

MINUTES

OTTAWA-CARLETON POLICE SERVICES BOARD

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

25 OCTOBER 1999

5:00 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: Councillor H. Kreling
Vice Chair: Mr. G. Baskerville
Members: Mr. D. Adam, Ms. E. Buckingham, Councillor J. Legendre,
Mr. J. McCombie

REGRETS

Regional Chair B. Chiarelli

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services Board confirm the Minutes of the 27 September and 19 October 1999 meetings.

CARRIED

PUBLIC DELEGATIONS

1. THANK YOU FROM OTTAWA REGIONAL CANCER CENTRE FOUNDATION

Mr. J. Orban, Chair, Ottawa Regional Cancer Centre Foundation, explained that the Ottawa Regional Cancer Centre (ORCC) operates from facilities at both the Civic and the General campuses of the Ottawa Hospital and is responsible for the delivery of cancer care in the Ottawa-Carleton Region and throughout the Ottawa valley. It is also a world class cancer research facility, treating over 17,000 cancer patients throughout the year and over 4,000 new cases annually.

Mr. Orban indicated that over the weekend of October 15th the ORCC held its third annual telethon, raising over \$1M for cancer care and research in the Region. The telethon was carried live on the new RO and broadcast live from the rotunda of the St-Laurent Shopping Centre. In addition to raising funds, the telethon provides an opportunity to inform the public about cancer, its prevention and care, as well as to enhance public awareness of the ORCC.

Mr. Orban stated the ORCC Foundation was formed in 1995 with a mandate to raise funds for and awareness of the cancer centre. He maintained that the formation of community partnerships is critical to a new Foundation board's success, and over the last few years the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Association and the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service (OCRPS) have strongly supported the foundation's activities, especially the telethon.

This year's telethon received tremendous support from the Service's officers and civilians who contributed by: assisting with security; participating on the phones; demonstrating some of the Service's specialized units; and assisting with a barbecue. Mr. Orban noted that all participating members did so on their own time. Feedback from ORCC staff, volunteers, production crew and the public was overwhelmingly positive. He expressed appreciation for the participation, enthusiasm and professionalism displayed by the men and women of the Police Service.

In particular, Mr. Orban thanked Mr. J. Petersen and Ms. B. Lawson of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Association for their organizational efforts, and Chief Ford for supporting police participation and for his own involvement over the years.

In closing, Mr. Orban noted that members of the Police Service have also assisted the ORCC by participating in the "Do It For Dad" Run held in June, an event which was co-sponsored by the Association, and by forming a committee to assist in the distribution of the Challenge magazine published by the ORCC in partnership with the Ottawa Citizen and designed for patients, survivors and their families. On behalf of the ORCC Foundation board, he offered sincere thanks to each and every officer and civilian who, through their participation, demonstrated a commitment to their community in a direct and meaningful way.

Chair Kreling thanked Mr. Orban for his presentation and for the effort he and the Foundation board make, noting it is a very valuable asset to the community.

That the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board receive this presentation for information.

RECEIVED

2. MR. T. GREEN, GUIDE DOG USERS OF NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

- Executive Director's memo dated 21 Oct 99 and letter submitted by Mr. Green dated 21 Oct 99

Mr. T. Green indicated the guide dog users' concerns relate to a press release issued on 5 October by the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service outlining steps that blind persons should follow when accessing police services to assist them in the protection of their rights under the *Blind Persons' Rights Act*. He believed the steps outlined in the press release put the onus on blind persons to protect their rights and provided no assurance that an individual's right of access will be protected as stated in the *Act*. He hoped that by coming before the Board, the delegation would be able to explore some of these issues and the four recommendations in their submission.

Ms. V. Collicott expressed concerns about the lack of access and support the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service shows to blind people, as demonstrated through some complaints and incidents that have occurred in the Region. She did not believe the press release of October 5th provided the support the delegation had hoped for when they appeared before the Board in July. She noted the press release states the police have committed to continuing to support the *Blind Persons' Rights Act*, but Ms. Collicott did not believe the police were supporting the *Act* to the degree they should. She believed when access is denied to a person because of the presence of their guide dog, that individual's right is denied and charges should be laid. She argued that once blind persons have shown their Attorney General of Ontario cards and explained their rights, and that the police have been called to re-iterate those rights and access continues to be denied, the person denying access should suffer the consequence of that continued denial and be charged.

Ms. Collicott maintained that in situations such as the one experienced by Mr. Green in July, when a trip to the store to buy a bag of milk caused him to be delayed by an hour and a half because the store manager would not allow him into the store, there is an extraordinary amount of stress on the blind person. She re-iterated, blind persons need strong support from the Police Service in enforcing the *Blind Persons' Rights Act*. She felt it was unfortunate that blind persons were not consulted before the Police Service put out its press release because it would have provided an opportunity to address these issues and discuss them in advance of the release. She believed it is important that blind persons be included in the dialogue.

Mr. A. Conway indicated that since he is not a resident of Ontario, he does not carry an Attorney General identification card. He felt it is important that the Police Service recognize other forms of identification, such as those issued by the schools that train guide dogs, as being valid for the purpose of enforcing the *Act*. He maintained this is important not only to him, but also to tourists visiting the nation's capital. Mr. Conway noted the press release of October 5th made no mention of other acceptable identification for non-Ontario residents and he wished to see that clarified in any future releases.

Mr. C. Stark concurred with Mr. Conway's comments, adding the identification cards provide further assurance, whether they come from a recognized training institution, the Attorney General or another organization. He suggested that guide dogs are professional and a blind person and his guide dog are a team, not to be mistaken for someone trying to get their pet into a store. He stated that when the delegation came before the Board in July it was in the hope that when access is denied despite efforts to educate the perpetrator with regard to the *Act*, the law would be applied, not three days later or after an investigation. He questioned the need for investigations and argued that an investigation forces the blind person to relive the incident.

Mr. Stark indicated that members of the delegation met with representatives of the Police Service to discuss the issue and at that time, there was a divergence of opinion with regard to the use of discretion in applying the law. Representatives of the Service put forward the notion that there needs to be some discretion, while members of the delegation argued that discretion created vulnerability for blind persons and was not supported by the law. He did not feel that divergence of opinion was reflected in going forward with the press release of 5 October, which did not provide the delegation with the level of comfort they sought. Mr. Stark asked that consideration be given to changing the process proposed in the 5 October press release and that the right of access of guide dog users be further publicized to give them the confidence they need to feel they are part of the community.

Ms. P. Leclair

Mr. Green indicated that Ms. P. Leclair, who is deaf and blind, was unable to attend the meeting and therefore submitted her comments in writing. He provided the Board Chair with a copy of her letter which Chair Kreling read aloud.

Deputy Chief Bevan outlined the efforts of the Police Service in implementing some of the changes necessary to meet the goals of the delegation. He explained that efforts to this end commenced on 16 July when staff reviewed the investigation into the incident involving Mr. Green to determine how it could have been better handled. Since then, staff have had a number of discussions with Mr. Green and a mediation session was arranged with the officer involved. There was a meeting between members of the delegation and staff from the Service's Professional Development Centre as a result of which staff commenced an immediate program to educate patrol officers on the *Act*, their roles and responsibilities, as well as the needs and expectations of blind persons who are refused service. He stated Mr. Green and Mr. Stark helped the Service to begin the design of a program which will sensitize police officers to the needs and expectations of blind persons. A program is currently under development and a volunteer will be delivering the training, which should be completed during the winter. In addition, the Staff Sergeant in charge of the Communication Centre met with each of the five platoons to explain the process to be followed should a blind person call for assistance, either

on one of the Service's business lines or on 9-1-1, so that all communicators are educated on the process.

Deputy Chief Bevan indicated these steps have been identified in a letter to Mr. Green dated 1 September updating him on the efforts of the Service and the timelines for meeting its goals. It was his understanding that there was to be another meeting between members of the delegation and the Professional Development Centre to further the design of the sensitivity training. All in all, there has been considerable effort by numerous members of the Police Service to ensure this organizational change takes place. He summarized, when the delegation was before the Board in July, staff heard their message loud and clear and took immediate action to ensure the organization and its officers are sensitive to the needs and expectations of guide dog users.

Deputy Chief Bevan explained the Service uses alternative conflict resolution methods as a tool to resolve conflicts. He noted that in two cases since July, alternative dispute resolution has been used in matters pertaining to the *Blind Persons' Rights Act* and on one occasion, it was successful. He indicated it is a tool the Police Service finds very useful in dealing with problems and with change, and to take away police officers' discretion in dealing with matters would inhibit the ability to use alternative dispute resolution.

Chief Ford re-iterated the Service's commitment to the concerns expressed, stating Deputy Chief Bevan and a team of staff members have spent considerable time dealing with this issue and working to resolve it. The Service continues to support sensitivity training and a guide dog users' advisory group will be formed to address issues relating to the provision of services. The working group will include members of the community and members of the Police Service. It will be chaired by the officer in charge of professional development and will be assisted by representatives from patrol operations, diversity/race relations, and community development, reporting to the Deputy Chief of Operations Support. The Service will continue to work with the community to develop the best possible service delivery as well as sensitivity training.

Mr. Green referred to the mediation session between himself and the officer involved in the July incident, stating it failed because the officer left in the middle of the scheduled three-hour session. With respect to the meeting between members of the delegation and staff from the Professional Development Branch, he indicated the group only dealt with half of the agenda and agreed to meet again but neglected to set a date. He was pleased to learn that the development of a training program was progressing and was interested to know what steps were being taken to ensure that sensitivity issues relating to blind persons would be incorporated in it. He was not aware that a committee would be formed to address these issues and wondered if guide dog users would be included in its membership.

Mr. Stark was pleased to hear of the progress made and of the Service's commitment to this issue. However, he maintained it does nothing to address the basic issue from the perspective

of the guide dog users. He argued that mediation after the fact does not provide access for a guide dog user who wants to enter a store to buy a bag of milk.

In response to a question from Mr. Conway with regard to the recognition of other forms of identification for the purpose of enforcing the *Blind Persons' Rights Act*, Chief Ford stated the *Act* includes people from outside the Province of Ontario, therefore they would be treated in the same way and afforded the same rights as persons carrying an identification card from the Attorney General of Ontario. Chair Kreling surmised the reason this was not specifically indicated in the press release was because it was intended to state the Service's commitment to enforcing the *Act*, which already includes a provision for the recognition of identification from other jurisdictions.

Member Legendre noted the delegation's submission included a recommendation that the Board instruct the Police Service to include guide dog users in the development and delivery of sensitivity training. He recalled this point being raised during the discussion in July. He assumed, from the delegation's presentation that this had not been done. Deputy Chief Bevan confirmed that the Service had obtained, on a volunteer basis, the services of a 27-year old blind woman who is a guide dog user and who has experience in this area.

In response to a question from member Legendre, Mr. Green explained the six occurrences of denial of access alluded to in his and Ms. Leclair's letters. The first count of denial of access would occur when blind person tries to access a service or enter into a building and is told to get out with the dog. The second occurrence would occur when the blind person explains to the person denying service that they are a blind person, the dog is trained, and that they have a right of access, and the person continues to deny access. The next step in Chief Ford's press release suggests that the blind person should show their Attorney General identification card and explain the legislation, therefore once that occurs and the person persists in denying access, that would be a third count in terms of offending the *Act*. At this point, the press release suggests that the blind person should telephone the police department and an officer would talk to the offender and try to resolve the situation over the phone. Once this happens and the offender still insists that the guide dog user can not enter with the dog, that is a fourth count. The fifth count occurs when the aforementioned telephone call is unsuccessful and a police officer is dispatched to the scene to mediate the situation and is unsuccessful. He maintained that to this point, based on the steps outlined in the press release, the offender has had five opportunities to comply with the *Act* and has persistently refused. According to the steps outlined in the press release, at this point, information would be taken by the attending officer and an investigation would ensue. If the offender still insists that they have the right to deny access, that would be a sixth count.

Member Legendre noted all these occurrences are part of the same incident and not six separate occurrences. In response to member Legendre questioning the need for an investigation, Chief Ford explained there are actually five steps that would be taken when the

blind person with a guide dog is at a facility. The first step is for the blind person to show their Attorney General identification card and try to explain the *Blind Persons' Rights Act* to the offender. Upon refusal of that, they would call 9-1-1 and the person receiving their call would talk to the offender to explain the guide dog user's rights. If the offender still refuses access, than an officer would be dispatched to the scene to handle the situation. The sixth step refers to complaints received after the fact; i.e. when a guide dog user leaves the scene of the offense, goes home and then decides to phone in a complaint to the police. Member Legendre wondered how it would be handled if an officer is called to the scene, several attempts have been made to explain the Act, and there is continued non-compliance. Chief Ford stated that continued non-compliance would lead to the person being charged.

Deputy Chief Bevan referred to a recent incident where a blind person who was refused service by a taxi company subsequently contacted the police to file a complaint. An investigation was conducted and there was dispute resolution involving the owner of the taxi company, the driver and the union. He noted that through that process, a number of people were educated with respect to the *Act*.

Vice Chair Baskerville stated that other groups in the community from time to time provide their services, knowledge and expertise to the Police Service on a voluntary basis in the spirit of willingness to cooperate with the police in furthering the whole concept of community policing, and to develop improvements in how police services are delivered. He expressed his surprise in reading in the delegation's submission, the suggestion that guide dog users who are involved in developing sensitivity training should be remunerated for their work and time.

Ms. Collicott indicated she thought it was appropriate to pay for the skills and expertise of professionals. She believed people with disabilities have been exploited in the past in volunteering their services and expertise and she did not condone that practice.

Mr. Stark agreed that blind persons should make their contribution to society. He stated he has volunteered approximately 200 to 300 hours of his time to this issue and to that of audible traffic signals. However, he felt the training of police officers should be conducted by professionals and professionals should be paid for their services. He noted there is an approximately 75% unemployment rate among blind people and though they should contribute to their communities, he believed there comes a time when organizations such as the RMOC and the Police Service should pay for the services they receive from these groups.

Member Buckingham indicated she had read the delegation's submission with interest and noted the words "Guide Dog Users" was capitalized. She wondered if it referred to an organization and if so, how many people it represents.

Ms. Collicott explained the reason it is highlighted is that there are two different organizations. The Guide Dog Users of Canada is a national group that works on national issues of access as well as other matters, and the Guide Dog Users of the National Capital Region addresses local issues. She indicated the issues discussed in the submission are from the perspective of the Guide Dog Users of the National Capital Region. She stated it is an informal group that does not have a precise membership. Dialogue is conducted through an electronic list serve and in informal meetings as side bars at national meetings.

From Ms. Collicott's explanation, Member Buckingham believed the delegation had no formal mandate from guide dog users. She felt the issues being raised would be of interest to blind persons in general and was surprised they were not being represented by a formal group so there might be a clear understanding of the membership and a formal means of designating a spokesperson.

Ms. Collicott argued that though the group does not conduct formal meetings, the views they bring before the Board are the result of a consensus. She believed that approximately 30 people had participated in the discussion leading to the submission presented to the Board.

Mr. Stark stated that though they do not appear before the Board in the same status as someone who is elected to represent the people, the group is representing a perspective in society and he hoped that if that perspective is logical, the Board would accept that rather than question their credibility. He noted the Canadian National Institute for the Blind (CNIB) is not an elected body and they do not train guide dogs, in fact they specifically do not address guide dog issues. There are four guide dog schools in Canada but there is no recognized organization of guide dog users other than the national organization referenced by Ms. Collicott, the local group represented by the delegation and some similar groups in Vancouver and Victoria. He maintained the issue of who the delegation represents is not as important as what they represent.

With respect to the assumption that these issues are faced by all blind persons, Mr. Conway had never heard of people who carry white canes being denied access to services because they are blind. Whether a blind person uses a white cane or a guide dog is a personal choice.

Mr. Green re-iterated that the written submission before the Board had gone through a number of versions and is the result of the collective thoughts of at least 30 people.

Based on the explanation of the six steps outlined in the press release and the steps listed in the written submission from the delegation, Chair Kreling did not see that there was a difference of opinion. Mr. Green replied that had the fifth step listed in the press release been clarified, as explained by Chief Ford earlier in the meeting, it would have gone a long way towards relieving the guide dog users' anxiety.

With respect to the issue of telephone communication between a 9-1-1 operator and a person denying access to a facility or service, Mr. Green argued that unless the blind person can call the police from the facility to which access is being denied, there is a strong likelihood that communications between the 9-1-1 operator and the blind person will be lost while the operator makes a call to the offender. This is a concern because the blind person, having call 9-1-1, has no way of knowing how long it will take for the situation to be resolved or whether or not an officer will be dispatched. Chair Kreling understood the speaker's concerns, but expected that common sense would prevail in such situations and that when a blind person calls 9-1-1 from a location other than the site at which the occurrence has happened, the police would find a way to maintain communications with that person. He maintained the Police Service could not possibly try to itemize in a press release the myriad of circumstances that might arise.

Member Legendre indicated he would be proposing a motion to address two of the issues raised by the delegation and to clarify the Police Service's future policy on the issue. He proposed that the Board direct the Chief to clarify, as part of the sensitization and awareness process currently underway internally, that charges will be laid when clear warning has been issued with respect to the *Act* and refusal of service continues, and that all reasonable forms of identification, be they from institutional or non-institutional bodies, would be accepted by officers as reasonable evidence of the facts. He argued that if, when a case rises to the courts, a form of identification is found to be invalid, the case would simply be dismissed. He maintained that it should be made clear to officers that good judgement must be used in such instances.

Moved by J. Legendre

That the Chief of Police clarify that:

- 1. As part of the sensitization and awareness process currently underway internally, charges will be laid when clear warning has been issued with regard to the requirements of the *Blind Persons' Rights Act* and refusal of service continues; and**
- 2. That all reasonable forms of identification, from public and non-public bodies, are acceptable to the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service.**

Chief Ford believed member Legendre's motion would infringe on the common law right of discretion on the part of an officer, and suggested he would like to obtain a legal opinion vis-a-vis the operational issue of such a proposal before it is considered by the Board. He maintained the Service has very clearly taken steps to ensure a proper handling of such situations in the future, but to delineate the matter as is suggested by member Legendre's motion goes beyond the purview of the Board.

Member Legendre stated he was prepared to delay consideration of his motion to the next meeting so that the Board could obtain its own legal opinion. He requested that legal opinions be provided in writing by the Chief's counsel and the Board's Solicitor.

Member McCombie believed member Legendre's motion to be nebulous in that the issues it raised had been explicitly covered by the Chief and Deputy Chief in their earlier comments. He maintained that the Chief has to have a certain amount of discretion in administering a policy.

Member Legendre did not believe it was clear that the message was being sent to front-line officers. He argued that had it been clear, he would be satisfied. He added that he saw it as a matter of policy. He expressed awareness of the aspect of discretion but thought he heard, in response to his earlier questions, that the opportunity for mediation would be used in circumstances different from the ones faced by Mr. Green earlier this year. He thought it within the Board's purview to give some direction and maintained that was the intent of the motion.

In response to a question from Chair Kreling, Mr. D. White, Solicitor, RMOC, suggested the Board could accept the motion as a notice of motion and refer the matter to staff, either the Chief's counsel or the Regional Solicitor, for comment with respect to the legal implications of the motion and whether it would be within the jurisdiction of the board.

In conclusion, Chair Kreling wished to make it very clear to the delegation that the Board takes their comments very seriously. He hoped they would agree that there have been some improvements as a result of their presentation in July. He stressed it is the Board's intention that the Police Service provide training and direction to front-line officers and to staff in the communications centre so that situations such as the one faced by Mr. Green in July do not re-occur. He added, the Board fully expects that the Police Service will utilize the suggestions and expertise of guide dog users. The Service's commitment to enforcing the *Blind Persons' Rights Act* should not be considering as a wavering commitment. He hoped the delegation would recognize that their presentation had provided an opportunity to clarify the content of the press release of 5 October. The press release was not a full representation of the work that has been on-going with respect to the *Act*, but a summary of the types of changes that have been implemented. He re-iterated the Board's and the Police Service's commitment to enforcing the *Act*.

Member Legendre suggested that better communication may have prevented a lot of the misunderstanding that has occurred, and that some closer contact in the future would serve everyone well.

Chair Kreling felt it was more a matter of interpretation than communication. He asked staff to confirm that when an officer attends a location where a blind person with a guide dog has been refused access, and the officer is able to determine that a violation of the *Blind Persons' Rights*

Act has occurred, that a charge would be laid by that officer at that time. Chief Ford stated a charge can be laid and would be under those circumstances. He explained that under the *Act* there is no stipulated fine, therefore, it must go to court for a fine to be determined by a justice of the peace but a court issuance can and would be issued at the time of the incident.

Chair Kreling clarified again that the sixth step listed in the press release of 5 October, with respect to investigations, refers to situations in which a complaint is filed after the fact.

That the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board receive this presentation for consideration.

RECEIVED

3. INTERVAL HOUSE
- Executive Director's memo dated 20 Oct 99

Ms. L.A. Hayes, Executive Director, Interval House of Ottawa-Carleton, explained that Interval House is a shelter for abused women and children who are fleeing domestic violence. She indicated the house is currently classified as "residential" under the False Alarm Reduction By-law, but she argued it is neither commercial or residential. Interval House has security cameras, bullet proof windows and special alarms for those who are hearing impaired and visually impaired. It is a non-profit organization that exists to keep women and children safe. She asked that Interval House be reclassified as a safe house under the By-law.

Member Buckingham acknowledged the value and necessity of the service Interval House provides in the community, but questioned why it should be exempted from paying a fine when a false alarm does occur on the premises. She stated the normal process when an alarm goes off is for the security company to call the house before the police are dispatched. This provides an opportunity to stop the call to the police in the event the alarm is false. If a call goes in to the police and officers are dispatched, there is a cost and a redirection of resources and that is the essence of the policy.

Chair Kreling requested legal advice on whether or not the False Alarm By-law, as it is written, contains provisions for exemptions. Mr. D. White, Solicitor, RMOC, indicated that as drafted, the by-law currently does not provide for exemptions. Under the *Municipal Act*, the provisions under which this by-law was passed, the by-law may be drafted to exempt a particular class of persons, however there are currently no such exemptions contained in the False Alarm Reduction By-law.

Vice Chair Baskerville recalled the repeated reviews and discussions that took place at the time the by-law was drafted. He stated the purpose of the by-law was to encourage care and attention in the installation, maintenance and use of alarm systems, thereby reducing the demand on police services. He indicated his understanding was that there was not to be any exemptions. He acknowledged the dilemma in terms of classification but suggested the Board receive the presentation as he was not prepared to review or amend the by-law at this time.

Member Legendre wondered if there is some aspect of the operation of the safe house that makes it difficult to operate the alarm system properly. Ms. Hayes indicated that every time a new family arrives at the house, they are trained with regard to the alarms and procedures to follow. However, she noted many of the families who come to the safe house have a first language other than French or English and the training has to be provided through a cultural interpreter. She also explained that, either the children or mother may panic and open a door setting off the alarm. In those instances, staff call the alarm company to advise them of the false alarm.

Member Legendre stated that what he had just heard was a stronger argument than any that was put forward in correspondence to the Board. However he indicated he was not prepared to move a motion at this time. He suggested that the Board could examine the issue when it received the report on the False Alarm Reduction Policy appeal process, scheduled for later in the meeting.

Member McCombie wondered why kind of liaison the safe house has with its alarm company. Ms. Hayes replied there is liaison between Interval House and the alarm company. In response to further questions from Member McCombie, she indicated that when an alarm is triggered accidentally, staff of the safe house have two minutes to call the alarm company and inform them of what has happened. She believed that when the police arrive, it's either because they didn't get the call from the alarm company advising them the alarm was false or because they decided to check despite the call. She indicated there are two situations that can occur in which staff would not know an alarm had been triggered. She explained the staff of the safe house wear panic buttons and if they were doing something with the women and children and that button went off, they wouldn't know. Likewise, if when setting the alarm, they code it in wrong, that would trigger what is called an "ambush" and the alarm company would call to advise staff that the alarm had been triggered.

Chair Kreling thanked Ms. Hayes for her presentation and indicated the Board would take her request under advisement.

That the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board receive this presentation for consideration.

RECEIVED

ITEMS OF BUSINESS

4. STAFF PRESENTATION - COURT SERVICES

- Presentation by A/Staff Sergeant Ken Logan

Acting Staff Sergeant K. Logan provided an overview of the Court Security Section and its functions within the Police Service which include:

1. Transportation of Persons in Custody
2. Escort Persons in Custody to and from Court
3. Front Line Transportation for Special Events
4. Hospital Escorts for Persons in Custody and
5. Court House Security.

He noted the unit has four vehicles at its disposal and transports over 18,000 prisoners per year, completing over 4,000 trips. Several institutions are serviced by the Court Security Section including the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Detention Centre, the Royal Ottawa Hospital, the William Hay Youth Facility, the Sherwood Youth Facility, the Hull Detention Centre, Phoenix House, Fairburn House, Chaudiere House and Talitha House.

In summary, the Court Security Section provides the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police with a professional, uniform support service for the transportation and secure custody of persons detained and/or charged with a criminal offence within the Service's jurisdiction. Since 1985, Special Constables have provided a cost effective means to ensure that these persons are processed efficiently throughout the judicial system, while maintaining the integrity of the Police Service.

Acting Staff Sergeant Logan also provided an overview of the Cell Extract Team (C.E.T.), a new initiative of the Court Security Section which was established as a result of numerous incidents within the courthouse's cell block. He explained that a comprehensive research paper established that 60% of all injury claims registered from the Court Security Section between 1991 and 1997 were as a result of removing non-compliant and/or assaultive prisoners from an area for transportation purposes. The team research was initiated by one of the unit's Special Constables and the team has been trained in removing non-compliant and/or assaultive prisoners from a specific area.

He outlined the duties of the C.E.T. which include:

- The application of cell extraction training and specialized equipment in removing non-compliant or assaultive prisoners from an area;
- The provision of containment in the event of a situation requiring the deployment of the tactical team and/or hostage negotiator within a secure area; and
- The provision of escort capabilities in the event that the risk assessment of a prisoner or prisoners identifies a need for a higher level of security.

He outlined the training provided to the C.E.T. members and indicated the team members are under the direction of the C.E.T. coordinator and section supervisors for the purpose of training and activation. The team provides the Court Security Section with a less than lethal option within the use of force continuum. In closing, he noted that within the Province of Ontario, only two other police services have similar teams. The York Regional Police Service and the Hamilton-Wentworth Police Service have asked to review the OCRPS training methods to improve upon their own. The cell extraction team is now in its final stages of completion. Once the Standard Operating Procedures are finalized, the team will be in a position to be activated and deployed.

Vice Chair Baskerville noted the large volume of prisoners being transported by the Section and wondered what percentage of those are for remands or bail hearings. He explained his interest in the use of video remand to cut down on this traffic and the probability of incidents necessitating the deployment of the C.E.T. Acting Staff Sergeant Logan stated the Section is in the process of compiling statistics to that effect as a result of Chair Kreling's inquiry at the last Board meeting. He indicated he has been in contact with the project officer for the Offender Transportation Project within the Ministry of Correctional Services, and he would like to discuss the possibility of reviving a video remand committee at the court house.

Member McCombie believed this issues dates back to a time when the Ottawa Police Service attempted to get the City's Justice of the Peace to go to the Regional Detention Centre (RDC) to do remands on-site. He indicated both sides were opposed; the Justice of the Peace were opposed to going to the RDC and the prisoners insisted on their day in court.

Deputy Chief Bevan noted the Special Constables in the Court Security Section work under very difficult circumstances yet for the past two years and on their private time, they've organized weekend excursions for blind children.

That the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board receive this presentation for information.

RECEIVED

5. FALSE ALARM REDUCTION POLICY APPEAL PROCESS

- Director, Financial Services & Materiel Management's report dated 18 Oct 99

Member Legendre recalled that at the time the by-law was enacted, he asked whether the statistics developed as a result of the by-law would be made public and the police had indicated that would not be a problem. He noted the Service now has approximately one year's worth of statistics in its database and should have a sense of which types of systems perform better than others. He wondered if that information would be made public. He maintained the database is being developed with public funds and the public have a right to the information. He explained that he expected the Service to be able to indicate to consumers which manufacturers' systems perform better than others. Ms. D. Frazer, Director, Financial Services & Materiel Management, indicated staff will determine whether the information in the database could be correlated and released to the public.

Member Legendre stated he continues to receive calls from people who experience difficulty in obtaining services in French when contacting the alarm unit. He believed there is a shortage of bilingual staff at the Greenbank office where the alarm unit is located. Chief Ford stated there are bilingual personnel at the Greenbank office. He indicated he would look into the availability of bilingual staff at the alarm unit to ensure that persons phoning in can be served in French.

Member Legendre did not believe any of the three options put forward in the report would address the issue of conflict. He noted the people who make the initial decision as to whether or not an alarm is false are the same people who deal with the appeal. Ms. Frazer explained staff took the approach of looking at how the appeals could be handled within the Service's existing administration rather than deferring to an external body. She noted the appeals that are coming forward are not particularly complex and do not require a great deal of judgement. She was satisfied they could be handled in house rather than deferring to a third party tribunal which would bring about its own costs.

Member Legendre supposed that if someone is dissatisfied with the handling of their appeal, they could submit a complaint and go into that process. Though she indicated she was not familiar enough with the public complaint process to offer an opinion, Ms. Frazer indicated someone could alternatively appeal to the Board.

In response to a question from member McCombie, Ms. Frazer indicated the volume of appeals is approximately 200 per year which represents 1% of the false alarms.

Member McCombie believed that in option 1, staff are perhaps too close to the situation to be objective. He felt option 2 would prove to be too time consuming for the Director of Financial

Services and that option 3 would pose the same problem for the Director General. Having said that, he wondered if staff could come up with an alternative option.

Member McCombie voiced his opposition to the by-law, indicating his concern for elderly people who feel they need an alarm system for their safety and well-being. He stated that elderly persons can sometimes be forgetful and make honest mistakes such as opening their back door, and activating the alarm system. He did not believe the police should automatically issue fines in such cases.

Vice Chair Baskerville perceived option 1 as being biased towards the operator of the system and felt the Service needs a review mechanism, therefore he rejected that option. He rejected option 3 because he could not see burdening the Executive with such micro-management work. He believed option 2 could be viable with some modifications. He felt the composition of a review panel should be left to the discretion of the Chief of Police but believed it should be a two-stage process in which the manager of the alarm unit would make the first determination and forward to a review panel any appeals that he/she felt inclined to reject. He maintained this would give the manager of the alarm unit the discretion to use his/her own judgement before engaging the assistance of the panel.

Ms. Frazer indicated now that the alarm unit has been in operation for over a year, there are some precedents being set and many of the appeals coming forward could fit into categories. Fewer of them would therefore need to rise to a panel and the volume would diminish.

Member Legendre suggested this report is a good example of why the Board needs more of its own staff resources, to bring forward suggestions that are more in the public's interest. In terms of the options put forward in the report, he wondered if there is anything in the legislation that would prevent the Board from establishing a citizens' panel to review the appeals. D. White indicated that type of board is not contemplated under the acts that form the basis for the False Alarm by-law, therefore he was hesitant to provide a definitive answer. He was unaware of any other such panels in existence and suggested it would be fitting to refer the matter to staff, perhaps with some direction as to the role of such a board and whether it would exist in an advisory capacity or would have the authority to make a final determination.

Member Legendre wondered if it was necessary for the Board to make a decision tonight. He indicated he would have preferred to have a report that looked at the functioning of the alarm policy as a whole rather than considering this aspect in isolation, so the Board could perhaps suggest amendments to the policy and by-law. Mindful of the presentation from Interval House, he maintained there may be other groups that, from a public policy point of view, could be exempted from the impact of the by-law. He believed the service such groups provide to the community warrant an exception. He suggested that the Board ask staff to prepare a report that would review the by-law from those perspectives.

Chair Kreling recalled that the Board received its annual report on the False Alarm by-law in June and at that time, Board members requested that staff explore options for improving the appeal process because a number of them had received comments from the public that they felt there should be a separation between the alarm administrator and the appeal process.

Member Legendre did not recall the report the Board received in June and wondered if it contained any information with regard to the issues he had raised earlier, such as the possibility of exempting certain organizations from the impacts of the False Alarm Reduction By-law. He maintained that organizations such as Interval House operate on a very tight budget and they serve as a safety net for a very fragile group in society. To impose on them the decision of whether or not they can have an alarm system could jeopardize lives. He stated such considerations don't necessarily come forward in a statistical report.

Chair Kreling indicated the Police are not autocratically issuing fines for every occurrence of a false alarm at the safe house. They are working with Interval House and their alarm provider to find a solution that will suit their needs. He suggested that Board members review the report received in June and bring forward any issues they feel might be explored further.

With regard to the appeal process, Chair Kreling suggested the Board direct staff to amend option 2 as he also did not believe the Director General should be burdened with the appeal process. S. Kanellakos indicated the rationale for options 2 and 3 was to separate the process from the alarm unit while keeping it simple and internal. He explained that 90% of the appeals are quite simple and in those cases, the decision as to whether or not an appeal is approved does not require a lot of deliberation. Staff felt that to create an external panel would complicate the process unnecessarily. He indicated that should the Board wish them to, staff would re-examine the concept of a review panel and look at ways to make it workable without adding a lot of bureaucracy to the organization.

Chair Kreling suggested the Board direct staff to redefine option 2 to clarify the composition of the review panel.

Though she agreed that a review panel is an appropriate way to deal with appeals, Member Buckingham believed the composition of the panel is an operational decision and is not within the Board's purview. She thought it sufficient for the Board to direct that a two or three person review panel be implemented and that the membership of that panel be selected by the Chief of Police. She indicated she would be moving a motion to that effect.

In view of the uncertainty expressed by legal staff with regard to the possibility of an external panel, member Legendre wondered if member Buckingham would amend her motion to consider making her motion more general so as not to exclude the possibility of an external

panel. He maintained that from the public's point of view, there is a double conflict of interest. When an appeal is made, someone's judgement is being questioned and when a fine is levied, the Service receives the funds. He indicated he has been trying since the by-law was implemented, to separate the Service from this revenue stream because of the public perception it creates.

Member Buckingham indicated she was not prepared to amend her motion. She was concerned that once the process is externalized, it could potentially create a bureaucracy that could quickly grow into something much more complicated than is warranted at this time.

Member Legendre indicated he would be moving an amendment. To respond to the bureaucratic issue, he did not believe there would be any additional bureaucracy. He argued staff would be presenting cases to the panel whether it be an internal or an external panel. He wished to make another point with respect to the impending municipal restructuring. He believed the Region is headed towards a one-tier government and he felt it behooves that government to bring its citizens into participation. His suggestion is in the nature of an advisory committee. He felt that, depending on how the new one-tier municipal structure is implemented, there will be such mechanisms for citizens to participate in more ways.

Member McCombie wondered if Chief Ford had any views on the motions put forward. Chief Ford indicated staff would like to review the issues and some of the legal ramifications of certain alternatives before a decision is made.

Moved by J. Legendre

That staff consider a review panel independent of the Service.

LOST

YEAS: D. Adam, J. Legendre

NAYS: E. Buckingham, G. Baskerville, H. Kreling, J. McCombie

Moved by E. Buckingham

That the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board direct the Chief of Police to alter the appeal process by implementing a review panel comprised of three members of the Police Service selected by the Chief.

CARRIED

(J. Legendre dissented)

6. **IMPACT ON RECRUITMENT DUE TO IMPLEMENTATION
OF POLICE FOUNDATION PROGRAM AND RELATED INITIATIVES**
- Director, Human Resources' report dated 18 Oct 99

Vice Chair Baskerville thanked staff for preparing the report, which confirmed some of his initial concerns. He stated he supported the introduction of a Police Qualifying Exam (PQE) because he believed that: those wishing to pursue a career in policing have an obligation to prepare themselves academically; making the PQE a prerequisite for selection and commencement of practical training would put policing on the same basis as entry into most professions and vocations; and it would also have the effect of reducing training costs incurred by the Ontario Police College and the police services because candidates will be better prepared on their theoretical knowledge before entering the training programs. However, he did not support the Ministry's plan to have the PQE implemented by May 2000 because he felt: it must be integrated as part of the constable selection process; it would limit the pool of available candidates to those having graduated from a full-time course of study at a community college; there needs to be an alternate means for those aspiring to the profession to prepare themselves for the PQE, and the Ministry is approximately a year late in preparing and releasing the PQE self-study guide which is necessary for anyone wishing to prepare for the exam without completing a two year community college course.

He noted the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police has clearly stated its concerns in a resolution. He believed the Board should support the position the OACP has taken and obtain

the support of the Ontario Association of Police Services Boards (OAPSB) in indicating to the Ministry of the Solicitor General the desire to have alternate means of preparation in place well in advance of the implementation of the PQE.

He also expressed concern should the Police Foundation Program be made mandatory. He felt it would be disadvantageous to the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service and other police services who would be prevented from recruiting people from other work backgrounds with desired life skills, maturity and knowledge.

Member Legendre wondered what Vice Chair Baskerville felt was too restrictive about limiting candidates to those who have been through the Police Foundation Program.

Vice Chair Baskerville explained that making the Police Foundation Program mandatory would mean that the Police Service could only recruit officers from the pool of graduates coming out of a two year course at a community college. At this time, the Ministry has not made available any documentation that would assist people who wish to enter into policing by preparing themselves for the qualifying exam, and that creates a problem for ours and other police services.

Member Legendre believed, from the brief description outlined in the report, that the Police Foundation Program sounded like an excellent program. Vice Chair Baskerville agreed with the course of study for the Police Foundation Program, but maintained that making it mandatory would eliminate anyone who wants to become a police officer without going back to school full time, such as lawyers and others who have other experience and who could otherwise prepare for the PQE through a self-study program.

Member McCombie added that the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service, having recently completed its amalgamation, took in approximately 50 police officers from the OPP. He stated that if the Police Foundation Program had been mandatory, those transfers would not have been possible because the officers have not graduated from the Program.

Chief Ford stated the OACP agrees with Vice Chair Baskerville's comments. He explained that in recruiting new candidates, police services look for diversity in terms of their abilities and experiences and the Ministry's plan to implement the PQE by May 2000 would eliminate the possibility of recruiting people who hold university degrees as well as people coming from the work force who, because of the restrictions, would not have time to prepare for the exam through self-study.

Member Buckingham surmised that the primary concern is not with the PQE but with the timing of its implementation, because the mechanism for self-study has not been in place long enough for those contemplating a career in policing without going back to school full time. She noted those mechanisms are not in place now and until they have been in place for a sufficient period

of time, the recruitment pool will be severely limited. She noted that university and graduate degrees can be obtained through distance learning or self-study programs and she felt it reasonable to expect that the same should be true for preparation for the PQE.

S. Kanellakos noted that the demographics of retirement is such that the pool of candidates being recruited into policing across the province is not sufficient to replace those who will be retiring in the near future. He believed the OACP's concerns are that the Ministry's plan not only restricts the pool of raw resources coming in, but also restricts the ability to hire from diverse backgrounds based on such things as linguistics and gender. Such recruits are needed to represent the community. He re-iterated the need to delay the implementation until all mechanisms are in place to ensure the pool is sufficient to meet our needs.

Moved by G. Baskerville

WHEREAS the Police Service needs to have a ready source of qualified candidates from which to hire and the source of potential police recruits should not be artificially restricted;

WHEREAS the Police Service benefits from being able to recruit from all segments of the population to achieve the best representation of the whole community;

WHEREAS it is recognized that it is necessary for all police officers to have a common standard of police related knowledge prior to undertaking the practical phase of training and development;

WHEREAS the implementation of the Police Qualifying Examination (PQE) in May 2000, prior to establishing alternate methods of preparing for the examination, will limit our selection of potential police officers; and

WHEREAS it is this Board's belief that its concerns are shared by other Police Services Board;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services Board:

- 1. Support the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (OACP) Resolution 99-3 regarding Police Qualifying Examinations and Recruit Training;**
- 2. Request the Board of Directors of the Ontario Association of Police Services Boards (OAPSB) to endorse the OACP Resolution;**

3. **Support the need for the PQE, when implemented, to be an integral part of the Ontario Constable Selection System;**
4. **Support the continued recruitment of Police Officers from as large a population pool as possible and with this in mind is opposed to the mandatory full-time attendance at a Community College and completion of the Police Foundation Program as the only means of preparation for the PQE; and**
5. **Encourage the Ministry of the Solicitor General to implement and support alternate means of preparation for the PQE such as self-study and distance learning programs.**

CARRIED

7. POLICE SERVICES BOARD REWARD REQUEST
- Chief's report dated 18 Oct 99

Member Buckingham stated there is nothing in the legislation that requires the Board to approve rewards as the Chief is responsible for operational matters. She recalled raising this issue the last time such a request came before the Board. She believed this was clearly within the purview of the Chief. Though she felt it might be appropriate for the Board to have a policy that dictates the types of situations in which it might be appropriate to offer rewards, she did not believe the Board needs to approve specific requests. She maintained nothing precludes the Chief from authorizing this and bringing it to the Board's attention as an information item. She suggested that the Board receive the item for information.

Member McCombie wondered if the Service might be setting a precedent in offering a reward in this case. He was concerned that subsequent to this, the Chief would be expected to post a reward every time there is an unsolved motor vehicle accident involving a fatality.

Chair Kreling felt this is a peculiar situation in terms of the amount of effort that has gone into investigating it without conclusion. He stated the Chief will, from time to time, make such decisions and advise the Board accordingly.

That the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board receive this report for information.

RECEIVED

8. QUARTERLY COMPLAINTS REPORT - PART V,
POLICE SERVICES ACT - FOR PERIOD JULY 1 TO SEPTEMBER 30, 1999
Chief's report dated 15 Oct 99

Vice Chair Baskerville noted there have been 67 complaints filed under the category "Neglect of Duty" to-date this year. It represents an 85% increase over last year's rate. He wondered if staff could comment on this figure.

Chief Ford could not provide an explanation for the increase but indicated he would look into factors that may have precipitated it and inform the Board of such. He theorized it could be reflective of the increased area served by the OCRPS.

Vice Chair Baskerville noted under the heading Summary of Finding and Action Taken for complaint #99-150, a City of Ottawa Parking Control officer was found to have committed an error. Under the same heading for complaint #99-203, a faulty controller card was found to be at fault. He wondered what follow-up action is taken within the Service with complaints such as these. He suggested the Board would be interested in knowing what police deduce from such incidents and whether actions are taken to improve service.

Staff Sergeant R. Webber indicated that with respect to the Parking Control officer, the matter was addressed with the Parking Control Commission and the supervisor in charge of that officer dealt with the matter. With respect to the faulty control card, the problem was identified and rectified within the department.

Member Buckingham noted the report suggested the controller card was faulty for several weeks and wondered whether telecommunications equipment was tested on a regular basis.

S. Kanellakos explained that for a period of time the communications centre was having difficulty with incoming calls. In addition to the Service's technical staff, Bell Canada staff were brought in to try to find where the problem was occurring. By conducting audits of the various lines, it took them several weeks to isolate the source of the problem. He stated the equipment is inspected on a regular basis and the Service retains a service maintenance contract with Bell Canada in addition to having on-site technical staff.

That the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board receive this report for information.

RECEIVED

9. APPROVAL OF ARCHITECTURE SERVICES
FOR THE NEW EAST DIVISIONAL BUILDING
- Director General's report dated 20 Oct 99

That the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board approve the selection of the proposal as submitted by Barry J. Hobin & Associates Architects Inc. for Architectural Services for the delivery of the new East Divisional Building in the Township of Cumberland at the corner of 10th Line and St. Joseph Blvd. for an amount not exceeding \$353,787.00 including disbursements (plus GST).

CARRIED

10. OTTAWA-CARLETON CENTRE FOR CRIME PREVENTION (OCCCP),
COMMUNITY ALLIANCE FOR CRIME PREVENTION (CACP) STRATEGIC PLAN
- Board Chair's report dated 18 Oct 99

That the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board receive and adopt in principle the Draft Strategic Plan as prepared by the Community Alliance for Crime Prevention (CACP).

CARRIED

11. MEDIA ACCESS TO DIGITAL RADIO SYSTEM
- Verbal report from Deputy Chief Bevan

Member Buckingham wondered why it is essential that the Board receive this verbal report tonight and why staff were not able to provide a written report to be included in the agenda. She felt staff should submit written reports for inclusion in the agenda so Board members have adequate time to read the information. She did not feel the Board should continue to make exceptions for verbal reports.

Chair Kreling believed it was essential that the Board receive this report tonight because the Service is ready to go digital and there have already been discussions between the media and the Service's Executive with regard to access to transmission through the digital radio system. He felt Board members should be aware of the issue in the event they are contacted by the media. He noted the new system will significantly change the way media outlets receive information from the Police Service.

With respect to the absence of a written report on the agenda, Chair Kreling was of the understanding that the situation had been fluid over the last few weeks. He noted this report is simply for the information of the Board.

Deputy Chief Bevan apologized for not providing a written report and indicated staff had prepared a report for inclusion in the agenda but felt that some of the information in it would have been misconstrued had it been in the public domain in advance of the consultation with the media scheduled for 10:00 a.m. Thursday. Staff simply wish to advise the Board that the Service is in a position to go digital and, based on advice from legal counsel, will not be providing digital radios to the media because it would be a breach of the provincial privacy legislation. Staff will be meeting with the media and discussing options to meet their needs for timely information. He indicated media outlets have requested that the Police Service provide them with radios so they can continue to monitor police operations. He stressed that the Service did not give them radios in the past, but they simply found ways to intercept and monitor the system.

Vice Chair Baskerville recalled that when the Board approved the purchase of the radio system, it was his understanding that limiting media access was one of the benefits of changing to a digital system as it would allow a secure means of communication for police officers and improve their operational capability. He believed that if the media want to monitor police activities, they should find other ways of accessing information. He believed that should staff want to change that, a detailed report should be brought forward so that the Board may rule on it as a policy issue.

In response to questions from member Legendre, Deputy Chief Bevan explained that staff did not provide a written report as they did not want it to appear that decisions had been made with regard to options for communicating information to the media. Staff have offered to consult with the media to receive their input on alternatives to the old system, which allowed media outlets to listen in on police radios.

In response to a further questions from member Legendre, Deputy Chief Bevan confirmed that the implementation of the digital radio system is being held up pending consultation with the media. He indicated staff are considering a couple of options, one of which is a paging system that is widely used in other parts of the country. Media outlets pay for pagers and when there is a major incident, staff dial the pager number to prompt a call back from the media to give them information. He noted there are other scenarios being contemplated, some of which put the onus of Police Service staff who are already very busy when there is a major incident. Another option would be to post current information on the webpage, which would put the onus of the media to check the website on a regular basis. However, staff want to receive input from the media outlets before designing something like that. Ultimately, the Service needs some kind of automated solution.

Member Legendre wondered if there was any indication from the press community that there may be law suits around this issue. Deputy Chief Bevan replied there has been no indication of law suits but there has been indication there may be some vigorous complaints.

Chief Ford re-iterated the reason the Service is handling the situation this way is that staff want to give the media a chance, before the implementation of the digital radio system, to have a say on an alternate solution. He stated staff have received legal advice which indicates the Service can't give the media a radio to listen to police signals. Up until recently, Edmonton and Calgary have allowed the media to listen in on police signals but Alberta has now implemented human rights legislation and privacy legislation similar to Ontario's, and as a result they have began to withdrawn the radios from media outlets.

Member Legendre was surprised by these details and suggested that staff implement the new radio system as soon as possible. He argued the Service has purchased a new system to improve its effectiveness and provided staff training on its use, and he felt details relating to the media could be settled later. He was concerned that the delay may be prolonged depending on what staff heard from the media during Thursday morning's consultation.

Chair Kreling indicated staff are reviewing similar situations in other communities and looking at the solutions used in those jurisdictions. He believed that if there is some innovative way of dealing with the situation, staff will hear it from the media on Thursday.

Member McCombie wondered if it would be appropriate for the Board to pass a motion recommending that the Chief follow his legal advice. He realized it is an operational matter but a motion from the Board would support the Chief in his acceptance of the legal opinion.

Chair Kreling suggested that the minutes would reflect the Board's support. He did not feel the need to pass a motion to that effect.

Deputy Chief Bevan indicated staff intend to bring forward a detailed report, including a copy of the legal opinion, to update the Board on the situation and to seek the Board's endorsement of the ensuing policy.

That the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services Board receive this report for information.

RECEIVED

12. BOARD MEETING SCHEDULE FOR REMAINDER OF 1999 AND YEAR 2000

- Executive Director's report dated 20 Oct 99

Vice Chair Baskerville requested that tentative dates for police functions, such as award ceremonies and swearing-in ceremonies, be added to the schedule so Board members are aware of them with some degree of advance notice.

That the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services Board receive the schedule of Board meetings for the remainder of 1999 and the year 2000 for information.

RECEIVED

13. COMMENDATION LETTERS RECEIVED
SINCE LAST POLICE SERVICES BOARD MEETING

- Chief's report dated 18 Oct 99

That the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services Board receive this report for information.

RECEIVED

14. CHIEF'S VERBAL REPORT

Chief B. Ford reported on the following items:

- ◆ The Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service participated in the 24-hour Operation Impact campaign which took place on 30 September 1999. The campaign is a nation-wide project to promote road safety, particularly the wearing of seat-belts. During this year's campaign, a total of 141 infractions were issued.
- ◆ The OCRPS has put together a two-person squad to investigate persons who are of High Risk in the community. Recently released offenders will be targeted in attempts to arrest for Breach of Probation on similar offences.
- ◆ The OCRPS has committed one officer to Project Carcajou which targets Motorcycle gangs. This is a western Quebec project involving many officers from multiple police services. The OCRPS sees this as another opportunity to build solid working relationships with Quebec Police Services.

- ◆ The OCRPS Special Olympics Committee received a cheque for \$15,000 from the Ontario Law Enforcement Torch Run organization to help support the upcoming games in January 2000. Chief Ford has made a commitment, on behalf of the OCRPS, to raise \$50,000 for this cause.
- ◆ Linda Smyth has been promoted to the rank of Superintendent as a result of the recent promotional process. She is the highest ranking female officer ever in the history of the Ottawa-Carleton Region.
- ◆ The annual Fall Auction was held on Saturday, 16 October where unclaimed articles were auctioned-off raising \$25,000.
- ◆ A 3-day International Criminal Investigative Best Practices Symposium, hosted by the OCRPS commenced today and will run until the 27th. The Symposium will feature speakers from around the world. It is a very comprehensive and significant symposium organized by the OCRPS's Criminal Investigation Branch.
- ◆ On 31 October, Rogers Cable will be offering assistance to the OCRPS through the "Pumpkin Patrol" by making their bright red vans visible and ready to assist to ensure a safe Halloween.
- ◆ The Regional Cancer Centre telethon was held on 16 and 17 October and raised over \$1M towards cancer research.

In response to a question from member Buckingham, Chief Ford confirmed the Youth Centre will be holding its annual silent auction at Lansdowne Park, Salons A and B on 3 November.

With respect to the Best Practices Symposium, member Legendre believed it is occurring as an initiative of the OCRPS and more specifically of Deputy Chief Bevan. He also noted the Deputy Chief managed to obtain funding from the federal government in order to provide simultaneous translation for the symposium. He congratulated the Deputy Chief on the endeavour, noting it has resulted in a significant participation from the Province of Quebec which does not normally occur when translation is not provided.

Deputy Chief Bevan explained that as the Service became more involved in the CRS 2000 project, it became apparent that a symposium of this nature would be very beneficial. He indicated many ideas are going to be discussed during the course of the symposium and hosting it provides the Service with the opportunity to have more of its members attend than would otherwise be possible. He noted the symposium was a collective endeavour and is the result of the work of many people.

That the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services Board receive this report for information.

RECEIVED

OTHER BUSINESS

INQUIRIES

1. Scholarship Funds

Member McCombie inquired as to how many scholarship funds are under the auspices of the Board.

Chair Kreling explained there is a scholarship fund, which was originally set up by the Ottawa Police Service and which benefits the children of members of the Service. He indicated it is self-funding and by virtue of being the Chair of the Police Services Board, he sits on the board of trustees which meets annually to receive an auditor's report and financial statement as well as a list of applicants. He stated there is no specific criteria as to an academic bench mark or course of study for applicants, and this year, based on monies available and number of applicants, first year students were each going to receive something in the order of \$200 or \$300.

Vice Chair Baskerville explained the Thomas Flanagan Scholarship Fund is administered by Mr. David Pepper, Director of Community Development. It too is self-funding with money from the Ottawa-Carleton Community Foundation. Interest monies are used to fund a scholarship for an aboriginal or visible minority female who has shown an interest in pursuing a policing or a related course of study. The Board, through Mr. Pepper, runs the advertising, review and selection of candidates for the scholarship. In response to a question from member McCombie, Vice Chair Baskerville confirmed a significant portion of the fund originally came from the Board in recognition of Chief Flanagan.

Member McCombie's concerns were with the fact that though information is available about the Thomas Flanagan Scholarship, no information is available about the other. He felt it is a Board initiative, a Board fund and the Board should receive regular reports on it and it should be publicized.

Chair Kreling indicated there are annual statements and annual meetings of the board of trustees and he committed to having the information provided to member McCombie. He also suggested the list of beneficiaries of the fund could be announced as part of the Board's ceremonial proceedings.

2. Community Forum Meeting at St. Laurent Complex

Member Legendre indicated the next Regional Government community forum meeting will be taking place in his ward, at the St. Laurent Complex, on Friday, 29 October. He wished to confirm that members of the Police Service would be in attendance and that people with bilingual capabilities would be available to answer questions from citizens. In particular, he hoped Deputy Chief Bevan would be available. Deputy Chief Bevan indicated he had another commitment that evening and unfortunately could not attend.

CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO MOVE IN CAMERA

That the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services Board adjourn the public portion of its meeting to move In Camera to discuss Confidential Item 1 pertaining to personnel matters, in accordance with Section 35(4)(b) of the *Police Services Act*.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

W. Fedec

H. Kreling

Executive Director

Chair