Council Members are other key factors related to the success of any model.

Table 12: Benefits and Challenges of Existing Centre of Responsibility Centres in Canada

	Crime Prevention Ottawa	Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council	Surrey Crime Prevention Society	REACH Edmonton
Benefits	Secure Funding enabling long-term, strategic planning. Ability to work with other government departments to address risks associated with criminality.	Secure Funding enabling long-term, strategic planning. Ability to work with other government departments to address risks associated with community safety.	Ability to apply for grants at all levels of government as a not-for-profit organization. Ability to adapt and change priorities as required quickly.	Ability to apply for grants at all levels of government as a not-for-profit organization. Ability to adapt and change priorities as required quickly.

	Crime Prevention Ottawa	Waterloo Region Crime Prevention Council	Surrey Crime Prevention Society	REACH Edmonton
Challenges	Since they are ultimately accountable to the City of Ottawa, any significant shift in their operational model and service delivery would have to be approved by the municipally appointed board. As a result, the organization may be limited to adapt to the changing needs of the community and strategic partners quickly.	Since they are ultimately accountable to the Regional Government of Waterloo, any significant shift in their operation model and service delivery would have to be approved by the regionally appointed board. As a result, the organization may be limited to adapt to the changing needs of the community and strategic partners quickly.	Operational funding is not consistent that makes long-term strategic planning difficult. As a not-for-profit, there is no mandate for government or other not-for-profits to establish a partnership and work with the organization.	The learning curve associated for existing service providers and organizations when implementing REACH Edmonton presented initial challenges that required effective leadership and problem solving by the Executive director to resolve. As a not-for-profit, there is no mandate for government or other not-for-profits to establish a partnership and work with the organization.

5.3 Leading Practices

MNP consulted with stakeholders across Canada who are working to support community safety, to gather their input and insights into leading practices. Leading practices existed at the highest level, such as a model as well as at local levels with specific practices which have demonstrated positive results.

The Hub Model, which originated in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan in 2011, is a leading strategic, multi-agency practice to improve community safety and well-being in Canada. The main objective of the Hub Model is to provide a proactive, integrated response for vulnerable populations, based on an understanding of composite risk factors such as unemployment, low education, troubled home, and mental health issues. Ultimately, the intent of the Hub Model is to not only reduce crime, but to reduce the acute level of risk experienced by vulnerable populations.

In practice, the Hub Model includes a team of designated senior level staff from various community agencies and government departments delivering health, justice, social, and education services (Figure 41).

Figure 41: Hub Model



Operationally, the respective representatives meet for 90 minutes twice a week at the Hub Table to engage in a structured conversation designed to address specific clients facing elevated levels of risk. The result is the development of immediate, coordinated and integrated responses with existing resources. A Hub Table is not a service but rather a way to shift service delivery from an incident-driven response to a risk-driven response by utilizing and mobilizing existing systems and resources in a unified and dynamic way to address specific situations of elevated risk for which an integrated approach is required.

An example may be the following scenario: Over a two-week period, a home in Winnipeg is a high frequency location for domestic violence and noise complaints along with the residents experiencing a high frequency of visits to the local emergency room. At the biweekly Hub meeting, local police report on the multiple responses to the home over the previous two weeks and the nature of the issue. Subsequently, the by-law officer also reports increased visits to the home over the approximate same time period. Lastly, the local health authority representative indicates their recent involvement with the same party. The collective information is shared allowing the team to deliberate about the issues and identify the best possible solutions for the residents. A collaborative action plan is formulated with clear assignment of actions and ownership. Reporting is carried out at the next meeting. By utilizing this model, the City of Prince Albert was able to reduce their crime rates by 37% and save an estimated $3.2 million in policing costs from 2011 until 2014.

The following four aspects distinguish the Hub Model from previous and existing models:

1) **Efficient Case Management and Timely Response** – Evaluation of the Hub Model has established that an initial intervention will typically occur within 24 to 48 hours after a course of action is agreed upon at the Hub Table. Of the cases reviewed by a Hub Table, 53% are resolved in one week and 79% of cases are resolved in two weeks. It is important to note that since the Hub Model is not a service provider in and of itself, the 'end' of a case is the result of deescalating the assessed risk below acute levels for the individual/family and ensuring they are in contact with the service(s) that they require to meet their needs. Essentially it connects the service providers with the individuals requiring the services and the service providers follow their regular operational response through to closure or resolution.
2) **Information Sharing is Purposeful and in Accordance with Privacy Regulations** - One fundamental aspect of the Hub Model is to address the information and service-related silos through data sharing. Information sharing was historically, and may still be, seen as a constraint due to privacy. Concerns have been raised about the related privacy issues involved with sharing health, justice, and other personal information about individuals/families. To mitigate these concerns, the following four-stage filter process has been developed and formalized by the Hub Model:
    - The originating agency determines need for multisector involvement.
    - The identifying information is removed from the description of the situation brought to the Hub table.
    - The Hub table reaches consensus on presence of acutely elevated risk – limited information is disclosed to determine which agencies should be involved.
    - Intervention planning is performed only by the lead and supporting agencies, who meet to share information and determine the right intervention for the situation.
3) **Source of New Forms of Data** – The data collected by the Hub Table has led to new insights into risk patterns that allow practitioners the ability to predict when certain situations will occur and ensure that they are investing and supporting programs that have been proven to be effective and efficient, both proactively and in response to infractions. Essentially, the data collected is allowing service providers to prevent events from occurring in the first place.
4) **A Highly Replicable Model** – Initially, the Hub Model was adopted from a crime reduction initiative in Glasglow, Scotland that sought to reduce youth violence by addressing it as a public health crisis. Since being applied in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, the Hub Model has been adopted in over 115 communities across Canada including the Thunderwing initiative in Winnipeg (more information below).

Block by Block Initiative and the Thunderwing Project: In 2013, the Block by Block Initiative began as a three-year project funded by Manitoba Justice. The goal of the Block by Block Initiative was to improve community safety by offering coordinated government and community-based services to families and individuals in crisis. To accomplish this goal the Thunderwing Project was developed and implemented after consultation with Winnipeg communities as well as organizers of the Hub Model in Prince Albert. Thunderwing is a long-term and consent-based project that brings government and community-based services together to remove barriers to accessing services required by families and individuals in crisis. Initially, Thunderwing only involved a 21 block by 21 block area within the North End of Winnipeg that has a concentration of high-risk families and individuals. However, due to the continued success of the program, the catchment area for Thunderwing has been expanded to include over 140 blocks stretching across 3 high-risk neighbourhoods in Winnipeg. Evaluation results have found that the Thunderwing project has a $5 to $1 social rate of return, primarily from cost avoidance by the Winnipeg Police Service, Manitoba Justice, and Manitoba Families. Specifically, the project has helped to return and keep 63 children with their parents, 12 individuals leave abusive relationships and connected 55 individuals to available services they require amongst other notable outcomes. Based on the successes of the Thunderwing project, the secretariat for the Block by Block initiative was intended to recommend policy changes to establish more effective and efficient operations of government and community-based service delivery. Unfortunately, there is no publicly available data about the outcomes of these efforts by the secretariat to report at this time.

Connectivity: Based on the Hub Model that began in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan in 2011, Connectivity began in 2014 in the Waterloo Region of Ontario and is the name provided to 'situational tables' i.e. Hub Tables. In accordance with the Hub Model, Connectivity brings together government and community-based service providers to collaboratively and proactively address individuals and families with elevated levels of risk. The goal of Connectivity is to reduce emergency room admissions, child protection cases, prosecutions, violent crime and youth victimization. On a weekly basis, up to 30 service providers meet to discuss how to reduce individuals and families experiencing a crisis to a stable level and ensure they receive the on-going support that they need from the applicable service provider. As a result of a collaborative assessment completed by representatives of Connectivity, individuals and families in crisis receive access to housing, economic, as well as physical and mental health supports based on their needs. Between 2014 and 2018, Connectivity has helped 344 families/individuals resulting in 1,341 fewer calls to the Waterloo Regional Police Service and 126 fewer emergency department visits that both equate to $139,131 costs diverted from emergency services in the region alone.

New Opportunities and Hope (NOAH): Neighbourhood residents in Sudbury, Ontario initially came together and determined that they wanted to make their community healthier and more productive. As a result, NOAH's Supportive Partnerships Advocating Community Empowerment (SPACE) was established to provide a comprehensive breadth of services in one physical space to address the needs of individuals and families. Presently, NOAH's SPACE has more than 40 different service providers including community, health, child welfare, Aboriginal, and police organizations/departments. Some of the activities provided by the service providers include; educational workshops, cultural workshops, health services e.g. flu vaccines, and community events e.g. barbeque. Overall, service providers involved with NOAH's SPACE focus on addressing crime and high-risk neighbourhood characteristics e.g. poverty, housing, and lack of services by providing strong police engagement and access to resources and professional services. However, there are no publicly available documents establishing the impact of this program.

Although this section has talked exclusively about the Hub Model, it should not be considered separate from the Centre of Responsibility. Essentially, while the Hub Model is meant to directly assist front-line service providers, the Centre of Responsibility augments the Hub Model by focusing on broader notions

of community safety and wellness with a focus on establishing long-term, strategic community goals and initiatives. Specifically, the Centre of Responsibility conducts collaborative analysis of Hub data and other recognized trends and data sources which serve to inform the identification of high value opportunities for systemic change as well as develop, implement, and evaluate crime prevention strategies and initiatives.

The Hub Model could be an important initiative within a Centre of Responsibility as it formalizes the working relationship and operational procedures of front-line service providers to provide a cohesive and effective response to need. It serves to address immediate needs as well as mitigate potential decline or exacerbation of criminal activity.

5.3.1 Safer Ontario Act

The Safer Ontario Act (2017) repealed and replaced Ontario's 1990 Police Services Act, served to amend the Coroners Act and created the Missing Persons Act and the Forensic Laboratories Act.

The Act was heavily influenced by the Association of Ontario Municipalities and the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police who had been working on a new public safety model in Ontario. With respect to police services and missing persons, the Act introduced the following changes:


Figure 42: Changes Resulting From the Replacement of Ontario Police Services Act (1990) with the Safer Ontario Act (2017)

	Changes	Impact
Focus area – **POLICE SERVICES**		
Proactive and collaborative approach to community safety and well-being planning	• Mandating municipalities to work with police services and local service providers to develop community safety and well-being plans tied to community risks • Mandating municipal police service Boards to participate in the planning led by municipalities	• Municipalities are accountable for the plans • Promote collaborative partnerships between municipalities, police and sector services • Helping align service needs to service response
Enhancing police accountability to the public	• A new Inspector General position to oversee and monitor police services and police service boards • Updated police disciplinary process • Required Board training on human rights and racism • Strengthened Board reporting requirements • Adjustments to Board size and membership	• Ensuring continued public trust • Ensuring police services and Boards are more representative and accountable

	Changes	Impact
Outlining police responsibility and community safety service delivery	• Clarifying core duties of police through legislation • Modifying the special constable program to differentiate from police officers • Create Public Safety Institute to inform the delivery of police services, support evidence-based decision-making and ensure expert training to increase public confidence in policing	• Align training to most needed community safety issues • Ensure consistent education, training and standards for all police officers and special constables
Supporting the sustainability of First Nation policing	• Offering First Nation (FN) communities the option to come under the provincial policing framework • FNs can establish own police services • Engage with FN communities to develop strategic plan	• Strengthen relationship with FN communities • Hep ensure culturally responsive, sustainable, accountable and equitable policing with flexible community-specific response
Focus Area – **MISSING PERSONS**		
More effective response	• Allow police, in certain circumstances, to apply for judicial orders and access records that can assist to locate a missing person or authorize entry into a premises to search	• Help police to have right tools to respond effectively to missing persons • Balance public safety and privacy

Parallel to the development of the Act was the approach to Ontario's Mobilization and Engagement Model of Community Policing. This model was developed by the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (OACP) through extensive consultation, resulting in a shift towards a shared responsibility model. The shift towards having non-police community members in partnership with police to make and keep neighbourhoods safe and secure and to utilize police tactics to stimulate and support community members are at the heart of the model. The model also focuses on performance measurement, management and public policy outcomes to help inform reactive and proactive policing activities.

The below graphic was created by the OACP as an overview of the model, representative of a leading practice in Canada:



5.3.2 Stakeholders' Input on Leading Practices

MNP's current state assessment of service providers has revealed a significant inventory of services provided directly or in support of community safety. The assessment has also revealed that the majority of these service providers work, for the most part, on their own or through ad-hoc involvement with other service providers. There is no formal mechanism or forum through which to assess needs and leverage service providers' offerings or bring in other existing service providers to organize coordinated responses.

Stakeholders spoke highly of multi-system table responses as a best practice which has yielded success, such as with the fentanyl issue whereby WPS, WRHA, addictions specialists, community and other core service providers came together to develop and implement a response strategy. Facilitation of

solutions potentially related to privacy issues have been addressed in the past resulting in significant improvements to data sharing for common clients and ultimately common need.

Triaging of information was also mentioned by several stakeholders as a key input in coordinating effective response. Examples provided include the current CoW City Managers table as well as the community mobilization units. It is well known that first responder resources, such as WPS and WFPS, are often being used to fill the gap of other systems providers such as the health or child welfare systems. Time and resources are being used to support services that are not core to WPS or WFPS due to gaps in the operational response model. Setting up a cohesive multi-provider response system, with well defined triage protocols to determine response, was positively viewed by stakeholders as a step towards providing the right service for the right situation. It was suggested that results should include a reduction or shift of response from one type of responder (e.g. WPS) to another over time, serving as a measure to evaluate progress.

Outside of a dedicated forum or mechanism to do so along with an established governance structure, stakeholders saw the opportunity to further leverage some best practices already being employed in the City. Libraries, as a common gathering place for all people, was recommended as a facility to further leverage and use for outside service providers. Bringing the services to the clients in the library has seen good results such as with the community crisis workers who presently work in the libraries. Using library space for service providers to deliver awareness of their services or potentially deliver them through outreach has also seen positive results. There are 20 library branches in 20 different areas of the City which could be considered following a formal needs assessment as an additional venue from which to deliver services or increase outreach services already being delivered. The model of having community crisis workers situated in the libraries, on a rotational basis, is positively viewed and believed to have successfully supported community safety as well as potentially having mitigated negative situations from arising or escalating. This model could be further expanded with other service providers deemed appropriate based on an understanding of community's needs and the relevant service providers to include in this model. This approach allows stakeholders to be more centrally available and accessible to potential clients particularly when aligned with the libraries' operating hours.

Additionally, it was felt that community groups were not fully aware of libraries or other CoW facilities available to them for program or service delivery. Increasing awareness of these and potentially other facilities' availability could potentially increase the level of services available, as well as reach to more stakeholder groups.

As it relates to infrastructure, it was also suggested that some jurisdictions have had good success in containing costs by leasing rather than buying, building or owning facilities. Libraries were considered a good candidate to use leased space which could potentially add library spaces or smaller satellite operations for communities where needs are determined as high and a full library offering is not feasible. This could then further leverage the ability to offer other services through the libraries' infrastructure.

Though not related exclusively to libraries or other service providers, it was generally felt that there was a need to increase language offerings based on community demographics. With the mindset of leveraging existing service providers, services delivered in a community's dominant languages could be expanded through use of existing facilities located in a community. Investment of more online resources in multi-language options along with attachment to local service providers who can provide services in languages other than French and English could increase attachment to the service providers, to libraries and ultimately to the community as a whole, notably having a positive contribution on community safety and social development.

6 Moving Forward

The next stage of this project is to utilize the information in this report and through facilitated sessions, develop a community safety strategic action plan, supported by a desired future state model, appropriate governance and structure, and sufficient resourcing.

MNP is recommending we use a Collective Impact Planning model. Collective impact planning is not a fancy name for collaboration but a fundamentally different, more disciplined and higher performing approach to achieving large scale social impact. The following graphic shows the five conditions necessary for successful collective impact.

Figure 43: Future State




Table 13: Phases of Collect Impact Planning

Components for Success	Phase 1: Initiate Action	Phase 2: Organize for Impact	Phase 3: Sustain for Action and Impact
Governance and Infrastructure	Identify champions and form cross-sector group	Create infrastructure (backbone and processes)	Facilitate and refine
Strategic Planning	Map the landscape and use data to make case	Create common agenda (goals and strategy)	Support implementation (alignment of goals and strategies)

Components for Success	Phase 1: Initiate Action	Phase 2: Organize for Impact	Phase 3: Sustain for Action and Impact
Community Involvement	Facilitate community outreach	Engage community and build public will	Continue engagement and conduct advocacy
Evaluation and Improvement	Analyze baseline data to identify key issues and gaps	Establish shared metrics (indicators, measurement and approach)	Collect, track and report (process to learn and improve)

6.1 Rationale for Change

There are several of our findings that will answer the 'why do we need to change' questions:

- There is a continuum of community safety with prevention focused on the individual and community before they become victims of crime or offenders and response (deterrence and enforcement) once criminal or disorderly behaviour is observed.
- The City of Winnipeg has historically invested the vast majority of funds considered crime prevention, on the response end of the continuum.
- There are over 150 stakeholders who play different roles in addressing community safety, security and wellness, but they are acting individually and are not integrated under a collective framework.
- The City of Winnipeg has prioritized safety and security but its funding, dedicated to community safety service delivery, has a limited connection to specific needs and desired outcomes.

6.2 Strategic Directions for Consideration

The following are high level strategic directions for consideration in the strategic action planning process:

- Rigorous collection, analysis, reporting and dissemination of data and information impacting community safety and well-being.
- Comprehensive, current and commonly used neighborhood profiles including demographic information as well as safety and security risk assessments.
- Complete integration of taxpayer funded services targeted to 'at risk' individuals and communities based on a strong 'whole of city' assessment of need.
- System wide pairing of mental health/social/community workers with those focused on deterrence and enforcement.

6.3 Governance and Structure

Execution of this strategic action plan must be supported by effective governance and within an appropriate structure.

Governance

The Institute on Governance defines governance simply as "Who has the power, who makes the decisions, how other players make their voice heard and how account is rendered". It states that there is a need for governance anytime a group of people come together to accomplish an end. It rests on three dimensions:


- Authority
- Decision- Making
- Accountability

Best Practice Governance Principles

- Stewardship – who is the entity acting on behalf of and how is it ensuring it is compliant with its mandate, values and strategic direction; roles and responsibilities of all parties are clear; resources are efficiently used and risks are identified and mitigated.
- Effectiveness – the entity is designed to add value and can credibly measure its overall effectiveness
- Accountability – the entity is clear about who it is accountable to and regularly reports to these groups or organizations
- Culture – the values and policies are reflected in conduct and behavior

Structure and Organization

Designing a structure and organization is not about drawing organizational charts and diagrams, but about managing resources including people, process and technology to deliver results in the most effective and efficient way. The structure needs to be based on an in-depth understanding of the mandate and goals.



BEST PRACTICE DESIGN PRINCIPLES	
Simplicity	A position should be designed around activities that need to be performed and not tailored to the qualifications of the individual
Span of Control	The number of people effectively managed by one person should be selected so as not to sacrifice efficiency and effectiveness
Size and Balance	There should be a reasonable balance in the size of portfolios so they can be managed
Job Structure	A position should be designed around activities that need to be performed and not tailored to the qualifications of the individual

Specialization	The activities for which a single individual is held responsible should be similar
Decentralization of Authority	The responsibility for making a decision should be placed as far down in the organization as is appropriate
Authority and Responsibility	Leadership should be given responsibility for results and the authority needed to perform the job properly

6.4 Concept for Consideration



Appendix A – Master Stakeholder List

Provided as a separate attachment.

Appendix B: References

[i] Statistics Canada. (2019). *Police-Reported Crime Statistics in Canada, 2018*. Retrieved from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2019001/article/00013-eng.htm.

[ii] Statistics Canada. (2018). *Police-Reported Crime Statistics in Canada, 2017*. Retrieved from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2018001/article/54974-eng.htm.

[iii] Statistics Canada. (2017). *Police-Reported Crime Statistics in Canada, 2016*. Retrieved from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2017001/article/54842-eng.htm.

[iv] Statistics Canada. (2016). *Police-Reported Crime Statistics in Canada, 2015*. Retrieved from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2016001/article/14642-eng.htm.

[v] Statistics Canada. (2015). *Police-Reported Crime Statistics in Canada, 2014*. Retrieved from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14211-eng.htm.

[vi] Statistics Canada. (2014). *Police-Reported Crime Statistics in Canada, 2013*. Retrieved from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2014001/article/14040-eng.htm.

[vii] Winnipeg Police Service. (2019). *WPS Annual Statistical Report, 2018*. Retrieved from: https://www.winnipeg.ca/police/AnnualReports/annualreports.stm.

[viii] Winnipeg Police Service. (2018). *WPS Annual Statistical Report, 2017*. Retrieved from: https://www.winnipeg.ca/police/AnnualReports/annualreports.stm.

[ix] Winnipeg Police Service. (2017). *WPS Annual Statistical Report, 2016*. Retrieved from: https://www.winnipeg.ca/police/AnnualReports/annualreports.stm.

[x] Winnipeg Police Service. (2016). *WPS Annual Statistical Report, 2015*. Retrieved from: https://www.winnipeg.ca/police/AnnualReports/annualreports.stm.

[xi] Winnipeg Police Service. (2015). *WPS Annual Statistical Report, 2014*. Retrieved from: https://www.winnipeg.ca/police/AnnualReports/annualreports.stm.

[xii] Winnipeg Police Service. (2014). *WPS Annual Statistical Report, 2013*. Retrieved from: https://www.winnipeg.ca/police/AnnualReports/annualreports.stm.

[xiii] *https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/cntrng-crm/crm-prvntn/nvntr/dtls-en.aspx?i=10152*

[xiv] Waller, I. (2014). Smarter Crime Control : A Guide to a Safer Future for Citizens, Communities, and Politicians. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

[xv] U.S. Department of Agriculture. (2009). Access to Affordable and Nutrious Food: Measuring and Understanding Food Deserts and Their Consequences. U.S.D.A.