



**To:** Community Safety Committee **Date:** May 16, 2006  
**From:** Shawn Issel **File:** 09-5000-00/Vol 01  
 Manager, Policy Development & Corporate Programs  
**Re:** RCMP Emergency Response Team

**Staff Recommendation**

That \$160,774 of the funding set aside in the 2006 Operating Budget for the Emergency Response Team be released for expenditure.

Shawn Issel  
 Manager, Policy Development & Corporate Programs  
 (4184)

Att. 1

<b>CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER</b>		
<b>REVIEWED BY CAO</b>	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>REVIEWED BY TAG</b>	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

## Staff Report

### Origin

At the January 24, 2006 Council meeting the 2006 Operating Budget was approved with the proviso that the funding set aside for the Emergency Response Team not be expended until the Community Safety Committee referrals relating to the Emergency Response Team, were reviewed by the Committee and approved.

At the February 19, 2006 Council meeting, a report from the Chief Administrative Officer, regarding the Community Safety Committee referrals relating to ERT (Emergency Response Team), was received as a work in progress. It was moved and seconded that pending the outcome of meeting of the Lower Mainland CAO's on the Emergency Response Team, that staff provide a final report, including any outstanding referral items.

### Analysis

The outstanding ERT referrals not fully addressed in the CAO's report in February and requiring further action are with respect to more information regarding 1) operational details, specifically utilization of members between emergencies and the type of response Richmond could expect given that the team would operate out of Surrey; and 2) actions taken to improve consultation, specifically the status of the Mayors' Consultative Forum.

### Operational Details

In a previous report, staff advised that concerns raised by a number of municipalities regarding ERT were now being discussed at RAAC (Regional Administrators' Advisory Committee). As a result of these discussions a meeting was convened on March 30, 2006 with CAO's and LMD RCMP representatives regarding the Emergency Response Team. The purpose of the meeting was to better understand the ERT business case, and to report back to RAAC with findings and recommendations.

Utilization of ERT members between emergencies and the type of response municipalities could expect with the team operating out of Surrey was a common concern identified at this meeting. The findings of the group was that the team would be housed at the Surrey Detachment for the short term and would be moved to the new "E" Division HQ once it is built. The members of the team are expected to spend their time in each community in proportion to the share of service each community pays for, for example Richmond's share is equivalent to 2.93 members. To ensure the proportion of service continues to be equivalent to each municipalities' share of the costs, the RCMP intends to track the time spent in each municipality and report yearly.

It was agreed by the CAO's at the March 30<sup>th</sup> meeting, that the RCMP needed to work with municipalities to fine tune the business case, and that a small group of RCMP and municipal staff would work together to answer the questions put forward at the meeting and to send their findings (Attachment 1) to CAO's for distribution to their Councils. However, the consensus of the CAO's at the meeting was that the need for ERT was satisfied. The next meeting of RAAC is in July, it is anticipated that a verbal report of these findings will be given at that time.

As an example of ERT activities in communities, and not deployed to a tactical call out, the LMD provided an update in mid May on the previous week's response to incidents, while on patrol:

- Langley - assisted in follow up of two suspects in an armed robbery investigation.
- Langley – responded to a male, off his medication and now barricaded and very violent.
- Richmond - Detachment utilized on duty ERT members while patrolling Richmond, to be part of the emergency response for an emergency landing of a private jet that had smoke in the cabin.
- Surrey - assisted Detachment for takedown of a Marijuana Grow Lab.
- Coquitlam – while on patrol in Coquitlam detachment utilized on duty ERT members in their search for a male masturbating at a public site, and with a call of youths harassing the homeless.
- Mission - conducted a drug seizure.
- Surrey - searched for a suspect that dumped a stolen car after a minor chase by General Duty personnel.
- Aldergrove - conducted an impromptu meeting with Customs at the Aldergrove Border Crossing.
- Langley - supported General Duty in their search for a male suspect brandishing a shotgun.

The Richmond detachment was asked to provide further information with respect to ERT activities in Richmond. Inspector Rendall Nasset commented that, “the team has been very active in patrolling detachment areas, including Richmond, assisting with the execution of High Risk search warrants and the arrest of High Risk offenders where suspected weapons are involved. Additionally, members of the ERT have attended YVR, Sea Island and were given a familiarization tour as this location within Richmond is considered a high risk area. Having this team available and confident working in our environment provides a comfort level while policing an International Airport.”

#### Mayors' Consultative Forum

On May 16<sup>th</sup> the Mayor and staff attended a meeting between representatives of the RCMP (E Div and LMD) and the Mayors of the LMD municipalities. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss ways in which to improve communication and provide updates on several of initiatives. Deputy Commissioner Bev Busson began the meeting by stating that she wants municipalities to feel that they are making decisions based on full information, and to that end was committed to developing a better communication strategy.

The communication vehicles used in the past – Staff Working Group, Lower Mainland Policing Advisory Committee (PPC's) and the Mayors' Consultative Forum were discussed. There was general consensus at this meeting that the Mayors' Consultative Forum had been effective and that a similar format should be used by the RCMP to consult with the LMD Mayors. The RCMP proposed that these meetings would occur on bi-annual basis and that the next one could be scheduled to coincide with the UBCM Convention in October. It is the RCMP's intention to use the input about improving communication received from the Mayors at the meeting, to develop a communication/consultation protocol for bringing forward future initiatives to the appropriate forums.

## **Financial Impact**

The 2006 operating budget includes \$241,491 set aside for funding ERT. The revised cost estimate provided by LMD for 2006 is 160,774. This leaves a surplus of \$80,717 for this year's operating budget.

## **Conclusion**

The outstanding referrals regarding ERT were addressed through the RAAC committee review of the business plan and the Mayors' meeting with the RCMP. The CAOs that met with RCMP staff concluded that the RCMP's need for ERT is satisfied. The LMD acknowledges the need for regular communications and consultation. Improvements in consultation are being addressed by the LMD, including reactivating the Mayors' Consultative Forum.



Shawn Issel  
Manager, Policy Development & Corporate Programs  
(4184)  
SI:si

## LOWER MAINLAND EMERGENCY RESPONSE TEAM QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

A meeting was held March 30th at North Vancouver with a number of CAO's and Principal Policing Contacts from municipalities within the Lower Mainland District respecting the planned Emergency Response Team(ERT ). The following questions were raised at the meeting. Answers follow each question.

**Question #1:**

If the ERT Office is to be located in Surrey, will the City of Surrey benefit due to this fact in terms of the ERT's response to an ERT call or as a result of the "general patrol time" that the ERT members will be doing if they are not responding to an ERT call or performing other regional duties assigned to this group (ex. like the ROPE program mentioned in the Business Case)?

**Answer.**

The City of Surrey will not benefit specifically due to the fact that the ERT office will be in Surrey. When the members are on general patrol they will travel throughout all of the communities. The team's HQ will be at Surrey Detachment for the short term. It is anticipated that they will be moved to the new "E" Division HQ once it is built. The proposed site is Green Timbers in Surrey. The members of the team will generally spend their time in each of the communities in proportion to the share of the service each community pays for. The RCMP will track the time spent per location on routine patrol and will report yearly. We will also report on the calls for service and related response times. Thus, on average the City of Surrey will have proportionally the same amount of patrol time, and the same response time, to what it pays the same amount of patrol time and the same response time as all other communities.

**Question #2:**

What is the actual municipal share of the total ERT budget? Need to explain how calculate this.

**Answer**

Following is a calculation of the actual municipal, provincial and federal share of the ERT. The actual share of the costs are based on each contract in accordance with the PPSA rate of 90% or 70% as follows. The contract rates with the Federal Government (90% and 70%) are confirmed until 2012.

Municipality	Funding Formula	Overall %	Contract at 90 %	Fed Cost
Burnaby	14.71%	7.36%	6.62%	0.74%
Chilliwack	5.74%	2.87%	2.58%	0.29%
Coquitlam	7.77%	3.89%	3.50%	0.39%
Langley City	2.60%	1.30%	1.17%	0.13%
Langley Township	6.02%	3.01%	2.71%	0.30%
Maple Ridge	5.13%	2.57%	2.31%	0.26%
Mission	2.94%	1.47%	1.32%	0.15%
North Van City	3.30%	1.65%	1.48%	0.16%
North Van District	4.08%	2.04%	1.84%	0.20%
Pitt Meadows	0.95%	0.47%	0.33%	0.14%
Port Coquitlam	3.56%	1.78%	1.60%	0.18%
Richmond	9.56%	4.78%	4.30%	0.48%
Surrey	28.40%	14.20%	12.78%	1.42%
White Rock	1.15%	0.57%	0.52%	0.06%
Provincial Total	4.09%	2.04%	1.43%	0.61%
Provincial B.L.		30.00%	21.00%	9.00%
Federal B.L.		20.00%	20.00%	20.00%
Grand Total	100.00%	100.00%		34.50%
Municipal	43.06%			
Provincial	22.43%			
Federal	34.50%			
	100.00%			

The starting numbers in the first column are as per the agreement of the Staff Working Group with an approved funding formula based on 25% population and 75% Criminal Code Stats

Based on the above cost sharing allocation, the total number of ERT members that each city will pay for is:

Burnaby	6.62%	4.5 members
Chilliwack	2.58%	1.76 members
Coquitlam	3.50%	2.38 members
Langley City	1.17%	0.80 members
Langley Town	2.71%	1.84 members
Maple Ridge	2.31%	1.57 members
Mission	1.32%	0.90 members
North Van City	1.48%	1.01 members
North Van District	1.84%	1.25 members
Pitt Meadows	0.33%	0.23 members
Port Coquitlam	1.60%	1.09 members
<b>Richmond</b>	<b>4.30%</b>	<b>2.93 members</b>
Surrey	12.78%	8.69 members
White Rock	0.52%	0.35 members
Total Muni	43.06%	29.28 members
Total Provincial	22.43%	15.25 members
Total Federal	34.50%	23.46 members
Total Team		68 members

Example: Calculation of the City of Port Coquitlam's share.

The overall Municipal share based on the contract is 50%. Utilizing the approved funding formula of 25% population and 75% Criminal Code stats Port Coquitlam's share of the municipal cost would be 3.56%. Therefore 50% for Port Coquitlam is 1.78%. The contract under the Provincial Police Services Agreement states that the Federal Government pays 10% for municipalities over 15,000 citizens, therefore the actual cost to the city of Port Coquitlam is 1.60%. By paying for 1.09 members Port Coquitlam has access to a full time 68 member ERT.

### Question #3:

What is the police officer full time equivalent (FTE) being utilized under the current part-time ERT model? Detail amount due to training and the amount due to ERT response calls. If the current part-time police officer FTE is allocated out to all the muni's based on population what would that be per department?

### Answer

Based on the part time members receiving an average of 2.5 actual days of training per month there would be a total of 30 days training per year. There are 72 part time positions presently on ERT which equates to 8.5 total positions per year (notably, based on what occurred in Ontario, it is likely that future training day requirements would be increased by legislation). Based on an average of 3 days of actual call outs per month this would equate to 10 positions per year bringing the total to 18.5 positions per year currently that are not available to do police work at the various detachments where the members are stationed.

The number of actual part time members per Detachment varies throughout the District and from year to year for a number of reason. Availability of resources and transfers from location to location are two of these variables. A member could stay on ERT for a number of years and would be subjected to transfers and promotional moves and therefore be at a different Detachment than where he/she was first trained for the team. The Municipal share of where the part time resources should be located based on the funding formula are as follows:

Municipality	
Burnaby	4.77
Chilliwack	1.86
Coquitlam	2.52
Langley City	0.84
Langley Township	1.95
Maple Ridge	1.66
Mission	0.95
North Van City	1.07
North Van District	1.32
Pitt Meadows	0.24
Port Coquitlam	1.15
Richmond	3.10
Surrey	9.20
White Rock	0.37

Presently, some of the municipalities that have no representation on the part time ERT

**Question #4:**

In addition to the noted FTE savings for ERT training and response, will there be other officer FTE savings at the Detachments?

**Answer**

ERT will be involved in a number of additional duties (in many cases above the number of duties currently being performed) when there is no emergency incident to be involved with. The members will be responsible for executing high risk warrants including repeat offenders who are in violation of their parole, locating and arresting high risk offenders, Witness Protection, and Drug Enforcement to name a few.

There will, in some cases, also be a space savings like at the Coquitlam Det where the space that is currently occupied by the North Fraser ERT will not be required so the space could be used for other functions.

One of the big savings will be that there will not be members of your detachment pulled away for ERT duties while they are supposed to be working at your detachments, resulting in likely efficiency gains.



**Question #5:**

How do the overall ERT costs compare to other jurisdictions? Detail No# of ERT Officers to population served and/or overall ERT costs per population and municipal cost per population served etc.

**Answer.**

Following is the number of ERT members per population

ERT to Population Ratio			
	Population	ERT Members	Pop/Member
LA	3,800,000	77	49351
Peel Regional	1,192,400	25	47696
Portland	600,000	28	21429
San Francisco	750,000	40	18750
Seattle	580,000	28	20714
Toronto	2,096,034	59	35526
Vancouver	520,000	35	14857
LMD Municipalities	1,600,000	29.28	54643
LMD ERT	1,600,000	68.00	23529

The LMD municipal number is based on the total LMD ERT members of 68 multiplied by the percentage share of 43.06% that will be paid by the municipalities for a total municipal number of 29.28 members. When comparing stats based on population one needs to take into account what the function of the team is designed to accomplish. In most of the examples above there are other teams located in the municipal areas that would have different mandates be it Federal or Municipal, so it is difficult to make any comparisons.

**Question #6**

When will the results of the ERT Team be reported and what will be reported?(i.e. what are the key ways success will be measured).

**Answer**

There will be an annual report completed as of the 31st of March commencing in 2007. The report will identify the actual work load based on number of calls for service and locations (including the average response time and general patrol time, per municipality). The RCMP will also report on the success of the team. The report will also include vacancy pattern and budget dollars.

**Question #7**

What else is driving the difference between the original budget numbers and the new numbers as it can be seen that there are slight increases in year two and three.

**Answer**

The increased cost driver is the addition of the overtime budget. Initially the business case was completed using \$2,250 in overtime as the municipal share. Upon review and comparison with other units in operation this figure was adjusted to \$10,000 in OT per member as the municipal share. For a city the size of Port Coquitlam it would mean an increase of approximately \$20,000 per year. There were some other figures that were eliminated when it was determined that a separate facility (like cost of Commissionaires and building cleaning which are now paid for in the agreement with Surrey) which resulted in lower first year costs.

**Question #8**

Is there a commitment from the Federal and Provincial Government to pay their share?

**Answer**

There is a commitment from the RCMP that the Federal and Provincial business lines will continue to pay the 20% and 30% share of the overall cost of ERT in the LMD.