Open Report:	2026-150
To:	The Waterloo Regional Police Service Board
From:	Strategic Services Branch
Meeting Date:	March 18, 2026
Report Title:	Search of Persons in Custody 2025 Annual Report

Recommendation

For information only.

Summary

Following an internal audit conducted during 2020, correspondence and recommendations from the Office of the Independent Police Review Director (OIPRD)[1], and subsequent policy and procedure updates, Waterloo Regional Police Service (WRPS) is committed to reporting annually on search of persons in custody.

A search of a person is standard when: i) an arrest is made, ii) grounds exist for safety reasons during an investigative detention, iii) it is authorized by common law or the statute related to the offence, or lastly, iv) if the person has given consent. As per the Search of Persons Procedure (2024-008-LE), "a member shall ensure a search is authorized by law, not contrary to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom (the Charter), and conducted in the least intrusive manner possible while providing for the discovery of evidence, identification of the arrested person, tools to escape custody and anything that could cause injury." A search "must be reasonable and justified given the circumstances present at the time of arrest". As the level of intrusiveness of the non-consensual search increases, so does the justification.

Different types of searches are conducted by members to ensure that subject persons are not in possession of evidence, tools to escape custody, or any object that could

[1] As of the introduction of the Community Safety & Policing Act, the OIPRD has been renamed to the Law Enforcement Complaints Agency (LECA).

cause injury to themselves or others, including officers (Table 1). Any search beyond a frisk search must be deemed reasonable and authorized by the officer in charge of a prisoner management facility or a patrol supervisor. Upon authorizing a search, the officer in charge shall sign the digital form and document in their notebook the level of search and the justification. Each search is situational and evaluated. All circumstances are examined prior to authorizing a higher-level search. Consideration is given to: i) if the prisoner has a means and/or history of hiding drugs, weapons of opportunity, weapons, or other contraband, ii) if information is received to indicate their presence, iii) the nature of the offence(s), iv) the prisoner's past or present behavior regarding the safety of their person, other persons, or officer(s), v) whether it is necessary to seize evidence related to the offence, and vi) whether the search is lawfully justified based on the circumstances.

Table 1. Types of Searches

Search Type	Explanation*
Frisk Search	Patting down of the person, emptying and searching pockets, as well as the removal or rearrangement of clothing that does not expose a person's undergarments or areas of the body that are normally covered by undergarments. May include checking their personal possessions. For safety reasons, all persons under arrest are frisk searched prior to being placed in a Service vehicle.
Intake Search	More comprehensive than a frisk search and done in a more controlled environment, sometimes with the use of a wand and the opportunity for the person to indicate what items the wand may have detected. At minimum, all persons under arrest shall be intake searched upon being brought into a Service facility and prior to being placed in a cell.
Body Scan	More comprehensive than an intake search, a person entering into Central Division custodial facility may be asked to enter the Body Scanner. Prior to entering, they may identify any items that the Body Scanner may be detect that would be a risk to public or personal safety.
Strip Search Level 1	Person removes their own clothing, one piece of clothing at a time, down to the undergarments, and members inspect the article of clothing in a methodical manner. The person is allowed to replace each article of clothing immediately after inspection, unless doing so would compromise the safety or integrity of the search.
Strip Search Level 2	Person removes their own clothing, one piece of clothing at a time, including the undergarments, and members inspect the article of clothing in a methodical manner. The person is allowed to replace each article of clothing immediately after inspection, unless doing so would compromise the safety or integrity of the search.

* Paraphrased from Chief's Procedure (2024-008-LE) and Area Directive (2025-035) related to Search of Persons. Special consideration is given to religious/ceremonial items, gender identity, and other accommodations as needed.

Innovation and Modernization

Procedure dictates how to document Searches of Persons. In 2023, WRPS launched a phased approach to having all Search of Persons in Custody entered into the Niche RMS system. In 2024, all Search of Persons data was inputted using the Niche Custody Module. Throughout 2025, improvements were made to the Niche Custody Module based on user feedback and changes operating practice (e.g., integration of the Body Scanner for searches). These improvements positively impacted data quality; for example, we observed a 65% decrease in missing data related to Person Subject demographic information year-over-year.

In 2025, WRPS introduced the use of a Body Scanner into operational practice. The body scanner allows for the detection of contraband, including weapons and drugs, concealed in a person's clothing or body, without requiring the Person Subject to remove their clothing. Adopting a phased in approach, the Body Scanner is used instead of a Strip Search, where possible[2]. Therefore, to conduct a body scan, the same reasonable grounds and justification for a strip search are required. Since the Body Scanner has been operational, only 4 Strip Search Level 1 and 23 Strip Search L2 have been conducted. As the Body Scanner was used more frequently, we observed decreases in the overall number of Strip Searches ($r = -0.78$, $p < 0.001$). We will continue to monitor the effectiveness of this tool and any potential indications of systemic bias, as we do with all searches.

Report

This report is based on a 12-month dataset (January 1 to December 31, 2025) of Searches of Persons conducted within police custody facilities, including descriptive statistics on type(s) of search(es), location, approval, and demographics of individuals searched such as gender, perceived race, and repeated contacts.

In 2025, there were 292,878 CAD occurrences, 15,618 arrests, and 4,565 Searches of Persons in custody. Both the number of arrests and the number of Searches of Persons in custody have increased from the year prior (see Table 2; searches have increased by 7%). The most frequent type of search was an Intake Search (86% of all searches in custody, Table 2). Combined, 510 Strip Searches (both Level 1 and Level 2) were conducted, making up 11% of all searches in custody and occurring in about 0.2% of all CAD occurrences in 2025 (same as 2024). Due to this relatively small number, when conducting disaggregate analysis, the proportional numbers will fluctuate over time for reasons which defy systematic explanation and/or may be attributable to the variability of situations encountered during the reporting period. Where there are small counts per category disaggregate, analysis may convey identifying information; these analyses are not presented in this report.

[2] Across 2025,

The vast majority of persons (98%) received one type of search when brought into custody[3]. All searches beyond a frisk search were authorized as per procedure and in all but five cases (one strip search), justifications were provided (>99% of the time). Less than 4% of the searches returned contraband items, consistent with 2023 and 2024. The majority of items were recovered in Intake Searches, however, proportionately Strip Searches were most likely to return an item. Of the 510 Strip Searches conducted, 75 (15%) returned items, a 5% increase from the year before. The most common items found during Strip Searches were drugs or drug paraphernalia.

Table 2: Frequency Statistics for Search of Persons in Custody

	2023		2024		2025	
	Frequency (%)	**Items found (% of type of search)†**	**Frequency (%)**	**Items found (% of type of search)†**	**Frequency (%)**	**Items found (% of type of search)**
Unknown*	34 (1%)		100 (2%)		53 (1%)	
Frisk	163 (4%)	8 (5%)	23 (<1%)	1 (4%)	23 (<1%)	1 (4%)
Intake	3391 (80%)	92 (3%)	3585 (84%)	101 (3%)	3928 (86%)	95 (2%)
Body Scan					50 (1%)	3 (6%)
Strip Search Level 1	186 (4%)	13 (7%)	126 (3%)	13 (10%)	39 (1%)	7 (18%)
Strip Search Level 2	469 (11%)	47 (10%)	418 (10%)	44 (11%)	471 (10%)	68 (14%)
Body Cavity					1 (<1%)	1 (100%)
Total	**4243**	**160 (4%)**	**4252**	**159 (4%)**	**4565**	**175 (4%)**

*Type of search not recorded.
† Percentages were calculated by dividing the number of items found by the number of searches conducted for that search type.

As of April 2024, all persons are held in custody at Central Division or Courts facilities. As a result, the number of searches taken at North or South division have decreased dramatically. The majority of searches conducted at an “Other” location occurred at a hospital.

Table 3: Search of Person by Location

[3] 82 Searches of Persons (2%) involved than one type of search conducted. In these cases, the most comprehensive type of search is represented in search type counts.

Location	2023	2024	2025
	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)	Frequency (%)
Central	3514 (83%)	4058 (95%)	4318 (95%)
North	223 (5%)	8 (< 1%)	1 (<1%)
South	221 (5%)	13 (< 1%)	10 (<1%)
Courts	274 (6%)	166 (4%)	173 (4%)
Other	9 (< 1%)	2 (< 1%)	3 (<1%)
Unknown	2 (< 1%)	5 (< 1%)	60 (1%)
Total	**4243**	**4252**	**4565**

Repeated Contacts

In 2025, 709 individuals were taken into custody more than once (vs. 602 in 2024). We refer to these individuals as having "repeated contacts" within Search of Persons data. These 709 individuals were involved in a total of 1866 searches, accounting for about 40% of all searches in custody (this is a jump from last year, where repeated contacts made up 32% of all searches; see Table 4). Overall, 20% of all individuals who were searched in custody contributed to 41% of all searches.

Of the Strip Searches conducted in 2025, 51% (260 of 510 total Strip Searches across Level 1 and Level 2) involved individuals with repeat contacts (including previous Strip Searches). Again, this is an increase from 2024, where repeated contacts made up 45% of all Strip Searches. Repeated contacts were more likely to receive a Strip Search Level 2 compared to non-repeat contacts.

Table 4: Frequency of search types for repeated contacts, 2025

	Frequency (%)	Percentage of Total Search Type*
Unknown*	26 (1%)	49%
Frisk	7 (<1%)	30%
Intake	1536 (83%)	39%
Body Scanner	21 (1%)	42%
Strip Search Level 1	15 (1%)	38%
Strip Search Level 2	260 (14%)	55%
Body Cavity	1 (< 1%)	100%
Total	**1866**	**41%**

***Calculated by dividing the number of searches for each search type conducted on repeat contacts by the total number of searches for that search type.

Person Characteristics

In accordance with procedure 2024-008-LE, *Ontario's Anti-Racism Act (2017)*, the Data Standards for the Identification and Monitoring of Systemic Racism (Data Standards,

2018), and WRPS' Race- and Identity-Based Data Collection Strategy (RIBDCS), person characteristics (age, gender, perceived race) have been examined for the purpose of identifying, monitoring, and addressing systemic bias.

Minimum requirements under the Data Standards specify the use of local resident population benchmarks to identify disproportionate impacts across public sector organizations. A resident population benchmark represents the cumulative impacts of various systems, institutions, and societal dynamics that contribute to the over-representation of specific groups in particular outcomes. While policing contributes to this number, it is not the sole driver of observed disproportions (Foster & Jacobs, 2023)[4]. Disproportion analysis asks the question: "Is there equal representation of individuals within police data based on what would be expected from local resident population demographics?"

The answer to this question is: No. When benchmarked against resident population demographics police interactions disproportionately overrepresent people based on race, gender, and age. This has been repeatedly documented across the policing sector and WRPS is no exception.

A major limitation to resident population benchmarking is that this comparison provides little insight into the disparities that occur at decision making points within a police interaction that may drive observed disproportions. In order to better uncover and understand the police-specific drivers of disproportionate representation, WRPS' race-based analytic framework has been extended to focus on enforcement-action benchmarking.

WRPS' enforcement-action benchmarking strategy uses police incident benchmarks and enforcement-action benchmarks (where available) to drill into the system-level factors (police practices, policies and procedures) that may contribute to disparate outcomes. By examining multiple contextual pieces, we are able to ask: "Given similar circumstances, do we see similar outcomes for racialized individuals and White individuals"? This is achieved by comparing the proportion of individuals within groups to an appropriate reference group within similar police-relevant contexts. An analytic framework that prioritizes enforcement-action benchmarking analyses is better positioned to identify police-specific drivers underlying representation for the purpose of informing solutions that are designed to reduce systemic inequities (Foster & Jacobs, 2023). WRPS' analytic strategy aligns with a Human Rights approach and was created in consultation with academic subject matter experts Dr. Lorne Foster and Dr. Les Jacobs.

[4] Foster, L. & Jacobs, L. (2023). A guide for creating benchmarks for racial disparities: What should be considered in benchmarks at a medium/advanced level. February, unpublished.

When interpreting benchmark ratios, values greater than 1 indicate overrepresentation. A cut-off of $\geq$ 1.5 was selected to identify concerning overrepresentation, (Lamberth, 1996; Police Foundation, 2003; Withrow et al., 2008)[5].

Age

Table 5 depicts the frequency of searches conducted separated by age. For 18 Searches, there was no age or birth information; these were removed from the analysis (0.3% of Searches were missing age data in 2025 vs. 3% in 2024). The 229 searches conducted on Young Persons, where perceived race data was captured, are presented in Table 9.

When comparing to the local resident population, we see that individuals aged 18-44 were overrepresented in Searches (ratios range from 1.92 to 2.14). Additionally, individuals aged 12-17, and individuals older than 55, were underrepresented in Searches as compared to the local resident population (ratios all below 0.51).

Enforcement Action Benchmarking. Searches were not equally distributed across the age groups, X^2 (6) = 2479.4, $p < .001$. Equal representation across ages would be reflected by having around 14% of Searches (~590 Searches) for each age group. Instead, 25-44 year-olds were overrepresented.

Table 5: Searches Conducted Separated by Age.

	Age							**Total**
	12-17*	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	
Frequency	229	612	1530	1246	559	288	83	**4547**
Percentage	5%	14%	34%	27%	12%	6%	2%	**100%**
Population	12%	7.3%	15.4%	13.6%	12.6%	12.4%	15.6%	
Disproportion ratio	0.42	1.92	2.21	1.99	0.95	0.48	0.13	

*Statistics Canada age categories range 10-19 therefore population for 12-17-year-olds is likely to be overestimated and for 18-24 is likely to be underestimated.

Gender

Gender identity was collected through self-report for all Searches of Persons. Self-reported gender was missing for 62 cases.

Of the remaining 4,503 searches conducted in 2025, 3,663 (82%) were on men, 818 (18%) were on women (Table 6), and 22 were on transgender or intersex individuals

[5] Lamberth, J. (1996). *A report to the ACLU.* New York: America Civil Liberties Union. Police Foundation (2003). *A multijurisdictional assessment of traffic enforcement data collection in Kanas.* Washington, DC: Author.
Withrow, B. L., Dailey, J. D., & Jackson, H. (2008). The utility of an internal benchmarking strategy in racial profiling surveillance. *Justice Research and Policy*, *10*(2), 19-47

(0.5%). When compared to the local resident population, males were overrepresented in Searches of Persons in custody (ratio = 1.64), while females were not (ratio = 0.36).

Using our enforcement-action benchmarking strategy, we compared the proportion of women to men at each of the search levels. Only one ratio exceeded the critical cut-off. In 2023, Strip Search Level 2 were more frequently conducted on women as compared to men (benchmark ratio = 2.75). In 2024, the only ratio that exceeded the critical cut-off was Frisk searches (benchmark ratio = 1.60), where women were overrepresented, although this represents six searches. In 2025, women were overrepresented in Strip Search Level 1s (ratio = 1.63). We have not observed consistent year-over-year gender disparities for any Search Type.

Table 6: Type of Search by Gender

	Female		Male		
Type of Search	**Count (C_F)**	**% Females ($\%_F$)**	**Count (C_M)**	**% Males ($\%_M$)**	**Benchmark Ratio ($\%_F$ / $\%_M$)**
Unknown			2	< 1%	
Frisk	2	0.2%	21	0.6%	0.33
Intake	691	84.5%	3209	87.6%	0.96
Body Scanner	10	1.2%	39	1.1%	1.09
Strip Search Level 1	11	1.3%	29	0.8%	1.63
Strip Search Level 2	104	12.7%	362	9.9%	1.28
Body Cavity			1	< 1%	
Total	**818**	**100%**	**3663**	**100%**	
Population					
Disproportion					

Race

Perceived race was indicated by the member completing the search, as outlined by the Data Standards. In 29 searches (vs. 90 in 2024), perceived race data was not provided, and these were removed from relevant analyses. In 2025, searches were most frequently conducted on individuals perceived to be White (66%, Table 7a). When comparing to the local resident population, Black (ratio = 2.98) and Middle Eastern (ratio = 2.67) individuals were overrepresented. These were the same ratios observed in 2024.

Table 7a. Frequency of Type of Search by Perceived Race

Type of Search	Black	East/Southeast Asian	Indigenous	Latino	Middle Eastern	South Asian	White
Unknown	4	1			1	1	25
Frisk	4			1	2		15
Intake	573	183	38	129	351	134	2514
Body Scanner	5	5			2	3	35
Strip Search Level 1	7		1		1	1	29
Strip Search Level 2	36	6	7	10	16	18	377
Body Cavity						1	

Total	**629 (14%)**	**195 (4%)**	**46 (1%)**	**140 (3%)**	**373 (8%)**	**158 (4%)**	**2995 (66%)**
Population	4.7%	6.8%	1.7%	2.2%	3.0%	9.7%	72.0%
Disproportion Ratio	2.98	0.59	0.59	1.36	2.67	0.41	0.92

Enforcement-action benchmarking is one tool to better understand the potential drivers of observed disproportion. Due to issues related to small numbers, this analysis focuses on Black and Middle Eastern individuals, as compared to White individuals for each type of search (Table 7b and Table 7c). Benchmark ratios indicated no disparities for any of the Search Types.

Table 7b. Percentages for Type of Search by Selected Perceived Race Categories

	Black		**Middle Eastern**		**White**	
Type of Search	**% Black ($\%_B$)**	**% Total ($\%_{BT}$)**	**% Middle Eastern ($\%_{ME}$)**	**% Total ($\%_{MET}$)**	**% White ($\%_W$)**	**% Total ($\%_{WT}$)**
Unknown	0.6%	< 0.1%	0.3%	< 0.1%	0.8%	0.6%
Frisk	0.6%	< 0.1%	0.5%	< 0.1%	0.5%	0.3%
Intake	91.1%	12.6%	94.1%	7.7%	83.9%	55.4%
Body Scanner	0.8%	0.1%	0.5%	< 0.1%	1.2%	0.8%
Strip Search Level 1	1.1%	0.2%	0.3%	< 0.1%	1.0%	0.6%
Strip Search Level 2	5.7%	0.6%	4.3%	0.4%	12.6%	8.3%
Total	**100%**	**13.9%**	**100%**	**8.2%**	**100%**	**66.0%**

Table 7c. Benchmark Ratios for Type of Search by Selected Perceived Race Categories

	Black ($\%_B$ / $\%_W$)	**Middle Eastern ($\%_{ME}$ / $\%_W$)**
Type of Search		
Unknown	0.75	0.38
Frisk	1.20	1.00
Intake	1.09	1.12
Body Scanner	0.67	0.42
Strip Search Level 1	1.10	0.30
Strip Search Level 2	0.45	0.34

Intersectional Analysis

Table 8 presents the intersection of gender and perceived race by search type. In 2025, consistent with 2023 and 2024, around 44% of all searches conducted were Intake Searches performed on White males.

Enforcement-action benchmarking revealed overrepresentation. Setting a minimum of at least five searches per cell, within searches conducted on females, we see that Indigenous women are overrepresented in Strip Search Level 2 (ratio = 1.53). Overall, searches conducted on Indigenous individuals were twice as likely to be conducted on females relative to White individuals (ratio = 2.00).

Table 8. Frequency of Type of Search by Perceived Race and Gender

Type of Search	Black	East/Southeast Asian	Indigenous	Latino	Middle Eastern	South Asian	White	Total
Female								
Frisk							1 (0.2%)	**1**
Intake	78 (93%)	21 (95%)	17 (77%)	10 (100%)	28 (100%)	17 (89%)	519 (82%)	**690**
Body Scanner		1 (5%)				1 (5%)	8 (1%)	**10**
Strip Search Level 1	1 (1%)						9 (1%)	**10**
Strip Search Level 2	5 (6%)		5 (23%)			1 (5%)	93 (15%)	**104**
Total	**84**	**22**	**22**	**10**	**28**	**19**	**630**	**815**
Male								
Frisk	4 (1%)			1 (1%)	2 (0.6%)		14 (0.6%)	**21**
Intake	494 (91%)	161 (94%)	21 (88%)	119 (92%)	321 (94%)	116 (85%)	1972 (85%)	**3204**

Body Scanner	5 (1%)	4 (2%)			2 (0.6%)	2 (1%)	26 (1%)	**39**
Strip Search Level 1	6 (1%)		1 (4%)		1 (0.3%)	1 (1%)	20 (1%)	**29**
Strip Search Level 2	31 (6%)	6 (4%)	2 (8%)	10 (8%)	16 (5%)	17 (12%)	279 (12%)	**361**
Body Cavity						1 (1%)		**1**
Total	**540**	**171**	**24**	**130**	**342**	**137**	**2311**	**3655**

Note: 22 searches were missing gender information and are not included in the table. As a result, the totals for each race group will not match Table 7a. Percentages calculated within race and gender. Some percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding error.

Table 9 presents the racial composition of Young Persons in all searches conducted in 2025 (226 of 229 Young Persons; see footnote of Table 9 for explanation). Black Young Persons were overrepresented and proportionally contributed to more searches as compared to Young White persons. Middle Eastern Young Persons were not overrepresented, a change from 2024.

Table 9. Frequency of Type of Search involving Young Persons, by Perceived Race

	Young Persons			Adults			
Type of Search	**Count (C_Y)**	**% Young Persons ($\%_Y$)**	**% Within Race Group ($\%_{YR}$)**	**Count (C_A)**	**% Adults ($\%_A$)**	**% Within Race Group ($\%_{AR}$)**	**Disparity ($\%_{YR}$ / $\%_{YR\text{-}White}$)**
Black	64	28%	10%	561	13%	90%	2.50
East/Southeast Asian	6	3%	3%	188	4%	97%	0.75
Indigenous	2	1%	4%	44	1%	96%	1.00
Latino	7	3%	5%	133	3%	95%	1.25

Middle Eastern	20	9%	5%	352	8%	95%	1.25
South Asian	4	2%	3%	154	4%	97%	0.75
White	123	54%	4%	2865	67%	96%	
Total	**226**	**100%**	**5%**	**4297**	**100%**	**95%**	

Note: There were 18 searches without age information and 29 searches without perceived race data. As such, the sums for each age and race group will not match Table 5 or Table 7a, respectively. Percentages within race group were calculated based on data in this table, not table 7a.

Repeated Contacts by Perceived Race

Enforcement action benchmarking revealed overrepresentation for persons with repeat contact (Table 4 and 10). Note that a single individual could be perceived as belonging to different racialized groups (e.g., an individual with five recontacts was perceived as East/Southeast Asian twice and South Asian three times), making it possible that the same individual may be counted multiple times in the table (e.g., once under East/Southeast Asian with two searches, once under South Asian with three searches). There were no benchmark ratios that crossed the barrier for overrepresentation. However, individuals with repeat contact can account for a large percentage of searches for racialized groups. For example, five individuals make up 52.2% of searches for Indigenous individuals, while nine individuals make up 30.4% of all searches conducted on South Asian individuals.

Table 10. Repeated Contacts by Perceived Race Group

	Total Searches	Unique Individuals	Recontact Searches	Recontact Individuals	Percentage of Searches Involving a Recontact
Black	629	459	265	95	42.1%
East/Southeast Asian	195	158	45	8	23.1%
Indigenous	46	27	24	5	52.2%
Latino	140	109	46	15	32.9%
Middle Eastern	373	297	110	34	29.5%
South Asian	158	119	48	9	30.4%
White	2995	2171	1315	491	43.9%

Summary and Future Directions

In summary, the number of arrests and Searches of Persons in custody increased from 2024 to 2025. Intake searches remain the most common search type used. Dangerous items were returned in 4% of the searches conducted in 2025, the same as 2024. Items returned were most frequently were drugs/drug paraphernalia.

Disaggregate analysis by search type revealed the following:

- Women overall were overrepresented in Strip Search Level 1 relative to men
- Indigenous women were overrepresented in Strip Search Level 2 relative to White women
- Black Young Persons were overrepresented and proportionately accounted for more searches within the racial category, in comparison to White Young Persons
- 41% of searches involved people who had previously been in custody during 2025

The Service-wide expansion of the Niche RMS Custody Module in 2024 has led to greater consistency in the information collected related to searches of persons in custody, resulting in improved data quality and analytic capabilities. 2025 saw a marked decrease in the amount of missing information in searches, however full and complete data will continue to remain a focus in 2026.

In 2025 WRPS introduced the Body Scanner as a new search method, to replace Strip Searches where possible.

Quantitative data is but one indicator of a fuller picture. Under the framework of the RIBDCS. The perspectives of community and Service members will be brought together to improve our understanding of the impacts of Search of Persons, with the goal of identifying potential recommended practices and targeting problem areas, where they exist. WRPS will continue to work towards better identifying and addressing the systemic issues that drive patterns in police data.

Strategic Business Plan:

The above report aligns with the following Strategic Business Plan 2024-2027 objectives:

Our Connections

☒ Communicate and engage

Financial and/or Risk Implications:

There are no financial and/or risk implications.

Attachments:

- Attachment A: WRPS Search of Persons in Custody – 2025 Annual Presentation

Prepared By:

Dr. Hasan Siddiqui, Data Analyst, EDI, Strategic Services Branch
Dr. Amanda Williams, Manager, Strategic Services Branch

Approved By:

Mark Crowell, Chief of Police