



## Ottawa Police Services Board

### Minutes 45

Monday, 28 May, 2018, 4:00 PM

Champlain Room 110 Laurier Ave. West

Krista Ferraro, Executive Director

(613) 580-2424, ext 21618

Krista.Ferraro@ottawa.ca

---

**Present:** Councillor E. El-Chantiry (Chair), L.A. Smallwood, (Vice Chair), A. Blaustein, Councillor A. Hubley, C. Nicholson

**Regrets:** Councillor T. Tierney, S. Valiquet

#### CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA

---

**That the Ottawa Police Services Board confirm the Agenda of the 28 May 2018 meeting.**

CARRIED

#### CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Minutes of 23 April 2018 meeting

---

**That the Ottawa Police Services Board confirm the Minutes of the 23 April 2018 meeting.**

CARRIED

## DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS: REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE CHAIRS & MINUTES

Human Resources Committee – Draft Minutes of 7 May 2018

Finance and Audit Committee - Draft Minutes of 7 May 2018

Complaints Committee – Draft Minutes of 16 May 2018

---

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

CARRIED

## 1. CHIEF'S VERBAL REPORT

---

Chief Bordeleau reported on the following items: Homicides, Tamarack Marathon, ByWard Market and Downtown Rideau, Cst. T. Gill, Police Week 2018, Fentanyl, Diversity Audit; Graybridge Malkam, Canada Road Safety Week and DC J. Skinner. *(A copy of the Chief's verbal report is available [online](#).)*

The rollout for Bike Patrol has already begun. Members are going through their requalification / recertification training and new members are being trained.

The deadline for the Diversity Audit is January 2019. An update presentation will be made at the June meeting.

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

RECEIVED

## 2. BYWARD MARKET STREET AMBASSADOR PROGRAM – 2017 ANNUAL REPORT AND 2018 FUNDING

Chief's report

Presentation

---

Ms. J. Jennings, Executive Director, Byward Market BIA, spoke about the training the ambassadors go through, which will now include mental health training. She also discussed the recent restructuring of the program that has resulted in the Byward Market BIA being 100% responsible for the day-to-day operations, supervision and scheduling of the Ambassadors.

**That the Ottawa Police Services Board continue to endorse the Street Ambassador program and approve the release of a \$10,000.00 contribution to the ByWard Market Business Improvement Area for operation of the program in 2018.**

CARRIED

3. **BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB OF OTTAWA: 2017 POLICE YOUTH CENTRE REPORT**

Presentation

---

Ms. C. Mooney, Executive Director, Boys and Girls Club of Ottawa, drew the Board's attention to highlights of the progress they have made in the renovation of their new Club House. *(A copy of the presentation is kept on file with the Board's Executive Director.)*

**That the Ottawa Police Services Board:**

- 1) **Authorize the transfer of \$50,000 to the Boys and Girls Club of Ottawa as approved in the 2018 Budget.**

CARRIED

- 2) **That the Ottawa Police Services Board receive this presentation for information.**

RECEIVED

4. **POLICE OFFICERS SCHOLARSHIP AND CHARITABLE FUND**

Executive Director's report

---

**That the Ottawa Police Services Board:**

- 1) **Forego its annual, \$7,000 capital contribution to the Police Officers Scholarship and Charitable Fund for 2018/2019 however remain a party to the fund with the Ottawa Police Association and continue the administration of individual scholarships to eligible children of permanent and retired members of the Ottawa Police Service;**
- 2) **Revisit future contributions in 2019, as recommended by the Finance**

**and Audit Committee.**

CARRIED

5. CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF POLICE GOVERNANCE ANNUAL CONFERENCE:  
ATTENDANCE AND SPONSORSHIP

Executive Director's report

---

**That the Ottawa Police Services Board approve:**

- 1. The attendance of Vice Chair Smallwood, Member Blaustein at the 2018 Canadian Association of Police Governance Conference being held in Winnipeg, Manitoba from 9 – 11 August 2018.**
- 2. A \$1,500 Bronze sponsorship for the Canadian Association of Police Governance's 2018 Annual Conference.**

CARRIED

6. RENEWAL OF MICROSOFT ENTERPRISE AGREEMENT

Chief's report

---

A question was raised as to why the taxes are non-refundable. It was clarified that a significant portion of the HST paid by the OPS is refunded; amount paid in HST is 1.6%, which is consistent with what the City pays.

**That the Ottawa Police Services Board approve the renewal of a Microsoft Enterprise Agreement through Microsoft for a three year term from 01 April 2018 to 31 March 2021 at an approximate three year cost of \$2,641,919.50, including non-refundable taxes.**

CARRIED

7. RENEWAL OF OC TRANSPO SPECIAL CONSTABLE PROGRAM

Chief's report

---

**That the Ottawa Police Services Board approve the continuation of the OC**

---

**Transpo Special Constable Program for a term of five years.**

CARRIED

8. BACKGROUND CHECKS

Presentation

---

Director General Frazer and Mr. J. Letourneau updated the Board on the status of Background Checks and the fee structure that will be considered. *(A copy of the presentation is kept on file with the Board's Executive Director.)*

It was clarified that overhead costs are being taken into account in the updated fee structure, which includes a significant staffing component as well as IT infrastructure that drives the direct costs related to the checks. A request was made to have more detail be provided pertaining to the numbers being proposed for overhead costs.

In terms of the costing options, a request was made to have an option added that reduces the cost of the easily processed checks and increases the cost of the more time consuming checks.

The private sector/outsourcing pricing is identified within the report. It is possible for third parties to complete Level 1 checks only. There are police services who have taken this on as a business. If the OPS were to consider this option they would have to reconsider the size of their lobby at Queensview as walk-in business is limited due to fire restrictions.

OPS volume is mainly within the Level 2 and 3 checks. It was suggested that this information be available during the public consultations as some might suggest it is available at a lower cost.

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

RECEIVED

9. CONDUCTED ENERGY WEAPON EXPANSION PROGRAM

Chief's report

Presentation

---

The Board received a presentation from DG Frazer, Supt. S. Hartley and Supt. M. Ford. Ms. Frazer apologized for the lateness of the report and the amendments to the recommendations as staff was negotiating until the final moments. *(A copy of the presentation is kept on file with the Board's Executive Director.)*

**Ms. H. Stecher**, wished to voice her concerns to the Board regarding CEWs. She explained that she is not anti-police in any way, but she is terrified by this plan as an individual with multiple disabilities. She has lost a portion of her hearing. The plan accounts for mental health issues but not individuals who cannot hear.

The Vice Chair was concerned that this expansion would not take into account de-escalation training however he is pleased with the report and is impressed with the statistics. The Chief added that the province is currently working on a new framework for use of force that will include de-escalation. This information will be accessible later this year through the Province.

**That the Board approve:**

1. **An amendment to the Board's Use of Force Policy AL-012 to replace the language in section iii as follows; The Chief of Police will be authorized to: Issue a conducted energy weapon (CEW) to all Sworn police officers.**
2. **The purchase of 800 CEWs from M.D. Charlton Co. Ltd. of \$449,627.20 (exclusive of taxes) for the Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the expansion plan. (This will be the first of five annual payments.)**

CARRIED as amended

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

RECEIVED as amended

10. QUALITY ASSURANCE ANNUAL REPORT 2017 (COMPLIANCE WITH MINISTRY STANDARDS)

Chief's report

---

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

---

RECEIVED

11. SERVICE INITIATIVE CLOSE OUT REPORT

Chief's report

---

The Chief acknowledged all the hard work done by DC J. Skinner and her team. *(A copy of the presentation is kept on file with the Board's Executive Director.)*

[Ms. L. Marleau, Crime Prevention Vanier](#)

[Ms. C. Parrott, Security Committee](#)

In response to the presenters' comments about educating the public on reporting, Supt. M. Ford explained that more information will be coming forward in the evaluation process. In the interim, officers will be working with community members to address reporting clarifications and expectations.

DC Skinner explained that online reporting continues to evolve. They are attempting to simplify some of the processes according to incident type. Unless staff know about the challenges the public are facing they cannot be worked out. The reporting process must be made as easy as possible for the community to report something.

[Mr. T. Harris, Federation of Citizens of Ottawa](#)

Chair El-Chantiry explained that Board Member Valiquet participated in CICAG and has plans to reach out to other community members to discuss the next steps.

The Community Safety Services Framework introduced the concept of Formalized Community Networks (FCNs) that provide a focused approach for Community Police Officers (CPOs) to enhance existing relationships with communities. The FCN has a process that allows crime trending tracking. Crime analysts provide information on the crime trends that are occurring and decisions are based on complexity and the prioritization of resources.

Referencing page 14 of the presentation and the Strategic Review and White Paper completed on Civilianization and Outsourcing of Police Services, D/C Skinner noted that the paper did not come to the Board. It was a white paper to inform decision makers within the police service about the opportunities that are available for outsourcing. Bill 175 gives the OPS an impetus to resurrect the paper and make sure that decision makers have the knowledge and are

prepared to use it as necessary. A request was made to have this information included as part of the response to the outstanding inquiry on outsourcing.

The Continuous Improvement Office is the plan for the future and will have to be included in the 2019 Budget. An assessment evaluation of the changes that have taken place will be conducted.

Members of CICAG were surveyed and most were satisfied with the outcome. The community advisory group is essential, however, roles and responsibilities must be understood by everyone. The group attempted to be all things to anyone. Information must be available about what the organization looks like. In future the process must be more focused.

A concern was raised about the rotation of officers patrolling under the new mode. It was suggested that it makes it difficult for officers to better understand the area and build relationships and trust with those who live and work there. D/C Skinner explained that there are still community officers in Centretown that have bikes and walk the beat. The difference now is that it is a service delivery method. Members of the front line, who are working in lower town on patrol, work all of their shifts in that zone. It may not be daily, but it is on their scheduled shifts.

There have been numerous discussions about monitoring the success of the program. Due to the number of people trying to understand the new processes, the requirement is on the leaders of the organization to continue to monitor and make changes for the good of the organization. Members will be happier when they are more engaged in their work; there is a need to invigorate this with strong communications down the chain of command.

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

RECEIVED

12. PERFORMANCE REPORT: FIRST QUARTER 2018

Chief's report

---

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

RECEIVED

13. FINANCIAL STATUS REPORT: 1ST QUARTER 2018



Chief's report

---

Referencing the 2018 First Quarter Financial Report, Financial Accounts, Compensation is showing 42.4% spent to date. It was explained that the numbers are associated with retirement costs, which are front loaded at the beginning of each year.

The Chair wondered if there was an opportunity to do a similar assessment on the paid duty program to ensure it is truly priced for full cost recovery. It was suggested that the process used for background checks be replicated with paid duties and reported back to the Board. It would be a good exercise to ensure all costs are being recovered and not subsidized in any way. The Director General indicated the report would be presented at the next Finance and Audit Committee meeting on 12 September 2018.

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

RECEIVED

14. WORKFORCE MANAGEMENT REPORT: FIRST QUARTER 2018

Chief's report

---

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

RECEIVED

15. OUTSTANDING BOARD INQUIRIES & MOTIONS: MAY 2018

Executive Director's report

---

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

RECEIVED

16. 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 6:40 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Krista Ferraro  
Executive Director

\_\_\_\_\_  
E. El-Chantiry  
Chair

. K.

### **Document 1 – Lucie Marleau, Crime Prevention Vanier**

- Thank you for the opportunity to provide my comments on the Service Initiative Implementation Community Advisory Group.
- My name is Lucie Marleau. I'm the founder of Crime Prevention Vanier and the NWProgram Volunteer Coordinator for Vanier.
- My main motivation for participating if the CAG was to advocate for neighbourhood policing – and please notice that I use 'neighbourhood' as oppose to 'community' policing given that OPS has a very broad definition of 'community' - which includes health and hospital services, and the LGBTQ and Islamic groups, CDF and other interest groups. Areas who's OPS needs differ from neighbourhoods.
- Being a member of CAG was quite an investment of my volunteer time! - dozens upon dozens of hours for sure.
- It's worth noting that the majority of the members of the CAG were paid staff. Those of us representing neighbourhoods were volunteers.
- In retrospect, and should OPS undertake a similar exercise in the future, I would strongly recommend that the consultations start earlier and be divided into like-minded groups that require similar services from OPS.
- I'm slightly ashamed to say that 90% of the content of 1.5 yrs of meetings was way beyond my ability to comprehend – let alone share what I was hearing with my fellow crime fighters in Vanier.
- A lesson learned I'd suggest moving forward is in the future, ensure that the information provided is digestible and easily transferable to the broader community. Had someone asked me to summarize a meeting, I would not have been able to.
- I read the report very carefully and I believe there is a false statement on p. 5 "*SIICAG members believed their participation was...instrumental...*". I think it's presumptuous to state what members 'believed' & I do not recall being asked that question so I challenge that assertion. As well, I do not recall feeling like CAG made "*significant contributions to selecting Overbrook and Lowertown to implement the first Formalized Community Networks neighbourhoods*" as indicated on p. 6.
- As I stated, my main objective in participating was to look out for the interests of neighbourhood policing and to that end, there were some success:
  - The extension of tenure durations for Community Police Officers;

- the transfer of knowledge between the departing CPOfficer and his/her replacement – though this last gain is NOT mentioned in the SI Close Out Report.
- And the Formalized Community Network or FCN
- Being a safety and crime prevention advocate in Vanier, I was particularly keen to be involved in the FCN but we were not consulted on what it would entail and how it would be implemented. I think I would have been a useful contributor to its development and roll-out plan.
- I have one uneasy feeling about the FCN. I find it somewhat disingenuous of the OPS to implement this project after the SI resulted in the elimination of our Neighbourhood Officer positions and 5 of the 15 CPOfficer positions which meant the expansion of the catchment area of the remaining 10 CPOfficers. In the case of Vanier, our CPO took on an additional 3 neighbourhoods. It feels to me like OPS in transferring some of the responsibility of neighbourhood policing to the residents to do for themselves – though I have no doubt that OPS views this as ‘pro-active’ policing.
- If you refer to the Engagement and Planning Framework of the FCN, it speaks of establishing neighbourhood profiles, crime data, identifying stakeholders, engagement plan, roles/responsibilities, Terms of Reference, objectives, reporting & tracking, joint action plan, and monitoring to name a few items in the FCN.
- That is a lot for a community to commit to and very procedural which is not always a good fit to the more organic way neighbourhoods implement community safety projects.
- To the best of my understanding, there is no funding or additional resources allocated to neighbourhoods to effectively undertake such a project.
- I reiterate my concerns that OPS is somehow trying to ‘arm’ neighbourhoods to do its own policing as a result of OPS’s decision to reduce its support of neighbourhood policing.
- At the very least, the FCN should have been developed & implemented BEFORE the elimination of the CPO positions & new OPS service delivery model so that the FCN had been implemented, improved, refined, and rolled out to neighbourhoods thereby preparing them for the advent of the SI.
- The online reporting tools is not working well and I am still hearing from residents that their verbal reports to 236-1222 are not being taken and they are being told that their reports MUST be reported on-line. This despite me being told repeatedly by

OPS (and informing members of the NWProgram) that verbal calls will be taken – as I was told at SIICAG meetings & at the recent Crime Prevention Ottawa Speakers Series on Reporting. The latest example: A resident witnessed a drug exchange ‘live’ in the Burger King parking lot and called OPS. The OPS would NOT take the report on the phone. Reporting a ‘live’ crime online is ridiculous!

- The online tools does not allow for anonymous reporting so I know of many who are reporting to Crime Stoppers instead – reporting is also much simpler using the CSO process.
- Lastly, I would like to give credit to the GAC process for connecting me with other neighbourhoods – meaning Hintonburg and Lowertown - when it might not have happened otherwise. I’m happy to consider Cheryl and Thierry my comrades-in-arm and for that, I am grateful.
- Thank you.

DRAFT

**Document 2 - Cheryl Parrot, Security Committee**



COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC • ASSOCIATION COMMUNAUTAIRE INC  
1064 RUE WELLINGTON ST • OTTAWA, ONTARIO, K1Y 2Y3  
[www.hintonburg.com](http://www.hintonburg.com)

May 28, 2018

Chair El-Chantiry

Members Police Services Board

Service Initiative

The Hintonburg Community Association brought forward concerns about the Service Initiative 2 years ago Apr. 25, 2016 and again Apr 23, 2018. We have continuing concerns about the SI changes and the lack of back-up for the CPOs and the follow-up on community issues. So far the “Demand For Service” solution to disbanding the Neighbourhood Officers has not worked for us.

I sat on the SI Implementation Advisory Group since Oct 2016 and attended all but 2 meetings. It was a somewhat painful process. An issue for me was lack of time, especially at the beginning, to ask questions so that I clearly understood the many new processes. Questioning would be cut off for lack of time and presenters had no or little time at the end of the meeting to answer more in depth questions.

The way that Hintonburg worked so effectively with OPS in the past was by understanding the system – who to call for what and how to ask for help within your structure. Understanding terminology of policing eased communication. We understood it and it worked well for both the community & police. After 18 months of SI it is still somewhat baffling and I get different and sometimes conflicting information from different officers. If it is still confusing to OPS then it is extremely confusing for the public.

**Reporting:**

I have been providing advice to residents for more than 25 years – encouraging reporting, how to report, who to report to. Now I am not always providing the correct information.

An example: a suspicious person checking laneways and back yards. It was reported to me later that day and I suggested an on-line report rather than phoning

because I know that if it is a few minutes or hours later then no officer will be sent. The person tried to do it online but it is not possible for that category whereas if it had of been a drug deal that had just happened then an online report is requested by OPS. So perhaps you have too many categories for the public to keep straight. We still hear that occasionally verbal reports are refused – follow-up is difficult as people do not always remember the date & time of a call – especially days or weeks later.

Another resident called because she believed that a person wanted for a homicide (OPS advertised in the media) had being walking down a street. She could not call immediately – but when she did OPS refused to take a report. She was dumbfounded that the sighting on a particular street seemed to be of no interest.

At every public meeting OPS you emphasize reporting and say that if people do not report then you can do nothing about it. Please do not discourage reporting by making it more difficult to navigate. Please take the report no matter how you get it and have staff sort it into the right category later.

**Demand for Service:**

Last summer we asked our CPO to put in a DFS to have officers check a park on the main street on a frequent basis for alcohol. As soon as the liquor store open there were people drinking in the park – the drinking and offensive language stopped kids and families from coming to the park. I found out this year that the DFS request had been categorized as “Situational awareness” which on the chart in this SI close out report categorizes it as “For information only. No Action required” – and that is exactly what happened. Nothing. It seems reasonable to assume that if a DFS is entered that some action is required.

I have asked our CPO to enter a DFS for this issue again and will follow up to ensure it is not categorized that way this year and that there is a resolution.

**The Future:**

The SI program is here, there are some issues, how can we work together to make this work better for community and OPS?

What mechanism will be put in place to help us:

- Understand new additional changes that will be implemented.
- Have input on procedures to improve them if they do not seem to be working for the community
- Reduce confusion on how to report – 911, verbal, on-line

**Evaluation:**

At the April meeting “The Chief acknowledged that the plan is to come back with an evaluation of the Service Initiative. The May report will discuss the close out of the program.”

My reading of the May report is that there will be an evaluation in the near future (when?) but it also states “the costs and approach to build the evaluation framework and conduct a thorough assessment will be identified through the 2019 budget”. So is the evaluation 1-2 years away??

That really is too long for such important changes.

Sincerely

Cheryl Parrott

Co-Chair, Security Committee

DRAFT



### **Document 3 – Mr. Thierry Harris**

Bonjour mon nom est Thierry Harris et je suis ici aujourd'hui en tant que membre de la communauté habitant la Basse-Ville et représentant au SIICAG pour l'association des fédérations citoyennes d'Ottawa. Merci de nous accueillir aujourd'hui afin de vous offrir mes pensées sur le déroulement du Groupe Consultatif Communautaire du Service de Police d'Ottawa. Je tiens à tenir mon discours dans les deux langues officiels notre capitale nationale.

J'aimerais remercier tous les membres du service de police de la Ville d'Ottawa qui nous ont accueilli chaleureusement pendant des mois afin de travailler sur des dossiers en collaboration avec non seulement des membres du service mais d'autres organisations de la communauté. Je pense que c'est important de les mentionner car ils ont tous de leur manière apporté un point de vue unique vis à vis les enjeux auxquels font face notre service de police ainsi que ceux de la communauté.

L'apprentissage de manière horizontale et le réseau de confiance qui s'est formé entre les groupes communautaires autour de la table du SIICAG est à mon avis aussi importante que l'apprentissage vertical ou top down fait du service de police à la communauté. Je me suis personnellement fait des nouveaux amis qui sont ici avec moi aujourd'hui et dans quelques années lorsqu'on regardera en arrière on pourra se dire, on s'est rencontré entouré par la police et nous nous sommes jamais senti aussi en sécurité :)

J'aimerais aussi souligner l'important travail de Jane Wright qui a participé à toutes les rencontres et qui a fait en sorte que nous nous sommes retrouvés avec les bon dossiers au bon moment durant la durée du SIICAG. Your professionalism was exemplary and I think it is important to extend this compliment to the entire police staff who worked on the CAG for its duration over the months. We had a lot of questions and you were always ready to answer them so I thank you for that, and I am certain so does the rest of the community organizations and individuals members participating in the CAG.

As a member of the Federation of Citizens Associations of Ottawa, I joined the SIICAG group in December of 2016. We had just completed a safety and security survey at the FCA and had the pleasure of welcoming Deputy Chief Jill Skinner to our meeting that day to let us know about the new SI and its impact on communities. At my first December 2016 SIICAG meeting we had a breakout session during which in smaller groups we tackled some of the communication challenges the police were having in reaching community associations. I found that

first meeting to be the best one I had the pleasure of attending. And here is where I will go into what I believe are the challenges the CAG group should address moving forward. Please understand I am mentioning these from a point of view of absolute respect for everyone involved. I realise this was a first kick at the can.

However, if the goal is to improve then let me humbly offer you my remarks on how exactly the roll out of CAG took place from my perspective. In terms of improvements: a) Clearly you need to distinguish between the operational and advisory capacity of the CAG. This wasn't made clear and much time was wasted with miscommunications on this front. If you give a community an operational say by appointing them to decision making boards it would go a long way towards inclusivity and providing accessibility to decision making bodies that impact the quality of life in communities. b) During the CAG meetings if as much work was done summarizing the concerns and polling the community to identify pain points as was in explaining abstract bureaucratic concepts we could have got twice as much work done. c) Simply understanding the power structures of who does what, and when issues came to head (such as sanctuary city, the OPO crisis or community police officers) being able to act on them in an operational capacity on the CAG and would have been a much better use of people's time. We spent a lot of time understanding the big transition and were asked to sell this to communities but the results and effectiveness of this pitch was questionable. d) The CAG meetings were far from consistent depending on what needed to be discussed. We never really got a sense of moving the needle forward after the initial meetings which I thought were tremendously well run in more of a workshop format. e) By having so many different stakeholders around the table, we had a hard time identifying roles and responsibilities of each. That role definition could have been made clear upfront and should have been underlined at the beginning of each meeting. Instead we got a lot of 'death by power point' and many of us left meetings scratching our heads as to what real direction we were going.

In terms of next steps what I would like to see and what I believe many community groups would like to see, are concrete evaluation points on your measures of success for groups such as this moving forward. What are you doing to evaluate yourselves and what are those measures of success? How do you transparently feed this back to the Police Services Board and the community to build best practices and become a more effective group as a whole? To build trust with the community you need to trust the community and encourage us engage with you on a higher level than what is currently being done. Just because this is a long term perpetual goal doesn't mean we cannot remind ourselves of it every day we go to

work and stand in service of the community. In terms of another concrete suggestion of improving things next time I suggest perhaps a primer course might be developed, similar to that done for planning issues on how the police service operates. This will allow more community members to participate in that process who will then be able to work on a new CAG, if there is a plan to have one in the future.

So those are my remarks and I'll just leave you with this quote from Carl Shurz, a former American civil war veteran who went on to become a prominent advocate of civil service reform : Ideals are like the stars: we never reach them, but like the mariners of the sea, we chart our course by them. Thanks again for listening and for all the work you do for the community.

DRAFT

# HINTONBURG

COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION INC • ASSOCIATION COMMUNAUTAIRE INC  
1064 RUE WELLINGTON ST • OTTAWA, ONTARIO, K1Y 2Y3  
[www.hintonburg.com](http://www.hintonburg.com)

May 28, 2018

Chair El-Chantiry  
Members Police Services Board

## Service Initiative

The Hintonburg Community Association brought forward concerns about the Service Initiative 2 years ago Apr. 25, 2016 and again Apr 23, 2018. We have continuing concerns about the SI changes and the lack of back-up for the CPOs and the follow-up on community issues. So far the “Demand For Service” solution to disbanding the Neighbourhood Officers has not worked for us.

I sat on the SI Implementation Advisory Group since Oct 2016 and attended all but 2 meetings. It was a somewhat painful process. An issue for me was lack of time, especially at the beginning, to ask questions so that I clearly understood the many new processes. Questioning would be cut off for lack of time and presenters had no or little time at the end of the meeting to answer more in depth questions.

The way that Hintonburg worked so effectively with OPS in the past was by understanding the system – who to call for what and how to ask for help within your structure. Understanding terminology of policing eased communication. We understood it and it worked well for both the community & police. After 18 months of SI it is still somewhat baffling and I get different and sometimes conflicting information from different officers. If it is still confusing to OPS then it is extremely confusing for the public.

## Reporting:

I have been providing advice to residents for more than 25 years – encouraging reporting, how to report, who to report to. Now I am not always providing the correct information.

An example: a suspicious person checking laneways and back yards. It was reported to me later that day and I suggested an on-line report rather than phoning because I know that if it is a few minutes or hours later then no officer will be sent. The person tried to do it online but it is not possible for that category whereas if it had of been a drug deal that had just happened then an online report is requested by OPS. So perhaps you have too many categories for the public to keep straight.

We still hear that occasionally verbal reports are refused – follow-up is difficult as people do not always remember the date & time of a call – especially days or weeks later.

Another resident called because she believed that a person wanted for a homicide (OPS advertised in the media) had been walking down a street. She could not call immediately – but when she did OPS refused to take a report. She was dumbfounded that the sighting on a particular street seemed to be of no interest.

At every public meeting OPS you emphasize reporting and say that if people do not report then you can do nothing about it. Please do not discourage reporting by making it more difficult to navigate. Please take the report no matter how you get it and have staff sort it into the right category later.

**Demand for Service:**

Last summer we asked our CPO to put in a DFS to have officers check a park on the main street on a frequent basis for alcohol. As soon as the liquor store opened there were people drinking in the park – the drinking and offensive language stopped kids and families from coming to the park. I found out this year that the DFS request had been categorized as “Situational awareness” which on the chart in this SI close out report categorizes it as “For information only. No Action required” – and that is exactly what happened. Nothing. It seems reasonable to assume that if a DFS is entered that some action is required.

I have asked our CPO to enter a DFS for this issue again and will follow up to ensure it is not categorized that way this year and that there is a resolution.

**The Future:**

The SI program is here, there are some issues, how can we work together to make this work better for community and OPS?

What mechanism will be put in place to help us:

- Understand new additional changes that will be implemented.
- Have input on procedures to improve them if they do not seem to be working for the community
- Reduce confusion on how to report – 911, verbal, on-line

**Evaluation:**

At the April meeting “The Chief acknowledged that the plan is to come back with an evaluation of the Service Initiative. The May report will discuss the close out of the program.”

My reading of the May report is that there will be an evaluation in the near future (when?) but it also states “the costs and approach to build the evaluation framework and conduct a thorough assessment will be identified through the 2019 budget”. So is the evaluation 1-2 years away??

That really is too long for such important changes.

Sincerely

Cheryl Parrott  
Co-Chair, Security Committee

DRAFT