

INTEGRATED POLICE TEAMS REVIEW

Prepared for:

Mayor Bryson, Central Saanich

Mayor Desjardins, Esquimalt

Mayor Fortin, Victoria

Mayor Jensen, Oak Bay

Mayor Leonard, Saanich

Prepared by:

Police Services Division, Ministry of Justice

Catherine Tait, Catherine Tait Consulting

Peter Adams, Victoria Consulting Network Inc.

Submitted:

June 5, 2014

OVERVIEW

At the request of the Mayors of Victoria, Esquimalt, Oak Bay, Saanich and Central Saanich a review has been undertaken of integrated police teams that operate in the Capital Region. To conduct the review, relevant background documents were reviewed, a group meeting was held with the Mayors, and interviews were conducted with the police agencies that participate in the eight integrated teams¹ included in the study. The review was intended to identify issues and obtain perspectives on those issues from the Mayors and police agencies in the CRD but not to provide conclusions or recommendations. As such, the content of this report and in particular the Key Messages chapter reflects the results of the consultation phase rather than the views of Police Services Division or the consultants. The following are the key messages expressed during the consultation phase.

The Benefits of Cooperation

All police forces recognize that there are benefits to be gained through inter-force cooperation. Such benefits include: economies of scale; access to specialized equipment, training and personnel; and, increased effectiveness in addressing criminal activity that affects more than one community.

Integrated teams are perhaps the most visible method of departmental cooperation but, as a number of jurisdictions pointed out, they are not the only way that cooperation occurs today or could occur in the future. Other methods of cooperation include: contracting for service with another police department; providing mutual back up on an as needed basis; joint ownership of speciality equipment; and coordination of coverage (e.g. coordinated dog team scheduling). Another view is that the use of integrated teams does not address the need for much greater regionalization on a permanent basis. Also, there is scepticism among some forces that interest in integrated teams has been driven more by efforts to enhance the symbolism of cooperation rather than a concern for delivering police services in the most cost-effective way for all jurisdictions.

The Value of Existing Teams

Generally speaking, there is strong support for the mandate of existing teams and a respect for the quality of service being provided. However, while the quality of service provided by the integrated teams is generally well respected the capacity of some teams has been affected by cutbacks in resources caused by the withdrawal of participants and other sources of funding. Collectively, police forces are particularly concerned regarding the resource levels for MYST and RDVU and are actively seeking ways to strengthen these teams.

Use of non-police experts by some integrated teams (RDVU, IMCRT) is viewed as an innovative and effective method of addressing domestic violence cases and incidents involving people with mental health / addiction issues. These teams are effective because they bring together the law enforcement

¹ Regional Crime Unit (RCU), the Regional Domestic Violence Unit (RDVU), the Integrated Mobile Crisis Response Team (IMCRT), the Mobile Youth Services Team (MYST), the Crisis Negotiation Team (CNT), the Dive Team, the Crowd Management Unit (CMU) and the Greater Victoria Emergency Response Team (GVERT).

skills of police officers and the mental health and social work skills of the non-police team members in a coordinated way.

Decisions on Participation

Even where the service is valued, individual police forces are regularly evaluating whether continued participation in an integrated team represents best value for money in a world of constrained financial resources.

While the provision of police services within municipal boundaries is a requirement under the Police Act, police forces see participation in the teams as only one possible way to provide these specific services. Therefore they see participation in the teams as voluntary and recognise that membership may change over time. Each Police Chief and Detachment Commander will assess the costs and benefits for their municipality, of participating on each team, and may decide to end their participation.

The factors considered when deciding whether or not to continue participation can include:

- how frequently they expect to make use of the team's services compared to the cost of participation;
- insurance value of participating in a team, to reduce the costs of addressing infrequent but serious crimes with high cost investigations
- efficiency of joint investment in expensive specialized training and equipment
- effectiveness in addressing cross boundary crime, but mostly to the extent that a municipality would expect to experience this type of crime
- alternatives for accessing the service another way and the cost effectiveness of the alternative (e.g. provide internally; obtain from a neighbour; or, in the case of the RCMP, from Island District);
- opportunities for staff development;
- having less control over the portion of the police budget attributable to a team - and less operational control over the deployment of members contributed to a team - compared to the benefits of participation; and
- a recognition that some residents of outlying communities benefit from support provided by some teams when they are in the core area (e.g. MYST, IMCRT).

These factors differ for each municipality depending on their size, location, crime patterns and relationships with other police agencies. We were provided with examples where integrated teams could not respond to all cases in every participating municipality and this prompted re-examination of the level of participation by the municipality. In another instance there were too few cases that met a team's mandate occurring within a municipality to justify the continued cost of participation. Very recently, participants considered the usefulness of continued participation in the integrated Dive Team and decided to disband it at the end of 2014. In none of the cases, however, has the decision to withdraw been a reflection on the quality of service provided.

Police agencies agree that an individual force must have the flexibility to leave an integrated team (or decline to participate in a new team) because they have to be able to manage their budgets in response to local police priorities and changing circumstances. All agree that departures from a team can have a significant impact on the remaining participants. Therefore, the exit arrangements need to ensure reasonable advance notice (see next section).

Addressing Inconsistencies in Governance and Funding

The integrated teams have been created at different times and evolved differently resulting in differences in their governance structure, exit provisions, funding formula, budgeting process and reports. A Joint Management Team (JMT) was created in early 2013 to address these differences and to achieve greater consistency. The JMT is comprised of Deputies from independent police forces and Commanders of RCMP detachments.

Over the past year, the JMT has made a number of significant strides in improving governance arrangements and have created a draft protocol agreement that: implements more orderly exit provisions with an adequate notice period; recommends a new standard cost-sharing formula for most services; introduces a consistent approach to budgeting and annual reporting; and implements a standard term for officers serving on teams. In addition, the JMT has proposed that the participants in any newly established team be required to continue their participation for three years before they consider exiting from the service.

The new formula for sharing costs is almost universally accepted as fair – with the exception of one police agency that disagrees with changes to the cost sharing cost base². The single formula will provide consistency and will allow for easier communication when explaining how the contribution of each municipality is determined.

The JMT is also taking the lead in developing ways to improve the effectiveness of MYST and RDVU (MYST is the priority for 2014) and is considering the development of performance measures for the teams. A number of the integrated team MOUs are out of date and while this is not seen by some as an important issue for day to day effectiveness of the teams, the JMT has tasked team Operations Councils / Supervisors for each team to review their MOUs and make recommendations to the JMT.

Differences in the Role of Boards and Councils

The degree to which police boards and municipal councils are involved in making decisions regarding integrated team issues and monitoring the work of the teams varies from agency to agency. In some jurisdictions, the Chief or Detachment Commander makes the decisions and informs the board or council, while in others the Chief or Detachment Commander provides the board or council with information and the board or council make the decision. The police boards and municipal councils do

² Under the new approach, the cost base would share all officer and other costs among all participants; under the previous approach for some teams, only non-personnel costs were shared, and only by those participants that did not contribute officers.

not meet collectively to discuss integrated police teams but the Area Chiefs, Detachment Commanders and Deputies do.

In smaller communities policed by independent forces, police boards appear to have more involvement in decisions concerning the funding of and participation in integrated teams than those in larger communities. Similarly, the involvement of municipal councils in integrated team decisions within RCMP municipalities also varies. The RCMP has added layers of decision making involving the local Detachment Commander, Island District and the Commanding Officer at E Division who has the authority to sign MOUs. Island District does assist with the MOU process but decisions regarding participation on integrated teams are the responsibilities of Detachment Commanders, Mayors and councils.

There is a feeling in some police agencies that the process of reporting out to boards and councils on the work and success of integrated teams can be improved to support more informed decision making. The JMT has agreed to establish a standard annual report format and schedule for all the teams.

The Potential for Greater Cooperation

All police agencies suggested areas where additional cooperation may be possible. Areas mentioned include: communications and dispatch; police dog teams; computer forensics; intelligence sharing and region-wide crime analysis; forensic identification and crime scene analysis; child pornography investigation; traffic crash analysis; plain clothes units; and, records management, document transcription and preparation of court documents. However, there is not a universal feeling that creating more integrated teams is automatically the best way to achieve cooperation.

While some police agencies support the use of integration, some would proceed cautiously on expanding the number of teams because:

- They would want to be sure that their commitment of funding or resources would not compromise their capacity to address policing priorities in their own jurisdictions;
- Achieving support for regional initiatives can be difficult unless all potential participants can expect to see sufficient benefits for their jurisdictions; and
- Some would prefer to see existing teams enhanced before expanding into other areas.

Decisions to create new integrated teams should be taken on their merits, on a case by case basis, starting with shared objectives to address actual problems. This will create commitment to the value of a team.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW	i
INTRODUCTION	2
Summary of the Current Situation	3
KEY MESSAGES FROM CONSULTATIONS	8
The Benefits of Cooperation	8
The Value of Existing Teams	9
Decisions on Participation	10
Specific Examples of Participation Decisions	13
a. RDVU	13
b. RCU	14
c. Dive Team	14
Addressing Inconsistencies in Governance and Funding	15
Variations in Police Board and Municipal Council Involvement	18
The Potential for Greater Cooperation	19
APPENDIX: TEAM DETAILS	A1

INTRODUCTION

The municipalities and unincorporated areas of the Capital Region District (CRD) are policed by four independent police departments and three RCMP detachments. These police agencies cooperate in a number of ways, including through a number of integrated police teams or units that focus on particular policing issues. These teams include the Regional Crime Unit, the Regional Domestic Violence Unit, the Integrated Mobile Crisis Response Team, the Mobile Youth Services Team, the Crisis Negotiation Team, the Dive Team, the Crowd Management Unit and the Greater Victoria Emergency Response Team.

Participation by individual police agencies in these integrated units varies. In recent years, some participants have withdrawn from the Regional Crime Unit (RCU) and staff contributions to the Regional Domestic Violence Unit (RDVU) have been reduced, raising concerns regarding the impact of withdrawals, the level of commitment to, and the future of, the integrated team approach in the CRD. During a meeting between the Director of Police Services Division and the Mayors of Victoria, Esquimalt, Oak Bay, Saanich and Central Saanich in February 2013, Police Services Division agreed to undertake a review of CRD integrated policing services to examine whether improvements can be made to the structure and governance of integrated policing within the CRD. Two consultants, Catherine Tait and Peter Adams, were retained to assist Police Services Division with the review, and this report presents the results of the review process. The review was limited to the integrated teams listed above. The Vancouver Island Integrated Major Crime Unit and the Integrated Road Safety Unit are not covered by this review. Amalgamation of CRD police forces was also outside the scope of this review.

The review examined the present structure of integrated policing within the Capital Region, and through consultations with Mayors and police agencies, identified the benefits of cooperation and the value of existing teams. The review also examined the factors considered by local police agencies when deciding whether to participate in an integrated service and the roles played by police boards and municipal councils in coming to such decisions. Further opportunities for cooperation in policing services and functions were also identified.

The review was conducted in three phases. In the first phase, conducted during the summer and early fall of 2013, relevant documents were collected and reviewed, including Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) that established the teams, annual reports and activity statistics submitted by teams, budgets and related documents such as submissions for resource increases. Based on the review of these documents, a standard template of information was created for each team; these templates are presented in the Appendix and a short summary of the current situation is presented later in this Chapter.

The second phase entailed consultation, and began with a group meeting of the Mayors, followed by interviews conducted with the Police Chiefs, Detachment Commanders, and their Deputies. A representative of the RCMP Island District was also interviewed. Interviews were conducted during

November and December 2013, with some follow up occurring in January 2014. In March 2014, the new Chief of the Victoria and Esquimalt Police Department was interviewed to gain his perspective. The results of the second phase are presented in Chapter Two, Key Messages from Consultations. The third phase consisted of preparing the review report.

In the period while the review was underway, a new Joint Management Team (JMT) for integrated police teams in the CRD was created. The JMT has addressed and resolved a number of the Mayors' original concerns regarding integrated police teams in the CRD. These changes are being implemented in 2014, and are also described in this report.

This review was not intended to be an intensive review or evaluation, nor was it intended to assess the merits of potential options for change or provide recommendations. Rather, it was intended to identify issues and obtain perspectives on those issues from the Mayors and police agencies in the CRD. As such, the content of this report and in particular the Key Messages chapter reflects the results of the consultation phase rather than the views of Police Services Division or the consultants.

Summary of the Current Situation

The eight integrated teams covered by this review started at different times in response to a variety of issues, and their mandates address a diverse set of policing issues. Most of the integrated teams provide specialized services, some of which are provided on an occasional basis, and others on a frequent basis. Two teams include non-police experts in addition to their police members.

Each team has MOU or MOA³ that sets out the team mandate, participants, contributions, lines of authority and other arrangements. Until recently, police agencies contributed to the teams either by providing staff and / or equipment, or by providing funding to support the team. A new funding arrangement implemented in 2014 is described in Chapter Two. Exhibit One presents 2012 costs for each integrated team, municipal contributions to each team, and for comparison, the municipalities' overall police expenditures that year. Exhibit Two indicates the year in which each team began operations, its staffing level in 2012 and a key indicator of its 2012 activity level⁴.

³ With the exception of MYST which does not have an MOU.

⁴ At the time of writing, 2012 is the most recent year for which all information is available.

EXHIBIT ONE

2012 CRD INTEGRATED TEAM COSTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

CRD Integrated Services Review: Costs Allocations 2012; Compared to 2012 Police Budgets Overall

	Regional Crime Unit*	Regional Domestic Violence Unit**	Integrated Mobile Crisis Response Unit	Mobile Youth Services Team	Dive Team	Crowd Manage- ment Unit	Greater Victoria Emergency Response Team	Crisis Negotia- tion Team	Total Team Costs	2012 Municipal Police Expenditures***
Independents										
Victoria/Esquimalt		\$237,000	\$117,996	\$54,744	\$35,745	\$13,543	\$178,212	\$7,220	\$644,460	\$43,807,792
Oak Bay	\$91,959	\$18,636	\$11,287	\$5,236	\$5,588	\$2,117	\$27,858	\$1,129	\$163,810	\$4,254,307
Saanich	\$603,733	\$119,000	\$73,876	\$34,274	\$30,387	\$11,513	\$151,500	\$6,138	\$1,030,421	\$27,201,509
Central Saanich	\$91,959	\$18,636	\$11,287	\$5,236	\$4,822	\$1,827	\$24,041	\$974	\$158,782	\$4,285,517
RCMP										
Sidney	\$55,975	\$11,339	\$6,926	\$3,213					\$77,453	\$2,390,750
North Saanich	\$43,981	\$8,911	\$5,387	\$2,499					\$60,778	\$1,834,774
Sooke	\$43,981	\$8,098	\$5,387	\$2,499					\$59,965	\$1,525,853
West Shore	\$199,912	\$97,000	\$24,369	\$11,306					\$332,587	\$8,557,116
Total	\$1,131,500	\$518,621	\$256,515	\$119,007	\$76,542	\$29,000	\$381,611	\$15,461	\$2,528,257	\$93,857,618

* RCU budget excludes cost of RCMP Provincial Force contribution of 3 members and a crime analyst.

Sidney, North Saanich and Central Saanich withdrew from RCU in 2013.

** RDVU amounts for Victoria/Esquimalt, Saanich and West Shore are in kind contributions of police members.

Victoria subsequently reduced its contribution from 2 to 1 member.

*** Police Resources in British Columbia, 2012. RCMP Municipal expenditures exclude federal contribution amounts.

EXHIBIT TWO

2012 INTEGRATED TEAM, START YEAR, STAFFING AND KEY ACTIVITIES

CRD Integrated Services Review: Integrated Team Key Facts

	Regional Crime Unit	Regional Domestic Violence Unit**	Integrated Mobile Crisis Response Unit	Mobile Youth Services Team	Dive Team	Crowd Management Unit	Greater Victoria Emergency Response Team	Crisis Negotiation Team
Start of Operations**	2008	2010	2006*	2002	2004	2004	1977	1977
Members***								
Police full time	10	3	2	1	0	0	0	0
Police stand by members	0	0	0	0	6	60	14	9
Non-police members	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0
Key Activity Statistic 2012	124 files; 203 charges	64 new action files	3746 calls for service	76 files	2 calls for service	4 deployments & 3 cell extractions	57 operations	35 operations
2012 Key Activities by by Jurisdiction	Charges	Action Files	Calls for Service	na	na	Deployments	Operations	na
Victoria/Esquimalt	7	20	1,655			5	44	
Saanich	19	16	923			2	12	
Central Saanich	-	-	86				1	
Oak Bay	-	-	118					
Sidney/North Saanich	-	3	137					
Sooke	2	3	325					
West Shore	175	2	337					
Out of area / unknown / other		20	161					

* IMCERT began as a pilot project in 2004 and became operational on an on-going basis in 2006.

** Start dates for the Dive, Crowd Management teams are based on the date of the governing MOU.

Start dates for the Greater Victoria Emergency Response and Crisis Negotiation Teams provided by Saanich PD.

*** Members may not work full time on team duties. the members of the Dive, Crowd Management, Greater Victoria Emergency Response, and Crisis Negotiation teams represent the number of staff who are trained and available for call out as required.

The following provides a brief outline of the mandate and key activities of each team⁵.

1. **Regional Crime Unit (RCU):** Proactively targets prolific offenders who are responsible for a disproportionate amount of property crime. Many such offenders are transient and commit offences in more than one jurisdiction. Assigned members work full time on team activities. Oak Bay, Saanich, Sooke and West Shore participate in RCU. The province provides three members and a crime analyst to the team through the RCMP Provincial Force.

⁵ More detailed information on each team can be found in the Appendix, which presents a template of information for each team

2. **Regional Domestic Violence Unit (RDVU):** Provides follow-up services in select domestic violence cases where there is an elevated level of risk to victims, and/or their children, accompanied by a need for intensive victim support. The RDVU team includes police, community based victim service providers, and the Ministry of Children and Family Development (MCFD). Services include follow-up investigation, risk assessment, offender management, safety planning for victims and children, and intensive victim specific support through to trial, and in some cases beyond. Assigned members work full time on team activities. The Victoria Women's Transition House, MCFD and all CRD police agencies participate in RDVU.
3. **Integrated Mobile Crisis Response Team (IMCRT):** Attends to community crises arising from addictions or mental health issues, or public safety concerns. IMCRT is an interdisciplinary team that collectively triages calls for service. It involves the most appropriate staff based on discipline, gender, sub-speciality and provides consultation, and where necessary, direct intervention to resolve the crisis in the least intrusive manner possible while maintaining safety. The team is comprised of 7 Vancouver Island Health Authority (VIHA) psychiatric, child and youth and social work staff and 2 police officers. Assigned members work full time on team activities. VIHA and all CRD police agencies participate in IMCRT.
4. **Mobile Youth Services Team (MYST):** Provides a full time police officer to work with at risk youth, their parents, guardians and caregivers. The MYST officer also delivers presentations to youth on sexual exploitation and drug awareness, targets criminal investigations on pimps, johns and recruiters and works closely with youth organizations and groups throughout the community. All CRD police agencies participate in MYST.

The following four teams are covered by a single MOU entitled "CRD Integration of Specialised Police Services". Victoria/Esquimalt, Oak Bay, Saanich and Central Saanich Police Departments participate in all four teams; RCMP detachments do not participate. These teams are deployed on an as needed basis. The majority of the shared costs associated with these teams relate to specialized training and equipment:

5. **Crisis Negotiation Team (CNT):** Conducts negotiations in criminal barricades and suicide interventions. Negotiators may also participate in a standby capacity for pre-planned tactical operations.
6. **Crowd Management Unit (CMU):** Deployed to maintain public order at events such as Canada Day and New Year's Eve celebrations, protests and music concerts. CMU also performs cell extractions to resolve disturbances in police cells.
7. **Dive Team:** Performs operational dives for evidence recovery and searching for missing persons.

8. **Greater Victoria Emergency Response Team (GVERT):** Provides highly trained tactical members to respond to high risk calls including execution of warrants, criminal barricades, hostage rescue and prisoner transport.

KEY MESSAGES FROM CONSULTATIONS

This Chapter presents the themes that were expressed during the consultation phase of this review. The consultations began with a group meeting with the Mayors of Victoria, Saanich, Oak Bay, Central Saanich and Esquimalt. Interviews were then conducted with these municipalities' Chiefs of Police and their Deputies, as well as the RCMP Detachment Commanders and their Ops/Admin NCO's from Sidney / North Saanich, Sooke and West Shore. A representative of RCMP Vancouver Island District was also interviewed. The themes covered in the consultations include the benefits of cooperation, the value of the integrated teams, local decisions regarding participation in teams, governance and funding, as well as the potential for further cooperation in the future.

The Benefits of Cooperation

All police forces recognize that there are benefits to be gained through inter-force cooperation. Such benefits include: economies of scale; access to specialized equipment, training and personnel; and increased effectiveness in addressing criminal activity that affects more than one community. Some of these benefits are especially appreciated by smaller police agencies. For example, one smaller police agency commented that participation in the integrated teams allows them to take advantage of specialization and expertise while still retaining a community focus for most of their policing. Another said that because they provide only general policing the added expertise of the integrated teams is a real benefit.

Integrated teams are perhaps the most visible method of departmental cooperation but, as a number of jurisdictions pointed out, they are not the only way that cooperation occurs today or could occur in the region. In fact, some of the current teams have had history of informal cooperation (e.g. Dive Team) before they became a formal, standing integrated team. Other methods of cooperation include: contracting for service with another police department; providing mutual back up on an as needed basis; joint ownership of speciality equipment; and coordination of coverage. As one Chief put it, police agencies in the CRD have always come to each other's aid when needed. Examples of cooperation include:

- One smaller police department has a service agreement with a larger neighbour that covers investigative services, operational and administrative support. A separate MOU covers dispatch.
- Two other smaller agencies, also neighbours, share dispatch and use the same radio channel so communication is excellent and they back each other up on calls. This is not a formalized relationship and there are no charge backs except for major cases.
- One agency has a traffic crash analyst who works on accidents in a neighbouring municipality. Only overtime costs are charged back.
- Dog teams operated by three police agencies are scheduled collaboratively, to allow for round the clock coverage in the municipalities served by these agencies.

- An example of formal cooperation outside of integrated teams is the joint use of the CREST public safety radio system. CREST users also include a number of fire and ambulance services, and CREST is governed by its own Board of Directors.
- One police agency interviewed also referenced arrangements for services to be provided, as needed, with non-police agencies such as the military.

Another view is that the use of integrated teams does not address the need for much greater regionalization on a permanent basis. As well, there is scepticism among some forces that interest in integrated teams has been driven more by efforts to enhance the symbolism of cooperation rather than a concern for delivering police services in the most cost-effective way for all jurisdictions.

The Value of Existing Teams

Generally speaking, there is strong support for the mandate of existing teams and a respect for the quality of service being provided. One agency commented that they were generally pleased with the service provided and are satisfied that they receive their fair share of service from the teams. Another commented that the teams enhance the effectiveness of policing in their jurisdiction and operate across boundaries seamlessly. Yet another reported that the RCU had recently helped solve a rash of B&Es and thefts from autos in their municipality. One police agency did note that the teams are not able to provide all services to everyone on an immediate basis; sometimes the service may not be as timely as they would like, but they do respond to requests as they are able. Another feels that the span of control within the teams is too great - that the teams have too much control over the selection of their members and the types of calls they respond to. He would prefer to have greater control over how his members who are assigned to teams are deployed.

The presence of non-police experts on some integrated teams (RDVU, IMCRT) is viewed as an innovative and effective method of addressing domestic violence cases and incidents involving people with mental health / addiction issues. These teams are effective because they bring together the law enforcement skills of police officers and the mental health and social work skills of the non-police team members in a coordinated way. Support for these teams is reflected in comments such as these:

- IMCRT is a wonderful service that provides a key service in assessing people and deciding on a course of action. With limited officers on duty at any one time, having IMCRT available to escort someone to the hospital is valuable and efficient.
- RDVU brings a level of expertise to dealings with Crown and the Courts – they have credibility and their recommendations are listened to.

However, while the quality of service provided by the integrated teams is generally well respected, the capacity of some teams has been affected by cutbacks in resources caused by the withdrawal of participants and other sources of funding. MYST was launched with federal and provincial funding that supported non-police members of the team. When that funding eventually ran out MYST staffing was scaled back to one police officer. RDVU was originally staffed by family violence

experts and four police members but lost a police member as the result of internal restructuring by one of the contributing police agencies. RCU has reduced the number of officers on the team as a result of recent departures by three participating police agencies.

These resource reductions have impacted the services that can be provided to participants. While the broad mandate for these teams has remained the same, the service standards have had to adjust to changes in resources. RDVU, for example, has had to increase its threshold for accepting cases. Collectively, police forces are particularly concerned regarding the resource levels for MYST and RDVU and are seeking ways to strengthen these teams.

Decisions on Participation

Even where the service is valued, individual police forces are regularly evaluating whether continued participation in an integrated team represents best value for money in a world of constrained financial resources.

While the provision of police services within municipal boundaries is a requirement under the Police Act, police forces see participation in the teams as only one possible way to provide these specific services. Therefore they see participation in the teams as voluntary and recognise that membership may change over time. Each Police Chief or Detachment Commander assesses the costs and benefits for their municipality of participating on each team, and may decide to end their participation.

Clearly, the services that an integrated team provides must meet an operational need of its participants. Other factors considered when deciding whether or not to continue participation include:

1. **Frequency of use versus cost.** Of primary importance is an assessment of how frequently a police agency expects to make use of a team's services compared to the cost of participation. For example, one large municipality commented that 80% of a particular team's calls are within their jurisdiction so it is worth their while to participate. On the other hand, a smaller municipality notes that they have never had a call for the same team, and have used three other teams less than a half a dozen times each. While they continue to participate in these teams, the low frequency of use means that continued participation is subject to on-going consideration.
2. **Insurance.** Some types of crime may occur with a low frequency but entail high investigation costs. For such circumstances, particularly for small police agencies, it may be worth joining an integrated team on an insurance basis. As one Detachment Commander noted "integrated services or units can protect against high costs from infrequent but serious crimes, but integration may provide fewer benefits in the realm of everyday policing".
3. **Efficiency.** Joint investment in high cost specialized training and equipment can be more efficient than each agency investing in these things individually. This is especially true for a

number of CRD integrated teams where the training and equipment costs are shared among participants and the teams have a limited number of call-outs each year. One example is the Greater Victoria Emergency Response Team - it is a specialised service with high training costs.

4. **Effectiveness in addressing cross boundary crime.** Integrated police services are well positioned to respond to patterns of crime occurring in more than one jurisdiction that are the work of a single prolific offender. The original mandate for the Regional Crime Unit was based, in part, on this premise. However, municipalities must have a reasonable expectation that their jurisdiction will in fact experience this problem before participation in a team is worthwhile. One police agency commented that they participate in the RCU because it provides a benefit to the people of their municipality, within the municipal boundaries. Others have decided to leave the RCU, in part because of the low number of calls meeting the RCU mandate occurring within their jurisdictions.
5. **Cost effective alternatives.** As noted above, integrated services are seldom the only way that a police agency can access a service, and the availability and cost of alternatives are considered when assessing continued participation in an integrated team. A police agency may be able to provide a team's service internally, obtain it from a neighbour or, in the case of the RCMP, obtain assistance from Island District. Examples:
 - One Police Chief noted that his department needs access to emergency response and crowd management services, as they cannot reasonably provide these services themselves and have policing standards to meet. However, the Chief feels that they should always be considering the best method of obtaining these services; accessing these services on a cost recovery basis from another police agency could be a cost effective alternative to participation in the integrated teams.
 - RCMP detachments noted that Island District assistance is usually available for investigations of serious crime. One Detachment Commander commented however, that Island District would be unlikely to assist with property crimes committed by a prolific offender. Island District itself notes that it cannot backstop all investigations for every Island municipality as it has a limited number of investigators; they are more inclined to assist smaller detachments. As a result, one Detachment Commander noted that sometimes it is good to have a service (in this case, RDVU) covered off by an integrated team.
6. **Opportunities for staff development.** Team members gain experience and often specialized training while working on the teams that they bring back with them when they return to their home police agency. One Detachment Commander also noted that there can be a useful cross fertilization and knowledge transfer that occurs when members from different agencies work together. These benefits may be considered as part of the decision to join or continue with a team. Conversely, one Police Chief feels that there is a danger of identifying too many members

as specialists because this takes away from a more generalist role needed in front-line policing. Because specialists may not be busy all the time on team work they need to be able to be redeployed to areas that are of priority to the municipality.

7. **Less flexibility and control.** Participation in an integrated team necessarily involves a trade off between the benefits of membership and having less control over the portion of the police budget attributable to a team, and less operational control over the deployment of members contributed to a team. In other areas, Chiefs and Commanders are able to allocate resources nimbly to respond to local priorities and needs. In contrast, Chiefs and Commanders have less direct control over integrated team finances and staff.
8. **Support for residents of outlying communities.** Police Chiefs and Detachment Commanders recognize that at-risk residents of outlying communities benefit from support provided by some teams even when the teams are working in the core downtown area. This is particularly true of MYST and IMCRT. MYST provides prevention and education for youth in the downtown area, some of whom are actually residents of the Western Communities or communities on the Saanich Peninsula. The work can be seen as a crime reduction strategy, providing early intervention in the lives of at risk youth. Similarly, IMCRT works in all areas of the CRD, but receives most calls from Victoria/Esquimalt. Detachment Commanders from outlying areas recognize that residents from their communities with chronic mental health issues may receive IMCRT assistance locally, but also when they are in the downtown area.

This list illustrates the wide range of factors considered when decisions to join and continue participation in an integrated team are made. How these factors impact those decisions differs for each municipality depending on its size, location, crime patterns and relationships with other police agencies. As Exhibit Three illustrates, the police agencies in the CRD vary greatly in their size, which affects their ability to develop and deliver specialized services themselves. Crime rates also differ dramatically – communities with low rates of crime may not feel as great a need to address prolific offenders or cross boundary crimes, for example, as communities with higher crime rates. One police agency explained that they serve one of the safest communities in Canada, and have the time to undertake proactive policing such as night time vehicle checks; as a consequence of these factors, they feel limited need to participate in the RCU. Nonetheless, low crime rate communities may still wish to participate in an integrated team for its insurance value or to access expensive specialist services.

Larger police departments work in higher crime communities but are better positioned to provide some specialized services themselves; they too might not feel the need for integrated team services unless the teams provide clear benefits to their residents and cost effective alternatives do not exist.

One RCMP representative noted that because the integrated teams appear as separate line items in police budgets they can be singled out for greater scrutiny and questioning than perhaps their

relatively small proportion of overall costs would warrant. However, all agencies agree that cost pressures make them examine the affordability of specialized services carefully.

EXHIBIT THREE

CRD MUNICIPAL POLICING STATISTICS, 2012

	Population	Authorized Strength	Criminal Code Offences	Crime Rate	Municipal Cost per Capita
Independents					
Victoria/Esquimalt	101,999	243	10,108	99	\$429
Oak Bay	17,910	23	686	38	\$238
Saanich	114,013	154	4,915	43	\$239
Central Saanich	16,172	23	529	33	\$265
RCMP					
Sidney	11,578	14	611	53	\$206*
North Saanich	11,107	11	325	29	\$165*
Sooke	11,125	11	535	48	\$137*
West Shore					
Colwood	16,838	17	663	39	\$167*
Langford	31,195	28	1,992	64	\$146*
View Royal	9,994	8	522	52	\$120*

Source: Police Resources in British Columbia 2012

* Municipal costs per capita for RCMP municipalities do not include federal contributions which vary by population; the federal government contributes 30% to RCMP municipalities between 5,000 and 15,000 and contributes 10% to RCMP municipalities over 15,000 population.

Specific Examples of Participation Decisions

We were provided with examples where the factors outlined above played into the decisions of municipalities to reduce its contribution to, or withdraw from, an integrated team.

a. RDVU

In the first example, the level of in-kind contributions to the RDVU was reduced by a participating police department. The RDVU has the capacity to accept about 75% of the cases referred to it and therefore focusses on the highest risk cases of intimate partner violence⁶ with the result that a number of domestic violence files are not taken on by the team. When the

⁶ Regional Domestic Violence Unit (CRD) Second Year Report, September 2012.

police department reduced its in-kind contribution to the RDVU by one member, it redeployed that member to address local domestic violence cases that were below the RDVU threshold for service. Conversely, two other police agencies we spoke to commented that while they have few cases that make the RDVU threshold, they still value the case assessments that the team provides and the team's assistance with victim and offender management when offenders are released back into the community. Therefore these two agencies are happy to continue their participation in RDVU.

b. RCU

In another example, decisions to leave the RCU were prompted by three factors – low frequency of calls, an ability to provide investigations in house and the high costs of participation. RCU began in 2008 with participation by all CRD police forces and the RCMP provincial force but has seen the departure of three CRD police agencies since then. For the smaller municipalities that decided to leave the RCU the low number of calls within their jurisdictions was a clear indicator to them that their share of the unit's cost – which was relatively high as this team was staffed with 10 full time police officers⁷ – could be put to better use locally. One municipality noted that for the cost of their participation in RCU they could hire one additional officer to work full time locally; compared to the low number of RCU calls they experienced each year, this was simply the more cost effective option, prompting their withdrawal from RCU. They are, in fact, hiring another member and establishing a two member crime reduction unit. Two other agencies concurred and noted that while the RCU creates value added for the region the cost is too high for them; they could use their contributions better other ways. One commented that they have recently had some occurrences that would fit within the RCU mandate but they did the police work themselves with help from a neighbouring jurisdiction. High costs also prompted a large municipality to leave the team.

In response to these withdrawals, RCU has recently reduced the size of its team and shifted its mandate. The revised mandate now gives RCU the ability to target spree type crimes to identify the offender versus only targeting offenders who were known to be prolific. RCU will also focus more on the use of investigative techniques than the use of surveillance. The unit is available to assist any partner agency that requires additional resources to target a subject or crime spree that may not be known to the RCU.

c. Dive Team

In 2010, 2011 and 2012 the Dive Team performed a total of 10 operational dives and a number of agencies commented on their low use of the team.⁸ At least four of the police agencies we

⁷ RCU has reduced the number of officers by two as a result of decisions by three police agencies to withdraw from the unit in 2013.

⁸ Greater Victoria Integrated Police Dive Team Summary Year End Reports, 2010, 2011, 2012.

interviewed indicated that they were actively considering less expensive alternatives, including contracting for service from the private sector or a neighbour as needed.

Very recently, participants considered the usefulness of continued participation in the integrated Dive Team compared to other ways of acquiring the same service. As a result, the decision has been taken to disband the Dive Team at the end of 2014. Saanich Police Department will take on this service and make it available to others on a contract basis.

In none of the cases described above has the decision to withdraw from an integrated team been a reflection on the quality of service provided. As one agency commented, they are very happy with the quality of work of the integrated teams and any decision to pull out of a team is based more on value for money questions, rather than effectiveness or efficiency concerns. Another noted that departures from integrated teams should not be viewed as failures of the teams.

Police agencies agree that an individual force must have the flexibility to leave an integrated team (or decline to participate in a new team) because they have to be able to manage their budgets in response to local police priorities and changing circumstances.

While all agree that flexibility is needed, they all also agree that departures from a team can have a significant impact on the remaining participants. Therefore, the exit arrangements need ensure reasonable advance notice (see next section).

Addressing Inconsistencies in Governance and Funding

The integrated teams were created at different times and have evolved in their own ways, resulting in differences in their governance structures, exit provisions, funding formulas, budgeting and reporting processes. These differences have made rational decision making about the teams complicated and sometimes difficult to explain. In particular, until recently, there was concern from different quarters about uneven funding formulas, different notice provisions for participants exiting from a team, differences in staff terms, the processes used to fill vacancies on teams, and inconsistent reporting requirements that did not provide useful information to decision makers in a timely way.

In early 2013 a Joint Management Team (JMT) for the integrated teams was created to address these issues and to achieve greater consistency. All the teams covered by this review, plus Crime Stoppers, are within the scope of the JMT. The creation of the JMT has been a welcome development - one Chief stated that the JMT has created the missing governance foundation for integrated units in the CRD, and another commented that the JMT has solved most problems.

The JMT is comprised of a Deputy Chief from each of Victoria/Esquimalt, Oak Bay, Saanich and Central Saanich and Detachment Commanders from the RCMP detachments of Sidney/North Saanich, West Shore and Sooke. RCMP Island District also has a representative on the JMT. A draft protocol agreement describes the JMT's purpose:

“To administer regional Integrated Units in an effort to provide greater consistency in the management of the Units, and an efficient reporting structure that may be more effective in communicating with stakeholders”⁹

JMT decisions are made by consensus or by vote if consensus is not attained. According to the protocol, all JMT decisions must be ratified by Area Chiefs. The protocol also sets out reporting lines up to the JMT as each integrated team or unit will have an Operations Council or Supervisor who will report to the JMT for their team.

Over the past year, the JMT has made a number of significant strides in improving governance arrangements in the areas of funding arrangements, exit provisions, budgeting and annual reporting, and filling team vacancies. The agreed-to provisions are set out in the draft protocol:

1. A new standard **cost-sharing formula** for most services¹⁰ has been developed and implemented for 2014. Prior to this change, integrated team costs were shared in different ways. Some teams were supported by a combination of in-kind contributions from some participants with the balance of costs allocated among the remaining participants¹¹, while other teams allocated all costs among all participants¹². Allocated costs were shared using two different formulas - one split costs according to the authorized strengths of participating police departments and RCMP detachments¹³ while the other used a combination of property tax assessments, population and authorized strength¹⁴. The result was an uneven pattern of municipal contributions that varied from team to team. The single formula will improve consistency and will allow for easier communication when explaining how each municipality’s contribution is determined.

Under the new formula the in-kind contributions made by some participants will be included in the cost base to be shared by all participants. A formula then divides team costs among participants based on four equally weighted factors: authorized strength, population, property tax base assessment and calls for service. The new formula is largely accepted as fair, even by most of the jurisdictions whose costs increase slightly. However, one agency would prefer the existing approach where police forces are able to contribute members rather than pay a share of total team costs. Because member costs vary between participants, this agency does not want to share higher costs for members contributed by another agency.

2. More orderly **exit provisions with an adequate notice period** have also been developed by the JMT. When departures from integrated teams occur, operational and budget impacts on remaining participants can be significant and adequate notice periods are needed to give

⁹ Greater Victoria Integrated Police Units Protocol, (draft) 2013.

¹⁰ The new formula will apply to all integrated units except the RCU, which is excluded because the RCMP Provincial Force contributes a number of members to the RCU.

¹¹ MYST, IMCRT

¹² RCU, RDVU, CNT, CMU, Dive and GVERT

¹³ MYST, RCU, RDVU, IMCRT

¹⁴ CNT, CMU, Dive and GVERT

remaining participants time to make adjustments. Presently, the exit provisions contained in integrated team MOUs require notice periods varying between 30 days and 12 months. The JMT has recommended a uniform notice period of one full budget year (based on the municipal budget year of January to December) for exits, and in addition, has proposed that the participants in any newly established team be required to continue their participation for three years before they consider exiting from the service.

3. A **consistent approach to budgeting and annual reporting** will also be introduced. Until now, integrated team leaders prepared and submitted annual reports to their supervisors. The reports differed in the content presented, the period covered, and when during the year they were submitted. To support better-informed decision making, the JMT has created a standard template for the integrated team annual reports and has stipulated a common reporting period for all teams (July 1st to June 30th). Budget submissions for the following year must be made by June 30th, and all annual reports will be submitted to the JMT by August 15th to give the JMT time to review them, prepare a consolidated report on all integrated teams and make recommendations for the Area Chiefs' September meeting.
4. A **policy and process for filling vacancies** in integrated teams is also set out in the draft protocol. There has been some concern regarding the rotation of members through integrated teams and the balance of different police agency members on the teams. The draft protocol sets out a three-year term for members serving in full time positions on integrated teams. The JMT will approve job descriptions for each team, and will determine the parameters and process for posting vacancies. Police agencies will choose whether their personnel will be permitted to compete for an integrated team position.

In addition to implementing these governance decisions, the JMT has identified future activities including:

5. Taking the lead in developing ways to improve the effectiveness of MYST and RDVU. As discussed previously, both MYST and RDVU have experienced resource reductions and the JMT will consider strategies to strengthen these teams with MYST as a priority in 2014. A MYST Review Committee will explore potential collaborations with non-police services.
6. Considering the development of performance measures for the teams. Most of the integrated team MOUs contain provisions for evaluation of the team at some point before the MOU expiration but only one evaluation has been completed (IMCRT). Those interviewed confirmed that while evaluations have not been done, the JMT is starting to look at performance indicators for the teams.
7. Reviewing team MOUs and policies that affect policing. A few of the MOUs governing integrated teams are out of date or have expired; one team's MOU is still in draft form, and one

team does not have an MOU at all¹⁵. While most interviewed felt that the MOUs do not have much impact on the day-to-day effectiveness of the integrated teams, some did note that MOUs are helpful in establishing common expectations regarding a team's scope of service and the chain of command when officers work outside their home jurisdictions. In the draft protocol the JMT has tasked the Operations Council for each team with reviewing its MOU and making any recommendations for change to the JMT.

Variations in Police Board and Municipal Council Involvement

The degree to which police boards and municipal councils are involved in monitoring the work of integrated teams and making decisions regarding team issues varies from municipality to municipality. In some jurisdictions, the Chief or Detachment Commander makes decisions regarding the teams (and operational policing issues generally) and informs the board or council, while in others the Chief or Detachment Commander provides the board or council with information and the board or council makes decisions. The police boards and councils do not meet collectively to discuss integrated police teams but the Area Chiefs, Detachment Commanders and Deputies do.

In general, the reporting and decision making processes for integrated teams mirrors that of other policing issues within each municipality. For larger municipalities policed by independent forces, police boards set strategic objectives, but operational issues such as decisions regarding continued participation in integrated teams are generally the prerogative of the Police Chief. One Chief commented that he would take the initial decision to join a team to the police board but make decisions regarding exiting himself. In smaller communities with independent forces, police boards appear to have more involvement in decisions concerning the participation in integrated teams. For example, one Chief explained that a decision regarding continued participation in a team was discussed over the course of a few police board meetings and culminated in a recommendation by the Police Chief, which the board accepted and formalized by way of a motion. The Chief stated that the financial implications of this decision meant that the participation decision rested with the board. Another commented that any new MOUs would require approval of his police board, and that he would seek the concurrence of his board regarding the funding formula changes as part of the overall police budget discussions. He noted that small departments are able to keep the boards informed and involved at this level because they have fewer policing issues than the large departments.

The involvement of municipal councils in integrated team decisions within RCMP municipalities also varies. One Detachment Commander interacts with the Mayor, the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) and the chair of the council's Finance and Administration Committee. The Committee chair develops police funding recommendations to take to council, who then make decisions. This year the Mayor and CAO were consulted regarding the changes to the integrated team funding formula. Another Detachment Commander notes that while police boards do not exist for RCMP municipalities, the municipalities he deals with have developed Police Advisory Committees with

¹⁵ RCU and MYST, respectively.

whom he interacts. Yet another has contact with municipal CAOs but also works more directly with the municipal councils themselves. He gives the councils quarterly reports, which sometimes include information about the integrated teams, and provides information on cost implications for any suggestions made by the councils.

In addition to consultation with the municipalities they serve, the RCMP has added layers of internal decision making involving the local Detachment Commander, Island District and the Commanding Officer at E Division who has the authority to sign MOUs. A representative from Island District sits on the integrated teams JMT because provincial force members serve in the RCU but does not have any direct say in other teams. Island District does assist with the MOU process but decisions regarding participation on integrated teams and choices regarding local detachment budgets are the responsibilities of Detachment Commanders, Mayors and councils.

There is a feeling in some police agencies that the process of reporting out to police boards and municipal councils on the work and success of integrated teams can be improved to support more informed decision making and better accountability. As described above, the JMT has agreed to establish a standard annual reporting format and schedule for all the teams. When reports for all teams are prepared consistently and submitted at the same time, communication about the teams to boards and councils should be easier, more comprehensive and have better linkages to the police budgeting process. This will allow for decisions on integrated teams to be made in context with other decisions regarding local policing priorities and funding.

The Potential for Greater Cooperation

All police forces we interviewed suggested areas where additional cooperation may be possible. Some areas require specialized skills and/or equipment, including:

- Police dog teams
- Technology crime (computer forensics)
- Intelligence sharing and region-wide crime analysis
- Forensic identification and crime scene analysis
- Child pornography - this area is highly technical and very labour intensive. While the RCMP has a provincial Child Exploitation Team, a regional level team could reduce the currently lengthy wait times for technical analysis of computers
- Traffic-crash analysis – requires expensive specialized equipment

Other suggestions include administrative and support functions that could potentially provide greater efficiencies and improved regional effectiveness:

- Communications and dispatch – multiple dispatch agencies operate in the region and concern has been raised regarding dispatch response to 911 calls made from cell phones
- Records management, document transcription and preparation of court documents

However, while some police agencies support the use of integration and would look favourably at expanding integration to new areas, there is not a universal feeling that creating more integrated teams is automatically the best way to achieve cooperation. Some would proceed cautiously on expanding the number of integrated teams because:

- They would want to be sure that their commitment of funding or resources would not compromise their capacity to address policing priorities within their own jurisdictions. One agency notes that it takes a cautious approach to new initiatives that involve manpower. Generally, they are only willing to enter into new arrangements if they have new resources to support that initiative as they don't want to compromise existing policing priorities.
- Achieving support for regional initiatives can be difficult unless potential participants can expect to see local benefits. As one agency puts it, some integrated services help neighbours more than their own jurisdiction, and they would not be prepared to support a service that does not benefit their jurisdiction directly.
- Some would prefer to see existing teams enhanced before expanding into other areas.

Decisions to form new teams should be taken on their merits on a case by case basis. The decision to create a new integrated team should start with shared objectives to address actual problems, and be supported by a sound business case. This will create commitment to the value of a team.

APPENDIX: TEAM DETAILS

Team	Page
Regional Crime Unit	A2
Regional Domestic Violence Unit	A6
Integrated Mobile Crisis Response Team	A10
Mobile Youth Services Team	A15
Crisis Negotiation Team	A18
Greater Victoria Emergency Response Team	A21
Greater Victoria Integrated Dive Team	A24
Crowd Management Unit	A27

Regional Crime Unit

- a. **Team / Unit Name and Acronym:** Regional Crime Unit (RCU)
- b. **Team start date:** February 2008
- c. **Purpose:** Provide enhanced investigation of the most prolific offenders who commit crimes in the CRD, including robbery, break and enter, identify theft, possession of stolen property. A secondary mandate is to provide support to major crime investigative units in the CRD by way of services such as surveillance.
- d. **MOU term:** The MOU has never been signed. Under the provisions of the 2012 draft MOU, the MOU is open ended; the MOU can be terminated by agreement of all parties. The draft MOU is currently out of date because it references participation by Sidney/North Saanich and Central Saanich, all of whom have withdrawn.
- e. **Reporting period:** Calendar year. As of 2014 reporting period will be July 1 - June 30.
- f. **Participants:** Oak Bay, Saanich, Sooke, West Shore (Victoria withdrew in 2009, Sidney/North Saanich in 2013. In June 2013 Central Saanich Police Board also voted to withdraw from the RCU.) The province contributes three members through the RCMP Provincial Force (see below).
- g. **Governance structure set out in MOU**

The 2012 draft MOU sets out the following governance structure for RCU:

- Members of the CRD Area Chiefs that participate in RCU provide strategic direction, policy, and budget approval
- An Operations Council, comprised of the OIC Saanich Detectives, a senior member of the RCMP Island District, and a representative from one other participating department or detachment, oversees tactical operations of the RCU and provides general operational direction to the NCO i/c and ensures coordination with other regional investigative units.
- The Operations Council selects the NCO i/c from Saanich PD, and the 2 i/c from another participating agency. The NCO i/c selects all other members and civilian staff in collaboration with the Operations Council and a representative from the candidates home agency
- Members are subject to the operational direction and command of the NCO i/c but report to their respective agencies for administrative purposes.
- As with other CRD integrated teams and units, RCU reports administratively to the Greater Victoria Integrated Police Joint Management Team (JMT) established for CRD integrated units in early 2013. The JMT is overseen by the Area Chiefs of Police

Committee. The JMT is comprised of Deputy Chiefs for the independents and RCMP Detachment Commanders, but only agencies participating in the RCU will participate in discussions or votes pertaining to the RCU (i.e. Victoria, Central Saanich and Sidney/North Saanich will not participate in RCU matters at JMT meetings).

- h. Total budget:** \$1,131,500 (2012). The budget does not include the provincial contribution for the salaries and benefits of three police officers and one civilian position; these have been estimated at \$563,000 for all Provincial Force positions.

i. Budget breakdown

	2012	2013
Salaries and benefits*	921,050	955,757
Office space	60,000	60,000
Cell phones, communications	22,150	18,350
Investigation expenses	10,000	10,000
RCMP meal claims	2,400	2,400
Training / travel	4,500	5,000
Office supplies	4,500	4,500
Miscellaneous operating	2,000	2,000
Vehicle lease	40,000	43,200
Fuel & maintenance	36,500	35,000
Insurance	8,400	8,400
IT capital	5,000	5,000
Equipment replacement capital	8,000	8,000
Other capital	5,000	5,000
Total	\$1,131,500	\$1,162,607

*Excludes salaries and benefits for RCMP Provincial Force positions.

j. Resource contributions provided by participants (2012)

Contribution	Contributor	Comment
3 regular members	RCMP E Division (Provincial Force)	1 Crpl, 2 Cst
1 crime analyst	RCMP E Division (Provincial Force)	
4 regular members	Saanich	1 S/Sgt, 1 Sgt, 2 Cst
1 member	Central Saanich	1 Cst
1 member	Oak Bay	1 Cst
1 member	West Shore RCMP	1 Cst
1 Admin Assistant	Saanich	
Unit budgeting, billing	Saanich	

Note that these contributions (excluding E Division members / staff) are cost recovered from all participants. Cost base for recoveries includes salaries, benefits, pre-approved overtime, clothing allowance and cleaning allowance, approved incidental expenses, and approved travel and transportation.

k. Cost sharing formula and allocation basis

- Costs are allocated based on authorized strengths of participants based on figures in "Police Resources in BC".
- The costs shares are based on the 2010 strengths; the MOU does not specifically provide for updating the cost shares as strengths change.
- As three original participants have left, cost shares for the remaining participants have increased. For example, in the original MOU, Saanich's share was 30.2%. The following allocation was developed prior to the departure of Central Saanich in June 2013:

Police Agency	Members	2012 Percentage	2013 Percentage
Central Saanich	23	8.1%	8.9%
North Saanich		3.9%	-
Oak Bay	23	8.1%	8.9%
Saanich	152	53.4%	58.7%
Sidney		4.9%	-
Sooke	11	3.9%	4.2%
West Shore	50	17.7%	19.3%
Total		100%	100%

- The new cost sharing formula developed by the JMT will not apply to the RCU in 2014. This decision will be reviewed by the JMT for the 2015 budget year.

l. Costs allocated to each participant

	2012	2013*
Central Saanich	91,959	103,243
North Saanich	43,981	-
Oak Bay	91,959	103,243
Saanich	603,733	682,302
Sidney	55,975	-
Sooke	43,981	49,377
West Shore	199,912	224,442
Total Allocated	\$1,131,500	\$1,162,607

*Allocation prior to the departure of Central Saanich in June 2013.

m. Staff resources: 10 police members (RCMP Provincial, Saanich, Central Saanich, West Shore), 1 crime analyst (RCMP provincial), 1 Admin Assistant (Saanich).

n. Activity statistics for 2012

- 124 files opened (including 39 charge files, 37 intelligence files, 34 assistance files, 8 other investigative files and 6 admin/other).
- 45 persons charged with 203 criminal offences (39 files with charges)
- Offence locations: West Shore accounted for 86% of the offences where charges were laid, Saanich 9%, Victoria 3% and Sooke 1%. (Note: none in Sidney, North Saanich, Central Saanich or Oak Bay).
- Of the 34 assistance files, 5 were for Victoria and 6 were for other areas/agencies that are not participants in the RCU.

o. Other Comments

- Draft MOU references performance reviews that were to be conducted in 2010 and 2013; these have not been undertaken.
- The 3 members and crime analyst are contributed by provincial RCMP have no other home detachment.

Regional Domestic Violence Unit

- a. **Team / Unit Name and Acronym:** Regional Domestic Violence Unit (RDVU)
- b. **Team start date:** July 2010
- c. **Purpose:** To increase victim safety and offender responsibility by providing a cross jurisdictional response that is uniform in approach in domestic violence cases across the CRD.
- d. **MOU term:** December 31, 2011 – expired. A new MOU has been drafted and is awaiting signature. Under the expired MOU parties could exit from the unit with 30 days written notice.
- e. **Reporting period:** Mid-September to mid-September. As of 2014 reporting period will be July 1 - June 30.
- f. **Participants:** Victoria/Esquimalt PD, Saanich PD, Central Saanich PS, Oak Bay PD, West Shore RCMP, Sidney/North Saanich RCMP, Sooke RCMP; Victoria Women's Transition House Society (VWTHS), Ministry of Children and Family Development (MCFD)
- g. **Governance structure set out in MOU**
 - A Steering Committee with senior level representatives from Victoria PD, Saanich PD, West Shore RCMP, VWTHS and MCFD provides oversight on strategic policy and planning. The NCO/Officer in charge is selected by the Steering Committee.
 - Operational Managers are the NCO/Officer in Charge, VWTHS Program Manager and MCFD Clinical Supervisor. Team members other than the NCO/Officer in Charge are selected by Operational Managers.
 - Day to day direction to all team members is given by the NCO/Officer in Charge.
 - Operational Managers are to meet regularly to make joint decisions regarding file reviews, best practices, training, resource and partnership challenges.
 - As with other CRD integrated teams and units, RDVU reports administratively to the Greater Victoria Integrated Police Joint Management Team (JMT) established for CRD integrated units in early 2013. The JMT is overseen by the Area Chiefs of Police Committee. The JMT is comprised of Deputy Chiefs, for the independent police departments, and RCMP Detachment Commanders.

- h. Total budget:** \$518,621 (2012)¹⁶. This budget amount excludes costs for non-police team members. (The proposed budget for 2104 includes an estimate of the salaries for non-police members totalling \$160,000).

i. Budget breakdown

	2012 Budget
Police Salaries and Benefits	453,000
Administrative Support	41,621
Overtime	7,000
Supplies	2,000
Travel	2,000
Vehicle insurance and maintenance	8,000
Vehicle Replacement fund	5,000
Total	\$518,621

j. Resource contributions provided by participants

Contribution	Contributor	Comment
1 member (constable)	Saanich PD	Police members are supplied with cell phone, CREST radio and laptop by their home agencies
1 member (Sergeant)	Victoria/Esquimalt PD (Note Victoria originally contributed 2 members but reduced its contribution to 1 member in 2012)	
1 member (constable)	West Shore RCMP	
2 full time victim service workers with back up for absences	VWTHS	
1 full time child welfare worker with back up for absences	MCFD	
Investigative and surveillance overtime for high risk files	Originating police jurisdiction	
Facilities for all team members at (co-location).	Saanich PD	This includes desks, desk phones, parking, IT support and network access

¹⁶ Provided by S. Seivewright

k. Cost sharing formula and allocation basis

- Until 2014, in kind resource contributions from Victoria, Saanich and West Shore (see above) were borne by the home agency and not allocated by way of the cost sharing formula. In 2012, these in kind contributions were estimated to be \$237,000 for Victoria, \$119,000 for Saanich and \$97,000 for West Shore RCMP.¹⁷
- Until 2014, costs for 2 vehicles, 0.5 admin support, admin supplies, travel and investigation overtime were cost shared by Sooke, North Saanich, Sidney, Oak Bay and Central Saanich. In 2012 these were budgeted at \$65,621.
- Allocation of cost shared items is based on the number of members in each police agency:

Police Agency	Members	Percentage
Oak Bay	23	28.4%
Central Saanich	23	28.4%
Sidney	14	17.28%
North Saanich	11	13.58%
Sooke	10	12.34%
Total	81	100%

- As of 2014, a new funding formula will allocate all team costs among participants based on their share of four equally weighted factors: authorized strength, population, property assessment and calls for service.

l. Costs allocated to each participant in 2012

	2012 Allocation
Oak Bay	\$18,636
Central Saanich	18,636
Sidney	11,339
North Saanich	8,911
Sooke	8,098
Total	\$65,621

- m. Staff resources:** 3 police members (Victoria/Esquimalt, West Shore, Saanich) plus 3 civilian members (2 Transition House, 1 MCFD).

¹⁷ Provided by S. Seivewright

n. Activity statistics for 2012

- August 2011 – July 2012: 101 cases were referred to the RDVU, of which 27 were declined, 64 resulted in action, 9 resulted in a consult and 1 was not pursued due to lack of resources. Victoria, Saanich and MCFD are the largest referral sources. The team received 2 referrals from outside the CRD, both resulted in action.
- Since the team began operation in 2010 until July 2012, the team has acted on 157 cases. The outcomes of these cases are: 51% guilty pleas, 6% convictions, 4% criminal or civil peace bonds, 8% charges not laid or dropped, 2% acquittals, and 23% pending trial or still under investigation.

o. Other Comments

- Development of an evaluation framework has been undertaken by a Masters student working for the Ministry and will soon be defended. Once the JMT signs off on the framework the OIC intends to seek funding for the evaluation itself.
- The MOU states that Victoria/Esquimalt is to provide 2 members but currently provides only one. Victoria reduced their contribution to one member based on a resource analysis for the Department as a whole. A business case to increase the member complement to 4 was presented to the JMT in September 2013 but the request was denied.

Integrated Mobile Crisis Response Team

- a. **Team / Unit Name and Acronym:** Integrated Mobile Crisis Response Team (IMCRT)
- b. **Team start date:** December 2008 (previously operated since 1991 as the Emergency Mental Health Service staffed by a nurse and a social worker; a pilot project with police members began in 2004¹⁸)
- c. **Purpose:** To combine front-line crisis responder elements into a more efficient, responsive and interdisciplinary crisis response team, that can attend to the full continuum of community crises irrespective of age, addictions or mental health issues, or public safety concerns. The service will promote diversion from acute hospital resources and link to community service providers.

The goal of the team is to collectively triage calls for service, involve the most appropriate staff based on discipline, gender, sub-speciality, etc. provide consultation and where necessary direct intervention to resolve the crisis in the least intrusive manner possible while maintaining safety.

Service operates between 1300 and 2400 hours daily. MOA states that the team operates regionally (from Sidney through West Shore).

- d. **MOA term:** December 31, 2008 – December 31, 2011 (expired); new MOA signed in January 2012 with a term of December 31, 2011 to December 31, 2014. A party may terminate the MOA with 45 days' notice.
- e. **Reporting period:** Calendar year. As of 2014 reporting period will be July 1 - June 30.
- f. **Participants:** The MOA is between VIHA, Area Chiefs of Police Committee (ACPC) and the City of Victoria. VIHA participants are Mental Health and Addictions, VIHA Child, Youth and Maternal Health. Victoria/Esquimalt PD, Saanich PD, Oak Bay PD, Central Saanich PS, North Saanich/ Sidney RCMP, Sooke RCMP and West Shore RCMP participate.
- g. **Governance structure set out in MOU**

At the operational level, the VIHA MHAS Program Coordinator for Access and Crisis Response/Stabilization Programs (Devon Lin) provides primary day to day supervision to team members. A police NCO o/c has contact with the team members once every

¹⁸ "Mental Health Outreach Services and the Vancouver Island Health Authority (VIHA) A program evaluation of the Integrated Mobile Crisis Response Team (IMCRT)", Murray S.C. Anderson, Doctoral Candidate, March 2012.

month or two months. VIHA and ACPC direct their respective employees regarding the performance of their duties and obligations.

IMCRT is overseen by the Area Chiefs of Police Committee and the JMT established for CRD integrated units in early 2013. JMT is comprised of Deputy Chiefs for the independent police departments and RCMP Detachment Commanders.

h. Total budget: \$256,514 (2012)

Budget is for police resources only; it does not include VIHA contributions. The salary, benefits and backfill for VIHA team members is estimated to be approximately \$730,000¹⁹.

i. Budget breakdown

	2012
Member salaries and benefits	217,514
Backfill	20,000
Supplies	2,000
Communications	2,000
Training	3,000
Vehicle insurance and maintenance	6,000
Equipment	6,000
Total	\$256,514

Source: Report to Deputy Chiefs - May 22 2012

j. Resource contributions provided by participants

Contribution	Contributor	Comment
1 program coordinator	VIHA Mental Health	
2 social workers	VIHA Mental Health	
2 child & youth clinicians	VIHA Child Youth and Family Mental Health	
2 psychiatric nurses	VIHA Mental Health	
Psychiatric sessional time to support clinical operations	VIHA Mental Health	One session per week
1 admin assistant	VIHA Mental Health	Part time, also supports Mental Health intake, which is co-located with IMCRT

¹⁹ Provided by police Officer in Charge.

Contribution	Contributor	Comment
Unmarked van	VIHA Mental Health	
Insurance and operating cost for van	VIHA Mental Health	
Office space and program & admin support	VIHA Mental Health	
Cell phones / pagers for VIHA staff	VIHA Mental Health	
Insurance & registration for secure transport vehicle	VIHA Mental Health	
2 police officers + 0.4 FTE backfill	Area Chiefs of Police Committee	Victoria/Esquimalt and Saanich
Cell phones, radios, pagers for police officers	Area Chiefs of Police Committee	
Purchase and maintenance of secure transport vehicle	Area Chiefs of Police Committee	Donated by Oak Bay. Fuel and maintenance are team costs.
Insurance for police vehicle	VIHA Mental Health	

k. Cost sharing formula and allocation basis

- Until 2014, budget costs were allocated on the basis of a fixed formula based on the published authorized strength. The allocation below is based on the 2010 strength data.

Police Agency	Members	2012 Percentage
Victoria/Esquimalt	243	46.0%
Saanich	152	28.8%
Central Saanich	23	4.4%
Oak Bay	23	4.4%
West Shore	50	9.5%
Sidney	14	2.7%
North Saanich	11	2.1%
Sooke	11	2.1%
Total	527	100%

- As of 2014, a new funding formula will allocate costs among participants. This formula allocates team costs to participants for their share of four equally weighted factors: authorized strength, population, property assessment and calls for service.

l. Costs allocated to each participant in 2012

	2012 Allocation
Victoria/Esquimalt	117,996
Saanich	73,876
Oak Bay	11,287
Central Saanich	11,287
West Shore	24,369
Sidney	6,926
North Saanich	5,387
Sooke	5,387
Total Allocated	\$256,514

m. Staff resources

- 2 full time police members (1 from Saanich, 1 from Victoria/Esquimalt PDs) plus 8 relief workers from Saanich, Victoria/Esquimalt, Oak Bay and the RCMP.
- 1 program coordinator (funded by VIHA)
- 2 social workers (funded by VIHA)
- 2 child & youth clinicians (funded by VIHA)
- 2 psychiatric nurses (funded by VIHA)
- 1 part time admin assistant (funded by VIHA)
- Psychiatric sessional time (one session per week, funded by VIHA)

n. Activity statistics for 2012

- In 2012 the team had 3,746 calls for service, up from 3,328 in 2011.
- In 2012, 1,041 of the team's calls for service were initiated by police.
- The 2012 annual report notes that IMCRT had significant periods in 2012 when police officer backfill was not available.

o. Other comments

- An evaluation of IMCRT was completed by a doctoral candidate and submitted in March 2012²⁰.
- Schedule D of the MOA requires reporting of statistics on a monthly basis. The Officer in Charge prepares 3 and 6 months updates compared to previous year and a more comprehensive annual report. Monthly statistics are accessible to the leadership group if requested.

²⁰ Ibid

- The MOA states that VIHA is responsible for the cost to insure the secure transport vehicle. VIHA contributes a van and covers its insurance and operating costs. VIHA also reimburses the Victoria/Esquimalt PD for the insurance cost for an unmarked police vehicle, but not the cost of fuel or maintenance. This arrangement was established when Oak Bay Police Department donated the vehicle to the team.

Mobile Youth Services Team

- a. **Team / Unit Name and Acronym:** Mobile Youth Services Team (MYST)
- b. **Team start date:** 2002²¹
- c. **Purpose:** Provide police officer to work with at risk youth, their parents, guardians and caregivers. The position is also a point of contact for youth probation, MCFD, Boys and Girls Club, Kiwanis Youth Shelter, Youth Detox, Youth Employment Society etc.
- d. **MOU term:** No MOU exists for this unit
- e. **Reporting period:** Calendar year. As of 2014 reporting period will be July 1 - June 30.
- f. **Participants:** Victoria/Esquimalt PD, Saanich PD, Central Saanich PS, Oak Bay PD, West Shore RCMP, Sidney/North Saanich RCMP, Sooke RCMP.
- g. **Governance structure**
 - NCO/Officer in charge reports out to JMT formed in early 2013 to oversee the CRD integrated units. The JMT is comprised of Deputy Chiefs for the independent police departments and RCMP Detachment Commanders. The JMT reports to the Area Chiefs of Police Committee.
- h. **Total budget:** \$119,008 (2012)
- i. **Budget breakdown**

	2012 Budget
Salaries and Benefits	103,578
Overtime	600
Clothing allowance	1,070
Vehicle	7,700
Vehicle fuel/oil	3,600
Cellular phone	1,260
Travel / Conference	1,200
Total	\$119,008

Source: Report to Deputy Chiefs - May 22 2012

²¹ Source: <https://www.vicpd.ca/media/media-releases/2012/march-5-vicpd-media-conference>, accessed January 9, 2013.

j. Resource contributions provided by participants

- No in-kind contributions are provided by participants

k. Cost sharing formula and allocation basis

- Until 2014 allocation was based on the latest published authorized strength. The allocation below is based on the 2010 strength data.

Police Agency	2012 Percentage
Victoria/Esquimalt	46.0%
Saanich	28.8%
Central Saanich	4.4%
Oak Bay	4.4%
West Shore	9.5%
Sidney	2.7%
North Saanich	2.1%
Sooke	2.1%
Total	100%

- As of 2014, a new funding formula will allocate costs among participants. This formula allocates team costs to participants for their share of four equally weighted factors: authorized strength, population, property assessment and calls for service.

l. Costs allocated to each participant

	2012
Victoria/Esquimalt	54,744
Saanich	34,274
Oak Bay	5,236
Central Saanich	5,236
West Shore	11,306
Sidney	3,213
North Saanich	2,499
Sooke	2,499
Total Allocated	\$119,008

m. Staff resources

- 1 full time member

n. Activity statistics for 2012

- In 2012 the member worked on approximately 76 files.

o. Other comments

- The MYST officer delivers presentations to youth on sexual exploitation and drug awareness, works with and supports youth who are at-risk, and those being exploited, targets criminal investigations on pimps, johns and recruiters and works closely with youth organizations and groups throughout the community, such as Youth Empowerment Society, Youth Probation, Youth Core and Children of the Street Society.
- MYST was originally supported in part by funding from the province and federal government but now is supported only by the participating police agencies.

Crisis Negotiation Team

- a. **Team / Unit Name and Acronym:** Crisis Negotiation Team (CNT)
- b. **Team start date:** June 2004 (MOU date) but Saanich PD reports that CNT has operated in conjunction with the GVERT since its inception in 1977.
- c. **Purpose:** The establishing MOU covers four services that “may be more effectively delivered through a cooperative and integrated approach”. The other services are: Crowd Management, Dive Team and Emergency Response.
- d. **MOU term:** Part of MOU called “CRD Integration of Specialised Police Services”. Open ended; parties can withdraw by giving 12 months’ notice to the other parties; parties can agree to cancel the MOU.
- e. **Reporting period:** Calendar year. As of 2014 reporting period will be July 1 - June 30.
- f. **Participants:** Independent police forces: Victoria/Esquimalt PD, Saanich PD, Central Saanich PS and Oak Bay PD.
- g. **Governance structure set out in MOU**
 - Chief Constables approve budgets, OICs, extraordinary expenditures, amendments to the funding formula and policies and procedures.
 - Operations Management Team consisting of Deputy Chief Constables or delegates. The Team is responsible for overseeing operations of the four services and specifically for: overseeing the OICs; budget monitoring; recommending operating and capital budgets; delivery of service according to policies and procedures; and, program evaluation and audits.
 - Day to day direction given by the Officer in Charge of each service.
 - As with other CRD integrated teams and units, CNT reports administratively to the Greater Victoria Integrated Police Joint Management Team (JMT) established for CRD integrated units in early 2013. The JMT is overseen by the Area Chiefs of Police Committee. The JMT is comprised of Deputy Chiefs for the independent police departments and RCMP Detachment Commanders but only agencies participating in the CNT participate in discussions or votes pertaining to the CNT (i.e. the RCMP not participate in CNT matters at JMT meetings).
- h. **Total budget:** \$15,460 (2012). The budget includes the “capacity building and sustaining” costs. Call-out costs are not included in the budget.

i. Budget breakdown

	2012 Budget
Supplies	5,000
Training	5,000
Equipment	5,460
Total	\$15,460

Source: Report to Deputy Chiefs

j. Resource contributions provided by participants

- No in kind contributions are discussed in the MOU.

k. Cost sharing formula and allocation basis

- Until 2014, budget costs were allocated on the basis of a fixed formula. The fixed formula was derived from of average of three factors: assessment, population; and strength.

Police Agency	Percentage
Oak Bay	7.3%
Central Saanich	6.3%
Saanich	39.7%
Victoria/Esquimalt	46.7%
Total	100%

- Call-out costs (recoverable costs) are charged to the Local Authority requesting the call out. Call-out cost include: directly attributable overtime, on-duty hourly salary excluding benefits and off duty training costs.
- As of 2014, a new funding formula will allocate all team costs among participants based on their share of four equally weighted factors: authorized strength, population, property assessment and calls for service.

l. Costs allocated to each participant in 2012

	2012 Allocation
Central Saanich	974
Oak Bay	1,129
Saanich	6,138
Victoria/Esquimalt	7,220
Total	\$15,460

- m. Staff resources:** 9 trained members available for deployment as needed.
- n. Activity Statistics for 2012:** 35 operations in 2012
- o. Other Comments**
 - The MOU refers to a formal evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Integrated Specialised Services in the first year of operation and subsequent period evaluations after that.

Greater Victoria Emergency Response Team

- a. **Team / Unit Name and Acronym:** Greater Victoria Emergency Response Team (GVERT)
- b. **Team start date:** 1977 (Saanich Web site); June 2004 (MOU date) but Saanich PD reports that the GVERT began in 1977 under an Area Chiefs Agreement.
- c. **Purpose:** The establishing MOU covers four services that “may be more effectively delivered through a cooperative and integrated approach”. The other services are: Crowd Management, Crisis Negotiation and Dive Team.
- d. **MOU term:** Part of MOU called “CRD Integration of Specialised Police Services”. Open ended; parties can withdraw by giving 12 months’ notice to the other parties; parties can agree to cancel the MOU.
- e. **Reporting period:** Calendar year. As of 2014 reporting period will be July 1 - June 30.
- f. **Participants:** Independent police forces: Victoria/Esquimalt PD, Saanich PD, Central Saanich PD and Oak Bay PD.
- g. **Governance structure set out in MOU:**
 - Governance structure applies to all four team not just GVERT
 - Chief Constables approve budgets, OICs, extraordinary expenditures, amendments to the funding formula and policies and procedures.
 - Operations Management Team consisting of Deputy Chief Constables or delegates. The Team is responsible for overseeing operations of the four services and specifically for: overseeing the OICs; budget monitoring; recommending operating and capital budgets; delivery of service according to policies and procedures; and, program evaluation and audits.
 - Day to day direction given by the Officer in Charge of each service.
 - As with other CRD integrated teams and units, GVERT reports administratively to the Greater Victoria Integrated Police Joint Management Team (JMT) established for CRD integrated units in early 2013. The JMT is overseen by the Area Chiefs of Police Committee. The JMT is comprised of Deputy Chiefs for the independents and RCMP Detachment Commanders but only agencies participating in the GVERT participate in discussions or votes pertaining to the GVERT (i.e. the RCMP not participate in GVERT matters at JMT meetings).
- h. **Total budget:** \$381,611 (2012) - The budget includes capacity building and sustaining costs and is primarily salaries associated with the team leader, training and equipment. Call-out costs are not included in the budget.

i. Budget breakdown

	2012 Budget
Team Leader Position	124,294
Training	113,317
Supplies	41,000
Communications	32,400
Other Training	23,000
Insurance	3,000
Vehicle Maintenance & Gasoline	6,000
Weapons Maintenance	1,000
Uniforms	3,000
Range Fees	3,600
Equipment	5,000
Miscellaneous	1,000
Equipment Replacement Fund	25,000
Total	\$381,611

Source: Report to Deputy Chiefs

j. Resource contributions provided by participants

- No in kind contributions are discussed in the MOU.

k. Cost sharing formula and allocation basis

- Until 2014, budget costs were allocated on the basis of a fixed formula. The fixed formula was derived from of average of three factors: assessment, population; and strength.

Police Agency	Percentage
Oak Bay	7.3%
Central Saanich	6.3%
Saanich	39.7%
Victoria/Esquimalt	46.7%
Total	100%

- Call-out costs (recoverable costs) are charged to the Local Authority requesting the call out. Call-out cost include: directly attributable overtime, on-duty hourly salary excluding benefits and off duty training costs.

- As of 2014, a new funding formula will allocate all team costs among participants based on their share of four equally weighted factors: authorized strength, population, property assessment and calls for service.

l. Costs allocated to each participant in 2012

	2012 Allocation
Central Saanich	24,041
Oak Bay	27,858
Saanich	151,500
Victoria/Esquimalt	178,212
Total	\$381,611

m. Staff resources: 14 police members available for deployment

n. Activity Statistics for 2102: Responded to 57 calls in 2011/12.

o. Other Comments

- MOU refers to a formal evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Integrated Specialised Services in the first year of operation and subsequent period evaluations after that.

Greater Victoria Integrated Dive Team

- a. **Team / Unit Name and Acronym:** Greater Victoria Integrated Police Dive Team (Dive Team)
- b. **Team start date:** June 2004 (MOU date).
- c. **Purpose:** The establishing MOU covers four services that “may be more effectively delivered through a cooperative and integrated approach”. The other services are: Crowd Management, Crisis Negotiation and Emergency Response.
- d. **MOU term:** Part of MOU called “CRD Integration of Specialised Police Services”. Open ended; parties can withdraw by giving 12 months’ notice to the other parties; parties can agree to cancel the MOU.
- e. **Reporting period:** Calendar year. As of 2014 reporting period will be July 1 - June 30.
- f. **Participants:** Independent police forces: Victoria/Esquimalt PD, Saanich PD, Central Saanich PS and Oak Bay PD.
- g. **Governance structure set out in MOU**
 - Governance structure applies to all four team not just the Dive Team
 - Chief Constables approve budgets, OICs, extraordinary expenditures, amendments to the funding formula and policies and procedures.
 - Operations Management Team consisting of Deputy Chief Constables or delegates. The Team is responsible for overseeing operations of the four services and specifically for: overseeing the OICs; budget monitoring; recommending operating and capital budgets; delivery of service according to policies and procedures; and, program evaluation and audits.
 - Day to day direction given by the Officer in Charge of each service.
 - As with other CRD integrated teams and units, CNT reports administratively to the Greater Victoria Integrated Police Joint Management Team (JMT) established for CRD integrated units in early 2013. The JMT is overseen by the Area Chiefs of Police Committee. The JMT is comprised of Deputy Chiefs for the independents and RCMP Detachment Commanders but only agencies participating in the Dive Team participate in discussions or votes pertaining to the Dive Team (i.e. the RCMP not participate in Dive Team matters at JMT meetings).
- h. **Total budget:** \$76,542 (2012) - The budget includes the capacity building and sustaining costs and is primarily salaries associated with training days (12 days), certification and equipment. Call-out costs are not included in the budget.

i. Budget breakdown

	2012 Budget
Training days (12 training days)	36,792
Acting Pay	1,132
International Police Diver Symposium	3,313
Certification and Training	6,020
Equipment	3,827
Maintenance and gasoline	2,761
Cell Phone	707
Miscellaneous Supplies	1,104
Equipment Replacement Fund	18,151
Vehicle Operating Expenses	2,734
Total	\$76,542

Source: Report to Deputy Chiefs

j. Resource contributions provided by participants

- No in kind contributions are discussed in the MOU.

k. Cost sharing formula and allocation basis

- Until 2014 budget costs were allocated on the basis of a fixed formula. The fixed formula was derived from of average of three factors: assessment, population; and strength.

Police Agency	Percentage
Oak Bay	7.3%
Central Saanich	6.3%
Saanich	39.7%
Victoria/Esquimalt	46.7%
Total	100%

- Call-out costs (recoverable costs) are charged to the Local Authority requesting the call out. Call-out cost include: directly attributable overtime, on-duty hourly salary excluding benefits and off duty training costs.
- As of 2014, a new funding formula will allocate all team costs among participants based on their share of four equally weighted factors: authorized strength, population, property assessment and calls for service.

l. Costs allocated to each participant in 2012

	2012 Allocation
Central Saanich	4,822
Oak Bay	5,588
Saanich	30,387
Victoria/Esquimalt	35,745
Total	\$76,542

m. Staff resources: 6 police members (Victoria/Esquimalt and Saanich)

n. Activity Statistics for 2012: Two operational dives recorded in the 2012 annual report.

o. Other Comments

- The Dive Team will be disbanded at the end of 2014. Saanich Police Department will take on this service and make it available to other police agencies on a contract basis.

Crowd Management Unit

- a. **Team / Unit Name and Acronym:** Crowd Management Unit (CMU)
- b. **Team start date:** June 2004 (MOU date)
- c. **Purpose:** The establishing MOU covers four services that “may be more effectively delivered through a cooperative and integrated approach”. The other services are: Dive Team, Crisis Negotiation and Emergency Response.
- d. **MOU term:** Part of MOU called “CRD Integration of Specialised Police Services”. Open ended; parties can withdraw by giving 12 months’ notice to the other parties; parties can agree to cancel.
- e. **Reporting period:** Calendar year. As of 2014 reporting period will be July 1 - June 30.
- f. **Participants:** Independent police forces: Victoria/Esquimalt PD, Saanich PD, Central Saanich PD and Oak Bay PD.
- g. **Governance structure set out in MOU**
 - Chief Constables approve budgets, OICs, extraordinary expenditures, amendments to the funding formula and policies and procedures.
 - Operations Management Team consisting of Deputy Chief Constables or delegates. The Team is responsible for overseeing operations of the four services and specifically for: overseeing the OICs; budget monitoring; recommending operating and capital budgets; delivery of service according to policies and procedures; and, program evaluation and audits.
 - Day to day direction given by the Officer in Charge of each service.
 - As with other CRD integrated teams and units, CMU reports administratively to the Greater Victoria Integrated Police Joint Management Team (JMT) established for CRD integrated units in early 2013. The JMT is overseen by the Area Chiefs of Police Committee. The JMT is comprised of Deputy Chiefs for the independents and RCMP Detachment Commanders but only agencies participating in the CMU participate in discussions or votes pertaining to the CMU(i.e. the RCMP not participate in CMU matters at JMT meetings).
- h. **Total budget:** \$29,000 (2012) - The budget includes the capacity building and sustaining costs and is primarily salaries associated with training and equipment. Call-out costs are not included in the budget. The budget is net of a recovery of \$30,000 from the legislative precinct.

i. Budget breakdown

	2012 Budget
Munitions	14,700
Three Sets of Personal Equipment	7,500
Weapons Maintenance and purchase	1,000
Hydration/Nutrition supplies	4,400
Vehicle Rentals	2,000
Communications equipment	2,800
Personnel costs relating to Training	21,600
Training	5,000
Recovery from the Legislative Precinct	(30,000)
Total	\$29,000

Source: Report to Deputy Chiefs

j. Resource contributions provided by participants

- No in kind contributions are discussed in the MOU.

k. Cost sharing formula and allocation basis

- Until 2014 budget costs were allocated on the basis of a fixed formula. The fixed formula was derived from of average of three factors: assessment, population and strength.

Police Agency	Percentage
Oak Bay	7.3%
Central Saanich	6.3%
Saanich	39.7%
Victoria/Esquimalt	46.7%
Total	100%

- Call-out costs (recoverable costs) are charged to the Local Authority requesting the call out. Call-out cost include: directly attributable overtime, on-duty hourly salary excluding benefits and off duty training costs.
- As of 2014, a new funding formula will allocate costs among participants. This formula allocates team costs to participants for their share of four equally weighted factors: authorized strength, population, property assessment and calls for service.

l. Costs allocated to each participant in 2012

	2012 Allocation
Central Saanich	1,827
Oak Bay	2,117
Saanich	11,513
Victoria/Esquimalt	13,543
Total	\$29,000

- m. Staff resources:** 60 police members (Victoria/Esquimalt, Saanich and Central Saanich) available for deployment as needed.
- n. Key Activity Statistics for 2012:** 7 deployments recorded in the annual report (including 3 cell extractions) in 2012.
- o. Other Comments**
- MOU refers to a formal evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Integrated Specialised Services in the first year of operation and subsequent period evaluations after that.