



Ottawa Police Services Board

MINUTES 21

Monday, 25 July 2016, 4:00 p.m.

Champlain Room, 110 Laurier Avenue West, Ottawa

Present: Councillor E. El-Chantiry (Chair), J. Durrell (Vice Chair), C. Nicholson, L.A. Smallwood, Councillor T. Tierney, S. Valiquet

Regrets: Councillor J. Harder

CEREMONIAL ACTIVITIES / ANNOUNCEMENTS

a) Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services – Zone Advisors

Chair El-Chantiry welcomed Mr. David Tilley, Police Services Advisor, Zone 2, and Mr. Graham White, Police Services Advisor, North Zone, to the meeting.

CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

That the Ottawa Police Services Board confirm the Agenda of the 25 July 2016 meeting.

CARRIED

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

That the Ottawa Police Services Board confirm the Minutes of the 27 June 2016 meeting.

CARRIED

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

INQUIRIES

Member Smallwood made the following inquiries and requested that a response be provided at the next meeting:

1) Supplementary Training

To what extent does the police service offer supplementary training in addition to that which our members receive at the Ontario Police College and as a matter of policy, could additional emphasis be given to de-escalation techniques in circumstances where there is no immediate threat to officers or members of the public.

2) When and under what circumstances can our police service issue statements to the media that may not be accurate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS: REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE CHAIRS & MINUTES

- Human Resources Committee minutes – 08 June 2016
- Policy & Governance Committee minutes - 03 June 2016
- Policy & Governance Committee minutes - 20 June 2016

Chair El-Chantiry reported on the Human Resources Committee held on 08 June 2016 and Member Nicholson reported on the Policy & Governance Committee meetings held on June 03 and June 20, 2016.

That the Ottawa Police Services Board receive these reports for information.

RECEIVED

ITEMS OF BUSINESS

1. CHIEF'S VERBAL REPORT

Chief Bordeleau reported on the following items (*A copy of the Chief's verbal report is available online at ottawapoliceboard.ca*):

- Incident in Hintonburg
- Canada Run - Hells Angels
- Apprehension of US Fugitive
- Winthrop Private Homicide
- Gill Homicide Verdict
- Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police
- Supt. Uday Jaswal.

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

RECEIVED

2. BOARD COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS
Executive Director's report
-

That the Ottawa Police Services Board approve the appointments of L.A. Smallwood to the Finance & Audit Committee, and T. Tierney to the Complaints Committee.

CARRIED

3. CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF POLICE GOVERNANCE: NOTICE OF 2016 ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING & RESOLUTIONS
Executive Director's report
-

That the Ottawa Police Services Board receive for information the Notice of Annual General Meeting and the Resolutions to be considered at the 2016 Canadian Association of Police Governance Annual Conference.

RECEIVED

4. SERVICE INITIATIVE QUARTERLY UPDATE
Chief's report
-

Deputy Chief Skinner was accompanied by A/Superintendent M. Ford, A/Inspector R. Drummond and Ms. J. Wright, Project Manager to present the Service Initiative (SI) update. *(A copy of presentation will be kept on file with the Board's Executive Director.)*

After the presentation, the following individuals addressed the Board:

[Councillor K. Egli](#), Ward 9, Knoxdale-Merivale - *(A copy of the submission is attached.)*

Responding to comments, D/C Skinner explained that community policing is at the heart of the way the OPS does business and that is not going to change. The fact that one person is not assigned to a community police office is not going to change the ability to respond. The Ottawa Police Strategic Operations Centre (OPSOC) will provide the ability to be more strategic about realigning and provide a gateway for information that comes from the community.

D/C Skinner indicated that the Councillor's suggestion to have the Board involved in the process of selecting individuals for the advisory committee and developing the terms of reference would not be a problem. The composition of the committee will be very diverse as it must represent urban, suburban, and rural areas as well as neighbourhood associations and BIAs. The composition may change as the issues change.

The Deputy Chief further explained that community policing will be similarly modeled to school resource officers. The city is divided into 108 neighbourhoods that have been brought together into sectors. Each sector will have a team of officers from both a front line and a community safety service perspective. Officers will be responding in a team environment with a community police officer who is responsible for the neighbourhood either in a primary or secondary role based on the needs of the community.

Following the presentation and discussion, Member Valiquet proposed the following which the Board endorsed as a direction to staff:

That the Board be involved in developing and approving the terms of reference for the Service Initiative Advisory Committee and in the selection process and approval of the advisory committee members.

[Ms. C. Parrott](#), Hintonburg Community Association – *(A copy of the submission is attached.)*

[Mr. Awad Loubani](#), Co-Chair, COMPAC – *(A copy of the submission is attached.)*

[Ms. L. Marleau](#), Crime Prevention Vanier – *(A copy of the submission is attached.)*

After hearing from the public delegations a discussion ensued and points of clarification were made.

Member Nicholson noted that he has heard from numerous community members who feel these changes are counter intuitive. He emphasized one key area that will require a measurement tool will be the building of relationships and trust within the community. He thinks the program evaluation framework needs to be developed quickly, with the advisory committee weighing in. He believes it's vital to have a tool that will quickly measure successes and provide direction for corrective action.

Chair El-Chantiry thanked D/C Skinner for championing this workload and applauded the changes that have been made after hearing from members of the public. The Board needs to be kept up to date on the progress being made.

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

RECEIVED

5. REPORT ON 2016-2018 BUSINESS PLAN
Chief's report
-

That the Ottawa Police Services Board receive this report and online version for information.

RECEIVED

6. FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT: SECOND QUARTER 2016
Chief's report
-

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

RECEIVED

7. PERFORMANCE REPORT: SECOND QUARTER 2016
Chief's report

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

RECEIVED

8. WORKFORCE MANAGEMENT REPORT: SECOND QUARTER 2016
Chief's report

That the Ottawa Police Services Board:

1. **Approve the appointment of the sworn officers identified in Document B; and**
2. **Receive this report for information.**

CARRIED

RECEIVED

9. COMPLAINTS REPORT, PART V – *POLICE SERVICES ACT*: SECOND
QUARTER 2016
Chief's report

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

RECEIVED

10. LEGAL SERVICES STATUS REPORT: SECOND QUARTER 2016
Board Solicitor's report

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

RECEIVED

11. BOARD MONITORING REQUIREMENTS STATUS REPORT: SECOND
QUARTER 2016

Chief's report

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

RECEIVED

12. OUTSTANDING BOARD INQUIRIES & MOTIONS: JULY 2016
Executive Director's report
-

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

RECEIVED

13. LETTERS OF COMMENDATION
Chief's report
-

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

RECEIVED

OTHER BUSINESS

CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO MOVE IN CAMERA

Moved by L. A. Smallwood

That the Ottawa Police Services Board adjourn the public portion of its meeting to move In Camera to discuss confidential items pertaining to legal and personnel matters, in accordance with Section 35(4)(b) of the *Police Services Act*.

CARRIED

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

W. Fedec
Executive Director

E. El-Chantiry
Chair

DRAFT

Document 1 – Councillor K. Egli

- 1) Thank you for the opportunity to speak this afternoon. I have a lot of respect for the job that our police do and appreciate the current budgetary and efficiency issues.
- 2) However, I came tonight with a message from my residents. I have read the report, attended several consultations, met with Deputy Chief Skinner and heard extensively from my residents on the issue of community police officers.
- 3) My residents are very happy with the current community policing model. They see the proposed changes as a significant misstep on behalf of the department.
- 4) The report recommends a one third reduction in the number of officers, and a more general deployment model to be put in their place.
- 5) If I read the report correctly, the total savings projected are five million dollars over three years. How much of this is attributed to community police officer changes is not clear.
- 6) It is ok to float ideas for cost savings but you also should respond to community concerns and feedback about these ideas.
- 7) Here are some samples of what my community has said to me: "In our view, the current model supports the needs of our neighbourhood of 1,850 households. Further on the proposed changes say: 'From an administrative point of view, this is maybe desirable. From a neighbourhood point of view, this statement does not acknowledge the value of permanence and relationships offered/achieved through the community policing model.'"
- 8) Another community states: "We are concerned that the police are switching from a proactive/preventative crime initiative to the reactive approach."
- 9) In other words, I am going to suggest that this may be a pennywise but pound foolish proposal.
- 10) In addition to the community concern, based on some research I have done, this approach is not necessarily in sync with other jurisdictions' best practices. For example, in Hamilton, each ward is given a specific officer who is directly and deeply involved with the community.
- 11) Further, please be aware that I believe the 'single point of contact' referenced in the report is not what the community means. The Ottawa Police Service believes it is a supervisory officer (sergeant) that will deploy resources as

he/she sees fit. The community, based on the consultations that I attended, means the community police officer.

- 12) I understand this report is for information purposes and decisions have already been made. But let me stress that it is difficult to measure the good that community police officers do but, and as I say it I hope that I am wrong, it will be easier to see the negative impacts that this community policing void will create.
- 13) I urge the Board to find a way to revisit this decision. Failing this, I would urge you to monitor the effects of these proposed changes closely. An advisory committee is proposed and this may be a way to stay on top of this potentially bad decision.
- 14) I believe that great care must be taken in choosing this advisory committee. It should be representative of our diverse communities and stakeholders. Rural, urban, and suburban representatives should be appointed. Finally, might I suggest that, as part of your oversight responsibility, the Police Services Board have a role in choosing the members of the advisory committee.

Document 2



COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC ☐ ASSOCIATION COMMUNAUTAIRE INC
1064 RUE WELLINGTON ST

☐ OTTAWA, ONTARIO

www.hintonburg.com

July 25, 2016

Chair Eli-El-Chantiry
Members of Police Services Board

On behalf of the Hintonburg Community Association we are happy to see some of the assurances provided in the update report today - specifically:

- that all communities will have access to a CPO
- there will be one point of contact; the officer will be familiar with the neighbourhood's needs; that they will build a trusting relationship. We hope this implies that officers will be that one point of contact for at least 2 years at a time.

We are, however, still anxious to see what this means to our individual communities and we hope to have continuing dialogue on this.

We also ask to have some input on the criteria for deciding which CPCs stay and which go – we think we have an efficient, effective model at the Wellington CPC that works very well and could be easily copied in other areas of the City.

We do have some concerns about Demand Management. Some online reporting is appropriate but if it is too tedious people will not report and you will lose that useful information that your Control Centre needs to adequately analyse and direct resources. For 25 years we have encouraged residents to Report, Report, Report. Please make it easier not harder. Please be very clear on when to call just as you have with the "Make the Right Call" program and provide the option for a report over the phone – not everyone can or will report online.

I tried to see what the reporting was like for a minor incident that happened to an elderly neighbour. After 5 pages I was pretty frustrated.

Already people are being TOLD to report online – Not Offered a Choice of a verbal

report or online. Recently a 911 call was made about a violent suspect smashing car windows with a golf club. Police attended but did not apprehend him. Complainants were told by officers at the scene to file an on-line report. They were already distraught and filing an online report that will not be looked at for 24 hours or more did nothing to help their feeling of safety.

In the future you plan to add drug complaints to the online reporting – we have concerns about this and the timeliness of reading the reports and any action. You need to clearly articulate when people need to call and when to file on line.

We are encouraged to see that you will implement ongoing evaluation and community engagement. Some of these changes are major and will require adjustment and changes after implementation.

Please continue to work with us your community partners.

Sincerely

Cheryl Parrott and Wayne Rodney
Security Committee

Document 3 – COMPAC

A. General comments

COMPAC community members understand that the Ottawa Police Service needs to develop a new model for deployment in order to meet the challenges of a limited budget and expanding demands on police services. However, COMPAC strongly recommends that in this process community policing be strengthened and made to be more efficient and effective.

B. Community Policing Officers

In our opinion, embedding the Community Police Officers (CPOs) in the new frontline deployment structure is regressive measure as far as community policing has been a solid basis for building community trust in OPS. The following are aspects of community policing that are important for COMPAC community members and that should be made more efficient and effective in the new deployment model and to mitigate the risk of them being eliminated or at best minimized:

1. CPOs have built strong enough relationships so community members feel safer to report incidents to police.
2. CPOs have been focusing on building relationships building and trust building not just enforcement.
3. CPOs have been interacting with many members of a community help the police members have opportunity to understand the complexity of situations where why individuals may become criminalized (no longer just seeing people as “Bad Guys”). This interaction helps Police members get to really know the intricacies understand the inner workings of their communities which is important for both community-building and crime prevention.
4. CPOs have been working with local service providers to support social and community development initiatives that target the risk factors associated with crime and victimization.
5. CPOs provide formal and informal public education to community members about everything including police procedure, “Make the Right Call”, Partner Assault, Elder Abuse, Youth Internet Safety, etc.
6. CPOs use “soft skills” like non-violent communication, conflict resolution, mediation to address community concerns.

7. CPOs follow up with individuals and communities impacted by criminal incidents in order to provide updates and offer supports (i.e. Victim Services).
8. CPOs provide positive role models of police which encourages more community members to consider policing as a career.
9. CPOs interact with public in a “casual”, accessible, and less time-constrained manner, which allows for more easy relationship building and trust building.
10. Presence of CPOs in community helps to reduce the fear of retaliation felt by those who have reported criminal activity to police
11. Police community engagement improves community’s image of policing (cited as reason why one member joined COMPAC and another became interested in becoming a police officer)

C. Impact of New Deployment Model on Community Policing

1. COMPAC Community members welcome the suggestion made at community consultations that all OPS Patrol officers will now receive the same level of training as Community/Neighbourhood Police officers so that they become more competent and empathetic in their interactions with the public and more able to take on the functions of Community/Neighbourhood police in areas outside of the “108 Priority Neighbourhoods” identified. However, COMPAC community members are concerned that with the loss of specialized community police centres and community police officers, there will be fewer opportunities for the type of casual interactions with police officers which require time but are necessary for relationship building and trust-building between police and community.
2. COMPAC wants to see the positions of School Resource Officers (SROs) and CPOs maintained and improved through focused community consultations and partnerships aimed at ensuring these positions are more efficient and effective for both police and the communities they serve.
3. COMPAC also is concerned that the new deployment model might affect the police’s ability to be culturally competent when engaging with indigenous (First Nations, Metis, Inuit), racialized, and religious minority communities. COMPAC community members have often worked with police officers from various units to do culturally competent presentations within their respective communities. For example, arranging for a Haitian Canadian police officer to deliver a presentation on the police complaints process to members of the Haitian community, or a Sikh police officer to deliver a presentation on Elder Fraud in Punjabi to Sikh seniors, or a Somali police officer to delivering a presentation on reporting crime to OPS for a group of Somali youth.

These particular officers were not in positions at the time where any of this was part of their mandate, but their supervisor's allowed them to participate in these important activities within their respective communities. COMPAC community members hope that officers will still be free to do community engagement work that may not be within their assigned job description but which is critical for relationship building and trust building with indigenous, racialized, and religious minority communities. This work should be seen as important police work and not something frivolous, dispensable, or "soft".

4. COMPAC community members are also concerned about the impact of the new deployment model on police morale. Poor police morale can have a negative impact on community-police relations. COMPAC community members hope that the SI is prioritizing boosting police morale as crucial to making the OPS more efficient and effective.

D. Concerns with SI Community Consultation Process

1. OPS did not present the current model of deployment alongside the new model proposed so consultation participants were unable to assess whether this new model was more cost-effective and efficient than the current model. Even to date, it is very difficult to understand the effects of the proposed changes as there was little information on the current method of deployment vs the proposed method of deployment. How can we truly judge what is here and the changes proposed if we don't know exactly what is changing?
2. Although making every police member a CPO is a noble objective, the concern is that responding to calls for service will take priority over the community policing, i.e., connecting and building long-term relationships, knowing the key players in communities, attending community meetings. The new SI doesn't address that, especially the 'how'.
3. Consultation process seemed rushed. Consultations COMPAC Community members attended did not have many indigenous (First Nations, Metis, Inuit) or racialized community members present. Opportunities for future community consultations on more specific aspects of community policing were not proposed at the consultation. Accordingly, there should have been more consultations across the city over a longer period of time.
4. Consultation participants felt that they were presented with a "done deal" which was going to happen whether they approved of it or not.
5. Concern that community members' opposition to the proposed changes was not properly recorded by facilitators.

6. Lack of representation at consultations of residents of the “108 Priority Neighbourhoods” identified by D/C Skinner; hearing from service providers who work in these neighbourhoods is not the same as hearing directly from residents.
 7. Unclear to consultation participants how their feedback will be used and what the next steps in the implementation of the new deployment model are.
- E. Recommendations for the Service Initiative Team Moving Forward
1. SI should emulate the solution used by the Traffic Stop Team by creating an advisory committee consisting of 5-6 OPS members and 4-5 COMPAC members to review on periodic basis the progress of the SI project.
 2. OPS should work with COMPAC and community health and resource centres to conduct consultations within the 108 priority neighbourhoods to determine the objectives of community policing within these areas in order to make it more efficient and effective for both the police and these communities.
 3. Efforts need to be made to ensure that police engagement in priority neighbourhoods are aimed at trust-building and relationship-building so communities do not feel targeted, stigmatized, or over-policed.
 4. Specific focus groups should be organized with indigenous and racialized particularly those new to Ottawa (i.e. Inuit community) or new to Canada (immigrants and refugees), with the support of COMPAC community members and service providers, in order to get their feedback on the best ways to ensure that the new deployment model's approach to community policing addresses their needs efficiently and effectively.
 5. The SI Team should make regular presentations to COMPAC where SI team members ask for COMPAC community members' advice on how to effectively and efficiently engage, consult, and communicate with their respective communities about the SI.

Document 4 – Crime Prevention Vanier

- I thanked the OPS, specifically DC Jill Skinner and her team, for how well the public consultations were presented, for preparing an outcome document (as requested by participants), and for continuing to involve key stakeholders moving forward. I found the document comprehensive and reflective of what I heard at the two consultations I attended.
- The SI Update provided more clarity than what was previously available - though there is still some aspects that require clarification such as the criteria that will be used to determine 'high priority areas' and the selection process for the 'community advisory committee'.
- I agreed with the concerns mentioned by previous presenters that the SI appears to be more reactive to crime than proactive (crime prevention) and that residents are not apt to report online or by phone suspicious behaviours, prostitution-related activities, problem addresses, drug-related activities - where there is no actual crime witnessed or committed.
- I reiterated the importance of Community Police Officers (CPOs) and having 'one point of contact' - which I view as one and the same. CPOs allow for a connectivity, continuity, and trust building between residents and the OPS; CPOs attend community meetings and events; a 'single point of contact' or CPO understands the neighbourhood, gathers intelligence not reflected in online/telephone reporting (data), reports to the community on issues related to criminal activity and new crime trends, OPS initiatives/tools/events; feedback or updates on concerns raised at previous meetings; etc.
- I appreciated the intent to remove silos within OPS. In Vanier, the CPO is not informed that a crime has been reported to OPS so, in effect, a resident needs to report a concern twice - once via online/telephone & once to our CPO in the event that he/she may want to follow-up. Making information more readily available to CPOs would be a great benefit.
- I appreciated the focus on road safety and traffic enforcement and urged the OPS to ensure that sufficient resources are allocated to what is acknowledged as the #1 safety concern of Ottawa residents.
- I was happy to read that the SI will increase the presence of uniformed officers and urged the OPS to bring more foot patrol on Vanier's main streets.
- I advocated for crime trend data specific to communities as oppose to by Ward (as is currently available) or by the newly defined OPS "sectors". Community groups and CPOs need crime trend stats that properly reflect the happenings in

the neighbourhood so that we may put in place safeguards and tailor our crime prevention approach accordingly.

- I wholeheartedly endorsed the intent of the OPS to implement 'cross-over/knowledge transfer' from one officer to another and for involving the community in the training of a new CPO. I gave the example of our CPO leaving with less than a week's notice and the position remaining vacant for 3 months.
- I reiterated the importance of the CPO in terms of OPS volunteer recruitment & training, the Neighbourhood Watch Program, CPTED audits and training, and the Multi-Stakeholders' Approach to Problem Addresses.
- I cautioned the PSB on the use of the term 'High Priority Area' as to not inadvertently reinforce the current stigma of some 'vulnerable' communities - particularly when using the term with the media given that it is often the culprit of stigmatizing areas it deems to be 'crime prone'.
- Given the 'push' to use online reporting (and using that information to realign OPS priorities), I suggested that the OPS online tool be reviewed to make it shorter & more user friendly.
- And lastly, I encouraged OPS to market/promote their new way of doing business to that it is well understood by residents.

DRAFT