Winnipeg Police Service • Service de Police de Winnipeg
"A safer community built on strong, trusting relationships" « Collectivité sécuritaire, fondée sur des rapports solides et de confiance »

June 30, 2017

[redacted]

Re: Your request for access to information under Part 2 of *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*;
Our file number: **17 06 419**

On June 5, 2017, the City Clerk's Department received your request for access to data and information regarding the **Use of Police Service Dogs**, including:

1. **Number of Police Dogs**
2. **Subject Bites**
3. **Non-Subject Bites**
4. **Apprehensions**
5. **Style of Training**

In response to an Estimate of Costs, your payment of $76.00 was received on June 7, 2017. This was to account for 2.5 additional hours of time for our Canine Unit to compile the information, plus the cost of a CD.

Access is partly granted. Requested information pertaining to all 5 points is enclosed on a CD. However, portions were severed (edited) according to provisions of *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, explained below. These clauses also appear on the records where applicable.

Disclosure harmful to law enforcement or legal proceedings

25(1) The head of a public body may refuse to disclose information to an applicant if disclosure could reasonably be expected to

(e) endanger the life or safety of a law enforcement officer or any other person.

We elected to sever our members' names per s. 25(1)(e). Providing this information could potentially compromise their personal safety.

Continued on page 2...

Disclosure harmful to security of property

26 The head of a public body may refuse to disclose information to an applicant if disclosure could reasonably be expected to harm or threaten the security of any property or system, including a building, a vehicle, an electronic information system or a communications system.

We chose to sever a non-public cellular phone and facsimile number per s. 26. It is plausible disclosure may harm their security.

The actual billable time required by our Canine Unit to prepare the record was the same as what we had estimated. Therefore, no partial refund is forthcoming.

Subsection 59(1) of *The Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* provides that you may make a complaint about this decision to the Manitoba Ombudsman. You have 60 days from the receipt of this letter to make a complaint on the prescribed form to: Manitoba Ombudsman, 750 – 500 Portage Avenue, Winnipeg Manitoba, R3C 3X1; Telephone 204-982-9130 or 1-800-665-0531.

Sincerely,

C. Chabot

Colleen Chabot
FIPPA Coordinator
Ph. (204) 986-4996
Email wps-fippa@winnipeg.ca

Alternate contact: Michele Trudel
FIPPA Coordinator
Ph. (204) 986-2101

Enclosure

cc Richard Kachur, City Clerk
Konrad Krahn, Corporate FIPPA Coordinator

Winnipeg Police Service Canine Unit Statistics and Deployment Method

September 1, 2015, to September 1, 2016,

FIPPA REQUEST 16 11 985

STATISTICS*

1. Number of Police Dogs: 13
2. Subject Bites: 17
3. Non-Subject Bites: 0
4. Apprehensions: 171
5. Style of Training:

The Winnipeg Police Service (WPS) Canine Unit **does not** use the "Bark and Hold" or "Find and Bite" method of training. We teach a "Handler Control Policy, " based on the following rationale.

In our program, the canine has two roles. Their primary function is to track offenders from crime scenes and search for evidence using their enhanced olfactory capabilities. Second, the dog is available to be deployed as a use of force option when required to take hold of a suspect using a controlled bite.

In the WPS use of force continuum, the canine bite is considered an intermediate weapon along with oleoresin capsicum (OC) spray, impact weapon, and conducted electrical weapon (CEW). The force option utilized is at the discretion of the handler based on the perceived threat, the level of resistance encountered and the totality of circumstances. The handler may deploy the dog to apprehend a suspect with the intent to temporarily incapacitate him and overcome their resistance when other options failed or were deemed ineffective or inappropriate.

In our opinion, this method is superior to "Bark and Hold" because the handler, not the dog determines which level of force is required to control a suspect.

"Bark and Hold" is derived from the sport of Schutzhund dog training and does not adapt well to real-time real world scenarios. The "find and bite" method is inconsistent with the WPS use of force policy and could never be considered an option.

P/Sgt. 25(1)(e) #1711
Supervisor/Trainer
Winnipeg Police Service
K9 Unit/Division 50
PSD Wika #56
PSD Jester #61
204-26

P.O. Box 1680
Winnipeg Manitoba R3C 2Z7
Office 204-986-3489
Fax 204-986-26
25(1)(e) @winnipeg.ca

* *Statistics compiled by Cst.* 25(1)(e) *#2380/WPS/K9*