



# City of Richmond


## Report to Council

**To:** General Purposes Committee  
**From:** John McGowan  
Acting General Manager, Law and Community  
Safety  
**Date:** October 18, 2016  
**File:** 09-5350-00/2016-Vol  
01  
**Re:** Response to UBCM Request for Input on RCMP Auxiliary Constable Program

### Staff Recommendation:

- 1) That Option 3 (Tiered Program), as described in the staff report titled, "Response to UBCM Request for Input on RCMP Auxiliary Constable Program", dated October 18, 2016, from the Acting General Manager of Law and Community Safety, be endorsed; and
- 2) That a response indicating the preferred option along with a copy of this report be sent to the Union of BC Municipalities (UBCM).

John McGowan  
Acting General Manager, Law and Community Safety  
(604-276-4104)

REPORT CONCURRENCE	
REVIEWED BY STAFF REPORT / AGENDA REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE	INITIALS: DW
APPROVED BY CAO 	

## **Staff Report**

### **Origin**

In October 2014, a new directive was issued by the RCMP for all RCMP Auxiliary Constables to be under the armed supervision of a Regular Member (police officer). The armed member supervision requirement applies to both community and patrol related activities.

In January 2016, the national RCMP Senior Executive Committee revised the RCMP Auxiliary Constable Program (ACP) policy by discontinuing ride-alongs and firearms familiarization. They also began a review of the uniform options and the creation of a National Activity Matrix for the program. Following this policy change, no patrol support related activities were permitted and the armed member supervision requirement remained.

In April 2016, the Province, through the UBCM, circulated a questionnaire regarding the ACP requesting input from local governments regarding the future of the ACP in British Columbia. Council responded to this inquiry on May 10, 2016.

In May 2016, RCMP "E" Division published a discussion guide on the Auxiliary Constable Program with a link to a separate internal BC RCMP survey. RCMP "E" Division requested the survey be completed by the Richmond Detachment Commander with input from an elected municipal official. The City responded to the BC RCMP survey on May 5, 2016.

In October 2016, the UBCM requested input from local governments on three different options being considered by the RCMP National Crime Prevention Services on the Auxiliary Constable Program. The deadline for submission of the preferred option by local governments is November 1, 2016. Once the information is received, the UBCM will convey the responses to the RCMP.

This report supports Council's 2014-2018 Term Goal #1 A Safe Community:

*Maintain emphasis on community safety to ensure Richmond continues to be a safe community.*

*1.2. Program and service enhancements that improve community safety services in the City.*

*1.3. Improved perception of Richmond as a safe community.*

### **Background**

The Province authorized an ACP to provide an opportunity for the public to volunteer with the RCMP to strengthen communities and to address crime and disorder. The ACP provides a volunteered unarmed uniformed peace officer to provide community policing and crime prevention services under the direct supervision of a police officer or under the general supervision of the detachment or department. Activities include: accompanying police officers on patrol; assisting at community events; presenting crime prevention strategies in schools;

conducting traffic control; foot or bike patrols, participating during search and rescues, parades and other ceremonial events.<sup>1</sup>

The RCMP ACP program is governed by the RCMP Auxiliary Constable Program Policy and the Ministry of Justice's "*Provincial Policy on Auxiliary/Reserve Constable Program*". The revisions of the ACP policy in October 2014 and January 2016 ordered at the National RCMP level thereby overriding any provincial and local detachment policies on the program.

At this time, only the RCMP ACP has been restricted under the requirements of armed direct supervision and the discontinuation of the ride-along and patrol activities. BC's independent police services' Reserve Constable Programs have not been affected. Reserve Constables within their respective municipalities continue to participate in community events and safety patrols without direct supervision of a regular police officer and have the ability to participate in ride-along duties.

#### Impact of the Policy Changes to the RCMP Auxiliary Program

The ACP provides crime prevention and police presence to the community through the detachment's Crime Reduction initiatives. Following the changes to the ACP policy, the City has experienced a significant decrease in volunteer hours by Auxiliary Constables. After the implementation of the armed supervision requirement, volunteer hours decreased 36%<sup>2</sup>. After the implementation of the discontinuation of the ride-along, volunteer hours further decreased 71%<sup>3</sup>.

The impacts of the policy changes to the ACP on the crime prevention programs in the City of Richmond are summarized in Attachment 1.

These policy changes have also impacted the morale of Auxiliary Constables in the program. In January 2016, an independent private social media group was created for members of the RCMP Auxiliary program across Canada. Members in this closed group initiated an internal survey and 281 Auxiliary Constables provided their responses<sup>4</sup> (Attachment 2).

The internal survey highlighted the disagreements by Auxiliary Constables regarding the restrictions of the program outlined below:

- 204 or 72.6% of the respondents were from British Columbia.

---

<sup>1</sup> Province of B.C.

<http://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/justice/criminal-justice/policing-in-bc/the-structure-of-police-services-in-bc/auxiliary-reserve-constables>

<sup>2</sup> 10,755 hours from January to October 2014  
6,895 hours from January to October 2015 (-36% from 2014)

<sup>3</sup> 4,636 hours from February to May 2014  
2,900 hours from February to May 2015 (-37% from 2014)  
1,352 hours from February to May 2016 (-71% from 2014; -53% from 2015)

<sup>4</sup> The confidence level of the internal survey is estimated at 95% confidence with plus or minus 5.31%, based on an approximate total of 1,600 Auxiliary Constables across Canada.

- 78.3% of the respondents did not agree with the October 2014 policy change (armed supervision requirement).
- 91.8% of the respondents did not agree with the January 2016 policy change (discontinuation of the ride-along duty).

The survey also polled questions on uniform, training, safety and risk awareness. One of the questions in the survey queried the support for a “tiered” program, where responsibilities and activities are authorized after meeting certain guidelines. The result was that 84.7% of the respondents supported the idea of a tiered program. As well, 98.6% of the respondents indicated they were willing to undergo additional training to meet the safety standards in the program.

#### UBCM Request for Local Government Input on the Auxiliary Constable Program

On October 13, 2016, the UBCM requested the local government input on options regarding the ACP going forward (Attachment 3). These options were developed by the RCMP National Crime Prevention Services using input from previous consultations. Three options were presented:

**Option 1 (status quo):** Maintain the ACP in its current form (consistent with January 2016 changes), with no Auxiliary Constable participation in general duty patrols or ride-alongs, and no firearms familiarization training, Auxiliary Constable’s would remain appointed peace officers, wear a police-type uniform, and be issued intervention tools and soft body armour. A training standard and activity matrix would be subsequently developed to ensure minimum standards for Auxiliary Constables. At this time, the level of supervision (direct or indirect), nature of the activity matrix and training requirements are unknown.

**Option 2 (Community Corps Program):** ACs would participate solely in community policing (e.g. safety education, crime prevention initiatives). They would wear a civilian-type uniform, and would not be appointed as peace officers. The RCMP has developed a draft training standard, should this option be implemented, that consists of 13 courses totaling 81.5 hours (52 classroom hours, 39.5 hours online).

**Option 3 (Tiered Program – Recommended Option):** A three-tier system. Each tier would have specific requirements for training and experience.

- a) **Tier 1** would be comprised of the duties and training standards described in Option 2, with participation set at 48 hours per year.
- b) **Tier 2** would include all Tier 1 activities, as well as traffic and crowd control, parades and public ceremonies, and foot or bike community presence under indirect supervision. Tier 2 Auxiliary Constables under would be appointed Peace Officers, wear a police type uniform, and be issued intervention tools and soft body armour. Training would include Tier 1 courses, as well as six additional courses. Participation would be set at 96 hours per year with a curfew imposed after 9:00 p.m.
- c) **Tier 3** would include Tier 1 and Tier 2 duties, as well as general duty patrol (in an RCMP vehicle, all-terrain vehicle, snowmobile, marine vessel, bike, on foot, etc.), check stops

and other activities deemed appropriate. Training would build on the Tier 1 and Tier 2 standards, as well as firearms familiarization and additional courses as determined by the division training unit. Participation would be set at 144 hours per year with a curfew imposed after midnight.

The deadline for local governments to provide their preferred options, via online survey, is November 1, 2016. The UBCM will then convey the responses to the RCMP.

#### Analysis of the Auxiliary Constable Program Options

Prior to the ACP policy changes, the Auxiliary Constables were effective in providing police-community communication, improving crime reduction activities and improving the community's sense of safety and security. Analysis and recommendation is provided in the following sections.

##### Option 1 (status quo)

- Option one retains present requirements for armed supervision and discontinues ride-alongs and firearms familiarization. These policy changes decreased volunteer hours by 71% in the City.
- Internal survey of Auxiliary Constables revealed that 91.8% of the respondents do not agree with the status quo policy changes.
- The requirement of armed supervision depends on the availability of limited police resources. If police officers are available, there may be overtime costs associated based on shift schedules. If not available, the support for the community event would be declined.

*If "Option 1 – Status quo" is adopted, the City would continue to experience low level of uniformed Auxiliary Constable presence in the City and community events.*

##### Option 2 (Community Corps Program)

- Option two allows Auxiliary Constables to participate in a community policing capacity dressed in civilian attire. The City has an existing program providing community policing in civilian attire operating out of the Community Police Station. There are currently more than 100 active volunteers for the three Community Police Stations in the City participating in community policing such as Lock Out Auto Crime, Speed Watch, Distracted Driving, general patrols and special initiatives such as Project 529.
- Based on the limited scope provided in Option 2, the responsibilities and activities would mirror the Community Police Station Community Policing volunteers. As such, the City does not require a duplicate program for the same activities.
- Option 2 also indicated that Auxiliary Constables would dress in civilian attire and would not have peace officer status. Should this change be implemented, the internal survey of Auxiliary Constables revealed that 57.3% of participants would resign, and 36.7% is undecided.
- The City would be responsible for the financial cost of uniform change-over.

*If “**Option 2 – Community Corps Program**” is adopted, it is anticipated the majority of Auxiliary Constables would resign. For those who remain, the City would be responsible for the financial cost of uniform change-over.*

#### Option 3 (Tiered Program - Recommended)

- Option three offers a three-tiered system with additional responsibilities and authorized activities based on training and experience. As it currently stands, the training program for the RCMP ACP is not standardized across the country.
- The British Columbia training curriculum for the RCMP ACP is unique because it covers almost all aspects of law enforcement and is six months in length (part-time). Recruits must pass both police tactics and written exams created by the Justice Institute of BC
- Graduates from the RCMP ACP in BC must then fulfill an additional 200 hours of field training before being signed off for active duty.
- Based on the existing ACP training regime in BC, the responsibilities at the proposed Tier 3 would be consistent to the “pre-existing” ACP program where armed supervision is not required, for certain approved activities, and general duty patrols are authorized.
- The internal survey of ACs revealed that, overwhelmingly, 84.7% of the respondents supported the idea of a “tiered” program and wants to resume the role of the Auxiliary Constables as they were before the armed supervision requirement. As well, 98.6% of the respondents indicated they are willing to undergo additional training to meet safety standards in the program.

*If “**Option 3 – Tiered Program**” is adopted, it is anticipated that the morale of Auxiliary Constables would be restored and contribution in volunteer hours would return to historical levels. The benefits to the City would be enhanced police officer presence that is consistent with Council Term Goal “1.3 - Improved perception of Richmond as a safe community”.*

It is recommended that “**Option 3 – Tiered Program**” be the City’s preferred option in response to the UBCM request for input on the Auxiliary Constable Program.

#### **Financial Impact**

None.

#### **Conclusion**

As a result of the RCMP National policy changes, there has been a negative impact on Crime Prevention programs, community events and a uniform police presence in the City of Richmond. Since November 2014, Auxiliary Constable volunteer hours have decreased following the requirements of armed supervision and the discontinuation of the ride-along program.

From the three options presented by the UBCM, “Option 3 – Tiered Program” is recommended as the preferred option for the City. The Tiered Program has three levels with each level allowing Auxiliary Constables to progressively engage in more authorized activities and responsibilities. At Tier 3, it is consistent to the “pre-existing” ACP program without the need

for armed supervision, for certain approved activities, and general duty patrol is authorized. The other benefit of a tiered model is to allow incremental evaluation of the Auxiliary Constables to ensure proper risk and officer safety assessment. It is anticipated that Option 3 would enhance the program while meeting the needs of the RCMP, local governments, Auxiliary Constables and the communities they serve.



Douglas Liu  
Manager, Business and Operational Analysis  
Law and Community Safety  
(604-276-4004)

- Att. 1: Impact on Crime Prevention Programs from the Richmond RCMP Auxiliary Constable Policy Changes
- 2: Internal Polling of the Nation-wide X Badge Survey
  - 3: UBCM Request for Local Government Inputs on Options of the ACP

## **Impact on Crime Prevention Programs from the Richmond RCMP Auxiliary Constable Policy Changes**

### *Effect on Crime Prevention Programs:*

The following programs are significantly impacted by the change in the RCMP Auxiliary Constable policy. Previously, these programs were typically attended by two or more uniformed Auxiliary Constables. As many of these events primarily occur on evenings and/or weekends, and Regular Members (RMs) are not expected to be readily available, it is likely that many of these activities will be suspended entirely.

The following programs are currently suspended or operating at a reduced level, as there are no Regular Members readily available to provide armed supervision:

- Home Security Checks
- DARE Program
- Mental Health Outreach
- Pedestrian Safety Campaign
- Block Watch
- Coastal Watch
- Community Safety Patrols
- Crime Watch
- ICBC Programs (Speed Watch, Distracted Driving, etc.)
- Safety Talks

### *Effect on Community Events:*

Many community events were attended solely by the Auxiliary Constables. The requirement of a Regular Member supervision at these events has greatly reduced the police presence in the community. Crime Prevention Unit members are not readily available on evenings and weekends; therefore, it is expected that these events will not have any uniformed RCMP Auxiliary Constable presence (unless overtime is authorised for the RM for armed supervision).

The following major events will be significantly impacted by the proposed policy change. An increase in Regular Members is required to support the direct supervision of all Auxiliary Constables, including those assigned to tasks such as traffic control, foot patrols, or participating at community events.

- Remembrance Day
- Burkeville Daze
- Ships to Shore
- Salmon Festival / Canada Day
- Halloween

The following events from 2015 were already supported by Regular Members, but similar events would require changes to duties and/or schedules to ensure that all Auxiliary Constables are provided with direct supervision from Regular Members.

- Alzheimer's Walk for Memories
- Freedom of the City (Traffic control)
- SOS Children's Village Run
- Santa's Arrival in Steveston
- Police Week Mall Display
- Ride, Don't Hide
- Ride for Refuge
- Vancouver Fireworks Nights



The following events were attended last year by Auxiliary Constables under general supervision to provide a uniformed presence via foot/bike/ATV/Kubota patrols, and create a positive police presence with the participating public. With the policy change, each of these types of events needs to be reviewed to see if a uniformed RCMP presence is necessary and requires the attendance of Regular Members for direct supervision.

- Philippine Relief Walkathon
- Kajak's Ice Breaker Run
- Children's Arts Festival
- Memorial Services (for VIP's)
- Wheelchair Basketball Championships
- MS Big Bike Event
- Elementary School Fairs (various schools)
- Railway Corridor Grand Opening
- "Learn to Camp" Events
- Thompson "Show-Off" Skate Event
- Community Outdoor Movie Nights (various community centres)
- Dolphin Classic Basketball Tournament
- Nations Cup Soccer Tournament
- Steveston Dragonboat Festival

#### Suspension of Ride-alongs

As of January 2016, the RCMP has now suspended all "Ride-along" duties. This includes all duties where Auxiliary Constables assisted regular members when responding to calls for service.

Although the volunteer hours of Auxiliary Constables participating in Ride-alongs only accounted for less than 25% of the annual total of hours, these duties provided regular field training and helped ensure that the skills of Auxiliary Constables remained up-to-date. Additionally, participation in Ride-alongs helped create a team atmosphere between Regular Members and Auxiliary Constables.

#### Uniforms:

Many Crime Prevention programs have been organised and run solely by the Auxiliary Constables. A uniformed Auxiliary Constable provides professional presence and authority to the public which contributes significantly to the effectiveness of program delivery.

Any proposed option of civilian dress for Auxiliary Constables participating in these programs and events would not provide any significant value to our clients beyond that provided by a Community Policing Volunteer with significantly less training and experience. The community preference is to see uniformed presence in the community and in public events.

Uniformed Auxiliary Constables involved in community events and programs also focus on providing positive police interactions with the public. This opens lines of communications and removes perceived barriers between the police and the public. Auxiliary Constables have stated their concern that the removal of body armour and intervention tools will lower the level of safety.

## Internal Polling of the Nation-wide X Badge Survey


## Nation-wide X Badge Survey

1. Are you partaking in this survey by your own free will, without persuasion or pressure by an external source or person? \*

Number of participants: 281

280 (99.6%): yes

1 (0.4%): no



2. Which division do you currently represent? \*

Number of participants: 281

204 (72.6%): E

- (0.0%): M

11 (3.9%): K

1 (0.4%): F

8 (2.8%): D

- (0.0%): G

- (0.0%): V

- (0.0%): O

- (0.0%): C

2 (0.7%): B

1 (0.4%): L


37 (13.2%): J

16 (5.7%): H

1 (0.4%): Other

Answer(s) from the additional field:

- E



3. How many years service do you currently have? \*

Number of participants: 281

18 (6.4%): Less than 1

57 (20.3%): 1-3

76 (27.0%): 3-6


54 (19.2%): 6-9

34 (12.1%): 9-12

26 (9.3%): 12-15

6 (2.1%): 15-19

10 (3.6%): 20+



4. What was your motivation/reasoning for becoming an Auxiliary (click all that apply)? \*


Number of participants: 281

152 (54.1%): To give back to my community in a positive way

18 (6.4%): To gain police experience for my career aspiration of becoming a police officer

148 (52.7%): To become involved in the policing initiatives in my community

106 (37.7%): All of the above



5. On average, how many hours do you contribute a year to the program? \*

Number of participants: 281

28 (10.0%): I have been below the mandatory 160 hours one or more times


13 (4.6%): I struggle to mee my hourly obligations every year, but still hit 160 hours

10 (3.6%): I only contribute the minimum 160 hours every year

97 (34.5%): 160 to 200 hours

44 (15.7%): 200 to 250 hours

89 (31.7%): 250 or more hours



6. What types of roles generally make up the bulk of your contributed hours? \*

Number of participants: 281


124 (44.1%): Ride-alongs

38 (13.5%): Community events

- (0.0%): Administrative duties

1 (0.4%): Training

118 (42.0%): A fairly even mix of all



7. Were you well aware of the risks involved in being an Auxiliary Constable and did you assume those risks expecting that those risk levels could fluctuate at any time, either decreasing or increasing in severity (risk being considered as grievous bodily harm or death)? \*

Number of participants: 281

281 (100.0%): yes

- (0.0%): no



yes: 100.00%


8. Are you, with today's modern issues in policing, still willing to assume the roles of Auxiliary Constables as they were, before the decisions for mandatory lethal over watch, and the Jan 26th decision to change the program? This means that ride alongs would still be okay and community events could be undertaken without lethal over watch or RM supervision. \*

Number of participants: 281

238 (84.7%): Yes, wholeheartedly and without change

36 (12.8%): Yes, but with some changes being made

7 (2.5%): No, I do not feel comfortable with things going back to being as they were before these changes




9. Following the shooting of events on Parliament Hill in Ottawa, and the fatal shooting of in St. Albert, did you re-evaluate your willingness to still go on ride-alongs or do community events without lethal over watch? In essence, did these events make you reconsider whether or not you still wanted to be an active Auxiliary Constable? \*

Number of participants: 281

4 (1.4%): Yes, I contemplated leaving my position

42 (14.9%): Yes, a bit, but I decided to remain in the program

235 (83.6%): No, I didn't think twice about my position





10. Given the training and equipment you were/are provided as an Auxiliary Constable, do you feel capable, prepared, and safe enough to undertake the roles of an Auxiliary as they were prior to the decisions for lethal over watch and the January 26th decision? \*


Number of participants: 281

195 (69.4%): Yes, I feel fully equipped and safe in doing so

67 (23.8%): Yes, I feel equipped enough but not as safe as I'd like

11 (3.9%): No, I do not feel safe with the equipment I have been provided with

8 (2.8%): No, major changes need to be made



11. Do you support the idea of tiering the auxiliary program to the extent that benchmarks have to be met over extended periods of time before more responsibility and less restrictions are given? \*


Number of participants: 281

88 (31.3%): Yes, after and extended period of time (6 months or more)

32 (11.4%): Yes, after a short probation period (less than 6 months)

118 (42.0%): Yes, at the discretion of the detachment OIC and program coordinator

43 (15.3%): No, experience is gained from having full access




12. Would you be willing to dedicate more of your personal time, voluntarily, to receive more general training (use of force, procedures, driving, shooting, etc.), and should it permit, training for more capable use of force options (eg: CEW)? \*

Number of participants: 281

152 (54.1%): Yes, more training is needed

125 (44.5%): Yes, should it be available, but I feel comfortable with the amount of training I have received and do receive throughout the year

4 (1.4%): No, I feel comfortable with the amount of training I have and receive yearly



13. Do you feel capable, and safe enough, to continue to take part in the ride-along program? \*

Number of participants: 281


254 (90.4%): I feel capable and safe enough

13 (4.6%): I feel capable but not safe enough

12 (4.3%): I feel safe enough but not capable

1 (0.4%): I don't feel capable enough and don't feel safe enough either

1 (0.4%): I do not take part in the ride-along program



14. Do you feel capable, and safe enough, to continue to take part in community-policing events in the community? \*

Number of participants: 281

250 (89.0%): I feel capable enough and safe enough (without lethal over watch)

5 (1.8%): I feel capable enough but not safe enough (without lethal over watch)

3 (1.1%): I feel save enough but not capable enough (without lethal over watch)


22 (7.8%): I feel capable enough and safe enough (with lethal over watch)

- (0.0%): I feel capable enough but not safe enough (with lethal over watch)

- (0.0%): I feel save enough but not capable enough (with lethal over watch)

1 (0.4%): I do not feel safe or capable enough

- (0.0%): I do not take part in community events




15. Did you agree with the decision for mandatory lethal over watch for Auxiliaries, following the shooting on Parliament Hill? \*

Number of participants: 281

61 (21.7%): yes

220 (78.3%): no




16. Do you agree with the decision to discontinue the ride-along program on January 26th? \*

Number of participants: 281

1 (0.4%): Yes, it is a necessary change

22 (7.8%): Yes, I agree that something needed to change but not to cancel the program

258 (91.8%): No, I do not agree with the change, I know the risks




17. Do you support the decision to make changes to the uniform? \*

Number of participants: 281

5 (1.8%): Yes, we need to be more distinguishable from the regular members

41 (14.6%): Yes, a few minor changes would be okay with me

235 (83.6%): No changes are needed





18. Do you agree that auxiliaries should have the same uniform as regular members? \*


Number of participants: 281

108 (38.4%): Yes, it is a way of making us less distinguishable as an unarmed officer

41 (14.6%): No, RMs should stand out more

2 (0.7%): No, I feel as though it would make me more of a target

130 (46.3%): No, it is good as it is



19. Do you support limiting the roles of Auxiliaries even further (as is assumed to take place) through the development of the proposed "activity matrix?" \*

Number of participants: 281

10 (3.6%): yes

271 (96.4%): no



20. If the uniform is changed in exchange for something less distinguishable do you see yourself resigning from the program? \*


Number of participants: 281

28 (10.0%): Yes, no matter the change

133 (47.3%): Yes, if drastic changes are made (no duty belt, golf shirts only, etc.)

17 (6.0%): No, I'm okay with change

103 (36.7%): It will depend on how drastic



21. Which changes to the uniform or dress code would make you consider resigning (click all that apply)? \*

Number of participants: 281

104 (37.0%): Change to different shirt colour


209 (74.4%): Golf shirts only

231 (82.2%): No more duty belt

110 (39.1%): Bigger or more "Auxiliary" logos

213 (75.8%): Fewer use of force options

15 (5.3%): I am okay with any of the above changes



22. If the agency gave you these options in order for the program to remain as it was, which (if any) would you support (click all that apply)? \*


Number of participants: 281

25 (8.9%): No insurance coverage if injured or killed

138 (49.1%): Signing a waiver to not sue the agency if injured

81 (28.8%): Paying for your own insurance

109 (38.8%): None of the above



23. Should the changes on January 26th be implemented do you see yourself resigning from the program? \*


Number of participants: 281

43 (15.3%): Yes

84 (29.9%): More than likely, yes

20 (7.1%): No

134 (47.7%): Depends on how drastic the changes are



24. Do you feel as though your opinions have been heard, considered or collected, in regards to the decisions taking place? \*


Number of participants: 281

10 (3.6%): Yes

170 (60.5%): No

35 (12.5%): Minimal

66 (23.5%): Too early to tell



25. What outcomes do you see happening as a result of these proposed changes (click all that apply)? \*

Number of participants: 281

258 (91.8%): Massive amounts of people resigning

215 (76.5%): Increased workloads on regular members


236 (84.0%): Increased costs on the agency (overtime, more bodies needed, etc.)

233 (82.9%): Interest in new people joining the program drastically reduced

189 (67.3%): Increased frustration among regular members (increased workloads, event management, etc.)

229 (81.5%): The complete demise of the program on a national scale

4 (1.4%): No outcomes will be the result of these changes



# RCMP Seeking Input on Auxiliary Constable Program

Oct. 13, 2016

Based on input received during previous consultations, RCMP National Crime Prevention Services has developed several options regarding the future of the Auxiliary Constable Program (ACP). UBCM asks BC local governments to indicate their preferred option [via survey](#) prior to Tuesday, November 1, 2016. UBCM will then convey responses to the RCMP.

The RCMP is considering three options with regard to the ACP. These options are as follows:

**Option 1 (Status Quo):** Maintain the ACP in its current form (consistent with January 2016 changes), with no Auxiliary Constable (AC) participation in general duty patrols or ride-alongs, and no firearms familiarization training. ACs would remain appointed peace officers, wear a police-type uniform, and be issued intervention tools and soft body armour. A training standard and activity matrix would be subsequently developed to ensure minimum standards for ACs. At this time, the level of supervision (direct or indirect), nature of the activity matrix, and training requirements are unknown.

**Option 2 (Community Corps Program):** ACs would participate solely in community policing (e.g. safety education, crime prevention initiatives). They would wear a civilian-type uniform, and would not be appointed as peace officers. The RCMP has developed a draft training standard, should this option be implemented, that consists of 13 courses totalling 81.5 hours (52 classroom hours, 39.5 hours online).

**Option 3 (Tiered Program):** A three-tier system. Each tier would have specific requirements for training and experience.

Tier 1 would be comprised of the duties and training standards described in Option 2, with participation set at 48 hours per year.

Tier 2 would include all Tier 1 activities, as well as traffic and crowd control, parades and public ceremonies, and foot or bike community presence under indirect supervision. Tier 2 ACs would be appointed Peace Officers, wear a police-type uniform, and be issued intervention tools and soft body armour. Training would include Tier 1 courses, as well as six additional courses. Participation would be set at 96 hours per year with a curfew imposed after 9:00 pm.

Tier 3 would include Tier 1 and Tier 2 duties, as well as general duty patrol (in an RCMP vehicle, all terrain vehicle, snowmobile, marine vessel, bike, on foot, etc.), check stops, and other activities deemed appropriate. Training would build on the Tier 1 and Tier 2 standards, as well as firearms familiarization and additional courses as determined by the division training unit. Participation would be set at 144 hours per year with a curfew imposed after midnight.

UBCM was initially given an insufficient amount of time to consult with local governments prior to submitting feedback to the RCMP. Based on input from stakeholders, including a letter from RCMP Local Government Contract Management Committee co-Chair, Councillor Sav Dhaliwal, the RCMP extended the deadline to November 1, 2016.

ACs are unarmed, uniformed volunteers whose primary purpose is to participate in community policing and crime prevention activities. In British Columbia, the ACP has been in existence for over 50 years and is governed by a

Provincial Policy. There are currently about 700 active ACs located in 67 RCMP detachments throughout the Province, volunteering about 120,000 hours of service a year to their local communities.

ACs are appointed under the BC *Police Act* to assist the Provincial Police Force in the performance of its duties. The Province provides the funding to support local ACPs approved and established at Provincial RCMP detachments. Municipalities with populations greater than 5,000 are responsible for providing policing within their municipality, and are responsible for funding their local ACP, with the Ministry providing maintenance support. The Province also provides ACs with personal liability protection, WorkSafe BC coverage, death and dismemberment insurance coverage, a training curriculum, badges and ID.