



**Public Meeting**

**September 21, 2017**

**Board Room – Police Headquarters  
1:00 PM**

**PUBLIC MEETING - AGENDA**  
**Thursday, September 21, 2017 @ 1:00 PM**

**Auditorium, 40 College Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor**  
**Toronto, Ontario**

[www.tpsb.ca](http://www.tpsb.ca)

---

1. Call to Order
2. Declarations of Interest under the [Municipal Conflict of Interest Act](#).
3. Confirmation of the Minutes from the meeting held on [August 24, 2017](#).

DEFERRED FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Deputation

4. July 13, 2017 from John Sewell, Toronto Police Accountability Coalition  
**Re: [Marijuana Arrests](#)**

The Board was in receipt of correspondence from Mr. John Sewell, Toronto Police Accountability Coalition, dated July 13, 2017

- *Additional Potential Deputations - refer to speakers list which will be available at the meeting.*

5. CONSENT AGENDA

- 5.1 September 08, 2017 from Andy Pringle, Chair  
**Re: [City Of Toronto Council – Supplementary Report to the Auditor General’s Phase One Report “The City Needs to Ensure Adequate Detection and Review of Potentially Excessive and Unusual Drug Claims”](#)**
- 5.2 September 08, 2017 from Andy Pringle, Chair  
**Re: [City Council: TransformTo: Climate Action for a Healthy, Equitable and Prosperous Toronto](#)**
- 5.3 August 31, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: [Semi-Annual Report: Write-off of uncollectible Accounts Receivable Balances January to June 2017](#)**
- 5.4 March 09, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: [Chief’s Administrative Investigation: Injury to Mr. Mark Towell](#)**

- 5.5 June 16, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: Chief's Administrative Investigation: Custody Injuries to Mr. Derek Trella**
- 5.6 June 16, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: Chief's Administrative Investigation: Custody Injuries to Mr. Maris Gravelson**
- 5.7 June 16, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: Chief's Administrative Investigation: Death of Mr. F.E.**
- 5.8 June 22, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: Chief's Administrative Investigation: Custody Injuries to Mr. Devendra Ramroop**

#### ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

- 6. August 10, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: Request for Special Fund: Beyond the Blue – Toronto Chapter**
- 7. August 30, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: Response to the Jury Recommendations from the Coroner's Inquest into the Death of Mr. David Andrew Doucette**
- 8. September 21, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: Special Constable Appointment: University of Toronto**
- 9. July 26, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: Special Constables: Toronto Community Housing Corporation, Increase in Approved Strength**
- 10. August 15, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: Recommendation for Payment of Legal Indemnification Case No. 2089-17**
- 11. August 31, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: Ergo-Industrial Seating Systems – Vendor of Record**

12. August 29, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: Speed Measuring Devices – Vendor of Record**
  
13. September 08, 2017 from Mark Saunders, Chief of Police  
**Re: Vendor of Record for a Facial Recognition System**

Correspondence Arising from Previous Business - none

Adjournment

Next Meeting

Date: Thursday, October 26, 2017  
Time: 1:00 PM

---

**Members of the Toronto Police Services Board**

Andy Pringle, Chair  
Chin Lee, Councillor & Vice-Chair  
Shelley Carroll, Councillor & Member  
Ken Jeffers, Member

Marie Moliner, Member  
Dhun Noria, Member  
John Tory, Mayor & Member

**Toronto Police Accountability Coalition**  
c/o Suite 206, 401 Richmond Street West, Toronto ON M5V 3A8.  
416 977 5097. info@tpac.ca , [www.tpac.ca](http://www.tpac.ca)

July 13, 2017.

To: Toronto Police Services Board

Please schedule this as a deputation item on July 27.

The Toronto Star reports that for a decade before 2014 (the latest data available), Toronto arrested three times as many Black people per capita as white people for simple possession of marijuana. The data used showed that all arrests were of individuals with no previous involvement with the criminal justice system. See <https://www.thestar.com/news/insight/2017/07/06/toronto-marijuana-arrests-reveal-startling-racial-divide.html>

The same report shows Black people were more likely to be held without release, or with restrictive bail conditions.

There is no reason to believe that what occurred before 2014 is still not occurring.

The discrimination by Toronto police on the basis of race is reprehensible, as well as being contrary to law. The public needs assurances that Toronto police officers will no longer discriminate, and that if they do, they will be removed from service.

The Board and the service have ample policies against racial discrimination, but these policies are not reflected in practice. This must change – discriminatory activities must be punished by management, as occurs in other public agencies.

Racial discrimination by police has gone on for far too long. It must stop. The Board must take effective action to ensure it no longer occurs on a systemic basis and ensure it is punished when it occurs on an individual basis.

The Board must act now to ensure racial discrimination does not continue and it must demand management makes the necessary changes.

Yours very truly,

John Sewell for  
Toronto Police Accountability Coalition.



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

September 8, 2017

To: Members Toronto Police Services Board

From: Andy Pringle  
Chair

**Subject: CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL – SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT TO THE AUDITOR GENERAL’S PHASE ONE REPORT “THE CITY NEEDS TO ENSURE ADEQUATE DETECTION AND REVIEW OF POTENTIALLY EXCESSIVE AND UNUSUAL DRUG CLAIMS”**

### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Board receive this report.

### **Financial Implications:**

There are no financial implications arising from the Board’s consideration of this report.

### **Background/Purpose:**

At its meeting held on July 4, 5, 6 and 7, 2017, City Council considered a report from the Auditor General supplementary to an October 2016 phase one audit of employee drug benefits.

The minutes detailing the City’s consideration of this item are available at this link:  
<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2017.AU9.10>

### **Discussion:**

In considering this item, Council approved a number of recommendations including a request that this report be forwarded to the Toronto Police Services Board for its information.

**Conclusion:**

It is my recommendation that the Board receive this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Pringle  
Chair



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

September 8, 2017

To: Members, Toronto Police Services Board

From: Andy Pringle  
Chair

**Subject: CITY OF TORONTO COUNCIL: TRANSFORMTO: CLIMATE ACTION FOR A HEALTHY, EQUITABLE AND PROSPEROUS TORONTO**

### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended:

- 1.that, prior to December 31, 2018, the Chief of Police be requested to report to the Board with respect to the extent to which the goals, recommendations and strategies outlined in the TransformTO report are reflected in TPS programs, activities and strategies; and,
2. that the Board forward a copy of this report to the City of Toronto Chief Corporate Officer for information.

### **Financial Implications:**

There are no financial implications arising from the recommendation in this report.

### **Background/Purpose:**

At its meeting held on July 4, 5, 6 and 7, 2017, City Council considered the report from the Parks and Recreation Committee with respect to the TransformTO strategies to achieve the community-wide reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

The minutes detailing the City's consideration of this item are available at this link:  
<http://app.toronto.ca/tmmis/viewAgendaItemHistory.do?item=2017.PE19.4>

### **Discussion:**

In considering this item, Council approved the following recommendation:



**City Council request all City Agencies and Corporations to align their business plans and strategies with the recommendations, goals, and principles presented in the report (April 20, 2017) from the Chief Corporate Officer and the strategies adopted by City Council on December 13, 14 and 15, 2016 (Item PE15.1 - TransformTO: Climate Action for a Healthy Equitable, and Prosperous Toronto) and City Council direct the Chief Corporate Officer to include the status of such alignment in the 2019 report to the Parks and Environment Committee on the implementation status of Transform TO.**

**Conclusion:**

It is my recommendation that that, prior to December 31, 2018, the Chief of Police be requested to report to the Board with respect to the extent to which the goals, recommendations and strategies outlined in the TransformTO report are reflected in TPS programs, activities and strategies; and, that the Board forward a copy of this report to the City of Toronto Chief Corporate Officer for information.

Respectfully submitted,

Andy Pringle  
Chair



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

August 31, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Semi-Annual Report: Write-off of Uncollectible Accounts  
Receivable Balances January to June 2017**

### **Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Services Board (Board) receive the following report.

### **Financial Implications:**

There are no accounts receivable write-offs to report for the first half of 2017.

The Toronto Police Service (Service) invoiced \$18,465,166 (excluding grants), while outstanding net receivables (customers with outstanding balances less deposits/prepayments received) totalled \$452,488.

With zero write-offs for this first half of the year, the Service performed better than the industry standard at 0.065% of total sales, which is considered low.

### **Background / Purpose:**

At its meeting of May 29, 2003, the Board approved Financial Control By-law 147. Part IX, Section 29 – Authority for Write-offs, delegates the authority to write-off uncollectible accounts of \$50,000 or less to the Chief of Police and requires that a semi-annual report be provided to the Board on amounts written off in the previous six months (Min. No. P132/03 refers).

The purpose of this report is to provide the Board with information on the amounts written off during the period of January 1 to June 30, 2017.

### **Discussion:**

External customers receiving goods and/or services from Service units are invoiced for the value of such goods or services. The Service's Accounting Services (Accounting) Unit works closely with divisions, units and customers to ensure that some form of written authority is in place with the receiving party prior to work commencing and an invoice being sent. Accounting also ensures that accurate and complete invoices are sent to the proper location, on a timely basis.

The Service has instituted a very rigorous process to mitigate the risk of accounts becoming uncollectible and therefore written off.

**Conclusion:**

In accordance with Section 29 – Authorization for Write-offs, of By-law 147, it is recommended that the Board receive this report.

Mr. Tony Veneziano, Chief Administrative Officer, will be in attendance to answer any questions the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police

/LR

SemiAnnual Report Writeoff of Uncollectible Accounts Receivable Balances Jan to June  
2017



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

March 9, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation: Injury to Mr. Mark Towell**

### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the board receive the following report.

### **Financial Implications:**

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

### **Background / Purpose:**

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) is notified of an incident involving serious injury or death, provincial legislation directs that a chief of police shall conduct an administrative investigation.

Ontario Regulation 267/10, Section 11(1) states:

"The chief of police shall also cause an investigation to be conducted forthwith into any incident with respect to which the S.I.U. has been notified, subject to the S.I.U.'s lead role in investigating the incident."

Section 11(2) of the Regulation states:

"The purpose of the chief of police's investigation is to review the policies of or services provided by the police force and the conduct of its police officers."

Section 11(4) of the Regulation states:

“The chief of police of a municipal police force shall report his or her findings and any action taken or recommended to be taken to the board within 30 days after the S.I.U. director advises the chief of police that he or she has reported the results of the S.I.U.’s investigation to the Attorney General, and the board may make the chief of police’s report available to the public.”

Upon conclusion of their investigation, the S.I.U. provides the Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) with a letter. The S.I.U. does not provide the T.P.S. with a copy of the report that was provided to the Attorney General.

### **Discussion:**

On June 30, 2015, officers from 53 Division Primary Response Unit responded to an unknown trouble call in the area of the Beltline Trail; a recreational trail in the neighborhood.

The complainant reported that while jogging along the trail, an unknown male, later identified as Mr. Mark Towell, had sexually assaulted the complainant. The complainant provided a detailed description of Mr. Towell to the officers.

The officers conducted a search of the area and observed a male party matching the description of the attacker jump out of the bushes on the north side of the trail. The officers, who were in uniform, identified themselves and ordered Mr. Towell to stop for the purposes of conducting an investigation. Mr. Towell immediately ran from the officers and they pursued him on foot.

Mr. Towell eventually stopped, turned towards the officers and took up a fighting stance. The officers directed him to surrender and attempted to place him under arrest. Mr. Towell refused to comply with their directions and a struggle ensued. Mr. Towell was subdued and placed under arrest. During the struggle, one officer suffered several broken bones to his hand.

Mr. Towell complained of injuries to his face and was transported to hospital; he was diagnosed and treated for a fractured nasal bone and scratches to his cornea. Mr. Towell was transported to 53 Division where he was charged with Sexual Assault, Assault with Intent to Resist Arrest and Assaulting Peace Officer Causing Bodily Harm.

The S.I.U. was notified and invoked its mandate.

The S.I.U. designated two officers as subject officers; six other officers were designated as witness officers.

In a letter to the T.P.S. dated March 22, 2016, Director Mr. Tony Loparco of the S.I.U. advised that the investigation had been completed, the file had been closed and no

further action was contemplated.

### **Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation:**

Professional Standards Support (P.S.S.) conducted an investigation pursuant to Ontario Regulation 267/10, Section 11.

P.S.S. examined the use of force in relation to the applicable legislation, service provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.S.S. investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest)
- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons)
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody)
- Procedure 06-04 (Emotionally Disturbed Persons)
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies)
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Procedure 13-17 (Memorandum Books and Reports)
- Procedure 15-01 (Use of Force)
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting)
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System)

The P.S.S. investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- *Police Services Act* Section 113 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Ontario Regulation 267/10 (Conduct and Duties of Police Officers respecting investigations by the Special Investigations Unit)
- Ontario Regulation 926 Section 14.2 (Use of Force Qualifications)

The P.S.S. investigation determined that the T.P.S.'s policies and procedures associated with the applied use of force were found to be lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

Acting Deputy Chief Peter Yuen, Operational Support Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police

MS:lc

Filename: siutowellpublic.docx



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

June 16, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injuries to Mr. Derek Trella.**

### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Board receive the following report.

### **Financial Implications:**

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

### **Background / Purpose:**

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) is notified of an incident involving serious injury or death, provincial legislation directs that a chief of police shall conduct an administrative investigation.

Ontario Regulation 267/10, Section 11(1) states:

"The chief of police shall also cause an investigation to be conducted forthwith into any incident with respect to which the S.I.U. has been notified, subject to the S.I.U.'s lead role in investigating the incident."

Section 11(2) of the Regulation states:

"The purpose of the chief of police's investigation is to review the policies of or services provided by the police force and the conduct of its police officers."



Section 11(4) of the Regulation states:

“The chief of police of a municipal police force shall report his or her findings and any action taken or recommended to be taken to the board within 30 days after the S.I.U. director advises the chief of police that he or she has reported the results of the S.I.U.’s investigation to the Attorney General, and the board may make the chief of police’s report available to the public.”

Upon conclusion of their investigation, the S.I.U. provides the Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) with a letter. The S.I.U. does not provide the T.P.S. with a copy of the report that was provided to the Attorney General.

### **Discussion:**

On January 14, 2016, at 2305 hours, the Toronto Police Drug Squad (T.D.S) was in the area of Gerrard Street East and Mutual Street to conduct a drug investigation based upon a Crime Stoppers tip. The officers were all in plain clothes and an undercover officer had made a purchase of narcotics from a male, later identified as Mr. Derek Trella.

After the purchase, Mr. Trella walked hastily eastbound on Gerrard Street East in an attempt to exit the area. As officers approached Mr. Trella, identifying themselves both verbally and with identification, he began to jog.

An officer approached Mr. Trella from the rear and wrapped his arms around him in order to effect the arrest and prevent a potential loss of evidence. Mr. Trella lost his balance and fell to the ground with the officer falling on top of him. Mr. Trella was arrested and handcuffed with the assistance of other officers from T.D.S.

Mr. Trella was turned over to uniform officers from 51 Division Primary Response Unit for transport. Upon being booked in at 51 Division, Mr. Trella complained of a sore right clavicle (collarbone). Mr. Trella advised that he had broken his collarbone 5 years ago and believed it may have been re-broken when he and the officer fell.

Mr. Trella was taken to hospital where he was diagnosed and treated for a fractured right clavicle (collarbone).

The S.I.U was notified and invoked its mandate.

The S.I.U designated one police officer as a subject officer; eight other officers were designated as witness officers.

In a letter to the T.P.S. dated August 10, 2016, Director Tony Loparco of the S.I.U. advised that the investigation was completed, the file has been closed and no further action is contemplated. Director Loparco excluded the subject officer from any criminality.

## **Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation:**

Professional Standards Support (P.S.S.) conducted an investigation pursuant to Ontario Regulation 267/10, Section 11.

P.S.S. examined the use of force in relation to the applicable legislation, service provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.S.S. investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest)
- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons)
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody)
- Procedure 04-44 (Undercover Operations)
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies)
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Procedure 15-01 (Use of Force)
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting)
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System)

The P.S.S. investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- *Police Services Act* Section 113 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Ontario Regulation 267/10 (Conduct and Duties of Police Officers Respecting Investigations by the Special Investigations Unit)
- Ontario Regulation 926 Section 14.2 (Use of Force Qualifications)

The P.S.S. investigation determined that the T.P.S.'s policies and procedures associated with the applied use of force were found to be lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

Acting Deputy Chief Peter Yuen, Operational Support Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police

MS:gp  
Filename:siutrellapublic.docx



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

June 16, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injuries to Mr. Maris Gravelson.**

### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Board receive the following report.

### **Financial Implications:**

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

### **Background / Purpose:**

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) is notified of an incident involving serious injury or death, provincial legislation directs that a chief of police shall conduct an administrative investigation.

Ontario Regulation 267/10, Section 11(1) states:

"The chief of police shall also cause an investigation to be conducted forthwith into any incident with respect to which the S.I.U. has been notified, subject to the S.I.U.'s lead role in investigating the incident."

Section 11(2) of the Regulation states:

"The purpose of the chief of police's investigation is to review the policies of or services provided by the police force and the conduct of its police officers."

Section 11(4) of the Regulation states:

“The chief of police of a municipal police force shall report his or her findings and any action taken or recommended to be taken to the board within 30 days after the S.I.U. director advises the chief of police that he or she has reported the results of the S.I.U.’s investigation to the Attorney General, and the board may make the chief of police’s report available to the public.”

Upon conclusion of their investigation, the S.I.U. provides the Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) with a letter. The S.I.U. does not provide the T.P.S. with a copy of the report that was provided to the Attorney General.

### **Discussion:**

On July 15, 2015, at 1531 hours, officers from 11 Division Primary Response Unit (P.R.U.) attended 10 Cobalt Avenue in regards to a reported Threatening.

The officers investigated the incident and subsequently arrested Mr. Maris Gravelson without incident. The officers transported Mr. Gravelson to 11 Division where he was paraded before the Officer-in-Charge.

A Level 3 search was authorized by the Officer-in-Charge and undertaken by two officers in the booking hall search room. As one of the involved officers removed one of the handcuffs, Mr. Gravelson became combative and swung his freed hand in an effort to strike the officer; he then shoved the officer away.

The officer delivered two closed fist distractionary strikes to the face of Mr. Gravelson and both officers took him to the ground. The Officer-in-Charge entered the room to assist in restraining and handcuffing Mr. Gravelson.

Mr. Gravelson complained of soreness to his chest and was transported to hospital by Toronto Paramedic Services (Paramedics) where he was assessed and diagnosed with three displaced rib fractures on his left side.

The S.I.U. was notified and invoked its mandate.

The S.I.U. designated one officer as a subject officer; three other officers were designated as witness officers.

In a letter to the T.P.S. dated May 31, 2016, Director Tony Loparco of the S.I.U advised that the investigation was completed, the file has been closed and no further action is contemplated.

## **Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation:**

Professional Standards Support (P.S.S.) conducted an investigation pursuant to Ontario Regulation 267/10, Section 11.

P.S.S. examined the use of force in relation to the applicable legislation, service provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.S.S. investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest)
- Procedure 01-02 (Search of Persons)
- Procedure 01-03 (Persons in Custody)
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies)
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Procedure 13-17 (Memorandum Books and Reports)
- Procedure 15-01 (Use of Force)
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting)
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System)

The P.S.S. investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- *Police Services Act* Section 113 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Ontario Regulation 267/10 (Conduct and Duties of Police Officers Respecting Investigations by the Special Investigations Unit)
- Ontario Regulation 926 Section 14.2 (Use of Force Qualifications)

The P.S.S. investigation determined that the T.P.S.'s policies and procedures associated with the applied use of force were found to be lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

Acting Deputy Chief Peter Yuen, Operational Support Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police

MS:lc

Filename:siugravelsonpublic.docx



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

June 16, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation: Death of Mr. F.E.**

### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Services Board (Board) receive the following report.

### **Financial Implications:**

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

### **Background / Purpose:**

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) is notified of an incident involving serious injury or death, provincial legislation directs that a chief of police shall conduct an administrative investigation.

Ontario Regulation 267/10, Section 11(1) states:

"The chief of police shall also cause an investigation to be conducted forthwith into any incident with respect to which the S.I.U. has been notified, subject to the S.I.U.'s lead role in investigating the incident."

Section 11(2) of the Regulation states:

"The purpose of the chief of police's investigation is to review the policies of or services provided by the police force and the conduct of its police officers."

Section 11(4) of the Regulation states:

“The chief of police of a municipal police force shall report his or her findings and any action taken or recommended to be taken to the board within 30 days after the S.I.U. director advises the chief of police that he or she has reported the results of the S.I.U.’s investigation to the Attorney General, and the board may make the chief of police’s report available to the public.”

Upon conclusion of their investigation, the S.I.U. provides the Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) with a letter. The S.I.U. does not provide the T.P.S. with a copy of the report that was provided to the Attorney General.

### **Discussion:**

The following report has been edited to remove identifiers to protect the identity of a victim of child abuse.

On October 2, 2015, officers from 41 Division attended an apartment in the area of Jane Street and Finch Avenue West, for the purpose of apprehending a child in need of protection. The officers were also attempting to locate the father of the child at the address and if he was present, were going to arrest him for child abuse related charges. This male was known to the officers as Mr. J.S., who was believed to be a resident of that apartment.

The officers were accompanied by the mother of the child and Children’s Aid Society (C.A.S.) workers who would take custody of the child once apprehended.

Upon arriving at the address, the officers from 41 Division were met by officers from 31 Division Primary Response Unit. Three of the officers proceeded up to the apartment while one of the officers remained outside the building with the child’s mother and the C.A.S. workers.

Once on the sixteenth floor, officers knocked on the door of the apartment and announced their presence as police officers. The officers repeated this three times before the door was answered by an adult female. The officers identified themselves to the female, explained their reason for being at the address, and requested permission to enter the apartment to search for the child. The officers were granted permission to enter the residence.

Once inside, the officers explained to the female they were there to apprehend the 18 month old child and, if present, to arrest the child’s father, Mr. J.S. The officers were advised that both the child and Mr. J.S. were present in the apartment and that Mr. J.S. was attempting to hide himself on the apartment balcony.

One of the officers went out onto the balcony but was unable to see anyone. He then looked over the balcony and observed the body of a male on the ground directly below.

The officers immediately called for Toronto Paramedics Services (Paramedics) and requested the assistance of other officers and a supervisor.

Paramedics and officers attended to the male laying on the ground. It was confirmed that this male was Mr. J.S., and when tended to by Paramedics was found to be without vital signs. He was subsequently pronounced dead at the scene.

The child in need of protection was located in one of the bedrooms and was taken into custody and turned over to the C.A.S.

The S.I.U. was notified and invoked its mandate.

The S.I.U. designated two officers as subject officers; thirteen other officers were designated as witness officers.

In a letter to the T.P.S. dated July 15, 2016, Acting Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised that the investigation was complete, the file had been closed and no further action was contemplated.

The S.I.U. further advised the T.P.S. that Mr. J.S. was in fact Mr. F.E. Mr. F.E. was an American citizen, with no lawful status in Canada and was wanted on federal drug warrants in the State of Florida.

The S.I.U. published a media release which is available at: [www.siu.on.ca](http://www.siu.on.ca).

### **Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation:**

Professional Standards Support (P.S.S.) conducted an investigation pursuant to Ontario Regulation 267/10, Section 11.

P.S.S. examined the use of force in relation to the applicable legislation, service provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

The P.S.S. investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. procedures:

- Procedure 01-01 (Arrest)
- Procedure 04-02 (Death Investigations)
- Procedure 05-06 (Child Abuse)
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies)
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Procedure 13-17 (Memorandum Books and Reports)
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting)



The P.S.S. investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- *Police Services Act* Section 113 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Ontario Regulation 267/10 (Conduct and Duties of Police Officers Respecting Investigations by the Special Investigations Unit)

The P.S.S. investigation determined that the T.P.S.'s policies and procedures associated with the action of the officers were found to be lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

The conduct of the officers was in compliance with applicable provincial legislation regarding the Standards of Conduct and applicable T.P.S. procedures.

Deputy Chief Peter Yuen, Operational Support Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police

MS:lc

Filename:siu2015-61public.docx



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

June 22, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Chief's Administrative Investigation into the Custody Injuries to Mr. Devendra Ramroop**

### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Board receive the following report.

### **Financial Implications:**

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

### **Background / Purpose:**

Whenever the Special Investigations Unit (S.I.U.) is notified of an incident involving serious injury or death, provincial legislation directs that a chief of police shall conduct an administrative investigation.

Ontario Regulation 267/10, Section 11(1) states:

"The chief of police shall also cause an investigation to be conducted forthwith into any incident with respect to which the S.I.U. has been notified, subject to the S.I.U.'s lead role in investigating the incident."

Section 11(2) of the Regulation states:

"The purpose of the chief of police's investigation is to review the policies of or services provided by the police force and the conduct of its police officers."

Section 11(4) of the Regulation states:

“The chief of police of a municipal police force shall report his or her findings and any action taken or recommended to be taken to the board within 30 days after the S.I.U. director advises the chief of police that he or she has reported the results of the S.I.U.’s investigation to the Attorney General, and the board may make the chief of police’s report available to the public.”

Upon conclusion of their investigation, the S.I.U. provides the Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) with a letter. The S.I.U. does not provide the T.P.S. with a copy of the report that was provided to the Attorney General.

### **Discussion:**

On October 27, 2015, at 1233 hours, uniform officers from 31 Division Primary Response Unit (P.R.U.) were on general patrol in the area of Finch Avenue West and Tobermory Drive. The officers were operating a marked scout car 3151.

The officers were travelling eastbound on Finch Avenue in the center lane when they observed a stalled motor vehicle pulled over to the side in the curb lane.

The officer driving the police vehicle activated the rear facing emergency lighting and slowed to offer assistance to the occupants of the motor vehicle. While slowing the police vehicle to an eventual stop, the marked police vehicle was suddenly struck from the rear by a Toyota travelling eastbound along Finch Avenue.

Officers from 31 Division, Toronto Fire Service, and Toronto Paramedic Services (Paramedics) attended the collision scene. The driver of the Toyota, later identified as Mr. Devendra Ramroop, had suffered injuries and was displaying signs of impairment; he was placed under arrest for Impaired Operation of a Motor Vehicle contrary to the *Criminal Code*.

Mr. Ramroop was extracted from his vehicle by Toronto Fire Service and Paramedics and transported to Hospital. The officers were also transported to hospital with back injuries and reported off duty as a result of their injuries.

Mr. Ramroop was assessed and diagnosed as having sustained two fractured ribs. He was released from hospital, transported to 31 Division, and charged with several criminal offences.

The S.I.U. was notified and invoked its mandate.

The S.I.U. designated one officer as a subject officer; one other officer was designated as a witness officer.

In a letter to the T.P.S. dated July 26, 2016, Acting Director Joseph Martino of the S.I.U. advised that the investigation was complete, the file had been closed and no further action was contemplated. Acting Director Martino excluded the subject officer from any criminality.

### **Summary of the Toronto Police Service's Investigation:**

Professional Standards Support (P.S.S.) and Traffic Services Unit conducted an investigation pursuant to Ontario Regulation 267/10, Section 11.

P.S.S. examined the use of force in relation to the applicable legislation, service provided, procedures, and the conduct of the involved officers.

P.S.S. investigation reviewed the following T.P.S. procedures:

- Procedure 04-21 (Gathering/Preserving Evidence)
- Procedure 07-01 (Transportation Collisions)
- Procedure 07-05 (Service Vehicle Collisions)
- Procedure 10-06 (Medical Emergencies)
- Procedure 13-16 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Procedure 13-17 (Memorandum Books and Reports)
- Procedure 15-02 (Injury/Illness Reporting)
- Procedure 15-17 (In-Car Camera System)

The P.S.S. investigation also reviewed the following legislation:

- *Police Services Act* Section 113 (Special Investigations Unit)
- Ontario Regulation 267/10 (Conduct and Duties of Police Officers Respecting Investigations by the Special Investigations Unit)
- Ontario Regulation 926 Section 14.2 (Use of Force Qualifications)

The P.S.S. investigation determined that the T.P.S.'s policies and procedures associated with the applied use of force were found to be lawful, in keeping with current legislation, and written in a manner which provided adequate and appropriate guidance to the members. None of the examined policies and procedures required modification.

Acting Deputy Chief Peter Yuen, Operational Support Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police

MS:lc

Filename: siuramrooppublic.docx



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

August 10, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Beyond the Blue – Toronto Chapter**

### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Board:

1. As an exception to the Special Fund Policy approve the request from the Toronto Chapter of Beyond the Blue, for one time funding in the amount of \$30,000.00, and;
2. In collaboration with the Chief, provide official support to the Toronto chapter of Beyond the Blue as articulated below.

### **Financial Implications:**

This request is an exception to the Board's Special Fund Policy and if approved the Board's Special Fund would be depleted by \$30,000, less the return of any funds not used.

### **Background / Purpose:**

At the Toronto Police Services Board (Board) meeting held on February 23, 2017, the Board received an oral deputation and report from Ms. Dilnaz Garda and Ms. Kristal Jones. The report was a request for funds and official support for the creation of a Toronto Chapter of the Beyond the Blue (B.T.B.) organization, which is an organization exclusively for the significant others, spouses, and family members of police officers (Min. No. P42/2017 refers). The Board approved the following Motion that stated, in part:

1. THAT the Board refer the deputation, including the request for financial support from the Board's Special Fund and the request for Toronto Police Services Board and Toronto Police Service (T.P.S.) endorsement of "Toronto B.T.B." as a support mechanism for T.P.S. family members as articulated in the handout, to the Chief of Police with a request that he review and consult with appropriate parties such as the

Toronto Police Association, B.T.B. and its partner police services with respect to the feasibility of the proposal, in light of current wellness programs and benefits offered to members;

2. THAT the Chief submit the above noted report to the Board for its April 2017 meeting

### **Discussion:**

Beyond the Blue (B.T.B.) was started in the fall of 2013 when approximately 30 spouses of the Calgary Police Service (C.P.S.) attended a weekend retreat together where they discovered the need for an organization with a common vision that focuses on the unique set of circumstances faced by law enforcement families. Four C.P.S. spouses sought and received the support and endorsement of the C.P.S. and the Calgary Police Association and formed Canada B.T.B. Canada B.T.B. respected the support already offered to police officers through the various programs that police services have instituted to ensure the wellbeing and mental health of their members. However, it endeavoured to create an organization that dealt specifically with the challenges that the families of law-enforcement officers faced. The Canada B.T.B. organizational model filled the void law-enforcement families were feeling when it came to access to resources that met their specific needs and how to effectively support their police officers, to encourage a better off-duty lifestyle and home environment, and to assist them with the personal challenges they experience in being the family member of a police officer.

In 2016, the York Regional Police Service (Y.R.P.S.) Peer Support Unit collaborated with Canada B.T.B. and realized a similar need for law enforcement families across the country. Y.R.P.S. valued the education and support offered to members' families through the success of the B.T.B. organizational model and commenced their own chapter specific to the needs of their Service members and families. The Y.R.P.S. B.T.B. program operates in collaboration with and under the direction of the existing Y.R.P.S. peer-support unit, and therefore must comply with the standards, policies and procedures that guide services offered to members of the Y.R.P.S. The Toronto B.T.B. chapter model, as currently proposed, would have no such oversight, which could create issues with respect to consistency of B.T.B. activities and initiatives with current T.P.S. programs, as well as potential confusion for T.P.S. members seeking peer support services for themselves and their families. Toronto B.T.B. has addressed this concern by agreeing to request Chief's approval prior to proceeding with any initiative that would require T.P.S. partnership.

In 2017, Canada B.T.B. welcomed Toronto as a newly instituted chapter under the leadership of its president, Ms. Dilnaz Garda, and vice-president, Ms. Kristal Jones. These women are both spouses and family members of currently serving T.P.S. officers, and advocates of mental health and well-being. Ms. Garda is the sister of late T.P.S. member Police Constable (P.C.) Darius Garda, who took his own life after struggling for years with mental health issues that arose after an on the job shooting,

and wife of a currently serving T.P.S. officer. Ms. Jones is also a wife to a currently serving T.P.S. officer and is the founder of an active Facebook page, Police Wives of Canada, which offers support for spouses of officers in Canada's law enforcement community. These two women have first-hand lived experience which has suggested to them that there is a need for a B.T.B. organization for T.P.S. members and their families.

It is the goal of Toronto B.T.B to build membership and then have members apply for the remainder of Board positions which include: secretary, treasurer, marketing and social coordinators. Toronto B.T.B., although already in operation, has exhausted its current resources for funding the necessary costs associated to starting a new organization.

Appended to this report is the organizational proposal of Toronto B.T.B. created by Ms. Garda and Ms. Jones. Included within this outline is the background of B.T.B., governance, marketing strategies, budget, and resources for support. As the Toronto chapter of B.T.B. is still in its infancy stages, this document is a proposal that outlines the responsibilities of being part of Canada B.T.B. and must be adapted to include collaboration guidelines with the T.P.S. as outlined within this report and respond to any concerns from Board members, should they arise during the meeting. It is recommended that the Toronto B.T.B. proposal be modified to articulate specific guidelines to ensure any potential risk to the T.P.S. is precluded. In addition, it is recommended that the proposal be modified to include the description of mechanisms to ensure ongoing collaboration with current in-house and contracted services provided to T.P.S members, including the Employee and Family Assistance Program, the T.P.S. Critical Incident Response/Peer Support Program, and the Human Resources Wellness pillar, including the Psychological Services section. This collaboration is essential to ensure that members are well informed about the full range of services available to them, with enough information to make clear and informed choices regarding the best means to ensure that their psychological health needs and those of their respective family members are met.

Toronto B.T.B. had a soft launch on March 1, 2017, to focus on gaining membership through the use of their already existing Facebook and Twitter social media accounts. The Toronto Police Association (T.P.A.) is in support of the endeavours of Toronto B.T.B. and allowed Toronto B.T.B. to organize a booth at the T.P.A.'s annual Canada's Wonderland family event in order to host an official launch in July 2017. This booth offered marketing materials for families and spouses of Toronto officers and had on-site technology available to register new members instantly, with the goal of registering a minimum of 100 new members. Further to allowing Toronto B.T.B. to organize a booth and engage T.P.S. members at the 2017 Canada's Wonderland Family event, the T.P.A. has agreed to provide printed posters, meeting space, and is currently reviewing its policies and budget to approve a funding proposal of \$3,000, all of which are at no cost to Toronto B.T.B.



Included in the appended proposal is a budgetary outline for year 1, as start-up funding in the amount of \$30,000 is being requested, as well as goals for the first 3 years and associated costs in a year-by-year per goal breakdown. The Year 1 cost breakdowns were determined in consultation with Calgary B.T.B. along with comparing their needs and budget to the needs and associated budget being sought by Toronto B.T.B. The year 1 start-up funding request in the amount of \$30,000 will be allocated as follows:

- Marketing (social media presence) \$1,000
- Yearly website costs (domain purchase and maintenance) \$250
- Workshops/ presenters/ information sessions (cost or presenter/honorarium) \$5000
- Stationery/ supplies/ printing/ promotional products \$6,000  
Facilities/food/beverages (Peer-led support group, badge babies, and workshop/ information sessions) \$8,600
- Community outreach/ benevolence committee \$600
- Office operations (phone, internet, PO box, yearly filing of charity return) \$ 1,000

In one calendar year from the date the funds are provided to Toronto B.T.B., the chair and co-chair of Toronto B.T.B. must report to the Board on the activities carried out, lessons learned, and what the funds were expended on. A 3-year budget plan will be required prior to awarding the money from the Special Fund and any funds not used will be returned to the Board.

It is important to recognise that although Toronto B.T.B. seeks to gain support from and align with the T.P.S. and association/unions of its designated chapter, they have declared their intention and the necessity of remaining a separate and independent entity. Ongoing collaborative dialogue is required to ensure that T.P.S. members and their families are provided with a range of resources and supports that are comprehensive, integrated, and able to meet their changing needs. While recognizing that the nature of that dialogue should itself be a collaborative process, a number of avenues for shared participation have been identified as follows:

1. It will be important for dialogue between the Toronto B.T.B. and the T.P.S. Wellness team to commence immediately, with meetings scheduled on at least a biannual basis and with the capacity to schedule additional meetings on an ad hoc basis as required.
2. The development of a shared communication plan that provides clear direction to members regarding the full range of Wellness services available to them.
3. The development of mechanisms for the objective and unbiased sharing of information regarding existing T.P.S. Wellness programs in the provision of Toronto B.T.B. services and supports. This may include the development of T.P.S. Information brochures that outline the range of services to members, with

agreement that this brochure (or brochures) be added to all information packages shared with T.P.S. members in the course of Toronto B.T.B. service provision, whether this information is provided in a hard copy or electronic format.

4. Identification of a clear line of communication when there are program developments and/or issues in service provision, ideally with a single point of contact identified by both Toronto B.T.B. and the T.P.S. Wellness team. In order to be most effective in the facilitation of day-to-day operations, this contact should operate in independence from the Chief's office.

Consistent with the Toronto B.T.B.s stated goal of sharing networks and resources with external partners, additional discussion should occur regarding the potential for formalizing a partnership between the Toronto B.T.B. and the in-house T.P.S. Wellness program that is comparable to the partnerships that Toronto B.T.B. has proposed with other external partners such as "Badge of Life", "Wounded Warriors", and others.

## **Conclusion:**

The Toronto B.T.B. organization has already commenced operation and the purpose of their deputation was to seek funding from the Board's Special Fund and to receive the official support from the Chief and the Board. Although a formal agreement would need to be drafted, Toronto B.T.B. can be seen as a positive addition to the various services already in place for T.P.S. members and their families.

If the considerations outlined within this report are managed to the satisfaction of the Chief and the Board, the T.P.S. will offer their official support to Toronto B.T.B. in the following ways, solely:

- Allow Toronto B.T.B. to post on the T.P.S. intranet, as well as attend T.P.S. events held specifically for T.P.S. members and their families,
- On-going collaboration with current T.P.S. Wellness programs and initiatives , and;
- A recommendation that the Board approve the request for funding as a one-time contribution from the Board's Special Fund and as an exception from the Policy in the amount of \$30,000

As previously stated, if the funding is approved by the Board, then Toronto B.T.B. should report back to the Board' in one year's time on how the money was spent, the success of the program and any issues encountered in the first year of operation.

I will be in attendance to answer any questions the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

August 30, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Response to the Jury Recommendations from the Coroner's Inquest into the Death of Mr. David Andrew Doucette**

### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Services Board (Board):

- (1) receive the following report for information; and
- (2) forward a copy of the following report to the Chief Coroner for the Province of Ontario.

### **Financial Implications:**

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendations contained within this report.

### **Background / Purpose:**

At its meeting January 26, 2017, the Board received correspondence from the Interim City Solicitor's Office entitled "Final Report: Inquest into the Death of Mr. David Andrew Doucette – Verdict and Recommendations of the Jury". This report summarized the outcome of the Coroner's inquest into the death of Mr. David Andrew Doucette (Min. No. P9/17 refers).

The inquest was conducted in the City of Toronto during the period of December 5 to December 14, 2016. As a result of the inquest, the jury made six recommendations, with five of the recommendations being directed to the Toronto Police Service (Service).

The purpose of this report is to inform the Board of the Service's review and implementation of the jury's recommendations.

The following is a summary of the circumstances of the death of Mr. David Andrew Doucette and issues addressed at the inquest, as delivered by Dr. John R. Carlisle, Presiding Coroner.

### **Summary of the Circumstances of the Death:**

*During the early evening of February 18th, 2015 Mr. David Doucette was invited for a few drinks by another male resident of 140 Spadina Road in Toronto, a rooming house.*

*Mr. Doucette went to the other resident's room and they shared a bottle of liquor. For reasons which remain unclear, Mr. Doucette suddenly began stabbing the other resident repeatedly in the face and neck.*

*The stabbing victim yelled for neighbours to call the police and ran out of the residence where he stood on the curb bleeding profusely while he waited for police and paramedics to arrive.*

*Mr. Doucette also left the residence and was observed by witnesses holding a bloody knife in his hand and watching the police officers and paramedics who had responded to the 911 call and were attending to the wounded man.*

*Responding police officers then saw Mr. Doucette and drew their firearms. An officer, who had his firearm drawn, yelled numerous times for Mr. Doucette to put down the knife, but Mr. Doucette did not do so. Mr. Doucette took steps toward the officer and the wounded man and was shot.*

*Mr. Doucette was transported to St. Michael's Hospital where he was pronounced dead.*

*A coroner was called and a post mortem examination was conducted.*

*The jury heard from 17 witnesses over five days, considered 16 exhibits and deliberated for approximately five hours before reaching a verdict.*

### **Discussion:**

Professional Standards Support – Governance was tasked with preparing responses for the jury recommendations directed to the Service from the Coroner's inquest into the death of Mr. David Andrew Doucette.

Service subject matter experts from the Toronto Police College (T.P.C.), Divisional Policing Support Unit (D.P.S.U.), Strategy Management, and Communications Services contributed to the responses contained in this report.

## **Response to the Jury Recommendations:**

### **To the Toronto Police Services Board and to the Chief of Police:**

#### **Recommendation #1:**

*The Toronto Police Services should actively and continuously explore new technologies in the area of less lethal use of force options. The findings should be available in a timely manner.*

The Service concurs and is in compliance with this recommendation.

In April 2016, the Service, in accordance with provincial legislation (R.R.O. 1990 Regulation 926, s. 14, *Police Services Act*, “Equipment and Use of Force”), deployed the less-lethal shotgun as an intermediate extended-range impact weapon to front-line officers.

The less-lethal shotgun operates on the premise of pain compliance or incapacitation, so that control of the subject can be established and may provide the opportunity for police officers to resolve potentially violent situations at a greater distance with less potential for causing serious bodily harm or death than other justifiable force options.

In coordination with the deployment of the less-lethal shotgun, training was provided by the T.P.C., and new Procedure 15-06, entitled “Less-Lethal Shotguns”, was operationalized. Currently, new recruits will also be instructed on the less-lethal shotgun as part of their mandatory training.

The Service continuously seeks to identify less-lethal force options and best practices to assist its members in safely resolving violent and dangerous situations.

The Service reported to the Board for a similar jury recommendation from the Thompson Inquest (Recommendation #2) in November 2015 (Min. No. P287/15 refers).

The Service also reported to the Board regarding alternate equipment options and use-of-force measures in the Iacobucci Report (Recommendation #74) and the J.K.E. Inquest (Recommendation #28) in September 2015 (Min. No. P232/15 refers).

#### **Recommendation #2:**

*Toronto Police Services should continue to explore the use of Conducted Energy Weapons by front line officers who have been provided with proper training.*

The Service concurs with this recommendation and has requested Board approval for the acquisition of more Conducted Energy Weapons (C.E.W.s) to be deployed to front-line officers.

At its meeting in October 2016, in a report to the Board entitled “Toronto Police Service 2017-2026 Capital Program Request”, the Service asked to acquire and deploy an additional 250 C.E.W.s to selected uniform front-line police constables and constables from designated specialized units (Min. No. P244/16 refers). This was in response to the continued need for less-lethal force options to help safely resolve dangerous encounters with community members.

This expanded deployment would complement the 545 C.E.W.s that are already issued to uniform front-line supervisors, and selected members of specialized units.

At this time, the Service’s request for additional C.E.W.s was not approved; however, the Board did approve the following motion: *“that the Board conduct community consultations, which will include the Board Mental-Health Sub-Committee, and report back prior to the procurement of any additional Conducted Energy Weapons proposed to be deployed to selected front-line officers”*.

The Service will continue to pursue the expanded deployment of C.E.W.s to front-line officers, pending the approval of the Board.

It should be noted that the Service also reported to the Board regarding the expanded deployment of C.E.W.s to front-line officers in the Iacobucci Report (Recommendation #59) in September 2015 (Min. No. P232/15 refers).

### **Recommendation #3:**

*Whenever a sergeant is dispatched to a scene, to consider directing dispatchers and the sergeants to communicate, whenever circumstances permit, the estimated time of arrival.*

The Service concurs and is in compliance with this recommendation.

It is standard operating procedure for communications dispatchers to routinely solicit information and provide updates related to the estimated time of arrival for sergeants dispatched to a scene.

Currently, Communications Services Directive C.6.1.21 entitled “Keeping Units Advised of Action Taken” states:

*Upon receiving a request for a specialized unit and/or a supervisor equipped with a C.E.W. to attend an event the dispatcher shall, if circumstances permit, ensure and confirm that officers receive the information that the specialized unit/supervisor is en route, providing an estimated time of arrival whenever possible.*

Additionally, all police officers, with the exception of those medically exempt, attend the T.P.C. every 12 months for the three-day In-Service Training Program (I.S.T.P.). As part of the 2017 I.S.T.P., officers receive an hour-long use of force lecture in which C.E.W.s are specifically discussed. The training stipulates that if a C.E.W. has been requested at a scene and circumstances allow for it, C.E.W. operators are to announce that a C.E.W. is available and on the way, as well as provide an estimated time of arrival for dispatch and other attending officers.

The Service reported to the Board for similar recommendations from the J.K.E. Inquest (Recommendation #37) in September 2015 (Min. No. P232/15 refers) as well as the Thompson Inquest (Recommendation #1) in November 2015 (Min. No. P287/15 refers).

### **Recommendation #5:**

*Consider building a repository of the locations of housing for those in need of social and psychiatric services and develop a process by which to access and disseminate the repository information at the time of dispatch.*

The Service is proceeding cautiously when considering the merits of this recommendation before any decisions are made for implementation.

The Service, as well as members of the mental-health community, including consumer survivors, share concerns that there are complexities that need to be assessed and considered in the areas of personal privacy, patient-physician confidentiality, stereotyping, and the stigmatization that victimizes persons experiencing mental-health issues. Consultations both internally and externally are required to properly explore all aspects of these issues.

The Service is continually working with its partners to improve interactions with members of the community. Since the release of the Iacobucci Report in 2014, the Service has undergone an extensive review of its policies and procedures, specifically interactions with persons in crisis.

The Iacobucci Report was a catalyst for the creation of a mapping tool that is now available for Service members, to effectively connect the public to community resources, including mental-health services.

Launched in May 2017, the “Community Asset Portal” (C.A.P.), developed by the Service’s Business Intelligence unit in collaboration with Ryerson University, is a web application that shows users an up-to-date map of social services such as shelters, community resource navigators, and mental-health and youth support services.

The C.A.P. is a valuable reference tool that detects the location of users and allows them to see the resources in their vicinity, using a colour-coded map or by moving through a list of categories, such as Health or Food & Housing services. It also shows



users how to get to the location by car, foot and public transit, as well as providing contact information.

This tool will also assist the D.P.S.U. through their initiatives, such as the “Furthering Our Community by Uniting Services” (F.O.C.U.S.) Toronto whereby community and social services resources can be located and utilized. F.O.C.U.S. Toronto is an innovative project, led by the Service, United Way Toronto, City of Toronto and local community organizations, that aims to reduce crime and improve community resiliency in the City of Toronto. The initiative brings together existing community agencies to provide a targeted, wrap-around approach to supporting individuals, children, youth and families that are experiencing heightened levels of risk involving anti-social behaviour as well as victimization. In April and October 2016, F.O.C.U.S. North Scarborough, Downtown East and Downtown West commenced collaborative risk-driven interventions in the formation of new situation tables, in addition to the F.O.C.U.S. Rexdale situation table. The expansion of these particular situation tables was a recommendation of an independent evaluation of the model to support scaling in different geographic communities in the City of Toronto.

The C.A.P. will also enhance the efforts of community engagement and liaison with the current and potential D.P.S.U. partners. Collective efforts will enhance community safety and well-being.

Another Service initiative, currently in development by the Service’s Strategy Management Unit, is the “Vulnerable Persons Registry”. It is the intent that this web-based registry will allow vulnerable persons or their caregivers to voluntarily provide information that may be accessed by Service members. This would provide officers with valuable and possibly vital information should they encounter the vulnerable person while they are in crisis. Privacy impact assessments are currently underway to identify and assess any risk-management issues.

### **Recommendation #6:**

*Ensure that police officers are oriented to high risk housing locations within their assigned divisions.*

The Service is proceeding cautiously when considering the merits of this recommendation before any decisions are made for implementation.

Similar to Recommendation #5, the Service will have to assess and consider a number of complexities, including privacy and confidentiality. Consultations both internally and externally are required to properly explore all aspects of these issues.

Furthermore, due care must be taken when labeling any housing locations as “high risk”, whether for mental-health issues or other policing concerns. This labeling can have adverse effects on the community’s perception that can lead to the stigmatization

and isolation of the residents of these locations. Members of the mental-health community, including consumer survivors, have also shared these concerns.

The Service does have planned initiatives in development that support the orientation and enhancement of officers' knowledge and familiarity with neighbourhood policing issues.

The D.P.S.U., along with members of the Transformational Task Force (T.T.F.), will be developing a comprehensive neighbourhood policing program that will have a "community-centric" delivery model to enhance community safety. It is proposed that Neighbourhood Officers will be embedded in every neighbourhood. This continuous presence will enhance their personal and professional skills required to be effective community collaborators and partners.

Neighbourhood Officers are the focal point of resource knowledge in their respective divisions and will be helpful to anyone seeking information on points of interest within a given neighbourhood in the City of Toronto. D.P.S.U. is currently the Service coordinator for the Neighbourhood Officer Program. D.P.S.U., along with the T.T.F., will develop strategies for Neighbourhood Officers to work in partnership with community resources needs specific to each of the respective areas they serve. Efforts will be proactive and insightful to co-develop solutions and share information with internal and external stakeholders.

## **Conclusion:**

As a result of the Coroner's inquest into the death of Mr. David Andrew Doucette and the subsequent jury recommendations, the Service has conducted a review of Service governance, training and current practices.

In summary, the Service concurs and is in compliance with Recommendations #1 and #3. The Service concurs with the intent of Recommendation #2 and is awaiting approval from the Board in order to move forward. The Service has concerns with Recommendations #5 and #6 and will proceed carefully while attempting to identify and work to resolve issues of privacy, confidentiality, stereotyping, and stigmatization through internal and external consultations.

The Service continues to strive for excellence in providing its members with the latest technology, equipment, best practices, and training, in order to safely resolve dangerous encounters and mitigate the potential for harm, whenever feasible.

Additionally, as stated in the first item in the Service's Mental-Health Statement of Commitment: "Members of the Toronto Police Service are committed to preserving the lives of people in crisis if reasonably possible. Our goal is the safety of every citizen and we aspire to preserve every life..."

Deputy Chief Peter Yuen, Operational Support Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police

MS/rg

Doucette Inquest.docx

Attachments:

Appendix A – Jury Verdict & Recommendations (Doucette Inquest)

# Verdict Explanation

**Inquest into the Death of  
David Andrew Doucette**

**Coroners Courts  
25 Morton Shulman Ave.  
Toronto, Ontario**

**December 5, 2016 to December 14, 2016**

I intend to give a brief synopsis of the issues presented at this inquest. I would like to stress that much of this explanation will be my interpretation of both the evidence presented and of the jury's reasoning in making recommendations. The sole purpose of this explanation is to assist the reader in understanding the verdict and recommendations made by the jury. This explanation is not to be considered as actual evidence presented at the inquest and is in no way intended to replace the jury's verdict.

## **Participants:**

Coroner's Counsel	Michael Blain Counsel Office of the Chief Coroner 25 Morton Shulman Ave. Toronto, ON M3M 0B1 647-329-1850
Coroner's Constable	Det. Const. S.A. (Scott) Lambert #9125 OPP Coroner's Inquest Unit Ontario Provincial Police Office of the Chief Coroner 25 Morton Shulman Ave. Toronto, ON M3M 0B1 647-329-1732
Coroner's Investigator	Det. Const. Heather McCallum # 13227 OPP Coroner's Inquest Unit Ontario Provincial Police Office of the Chief Coroner 25 Morton Shulman Ave. Toronto, ON M3M 0B1 647-329-1736

1000010 (M01/2016/01/11/0001)

Appendix - A

Reporter	Devon Lockett Network Reporting Services 100 King St. West, Suite 900 Toronto, ON M5X 1E3 416-359-0305 Fax: 416 359 1611
<b>Parties with Standing:</b>	<b>Represented By:</b>
Chief of the Toronto Police Service	Sie-wing Khow & Gail Glickman 40 College Street Toronto, ON M5G 2J3 416-808-7804 Fax: 416-808-7802
Toronto Police Services Board	Michelle Brady & Carol Smith 26 <sup>th</sup> Floor, Metro Hall, Stn 1260 55 John Street Toronto, ON M5V 3C6 416-392-7224 Fax: 416-397-5624
Police Constable Storey	Mr. Gary Clewley 357 Bay Street, Suite 703 Toronto, ON M5H 2T7 647-999-8910
Police Constable DeLima	Mr. Jimmy Lee 180 Bloor Street West, Suite 903 Toronto, ON M5S 2V6 416-360-1568 Fax: 416-686-8447

(016 CanLit 98262 (ON 0000))

### Summary of the Circumstances of the Death:

During the early evening of February 18th, 2015 Mr. David Doucette was invited for a few drinks by another male resident of 140 Spadina Road in Toronto, a rooming house.

Mr. Doucette went to the other resident's room and they shared a bottle of liquor. For reasons which remain unclear, Mr. Doucette suddenly began stabbing the other resident repeatedly in the face and neck.

The stabbing victim yelled for neighbours to call the police and ran out of the residence where he stood on the curb bleeding profusely while he waited for police and paramedics to arrive.

Mr. Doucette also left the residence and was observed by witnesses holding a bloody knife in his hand and watching the police officers and paramedics who had responded to the 911 call and were attending to the wounded man.

Responding police officers then saw Mr. Doucette and drew their firearms. An officer, who had his firearm drawn, yelled numerous times for Mr. Doucette to put down the knife, but Mr. Doucette did not do so. Mr. Doucette took steps toward the officer and the wounded man and was shot.

Mr. Doucette was transported to St. Michael's Hospital where he was pronounced dead.

A coroner was called and a post mortem examination was conducted.

The jury heard from 17 witnesses over five days, considered 16 exhibits and deliberated approximately five hours before reaching a verdict.

### Verdict:

<b>Name of the Deceased:</b>	David Andrew Doucette
<b>Date of Death:</b>	February 18, 2015 at 21:55 Hrs
<b>Place of Death:</b>	St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto
<b>Cause of Death:</b>	Gunshot Wound To Neck
<b>By What Means :</b>	Homicide

## Recommendations:

### To the Toronto Police Services Board and the Chief of the Toronto Police:

1. The Toronto Police Services should actively and continuously explore new technologies in the area of less lethal use of force options. The findings should be available in a timely manner.

#### Coroner's Comments:

*The jury felt that all less lethal use of force options should continue to be explored on an active and continuous basis and that all findings of such exploration should be made available in a timely manner.*

2. Toronto police services should continue to explore the use of Conducted Energy Weapons by front line officers who have been provided with proper training.

#### Coroner's Comments:

*The jury heard evidence that the Toronto Police Service is currently evaluating the use of conducted energy weapons (CEW) by frontline officers and that they are currently issued to supervisors and specialty units. The jury heard evidence that, in this case, an experienced frontline officer confronted with a man holding a knife felt that the use of the conducted energy weapon might have been an option and, indeed, he called over the police radio to see if one could arrive at the scene rapidly. A sergeant with such a weapon was on the way but did not arrive in time to make use of the CEW a possibility. The jury felt that in some cases the availability of the CEW to properly trained front line officers might prevent similar deaths in future.*

3. Whenever a sergeant is dispatched to a scene, to consider directing dispatchers and the sergeant to communicate, whenever circumstances permit, the estimated time of arrival.

#### Coroner's Comments:

*The jury heard evidence as set out above that a sergeant announced over the radio that he was on the call but did not give his location or estimated time of arrival. The jury heard that giving this information, where possible, is a current practice but, noting that it had not happened in this case, they felt that consideration might be given to a reminder or further direction.*

### To the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care and the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services:

4. Conduct a review as to whether specific types of health information should be provided to police services, who are frequently the first to have contact with an individual. Information to consider as part of the review may include information that may cause an individual to be a risk to others. The review

## Appendix - A

should include consultation with relevant stakeholders and include consideration of the best way to make the information available in a timely manner.

### **Coroner's Comments:**

*The jury heard that the officers in this case received a call about a man who had been stabbed and that the party doing the stabbing was on the scene. They knew nothing more about the parties involved or about the nature of the premise at the address given.*

*The fact was that the rooming house was one where support services often placed persons with psychiatric and social needs. The fact was that the deceased had a long history of violence and incarceration for violent assaults. He also had a history of treatment for mental illness and suicidality and was under treatment at a major hospital for those illnesses in circumstances where his care givers at that institution believed that he was a dangerous person and had taken steps to protect staff because of their fear of being alone with him.*

*The jury felt that, even if current law did not permit involuntary hospitalization in the absence of an "imminent" threat and even if a patient in the community suffered from a psychiatric illness for which there is no effective treatment, some protection for other members of society and first responders might nevertheless be afforded by the devising of some system whereby police might be able to access at least some information when responding to calls involving serious threats and violence by persons suffering from mental problems making violence predictable even if not imminent.*

### **To the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care, the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, Toronto Police Services Board and the Chief of Police:**

5. Consider building a repository of the locations of housing for those in need of social and psychiatric services and develop a process by which to access and disseminate the repository information at the time of dispatch.

6. Ensure that police officers are oriented to high risk housing locations within their assigned divisions.

### **Coroner's Comments:**

*The Jury heard, as stated above, that the responding officers had no information regarding the nature of the rooming house at the address of the call. The jury felt that if they had been aware that it was largely housing persons with psychiatric issues they might have been better able to deal with the call. The jury felt that there should be an information base about such premises that could be accessed and available to officers when a call is dispatched there. This might aid the officers and the residents where the call was to deal with psychiatric issues and might indicate that other resources should be dispatched if available. The jury also felt that officers should be oriented to such premises within the division they served.*



### Closing Comments

In closing, I would like to stress once again that this document was prepared solely for the purpose of assisting interested parties in understanding the jury's verdict. It is worth repeating that this is not the verdict. Likewise, many of the comments regarding the evidence are my personal recollection of the same and are not put forth as actual evidence. If any party feels that I made a gross error in my recollection of the evidence, it would be greatly appreciated if it could be brought to my attention so that any error can be corrected.

John R. Carlisle M.D., LL.B., FCLM

December 21, 2016

Coroner

2016 Carlisle 9/23/16 (ON: OCCC)



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

September 21, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Special Constable Appointment**

### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Board approve the appointment of the individuals listed in this report as special constables for the University of Toronto, subject to the approval of the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services.

### **Financial Implications:**

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

### **Background / Purpose:**

Under Section 53 of the *Police Services Act of Ontario*, the Board is authorized to appoint and re-appoint special constables, subject to the approval of the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services. Pursuant to this authority, the Board now has agreements with the University of Toronto (U of T), Toronto Community Housing Corporation (T.C.H.C.) and Toronto Transit Commission (T.T.C.) governing the administration of special constables (Min. Nos. P571/94, P41/98 and P154/14 refer).

The Service has received a request from the University of Toronto to appoint the following individuals as special constables:

Table 1 Name of Agency and Special Constable Applicant

Agency	Name
University of Toronto, St. George Campus	Kelvin CHU (New Appointment)
University of Toronto, St. George Campus	Kristen CURTIS (New Appointment)
University of Toronto, St. George Campus	Kristen DRINKWALTER (New Appointment)
University of Toronto, St. George Campus	Gabriel FEBBO (New Appointment)
University of Toronto, St. George Campus	Jenna GLEN (New Appointment)
University of Toronto, St. George Campus	Mackenzie REES (New Appointment)
University of Toronto, St. George Campus	Amber VAN RAVENSWAAY (New Appointment)
University of Toronto, St. George Campus	Ruth VICKER (New Appointment)

**Discussion:**

The special constables are appointed to enforce the *Criminal Code of Canada*, *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act*, *Trespass to Property Act*, *Liquor Licence Act* and *Mental Health Act* on their respective properties within the City of Toronto.

The agreements between the Board and each agency require that background investigations be conducted on all of the individuals who are being recommended for appointment or re-appointment as special constables. The Service’s Employment Unit completed background investigations on these individuals and there is nothing on file to preclude them from being appointed as special constables for a five year term.

The University of Toronto has advised the Service that the above individuals satisfy all of the appointment criteria as set out in their agreement with the Board. The agency approved strength and current complement is indicated below:

Table 2 Name of Agency, Approved Strength and Current Number of Special Constables

Agency	Approved Strength	Current Complement
University of Toronto, St. George Campus	50	32

**Conclusion:**

The Toronto Police Service continues to work together in partnership with the agencies to identify individuals who may be appointed as special constables who will contribute positively to the safety and well-being of persons engaged in activities on T.T.C., T.C.H.C. and U of T properties within the City of Toronto.

Deputy Chief of Police, James Ramer, Specialized Operations Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have with respect to this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police

MS:ao

BoardReportUofTSeptember2017.docx



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

July 26, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Special Constables: Toronto Community Housing Corporation, Increase in Approved Strength**

### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Board approve the request from the Toronto Community Housing Corporation (T.C.H.C.) to increase their approved authorized strength of Special Constables from 112 to 160.

### **Financial Implications:**

There are no financial implications relating to the recommendation contained within this report.

### **Background / Purpose:**

Under Section 53 of the *Police Services Act of Ontario*, the Board is authorized to appoint and re-appoint special constables, subject to the approval of the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services. Pursuant to this authority, the Board now has agreements with the University of Toronto (U of T), Toronto Community Housing Corporation (T.C.H.C.) and Toronto Transit Commission (T.T.C.) governing the administration of Special Constables (Min. Nos. P571/94, P41/98 and P154/14 refer).

T.C.H.C., Community Safety Unit is requesting that the Board increase their approved strength from 112 to 160 Special Constables.

T.C.H.C. is the largest social housing provider in Canada. Their portfolio includes nearly 60,000 residential units in 2,200 buildings. T.C.H.C.'s Community Safety Unit serves more than 110,000 people across 50 million square feet of residential space throughout the year by delivering safety programs to residents, securing their buildings and providing corporate security.

T.C.H.C. Special Constables are comprised of Constables, Field Supervisors and District Managers. They are appointed to enforce the *Criminal Code of Canada*, the *Controlled Drugs and Substances Act*, the *Trespass to Property Act*, the *Liquor License Act* and the *Mental Health Act* on T.C.H.C. properties within the City of Toronto.

They are charged with the responsibility of securing the T.C.H.C. facilities while ensuring the safety and security of their communities. In 2016, the T.C.H.C.'s Community Safety Unit responded to 57,133 incidents pertaining to requests for service and investigations relating to events on or near T.C.H.C. properties.

**Discussion:**

This enables the same officers to have a frequent and consistent presence in that community. Increasing the approved complement of Special Constables will assist the Community Safety Unit in achieving the goals they have set through this new deployment model.

With the increase of residents in T.C.H.C. facilities so have the requirements of T.C.H.C Special Constables. With the additional officers the Community Safety Unit will be able to meet the growing demands placed upon them .

**Table 1 Name of Agency, Approved Strength and Current Number of Special Constables**

Agency	Approved Strength	Current Complement
Toronto Community Housing Corporation	112	104

**Conclusion:**

The Toronto Police Service continues to work together in partnership with the agencies to identify individuals who may be appointed as Special Constables who will contribute positively to the safety and well-being of persons engaged in activities on T.T.C., T.C.H.C. and U of T properties within the City of Toronto.

The Toronto Police Service Special Constable Liaison Office is in support of the request from the Toronto Community Housing Corporation to increase their approved authorized strength of Special Constables from 112 to 160. We are confident that T.C.H.C. can manage this increase and it would be beneficial to both the T.C.H.C. and the Toronto Police Service.

A representative from T.C.H.C. and Deputy Chief James Ramer, Specialized Operations Command, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have with respect to this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police

BoardReportTCHCAugust2017.docx



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

August 15, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Recommendation for Payment of Legal Indemnification  
Case No. 2089-17**

**Recommendation:**

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service's Board (Board) approve payment of the legal account from Mr. Harry Black, in the amount of \$297,729.92, for his representation of an officer who was criminally charged with assault with a weapon.

**Financial Implications:**

If approved, the legal indemnification claim in the amount of \$297,729.92 will be paid out of the Toronto Police Service's (Service) Legal Reserve, which is funded from the Service's operating budget.

**Background / Purpose:**

A police constable has requested payment of his legal fees for \$297,729.92, as provided for in Article 12 of the Uniform Collective Agreement. The purpose of this report is to recommend payment of the claim.

**Discussion:**

This report corresponds with additional information provided on the Confidential Agenda.

**Conclusion:**

Article 12:01 (a) of the Uniform Collective Agreement states:



*“Subject to the other provisions of this Article, a member charged with but not found guilty of a criminal or statutory offence, because of acts done in the attempted performance in good faith of his/her duties as a police officer, shall be indemnified for the necessary and reasonable legal costs incurred by the member during the investigation of the incident that resulted in those charges being laid and for the necessary and reasonable legal costs incurred by the member in the defence of such charges.”*

Article 12:10 of the Uniform Collective Agreement states:

*“For the purpose of Article 12:01 (a), a member:*

*(a) shall be deemed to have been "not found guilty" where he/she is finally acquitted, where the charges are withdrawn or where he/she is discharged following a preliminary inquiry; and*

*(b) shall be deemed to have been "found guilty" where the member is given an absolute or conditional discharge or where, if as a result of charges laid he/she is subsequently found guilty of, or pleads guilty to, other charges arising out of the same incident or incidents.”*

City Legal has deemed the costs billed as “necessary and reasonable legal costs”. Accordingly, it is recommended that the Board approve payment of Mr. Black’s account.

Mr. Tony Veneziano, Chief Administrative Officer, will be in attendance to answer any questions that the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police

MS:PM:nl



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

August 31, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Ergo-Industrial Seating Systems - Vendor of Record**

### **Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Services Board (Board):

- 1) approve Ergo-Industrial Seating Systems as the vendor of record, for the supply and installation of office seating furniture effective the date of Board approval to July 31, 2018;
- 2) authorize the Chief to exercise the remaining two one-year option years on behalf of the Board, subject to the exercise of those options by the Ministry of Government and Consumer Services and the Toronto Police Service's (Service) satisfaction with the performance of the vendor; and
- 3) authorize the Chair to execute all required agreements and related documents on behalf of the Board, subject to approval by the City Solicitor as to form.

### **Financial Implications:**

The lifecycle replacement of furniture is included in the Service's capital budget program and funded from the Service's Vehicle and Equipment Reserve. Funds for furniture associated with the construction of new facilities or a major renovation are included in the respective capital budget for those projects. Any net-new seating requirements would be requested through the annual operating budget process and obtained based on budget approval.

The estimated annual expenditure for seating replacement is approximately \$340,000, including taxes.

### **Background / Purpose:**

The Facilities Management Unit manages the acquisition, installation and maintenance of all furniture and equipment within the Service.

The purpose of this report is to establish a Vendor of Record (V.O.R.) for the Service's seating requirements.

**Discussion:**

A V.O.R. arrangement was established by the Ministry of Government and Consumer Services for the supply, delivery, and installation of office seating and furniture, in accordance with the terms and conditions of Request for Bid, Ontario Shared Services (R.F.B., O.S.S.) - 00510687. The use of the V.O.R. arrangement is available on an optional basis to the Broader Public Sector. Utilizing this existing agreement allows the Service to benefit from provincial pricing, based on larger volumes, and avoids the Service having to go through its own procurement process for its office seating requirements.

The Province's contract with Ergo-Industrial Seating Systems has been in effect since August 4, 2015, and runs through to July 31, 2018. The contract also has two one-year options that the Province can exercise.

**Conclusion:**

Upon a review of the terms and conditions of the Provincial contract with Ergo-Industrial Seating Systems, it was determined that the products provided meet the Service's needs.

Approval is therefore being requested to utilize Ergo-Industrial Seating Systems for the installation and supply of office seating furniture until the contract ends July 31, 2018. In addition, should the Province decide to exercise the remaining two one-year option years, the Service is requesting the Board authorize the Chief to execute the option years on behalf of the Board, provided the Service is satisfied with the products and performance of the vendor.

Mr. Tony Veneziano, Chief Administrative Officer, will be in attendance to answer any questions the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.

Chief of Police

/EP

Filename: Ergo Industrial Seating Systems Vendor of Record.docx



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

September 13, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

**Subject: Speed Measuring Devices – Vendor of Record**

### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Toronto Police Service Board:

- (1) approve Davtech Analytical Services as the vendor of record for the supply and delivery of hand held Lidar devices, commencing upon Board approval of the contract to March 3, 2018;
- (2) authorize the Chief to exercise the two one-year contract extensions available under this contract, subject to the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services (O.P.P.), exercising the option period and the Service being satisfied with the product and services provided by Davtech Analytical Services; and
- (3) authorize the Chair to execute all required agreements and related documents on behalf of the Board, subject to approval by the City Solicitor as to form.

### **Financial Implications:**

The Toronto Police Service (Service) currently operates two types of speed measuring devices; hand held Lidar units and fix mounted mobile radar units. The suggested lifespan of both products is approximately ten years.

The lifecycle replacement of speed measuring devices is funded from the Vehicle and Equipment Reserve in the Service's approved capital program, and approximately \$1.4 Million is included in the 2017-2026 capital program for this purpose. The 2017 expenditure is estimated at \$250,000.

## **Background / Purpose:**

Traffic enforcement and protection of all road users are important elements of public safety. In 30% of fatal collisions, speed is a contributing factor according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. Excessive speed is a core element of the road safety problem. Speed measuring devices have been proven to reduce the number of collisions and have a positive impact on decreasing the number of fatalities, personal injury and property damage collisions on our roads.

Traffic Services co-ordinates the Service's speed measuring program, which includes both hand held and mobile vehicle mounted units. Currently 220 hand held and 84 mobile units are in operation throughout the Service.

In 2013, it was identified that a number of speed measuring devices had reached their reliability life span. Several of these units were purchased as far back as 1997 (16 years). Operated daily on a 24 hour basis, units had begun to fail on a regular basis. As a result, average repair costs had increased 18% during the time period of 2011 to mid-2013.

Faced with ever increasing downtime due to repairs, a life cycle replacement program was implemented. The purchase of more up-to-date devices has provided the Service with new and improved technological features, greater reliability and reduced repair costs assisted by a manufacturer warranty.

To protect the investment in current service assets, as well as ensure a consistent, reliable and cost effective source for both new product and repair of our speed measuring devices, the approval of a suitable vendor is required.

The purpose of this report is therefore to establish a vendor for the supply of hand held Lidar speed measuring devices only.

## **Discussion:**

As a result of the Service's membership in the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (O.A.C.P.) and the Provincial Speed Advisory Committee (P.S.A.C.), we have the opportunity to be actively engaged in discussion and testing of speed measuring technologies and the available purchasing options through current Provincial and Police Cooperative Purchasing Group (P.C.P.G.) contracts.

Since July 2016, the Service has been evaluating the DragonEye speed Lidar distributed by Davtech Analytical Services. Operator feedback has been extremely positive and has included the following observations;

- Light weight, resulting in minimal operator fatigue;
- Forward ergonomic handle design eliminating wrist strain;
- Improved performance during inclement weather conditions;

- Instantaneous motor vehicle acquisition resulting in positive target identification;
- Heads up display offering a more comprehensive aiming sight; and
- Enhanced features including sleep mode, obstruction mode, and target gating, ideal for difficult set up locations or community safety zones

There is currently a P.C.P.G. contract (No. O.P.P.-0884) in effect until March 3, 2018, with two additional one-year options that covers the purchase of the above product.

The following equipment and warranty will be received for each speed device purchased;

- Dragon Eye Speed Lidar
- Batteries
- Tripod, Joystick, mounting hardware
- 12V power cable
- Hard shell carry case
- Canadian operator manual
- Laminated operator's guide
- 5 year warranty

### **Conclusion:**

The World Health Organization predicts that by the year 2020, traffic related collisions will have jumped from ninth to third in the world for public health issues. Speed measuring devices have been proven to reduce the number of collisions and have a positive impact on decreasing the number of fatalities, personal injury and property damage collisions. Effective and reliable devices represent a core component of a successful speed management program.

It is recommended that Davtech Analytical Services be approved as vendor of record for the supply and delivery of hand held Lidar speed measuring devices, pursuant to the terms as outlined in P.C.P.G. Contract No. OPP-0884.

Deputy Chief Jim Ramer, Specialized Operations Command and Mr. Tony Veneziano, Chief Administrative Officer, will be in attendance to answer any questions the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police



## Toronto Police Services Board Report

---

September 8, 2017

To: Chair and Members  
Toronto Police Services Board

From: Mark Saunders  
Chief of Police

### **Subject: Vendor of Record for a Facial Recognition System**

#### **Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Board:

1. delegate authority to the Chief of Police to award the contract for a Facial Recognition System for the Toronto Police Service;
2. request the Chief to report to the Board on the results of Request for Proposals process, including the company the contract for the Facial Recognition System was awarded to, at the Board meeting following the contract award by the Chief; and
3. authorize the Chair to execute all required agreements and related documents on behalf of the Board, subject to approval by the City Solicitor as to form.

#### **Financial Implications:**

The acquisition of a Facial Recognition System is being funded from an approved Policing Effectiveness and Modernization (P.E.M.) grant.

#### **Background / Purpose:**

The purpose of this report is to obtain Board approval to delegate the authority to award a contract for a Facial Recognition system to the Chief, following a fair and open procurement process. The award will be made to the highest scoring and compliant bidder.

#### **Discussion:**

The Facial Recognition System project application was submitted to the Province and approved under the P.E.M. Grant. The system will enhance the ability to identify wanted criminals and bring them to justice. The community at large and the Service will greatly

benefit from arresting criminal offenders, particularly violent offenders as expeditiously as possible, thereby preventing further victimization.

The Service will receive \$1.6 Million from the Province, through the P.E.M. Grant, for the Facial Recognition System project. However, the system must be received and implemented, and the funds expended no later than March 31, 2018. Further, under the Board's Financial Control Bylaw 147, Board approval is required for any contract exceeding \$500,000.

The requirement to administer a fair and open procurement process, conduct a proper evaluation, obtain Board approval, get a contract in place and actually implement the system, will require significant time and could result in the delivery of the system not being achieved by the March 31, 2018 provincial grant deadline.

To help mitigate this risk, we are requesting that the Board delegate its authority for contract approval to the Chief, subject to a fair and open procurement process being conducted, and on the condition that the Chief will report to a future meeting of the Board on the contract award. Forgoing pre-Board approval for the contract award will save the Service 4-6 weeks and therefore enable the successful vendor to commence the implementation sooner, thereby increasing the likelihood that the March 31, 2018 system delivery deadline will be met.

#### **R.F.P. Process:**

Request for Proposal (R.F.P.) #1230424 was issued in August 2017 by the Toronto Police Service's Purchasing Services unit to potential vendors to provide the Facial Recognition System for implementation prior to March 31, 2018.

The Service advertised the R.F.P. internationally to potential vendors using MERX, an electronic tendering service.

The evaluation criterion for the proposals was included in the R.F.P., and is as follows:

- Stage 1 - Mandatory requirements (pass/fail)
- Stage 2 - Evaluated requirements (80% weighting) - requires an 80% score to move to the next stage
- Stage 3 - Demonstration (20% weighting) – requires an 80% score of stage 2 and 3 combine to move to the next stage
- Stage 4 - Field Test (80% weighting) - requires an 80% score to move to stage 5
- Stage 5 - Cost (20% weighting)

#### **Conclusion:**

The R.F.P. is expected to close in early September 2017 with the demonstration, field testing and price evaluations expected to be completed by mid-November 2017. This



will allow the successful vendor about four months to implement the system by the March 31, 2018 deadline.

Having to obtain pre-Board approval for the contract award would delay the start of the implementation period by about 4-6 weeks and severely constrain the vendor's ability to achieve the March 31, 2018 deadline.

The Service is therefore requesting the Board to delegate its authority for this contract award to the Chief, subject to a fair and open procurement process being conducted, and on the condition that the Chief will report to a future meeting of the Board on the contract award.

Deputy Chief James Ramer, Specialized Operations Command and Mr. Tony Veneziano, Chief Administrative Officer, will be in attendance to answer any questions the Board may have regarding this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Saunders, O.O.M.  
Chief of Police