



City of Richmond

Report to Committee

TO CS - Oct 10 2012

To: Community Safety Committee

Date: September 28, 2012

From: Phyllis L. Carlyle
General Manager

File: 09-5350-01/2012-Vol
01

Re: Integrated Team Annual Report 2011/12

Staff Recommendation

That the report titled “*Integrated Team Annual Report 2011/2012*” from the General Manager, Law and Community Safety, dated September 28, 2012, be received for information.

Phyllis L. Carlyle
General Manager
(604-276-4104)

REPORT CONCURRENCE			
ROUTED TO:	CONCURRENCE	CONCURRENCE OF GENERAL MANAGER	
REVIEWED BY SMT SUBCOMMITTEE	INITIALS:	REVIEWED BY CAO	INITIALS:

Staff Report

Origin

On August 28, 2012 the Lower Mainland District of the RCMP submitted to the City the *RCMP Integrated Team Annual Report 2011/2012*. At the September 11, 2012 Community Safety meeting staff were directed to “analyze the *Integrated Team Annual Report* and report back.”

This report responds to Council’s Community Safety Term Goal, which aims at ensuring resources are used effectively and are targeted to the City’s needs and priorities.

Background

The Integrated Teams consist of five specialized units: the Integrated Homicide Investigation Team (IHIT), Integrated Forensic Identification Services (IFIS), Integrated Collision Analysis and Reconstruction Service (ICARS), Integrated Police Dog Services (IPDS) and Emergency Response (ERT). These teams provide specialized services for those cities that contract with the RCMP and for some cities with independent police services in the lower mainland. The integrated teams provide municipalities with the ability to deal with the more complex and multi-jurisdictional of crimes.

Costs for integrated teams are shared by all municipalities that utilize their services. The cost sharing formula is based on two primary components:

- 1) Each municipality’s 5 year average of criminal code cases (accounts for 75% of the formula); and
- 2) Each municipality’s annual population (accounts for 25% of the formula).

The formula was designed to be an equitable distribution of costs, and to reflect a user pay philosophy. The intent is that all municipalities are to benefit. The funding proportions for integrated teams are:

- Integrated Homicide is a 70/30 split with the Province (effective April 1, 2012);
- Emergency Response is a 50/50 split; and
- All other integrated teams are a 90/10 split with the Federal Government.

Analysis

The City of Richmond’s expenditure for the integrated teams has increased from \$2,690,816 in 2008/2009 to \$3,348,869 in 2011/2012, with an annual projected budget of \$3,717,174 in 2012/2013, which equates to increase of 11% (\$368,305). Staffing costs are a major driver of these increases.

The table below provides a year by year comparison of the actual staffing levels (not budgeted staffing levels) funded by the municipal sector:

Table 1: Lower Mainland Municipally Funded Integrated Team Staffing

Year	Regular Members	Public Servants	Independent Police Dept. Strength	Civilian Members	Total Municipally Funded Staff	Year over Year Increase
2008/09	179.98	13.39	7.00	20.06	220.43	
2009/10	183.48	19.05	7.00	23.70	233.23	12.80
2010/11	193.16	18.42	10.00	19.68	241.26	8.03
2011/12	208.65	21.24	9.25	30.28	269.42	28.16
2012/13*	236.00	19.00	9.00	6.46	270.46	1.04
					Total	50.03

*2012/13 figures are projected.

In addition to the staffing complement above, the Provincial and Federal Governments fully fund other members directly bringing the total number of staff within the Integrated Teams to 322.

The key areas of projected cost increases for the 2012/13 budget for the Lower Mainland are:

1. Salary and Benefits - \$2,482,444 or 9.8%
2. Divisional Administration - \$1,119,243 or 23.0%
3. Minor and Major Fixed Assets - \$1,056,509 or 48%
4. Pensions - \$427,147 or 12.4%

Further, E Division's 5 year Integrated Team budget projections from 2013/14 to 2017/18 are set out below:

Table 2: City of Richmond Annual Projected Budget Increases

Fiscal Year	Budget All Integrated Teams	Integrated Team Annual Projected Increase
2011/12*	\$3,348,869*	
2012/13	\$3,717,174	\$368,305
2013/14	\$4,109,222	\$392,048
2014/15	\$4,251,423	\$142,201
2015/16	\$4,428,254	\$176,831
2016/17	\$4,595,226	\$166,972
2017/18	\$4,716,695	\$121,469
Total Projected 6 Year Increase		\$1,367,826

*2011/12 figures are Actual.

Analysis of Actual Expenditures versus Value of Services Received for the City of Richmond

Table 3 below provides a comparison between Richmond's actual expenditure under the current integrated team funding formula and the value of services received.

There are times when the City pays more than the value of the services provided, whereas there are other times when the City receives more services than paid for. Not all occurrences cost the same; some occurrences are more complex and require more resources than others (i.e.

homicides). As illustrated in the table, IHIT is the main cost driver for integrated teams and has the most variability in service level.

Table 3: City of Richmond Actual Expenditure versus Value of Services Received and 3 year Average

Emergency Response (ERT) 50/50 Split			Actual Expenditure	Value of Services Received	Difference Paid More/ (Paid Less)
2009/10	107	342,029	420,187	(78,158)	
2010/11	73	420,695	234,277	186,418	
2011/12	114	467,302	210,755	256,547	
3 Year Average	98	410,009	288,407	121,602	
Collision Reconstruction (ICAR) 90/10 Split			Actual Expenditure	Value of Services Received	Difference Paid More/ (Paid Less)
2009/10	22	188,268	218,537	(30,269)	
2010/11	7	195,773	76,023	119,750	
2011/12	19	208,378	224,609	(16,231)	
3 Year Average	16	197,473	173,056	24,417	
Forensic Identification (IFIS) 90/10 Split			Actual Expenditure	Value of Services Received	Difference Paid More/ (Paid Less)
2009/10	721	678,454	698,338	(19,884)	
2010/11	847	675,535	700,892	(25,357)	
2011/12	954	779,269	914,136	(134,867)	
3 Year Average	841	711,086	771,122	(60,036)	
Homicide Investigation (IHIT) 90/10 Split			Actual Expenditure	Value of Services Received	Difference Paid More/ (Paid Less)
2009/10	2	1,172,001	660,875	511,126	
2010/11	0	1,205,389	-	1,205,389	
2011/12	2	1,326,837	919,687	407,150	
3 Year Average	1	1,234,742	526,854	707,888	
Police Dogs (PDS) 90/10 Split			Actual Expenditure	Value of Services Received	Difference Paid More/ (Paid Less)
2009/10	1449	573,208	1,091,108	(517,900)	
2010/11	1429	489,695	922,494	(432,799)	
2011/12	1181	567,083	883,705	(316,622)	
3 Year Average	1353	543,329	965,769	(422,440)	

3 Year Summary	All Teams Occurrences	Actual Expenditure	Value of Services Received	Difference Paid More/ (Paid Less)
2009/10	2301	2,953,960	3,089,045	(135,085)
2010/11	2356	2,987,087	1,933,685	1,053,402
2011/12	2270	3,348,869	3,152,892	195,977
3 Year Average	2309	3,096,639	2,725,207	371,431

A review of the financial contribution versus the number of events for all municipalities identified that few municipalities receive a one to one ratio of expenditure to the value of services received.

Below is a comparison of what major cities paid in 2010/11 and 2011/12 versus the value of services received:

Table 4: Comparison of Major Cities Over Two Years

City	2010/2011			2011/2012		
	Amount Paid	Value of Service Received	Difference Paid More/ (Paid Less)	Amount Paid	Value of Service Received	Difference Paid More/ (Paid Less)
Burnaby	4,336,685	4,334,176	2,509	4,772,654	4,288,188	484,466
North Vancouver City	952,731	3,054,018	(2,101,287)	1,076,360	1,133,919	(57,559)
Richmond	2,987,087	1,933,685	1,053,402	3,348,869	3,152,892	195,977
Surrey	9,016,703	10,424,728	(1,408,025)	10,441,054	14,423,067	(3,982,013)

The tables below provide a team by team analysis of the actual expenditure versus value of services received for all municipalities that utilize the RCMP Integrated Teams

Table 5 Emergency Response (ERT) for 2011/12. Comparison of Expenditure versus Value of Services Received

Type	Municipality	Municipal Share	ERT Actual Expenditures	Municipal Portion	Value of Service	% of Service
Independent	Abbotsford	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	New Westminster	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
RCMP	Burnaby	90%	665,942	13.8%	325,377	6.7%
	Chilliwack	90%	315,493	6.5%	658,148	13.6%
	Coquitlam	90%	328,917	6.8%	155,293	3.2%
	Hope	70%	26,245	0.5%	11,092	0.2%
	Kent	70%	13,282	0.3%	16,639	0.3%
	Langley City	90%	113,504	2.4%	271,763	5.6%
	Langley Township	90%	296,511	6.1%	366,049	7.6%
	Maple Ridge	90%	260,032	5.4%	212,604	4.4%
	Mission	90%	143,792	3.0%	271,763	5.6%
	North Vancouver City	90%	150,187	3.1%	112,773	2.3%
	North Vancouver District	90%	176,520	3.7%	77,647	1.6%
	Pitt Meadows	90%	53,400	1.1%	51,764	1.1%
	Port Coquitlam	90%	166,210	3.4%	88,739	1.8%
	Richmond	90%	467,302	9.7%	210,755	4.4%
	Sechelt	70%	21,592	0.4%	-	0.0%
	Squamish	90%	74,291	1.5%	12,941	0.3%
	Surrey	90%	1,456,842	30.2%	1,950,410	40.4%
Whistler	70%	45,068	0.9%	9,244	0.2%	
White Rock	90%	48,207	1.0%	20,336	0.4%	
Grand Total			4,823,337	100%	4,823,337	100%

Table 6 Collision Analysis and Reconstruction (ICARS) for 2011/12. Comparison of Expenditure versus Value of Services Received

Type	Municipality	Municipal Share	ICARS Actual Expenditures	Municipal Portion	Value of Service	% of Service
Independent	Abbotsford	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	New Westminster	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
RCMP	Burnaby	90%	296,960	13.8%	224,608	10.4%
	Chilliwack	90%	140,689	6.5%	94,572	4.4%
	Coquitlam	90%	146,671	6.8%	106,393	4.9%
	Hope	70%	11,867	0.6%	23,643	1.1%
	Kent	70%	6,005	0.3%	82,750	3.8%
	Langley City	90%	50,616	2.4%	47,286	2.2%
	Langley Township	90%	132,221	6.1%	295,537	13.7%
	Maple Ridge	90%	115,956	5.4%	118,215	5.5%
	Mission	90%	64,121	3.0%	70,929	3.3%
	North Vancouver City	90%	66,972	3.1%	-	0.0%
	North Vancouver District	90%	78,712	3.7%	35,464	1.6%
	Pitt Meadows	90%	23,812	1.1%	23,643	1.1%
	Port Coquitlam	90%	74,117	3.4%	35,464	1.6%
	Richmond	90%	208,378	9.7%	224,608	10.4%
	Sechelt	70%	9,763	0.5%	23,643	1.1%
	Squamish	90%	33,129	1.5%	35,464	1.6%
	Surrey	90%	649,647	30.2%	662,003	30.8%
Whistler	70%	20,378	0.9%	23,643	1.1%	
White Rock	90%	21,497	1.0%	23,643	1.1%	
Grand Total			2,151,511	100%	2,151,511	100%

Table 7 Forensic Identification (IFIS) for 2011/12. Comparison of Expenditure versus Value of Services Received

Type	Municipality	Municipal Share	IFIS Actual Expenditures	Municipal Portion	Value of Service	% of Service
Independent	Abbotsford	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	New Westminster	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
RCMP	Burnaby	90%	1,110,539	13.8%	1,054,035	13.1%
	Chilliwack	90%	526,134	6.5%	687,039	8.5%
	Coquitlam	90%	548,503	6.8%	755,073	9.4%
	Hope	70%	44,411	0.6%	87,197	1.1%
	Kent	70%	22,475	0.3%	60,367	0.8%
	Langley City	90%	189,287	2.4%	148,523	1.8%
	Langley Township	90%	494,466	6.1%	319,085	4.0%
	Maple Ridge	90%	433,641	5.4%	377,536	4.7%
	Mission	90%	239,794	3.0%	180,144	2.2%
	North Vancouver City	90%	250,455	3.1%	427,363	5.3%
	North Vancouver District	90%	294,358	3.7%	179,186	2.2%
	Pitt Meadows	90%	89,051	1.1%	32,579	0.4%
	Port Coquitlam	90%	277,175	3.4%	27,788	0.3%
	Richmond	90%	779,269	9.7%	914,136	11.4%
	Sechelt	70%	36,537	0.5%	19,164	0.2%
	Squamish	90%	123,893	1.5%	61,326	0.8%
	Surrey	90%	2,429,478	30.2%	2,610,175	32.4%
Whistler	70%	76,265	0.9%	48,869	0.6%	
White Rock	90%	80,391	1.0%	56,535	0.7%	
Grand Total			8,046,122	100%	8,046,122	100.0%

Table 8: Integrated Homicide (IHIT) for 2011/12. Comparison of Expenditure versus Value of Services Received

Type	Municipality	Municipal Share	IHIT Actual Expenditures	Municipal Portion	Value of Service	% of Service
Independent	Abbotsford	100%	1,226,093	7.8%	919,687	5.9%
	New Westminster	100%	710,626	4.5%	-	0.0%
RCMP	Burnaby	90%	1,890,757	12.1%	1,839,374	11.8%
	Chilliwack	90%	895,710	5.7%	459,843	2.9%
	Coquitlam	90%	933,890	6.0%	459,843	2.9%
	Hope	70%	75,371	0.5%	459,843	2.9%
	Kent	70%	38,147	0.2%	-	0.0%
	Langley City	90%	322,243	2.1%	459,843	2.9%
	Langley Township	90%	841,867	5.4%	459,843	2.9%
	Maple Ridge	90%	738,270	4.7%	459,843	2.9%
	Mission	90%	408,238	2.6%	919,687	5.9%
	North Vancouver City	90%	426,411	2.7%	459,843	2.9%
	North Vancouver District	90%	501,227	3.2%	-	0.0%
	Pitt Meadows	90%	151,615	1.0%	459,843	2.9%
	Port Coquitlam	90%	471,909	3.0%	-	0.0%
	Richmond	90%	1,326,837	8.5%	919,687	5.9%
	Sechelt	70%	62,015	0.4%	-	0.0%
	Squamish	90%	210,917	1.3%	-	0.0%
	Surrey	90%	4,136,229	26.5%	7,357,495	47.1%
Whistler	70%	129,428	0.8%	-	0.0%	
White Rock	90%	136,876	0.9%	-	0.0%	
Grand Total			15,634,676	100%	15,634,676	100%

Table 9 Police Dog Services (PDS) for 2011/12. Comparison of Expenditure versus Value of Services Received

Type	Municipality	Municipal Share	PDS Actual Expenditures	Municipal Portion	Value of Service	% of Service
Independent	Abbotsford	100%	525,825	8.2%	511,067	8.0%
	New Westminster	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
RCMP	Burnaby	90%	808,456	12.7%	844,795	13.2%
	Chilliwack	90%	383,171	6.0%	341,210	5.3%
	Coquitlam	90%	399,226	6.3%	356,176	5.6%
	Hope	70%	31,980	0.5%	17,210	0.3%
	Kent	70%	16,173	0.3%	9,727	0.2%
	Langley City	90%	137,870	2.2%	193,801	3.0%
	Langley Township	90%	359,937	5.6%	317,266	5.0%
	Maple Ridge	90%	315,751	4.9%	335,972	5.3%
	Mission	90%	174,630	2.7%	110,744	1.7%
	North Vancouver City	90%	182,335	2.9%	133,940	2.1%
	North Vancouver District	90%	214,128	3.4%	175,095	2.7%
	Pitt Meadows	90%	64,828	1.0%	84,554	1.3%
	Port Coquitlam	90%	201,775	3.2%	145,164	2.3%
	Richmond	90%	567,083	8.9%	883,705	13.8%
Sechelt	70%	26,292	0.4%	9,727	0.2%	
Squamish	90%	90,235	1.4%	39,658	0.6%	
Surrey	90%	1,768,858	27.7%	1,842,984	28.9%	
Whistler	70%	54,920	0.9%	12,721	0.2%	
White Rock	90%	58,506	0.9%	16,462	0.3%	
Grand Total			6,381,979	100%	6,381,979	100%

In summary, the cost sharing formula aims for equitable distribution of costs, and thus a difference of \$195,977 between the City's actual expenditure and the value of services received for 2011/2012 is not significant on a base cost of \$3,348,869. Over the past three years, on average, the City has paid \$371,431 annually more for the Integrated Teams than the value of the services received and thus, future annual monitoring will take place.

Further, during the recent contract renewal negotiations, the City had requested the integrated teams should be 100% provincially funded. The Province had represented that all of the integrated teams would be funded on a 70/30 basis, and this would have been beneficial to the City. The Province should continue to be requested to fund the three remaining integrated teams (IFIS, PDS, and ICARS) at a minimum of 70/30 split.

Conclusion

Staff will continue to examine, based on historical usage, whether the existing cost sharing formula with other municipalities is equitable.



J Clarke
 Manager, Finance Community Safety
 (604-276-4004)