

MINUTES

OTTAWA-CARLETON POLICE SERVICES BOARD

CHAMPLAIN ROOM

28 JULY 1997

5:00 P.M.

PRESENT

Chair: Mr. P. Vice
Vice Chair: Mr. A. Bouwers
Members: Mr. G. Baskerville, Ms. A. Boudreau, Councillor D. Holmes, Councillor H. Kreling,
Regional Chair P. Clark

SWEARING-IN OF NEW BOARD MEMBER

Board Chair Peter Vice welcomed new member, Councillor Herb Kreling. He explained that Councillor Kreling was elected to the Board following David Pratt's resignation. Chair Vice thanked former Councillor Pratt for his contribution and hard work, and congratulated him on his federal election victory.

Councillor H. Kreling was officially sworn-in as a member of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services Board.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services Board confirm the Minutes of the 16 June 1997 meeting.

CARRIED

SPECIAL PRESENTATION OF POLICE AND FIRE GAMES PARTICIPANTS

Chief Brian Ford explained the Ottawa-Carleton Police Service sent 30 representatives to compete in the International Police and Fire Games in Calgary this summer. He complimented them on the 11 medals they brought home and introduced Sergeant Rick Welland who organized the team.

Sergeant Rick Welland thanked the Board and the Police Service for their support, and praised the participants for their impressive showing. Fifteen members of the team were present and introduced themselves, stating their sport and the medals they won. Sergeant Welland said almost 9,000 athletes from 47 countries around the world participated in the games.

ITEMS OF BUSINESS

1. PUBLIC COMPLAINTS REPORT (AS OF JUNE 1997)
- Chief's report dated 9 July 97

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

RECEIVED

2. OMERS SURPLUS - MANAGEMENT PLANS
- Board Secretary's memorandum dated 22 Jul 97 and attached joint report from RMO Finance Commissioner and Human Resources Commissioner

S. Kanellakos, Director General expressed his agreement with the position presented by the Region's Finance and Human Resources Commissioners. He explained these are one-time funds accumulated over a five year period and which are not included in the base budget. He stressed it is entirely at the Board's discretion to determine how the funds will be used. He added staff will be reviewing it as they prepare the 1998 budget and will bring forward recommendations for discussion at that time.

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

RECEIVED

3. FALSE ALARM REDUCTION POLICY UPDATE

Superintendent Peter Cuthbert and Sergeant John Ferguson provided an update on the False Alarm Reduction Policy.

Superintendent Cuthbert explained the by-law was approved by the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board on 28 November 96. As a result of Motions tabled by Regional Council on 9 July 97, Sergeant Ferguson prepared a report on the status of the by-law. He stated the goals of the by-law included: to reduce the number of false alarm dispatches; to improve the police capacity to respond to higher priority calls for service; to educate alarm holders on responsible alarm use; to encourage the alarm industry to improve their practices; to improve response efficiency and officer safety.

After outlining the consultation process that took place prior to the approval of the by-law, Sergeant Ferguson explained the two aspects of the policy. An annual registration is required to develop and maintain a database that would provide information on the type of system in use and any contents on the premises that could pose a danger to responding officers. In addition, a punitive aspect would be introduced after three false alarms to ensure remedial efforts are made to address the problem. Sergeant Ferguson stressed the Police are responding to all alarm calls and will continue to do so.

In response to questions from Councillor Holmes, Sergeant Ferguson indicated that collecting a fee for a service that has already been provided is often problematic. He added if the fees were too high it could discourage people from installing security systems. Therefore, an across-the-board registration makes the fee low enough to not discourage installations, and has the added benefit of providing the necessary information for the database. On the issue of licensing, he stated under the *Municipal Act* the Police do not have the ability to license alarm companies.

Regional Chair Clark questioned the need for collecting personal information. Sergeant Ferguson re-iterated the need for the database to contain information to enhance officer safety. He also noted knowing the valuable contents of premises will help officers to intercept people fleeing the crime.

The Board heard from the following delegations:

Doug McKeen, Glebe Business Group and Glebe Apothecary noted the initial letters of notice were sent to school boards but no notice was given to businesses and Business Improvement Associations. He indicated an alarm system in a store or business is a necessity. There were four false alarms at his store last year, all due to defective equipment or installation and he questioned the need to have his system re-certified, at his cost and by the company causing the problems, after three false alarms. He questioned how false alarms are being generated, stating his alarm company informed him the problems are being caused by approximately 20% of users with the other 80% experiencing little or no problems. Mr. McKeen believed the Police should license security companies that sell and install the equipment. He felt the by-law and policy do nothing to solve the problem.

In response to a question from Councillor Holmes, Sergeant Ferguson stated there are currently approximately 60% commercial and 40% residential false alarms, but those numbers are changing rapidly because security companies are targeting the residential market for new installations. He acknowledged some large companies do cause an inordinate number of false alarms.

Member Boudreau wondered if staff could comment on the statement that 20% of alarm holders are causing the problems. Sergeant Ferguson stated there is no solid data to support that statement. He indicated the data shows that approximately 60% of the homes with alarm

systems cause one false alarm per year and only about 5% have up to three false alarms per year.

Earl Acker expressed outrage at having to pay \$26 per year before the police will respond to an alarm at his home. He stated he had his alarm system installed three years ago thinking this was a responsible thing to do; he received an insurance discount as a result. Mr. Acker indicated he has never had a false alarm and believed the police should deal with the alarm companies. He suggested he would gladly pay a fine for a false alarm if it is caused by his error but if the cause of the false alarm is a defect, the company should pay the fine. Mr. Acker maintained the 47% who did not return their forms should be viewed as being opposed to the by-law.

Alex Turner stated he installed a security alarm in his home because, in less than one year as many as half the residences on his street were broken into. He pays a monthly fee for monitoring; when the alarm is triggered, the monitoring company calls to verify the situation before notifying police. Mr. Turner found nothing in the staff presentation to explain what types of alarm systems are causing the problems. He stated that in light of the high taxes they pay, residents should receive adequate protection. He believed the by-law to be unfair.

Thelma Boles stated she too has a monitored alarm system and a monitoring company verifies the situation before calling police. She believed the registration fee amounts to paying for a problem caused by others. She stressed that for people on a fixed income, it is difficult enough to manage without adding to that burden.

Ron McGuire explained he installed an alarm system in his home following a break-in in 1978. He expressed a willingness to pay for false alarms if and when he causes them. Mr. McGuire indicated he checked with police before upgrading his alarm system to ensure quality and reliability. Though he understood the need for the database, he believed those who cause the problem should pay and only after a failure to pay a false alarm fine should service be withheld. Mr. McGuire felt that those companies installing sub-standard systems should be held accountable. He believed the fee scale should be based on the size of the premises. He expressed a willingness to pay a one-time registration, but asked the Board to reconsider the annual renewal fee. Following a question from A. Boudreau on the issue of updating the database, Mr. McGuire suggested the Police target those homes that have declared questionable contents for regular updates and otherwise encourage people to be responsible by keeping the Police informed.

Councillor Holmes asked whether the Police would stop responding to calls if alarm owners didn't pay the registration fee. She also inquired whether staff had any sense of the rate of false alarms for monitored systems, and whether the Police had the ability to make it mandatory for monitoring companies to verify alarms before calling police. Sergeant Ferguson stated the Police have no intention of withdrawing services at this time. He indicated in 1994, the Police

did ask the companies to verify all alarms however, there is no way to enforce this. He did not believe all alarm companies are complying with the request.

Regional Chair Clark questioned the need for annual updates. He believed that unless people move or upgrade their system, the information will generally remain the same. He felt the security companies would be able to provide the information without creating a duplicate administration. Sergeant Ferguson stated the Police have found the information provided by security companies to be woefully inadequate and dangerously out of date. He explained an annual registration would confirm the information.

Member Boudreau inquired whether the police had information on the ratio between monitored and unmonitored systems. Sergeant Ferguson indicated it is impossible to keep track of unmonitored systems and therefore that statistic is not available.

Edward Lee thought it ironic that the Police have engaged in over two years of consultation with the alarm companies who have escaped without liability with this by-law, yet there has been no consultation with the alarm owners who are being asked to pay. He spoke to the intent of the policy, stating he did not receive any education on alarm systems when he submitted his registration. He felt that providing information to the police should be the obligation of alarm companies since they have files on their clients. Mr. Lee understood the annual fee in terms of cost recovery, but argued the public have been given no information on how the rate was set, and no assurances that it will not increase in the years to come. He believed the administrative cost of collecting the fee annually would create a bureaucracy that might not be worth the revenue generated. Mr. Lee thought it unfair to expect the majority of alarm holders to subsidize the minority who have a high rate of false alarms. He believed the solution is a strict penalty regime after several false alarms which would incur corrective instructions and action for both the user and the alarm company. Mr. Lee said the by-law appears to be an indirect revenue generator in light of the reduction in the Police Services budget and therefore an unfair increase in taxes. He requested the policy be reconsidered and rescinded.

Councillor Rick Chiarelli, City of Nepean received a number of phone calls, letters and home visits regarding this issue. He thought the by-law was perceived by the public as a victim tax. He understood the rationale but believed the Police Services Board should re-evaluate its decision. He stated the policy targets a particular police service and turns it into a chargeable service. He argued, this comes after a concerted effort to encourage people to install home security systems and to develop strategies to help police protect properties. The result is that people who have taken action to help the police are being penalized. The councillor argued there is a public interest in having people use security alarm systems and they shouldn't be penalized for doing so. In response to a question from Regional Chair Clark, Mr. Chiarelli indicated it may be worthwhile to look into making alarm calls subject to an insurance fee.

Frank Korycan asked the Board to reconsider the policy and by-law. He stated that, like many in his neighbourhood, he had a reliable system installed four years ago. Mr. Korycan believed the fact that he paid over \$2000 for his security system while others have paid as little as \$500 shows a disparity in the quality of systems available. He argued he has committed to paying for monthly monitoring to reduce the risk of false alarms and believed the annual registration fee amounts to taxation without representation. Mr. Korycan failed to see any educational value in the process and believed the policy places the Police Service at risk of liability upon failure to respond to a call. Since there is no information on what percentage of false alarms are generated from commercial properties, the speaker sustained residential users are being asked to subsidize commercial users. Mr. Korycan proposed an annual limit of two false alarms, with follow-up and monetary penalties for subsequent false alarms.

Regional Chair Clark asked staff to comment on the issue of liability following failure to respond. D. White, Solicitor, RMOC responded there are a number of factors that impact on the Police's ability to respond to a call, therefore he did not believe there would be an issue of liability. He indicated staff could research the question and follow-up with the Board.

Ronald Benn stated he first heard of this issue when he received the registration and invoice in June. He was concerned that such a registration system would not reduce the number of false alarms. He believed its real goal was to generate revenue and believed if that is the intent, it should be stated. Mr. Benn wished to confirm there would be an appeal process through which an alarm holder could contest a declaration of a false alarm.

Following a question from Councillor Kreling, Sergeant Ferguson stated there has always been and continues to be an appeal process against the designation of a false alarm. He explained it is a matter of speaking to the alarm company to determine the reason why the owner judged the alarm to be valid. The alarm company then communicates this to the Police and it is judged on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Benn suggested the alarm company be taken out of the loop as it is the resident and not the alarm company that is liable for the fine.

Roland Bens expressed his shock upon receipt of the registration form and invoice. He believed his paid taxes were tantamount to having a contract with the Region to provide certain goods and services which includes police services. Mr. Bens also indicated he pays a monthly fee for monitoring and therefore has never had a false alarm. He objected to having to pay for the mistakes of others and argued that responding to a false alarm is preferable to investigating a burglary. He thought the Police should be fining for false alarms. Furthermore, Mr. Bens felt the application questionnaire was intrusive and believed personal information should not have been released by alarm companies. He expressed bitterness and frustration in response to the implementation of this policy and by-law.

Councillor Kreling inquired about the Region's ability to charge and collect fines. Sergeant Ferguson did not believe the Region has the ability to levy a fine under the *Provincial Offences Act* or any Act. The only alternative is to add it on to municipal taxes.

Following a question from Councillor Holmes, D. White confirmed the *Municipal Act* does allow any fees or charges levied by the Police Services Board to be added to the property tax roll. He further confirmed there is no appeal process under such circumstances.

Bob Kline and Dean Smith, Riverside Park Neighbourhood Watch

Mr. Smith explained he is also a member of the executive of the City of Ottawa Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinators' Association and indicated they had received a briefing from Sergeant Ferguson in April, at their request. He believed that home security alarms help deter break-ins and therefore assist the police. Based on that fact, Mr. Smith assumed the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board did not wish to discourage the use of home alarms. He believed the by-law was flawed in three ways. It was badly introduced and implemented because of the absence of comprehensive policy papers explaining the need for it. It charges all householders an annual registration fee whether or not they generate false alarms and it ignores the responsibility of monitoring companies. He stated it is unfair that householders should be held solely accountable for false alarms. Mr. Smith argued there is no mention in the policy of an appeal process for defective equipment or alarm company error. He suggested a one-time registration fee to both householder and alarm company and that both be liable for punitive fines in the event of false alarms. He also recommended making widely available information on the by-law and its implementation.

Following comments from Regional Chair Clark, Mr. Smith acknowledged that alarm companies would likely download the cost onto clients in the form of higher rates but argued if they are held financially accountable for the problem, there will be greater incentive for them to provide quality equipment and to properly train users.

Councillor Holmes wondered if the presenters had discussed with their community the prospect of paying higher rates to their alarm companies as a result of fees charged to them. Mr. Kline indicated members in their watch area were upset by the implementation of this by-law and many refused to register. The councillor wondered if staff had information on the ratio of break-ins at residences with alarms versus those without. Sergeant Ferguson did not have that information but indicated only about 13% of premises in the Region have alarm systems.

Roderick Macleod supported the comments of previous speakers. He thought the policy was poorly conceived and failed to address the problem of false alarms. He stated residents believe they are behaving responsibly when they install alarm systems. Mr. Macleod questioned the Board's commitment to community policing and noted the lack of consultation with residential owners in developing the policy. He believed the data to be incomplete. He felt the policy is offensive and unacceptable as it appears to be revenue driven and punitive in nature. He requested the Board rescind the policy and revisit the by-law in light of comments brought forward by the community.

Robert Wallace had difficulty with the statistics presented by the police department. He questioned why staff could not provide statistics on the false alarms generated by residential versus commercial users since there was information available on the number of residential versus commercial systems. He was upset by the statement that alarm owners should return their completed registration form and fee in order to ensure police response, stating this was perceived as a threat. Regarding the statement that officer safety is compromised by a lack of information when responding to a call, Mr. Wallace argued officer safety is compromised every time they respond to a possible crime. He believed the by-law discriminates against alarm owners. He thought there is a conflict of interest because the police train volunteers to deal with home security through community watch programs and then recommend home security systems to residents.

Donald S. Archibald stated most of his questions were covered by previous speakers. He indicated there have been very few problems with his alarm system in 10 years and believed the problem lies with unmonitored systems. He did not accept the principle of an annual registration fee, nor did he agree with having to disclose the content of his home. Mr. Archibald questioned the Board's ability to make and impose laws.

Regional Councillor Alex Cullen stated this policy is before the Board because Council had requested it. He noted 10 members of Council were in attendance and thought this demonstrated the level of interest in this issue. The councillor acknowledged the Police Services Board was doing the right thing in trying to address the problem of false alarms but argued this policy does not achieve its goal. He asked the Board to reconsider the policy in light of public outcry. He thought residents would more easily accept a one-time registration fee with more onus on charging those who perpetuate the problem. He stated making the registration a one-time fee would create the opportunity to work on a new policy to target the problem users.

Dawn Dannehl, ByWard Market BIA, acknowledged the importance of reducing false alarms. She indicated the BIA would prefer preventative measures be implemented such as user education, standardization for alarm companies and the requirement for alarm owners to use a monitoring company. She noted the lack of consultation with the business community, stating of the many BIAs in Ottawa-Carleton, none received notice prior to the by-law implementation.

Robert Baldock agreed with the comments of previous speakers. He indicated his home was broken into twice prior to installing an alarm system. He did not believe the by-law meets its goals. He felt fining for false alarms would be more palatable than an annual registration fee. Mr. Baldock did not believe a system where a security guard responds to alarms would be acceptable. He argued guards are not as well trained as police officers and they place their lives in danger when responding to such calls. He believed there was potential for industry regulation.

Mary Nash re-iterated home owners who have installed systems should be rewarded and not penalized. She expressed displeasure with the timing of the meeting because people are on holidays. She was disappointed with the lack of public consultation and believed the Police should charge a fee for every false alarm instead of an annual registration fee. She hoped the Board would rescind the by-law.

Hal Willis agreed with the points made by the previous speakers. He argued that the number of false alarms has decreased drastically for some companies; for one alarm company, 80% of their residential customers have never had a false alarm, yet they are all required to pay an annual registration fee. He believed it inequitable to charge people with alarms because they put the least demand on police services for break-ins.

Bob Mercier supported everything said by previous speakers on the issue of personal responsibility. On the matter of legislative powers, he maintained Ottawa-Carleton is not the only area with this problem, therefore the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board should look at working with other municipalities to lobby for changes in legislation. Mr. Mercier believed the Police Services Board needs to look at charging the alarm companies instead of the users. He reasoned those with good products and services will naturally survive and those with sub-standard equipment will be driven out of business. He agreed with some of the information requested on the registration form but argued some of it could help thieves target homes.

Ms. Swann was nervous about the police philosophy when reference was made to differential response. She indicated her Regional Councillor informed her that a change in provincial legislation had allowed the police to charge for some services. She felt this was a mistake as it could lead to two levels of police protection, one for the rich and one for the poor. Ms. Swann thought the policy was based on the belief that people who have alarm systems can afford to pay. She argued, many people have alarm systems because they feel vulnerable. She did not believe the policy would lead to a reduction in false alarms. She believed that false alarms should be investigated to determine the source and address it directly. Ms. Swann supported the idea of a requirement for alarm holders to use monitoring services. She stressed citizens always expect the police to respond as quickly as possible to calls, it is a reasonable expectation. In regard to the personal information requested on the registration form, the speaker wondered if knowing the content of a home would impact on police response time.

Bernie Mason supported the comments of previous speakers. He indicated he installed an alarm system to deter break-ins. He believed the policy was poorly presented to the public and input was not considered. Mr. Mason expressed surprise over the statistics presented on false alarms as he has never had one. He stressed alarm companies should be held accountable, at least in part, for false alarms as it is their equipment and they are supposed to train the users. He added companies should be required to register their installations with the police. He believed the police should charge for false alarms instead of an annual registration and feared the future would see the problem worse.

Bert Foulds emphasized the need to be more pro-active in dealing with this problem. He thought there should be standards for equipment, installation and monitoring, stating the result would be increased quality. Mr. Foulds believed such a system would be viable and could be implemented by 1999. In closing, he stressed home owners should be consulted.

Councillor Holmes questioned staff on the Region's ability to license companies. D. White stated this would mean putting in place a licensing scheme. He added at present licensing authority does exist but it resides with local municipalities. To grant that authority to the Board or to Regional Council would require either an amendment to the *Municipal Act* or to the *RMOC Act*.

Member Boudreau wondered about the possibility of a voluntary certification program in lieu of a licensing scheme. D. White thought it would be legally possible but raised concerns about the operational feasibility.

Mervyn Wells disagreed with many of the statistics presented by staff and with the estimated cost for responding to false alarms. He felt the by-law is unjust and unconstitutional. He questioned the need to pay for alarm registration when no one in surrounding areas is being charged such a fee. He thought the problem is being caused by sub-standard equipment and that standardization is the solution. He expressed a desire to see the police err on the side of public safety when it comes to responding to calls for service. He believed there should be fines for false alarms so those who are causing the problems are the ones to pay.

Christine Leadman, Westboro BIA felt the notification of this by-law was inadequate. She noted BIA's were not given an opportunity to comment on the policy. She felt it is an unfair tax to people who operate their systems properly and that the policy does not deal with the problem it is meant to address. In regard to the information requested on registration forms, Ms. Leadman believed it duplicates the information on file with monitoring companies. On the issue of withdrawal of service, she was distressed and hoped this was not the intent of the police. She questioned what would be done with the revenue generated by the by-law.

Councillor Holmes inquired whether BIA's would support fines for all false alarms. Ms. Leadman thought the BIAs would support a system where a user would get one free and be fined for subsequent false alarms.

Jane Berlin, Alta Vista Community Association felt that charging all alarm owners for problems created by a few is unreasonable and unjust. She believed the fact that there are more and more alarm systems being installed is indicative that people have lost faith in the police service and feel the need to take their own protection in hand.

Ivan Veliky expressed amazement in finding out about the policy. He did not believe the by-law would solve the problem. On the issue of withdrawal of police services as a consequence

of not registering, Mr. Veliky wondered about the consequences of such a policy. He felt the alarm companies should be responsible in situations where a user is renting equipment.

Roger Lewis felt the policy treats all false alarms the same. He indicated the industry distinguishes between false alarms and nuisance alarms and believed that if there is no distinction, there is no way of knowing where the problem lies.

W. R. Scharf hoped the attendance at the meeting would have an impact on the Police Services Board. He wondered what the fee would be next year and believed his property taxes covered police services. He viewed the policy as discrimination against homeowners with alarm systems. He stressed in his situation there is little danger of false alarms because of the monitoring system in place. He questioned the claim of better service with the amalgamation of Police Services, stating he felt there was a better police presence in his neighbourhood before amalgamation. He believed the police would be liable if they do not respond to calls for service.

Bob Swenson shared the views of previous presenters. He thought the by-law was discriminatory. He believed the real issue is the credibility of companies and the quality of equipment and that the solution is to regulate them.

Achille Ienzi questioned the statistics presented noting residences with unmonitored alarm systems were not addressed. He maintained the home owners who have returned their registrations have done so under the threat of withdrawal of service. Mr. Ienzi wondered what would happen if there was an alarm call at his residence as he had not returned his registration. Chair Vice emphasized that until the Board and Regional Council make a final decision regarding the by-law, the police will continue to respond to all calls.

Paul Laughton felt there was poor public participation in the implementation of the by-law. He was concerned about fire alarm systems that are wired with security systems and how this will impact on fire department response. He opposed the requirement to provide information on the contents of his home. Mr. Laughton agreed with past presenters who suggested the security companies be licensed. He believed the companies should be required to provide the necessary information to maintain the police database. In closing, Mr. Laughton indicated the police have been recommending security systems to home-owners and therefore, he felt betrayed. He viewed the by-law as a tax-grab and berated the Police Executive for bringing forward such a policy. Vice Chair clarified the Executive brought forward the by-law at the request of the Board and it was approved by both the Board and Regional Council.

Andre Frank indicated he is both a small business owner and a home owner. He thought it unreasonable that the registration for businesses would be double the cost of home system registration. He stressed alarm systems in businesses are not a luxury but a necessity. He believed the alarm companies are entirely responsible for this problem yet they are getting away

without penalty. He maintained the alarm companies should be licensed and regulated instead of the end-users carrying the burden.

Claude Potvin stated that as a recent home owner, he thought installing a security system would help the police in ensuring security for his home and family. He wondered if the Police had considered a certification program for monitoring stations. He was dismayed by the lack of information regarding monitored and unmonitored systems and their respective percentages of false alarms.

Ms. Elliot did not think the Board should feel reassured by the statistics that show a low percentage of complaints. She believed the attendance at the meeting was representative of the level of dissatisfaction. She expressed support for a system that would fine for all false alarms. She did not wish to pay for the mistakes of others. Ms. Elliot stated that until she had her security system installed, she always felt vulnerable. She was angered at having to pay for a service that she did not feel was adequate in the first place.

Regional Councillor Al Loney empathized with the Board's position. He indicated a lot of people have contacted their elected representatives regarding this issue, and he believed the statistics on complaints received were too low. He thought the reason there were not more people in attendance to oppose the by-law was the summer scheduling. He hoped the discussion would lead to legislation changes to enable the Region to monitor companies that provide the service.

Regional Chair Clark did not believe there would be a potential for cost-recovery with the implementation of a certification program therefore, the Board would have to consider the economics of implementing such a system. He indicated he had initially raised concerns about liability and believed the Police could not refuse to respond. On the issue of revenue generation, Mr. Clark maintained it is a fact that you can't provide a service without money. In regard to the database, he maintained it is useful and necessary to provide officers with information when responding to a call. He agreed the ideal solution would see the offenders pay, but argued that brings up the issue of the quality of the equipment. He supported a one-time registration and a fining scheme for alarm companies with faulty equipment. He expressed an interest in implementing a fee system for updating information on the database but did not believe this needed to be done on an annual basis.

Councillor Holmes pointed out this is one of the first by-laws the Regional Police Service has introduced. She believed one of the problems was public consultation, and requested staff bring forward a report outlining a process for public consultation for future by-laws. She emphasized the need for a database and for annual updates in light of the number of people who move in any given year. She proposed a number of motions on issues to be reviewed and brought forward as part of a subsequent report to be presented to the Board in November 1997.

She moved the following:

1. **That the Alarm System Review Report (to be submitted to the Board in November 1997) allow for optional private information regarding goods in the establishment other than goods which could place police officers in danger;**
2. **That the Alarm System Review Report provide information regarding the fining of alarm companies;**
3. **That the Alarm System Review Report include options for an annual updating of the data base with and without an annual fee;**
4. **That the Alarm System Review Report provide for a system of fines for all false alarms and for one free false alarm, taking into account the frequency of fines, who should pay, and the issue of tenants versus owners;**
5. **That the Alarm System Review Report provide information on the necessary legislative changes in order to be able to license alarm companies;**
6. **That the Alarm System Review Report be circulated to all business improvement associations, neighbourhood watch associations and community associations, and that a public meeting be held and advertised in the media to provide an opportunity for information to be presented by the police and input to be received;**
7. **That a report be prepared on a public participation process for future by-laws;**
8. **That no renewal fee be charged until the report has been dealt with.**

Member Boudreau largely agreed with Councillor Holmes' comments. She agreed that those who are causing the problems should be the ones to pay. She requested that the report to be brought forward examine ways of doing that in a cost-effective manner. She maintained it is not cost-effective if a bureaucracy has to be created to administer the policy.

Councillor Kreling recalled he supported the by-law when it was presented at Regional Council. He endorsed moving forward since the base is in place for the by-law. He was in favour of a one-time registration with a nominal fee for updating. He agreed with the need to implement a fining system so that those who create the problem are the ones to pay for it. He believed the companies should share some responsibilities, but cautioned that is not something easily implemented.

Member Baskerville agreed with the need for better public consultation in the future. He maintained the Police Service needs a policy on false alarms. He believed it necessary to have a

registration system but hoped the costs of false alarms could be recovered from those who generate them. He thought it is necessary to have some sort of penalty to serve as an incentive for the proper training and use of alarm systems. Mr. Baskerville supported a one-time registration to get the by-law launched and the database in place.

Vice Chair Bouwers agreed the generators of false alarms should be penalized. He believed most people would support a one-time registration.

Chair Vice agreed with much of the discussion but wished to make it clear that the by-law is still in place and registration will have to take place, although the Board will make efforts to amend the by-law for next year. He stressed the need to get the database started.

Moved by D. Holmes

1. **That the Alarm System Review Report (to be submitted to the Board in November 1997) allow for optional private information regarding goods in the establishment other than goods which could place police officers in danger;**

CARRIED

2. **That the Alarm System Review Report provide information regarding the fining of alarm companies;**

CARRIED

3. **That the Alarm System Review Report include options for an annual updating of the data base with and without an annual fee;**

CARRIED

4. **That the Alarm System Review Report provide for a system of fines for all false alarms and for one free false alarm, taking into account the frequency of fines, who should pay, and the issue of tenants versus owners;**

CARRIED

5. **That the Alarm System Review Report provide information on the necessary legislative changes in order to be able to license alarm companies;**

CARRIED

6. **That the Alarm System Review Report be circulated to all business improvement associations, neighbourhood watch associations and community associations,**

and that a public meeting be held and advertised in the media to provide an opportunity for information to be presented by the police and input to be received;

CARRIED

7. **That a report be prepared on a public participation process for future by-laws;**

CARRIED

8. **That no renewal fee be charged until the report has been dealt with.**

CARRIED

Councillor Legendre requested clarification on the issue of suspension of service to unregistered homes. P. Vice acknowledged the Police will not continue to respond indefinitely to homes with unregistered alarms, but confirmed they will continue to respond until a final decision is made and notice given on the final disposition of the by-law and policy.

4. **MEMORIAL SERVICE FUNDRAISING INITIATIVE**
- Deputy Chief's report dated 22 Jul 97

Moved by A. Bouwers

That the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board approve a request from the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Pipe Band for funding in the amount of \$500.00.

CARRIED as amended

5. **STATUS REPORT ON STREET AMBASSADOR PROGRAM**
- Chief's report dated 22 Jul 97

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

CARRIED

6. **REPORT ON REGIONAL COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE**
- Deputy Chief's report dated 21 Jul 97

Councillor Holmes thanked Deputy Chief Mackie for his work in establishing the first meeting to initiate this committee.

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

RECEIVED

7. REGULAR REPORT FROM THE CHIEF AND OPP INSPECTOR

- verbal update from Chief B. Ford and Inspector L. Beechey

Inspector Beechey circulated a year-end report on OPP activities in the Region. He extrapolated some of the highlights of the report. The OPP have a total complement of 157 employees working within the Region. The population in the area has increased by 4% and the calls for service are up by 15%. Break and enters have dropped by 28%, drug enforcement has increased by 78% and in general, violent crimes are down. Inspector Beechey stated the complement of staff has not increased since 1994. During this time, there has been a steady increase in population and calls for service. He thanked the officers and civilians for a job well done in light of the increased workload and uncertainty surrounding amalgamation.

Councillor Holmes wondered if the reduction in crime is reflective of the average across Canada. Inspector Beechey indicated the Region has seen a greater reduction than what is being seen across the country.

Chair Vice added his thanks to employees working under these difficult conditions.

Chief Ford indicated the Region had its sixth homicide of the year and a person has been arrested and charged in connection with the crime. Constable Ken Wilson did a walk in aid of Diabetes and received good publicity and support from federal representatives. Public service awareness tips and media releases were sent out on 19 June focusing on home protection and on child safety. A park in Cumberland has been named in honour of the late Constable Yves Richer.

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

RECEIVED

OTHER BUSINESS

IN CAMERA

That the Ottawa-Carleton Police Services Board move In Camera to discuss a personnel matter, in accordance with Section 35(4)(b) of the *Police Services Act*.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

W. Fedec
Secretary

P. Vice
Chair