

DECLASSIFIED

Re: 3

FOIPOP Review

N/A

Approved to Release

C. Mc

Date ~~Spn~~ March 2 (2010)

# Proposed HRM Policing Model

Halifax Regional Board of Police  
Commissioners

March 1, 2010

1

## ORIGIN

Regional Council Motion to:

- Review policing services “with a view to developing an effective, long-term police resourcing strategy”
- and-
- Assess impact of changes to the service delivery model resulting from renegotiation of the Provincial Policing Contract

2

## Recommendation:

- That police services for the entirety of HRM be provided by the Halifax Regional Police (Model C)

3

## Recommendation has nothing to do with:

### Quality of Service

- Board has confirmed quality and quantity of service of both agencies are “good to excellent”

### Popularity

- Board assumes each service has broad community support

4

## Background

- Only municipality in Canada with two service providers
- Explanation lies in history

5

## Provincial Police Service Agreement

- Between Federal Government and Province of Nova Scotia
- Fixes types of expenditures and cost share formula (70/30)
- Expires March 31, 2012

6

## Municipal Responsibility

- “for the policing of and maintenance of law and order in the municipality”
- “for providing and maintaining an adequate, efficient, and effective police department at its expense in accordance with its needs”  
(*Police Act*, s. 35(1))
- \$74 million 2008/2009

7

## Control and Governance

### 1) HRP

- Board presents budget to Council
- Board provides civilian governance on behalf of Council in relation to the administrative direction, organization and policy required for adequate, effective and efficient policing

(*Police Act*, s. 53 and 55(1))

8

## 2) RCMP

- HRM pays Province
- Board is an advisory board “to provide advice to Council in relation to the enforcement of law, the maintenance of law and order and the prevention of crime in the municipality”
- Chair of Board may “give advice in writing to the chief officer”

*(Police Act, s. 68(1))*

9

## Police Resourcing Study

- 1) RFP
- 2) Perivale & Taylor Report (April, 2009)
  - Both agencies met national standards
  - Integration opportunities completed

10

- Selection of policing model requires “value judgments to assess the relative importance of net costs, the ability to provide oversight, and the various differences in the Model options”

(Perivale & Taylor, pg. 180)

### Model A - Status Quo

Advantages:	Disadvantages:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No disruption of service</li> <li>- RCMP rural expertise</li> <li>- HRP (sub)urban expertise</li> <li>- Community impact minimized</li> <li>- Federal perspective of RCMP</li> <li>- Maximized opportunity for Provincial partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Integration has gone as far as it can go</li> <li>- Duplication of overhead/administration</li> <li>- The presence of two service providers results in increased potential for miscommunication</li> <li>- Lack of statutory accountability of RCMP to the Board</li> <li>- Furthers perception of a divided municipality</li> <li>- Costs of future PPSA unknown</li> </ul>

**Projected three year cost: \$240,056,340**

### Model B - HRP to police the communities of Cole Harbour and Lower Sackville

Advantages:	Disadvantages:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The interests of Province may be met with 68 RCMP still present in HRM to police Tantallon and rural areas</li> <li>- Harmonizes urban/suburban core</li> <li>- Provides some increased control for HRM over police budget</li> <li>- Reduces some duplication of overhead/admin costs</li> <li>- More control for the Board of Police Commissioners on behalf of HRM</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RCMP may be challenged with maintaining critical mass</li> <li>- Will increase overall costs of provincial policing leading to an increase in cost for other municipalities</li> <li>- Increasing the geographic scope of HRP will increase HRM's exposure to legal liability and cost should policing error occur</li> <li>- May impair the relationship between HRP and RCMP</li> </ul>

### Model B - HRP to police the communities of Cole Harbour and Lower Sackville (cont'd)

Advantages:	Disadvantages:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Retains benefit of RCMP experience in policing small communities across Canada</li> <li>- Second least disruptive after Model A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Political impact – Province of Nova Scotia and HRM</li> <li>- Splits HRM in two, geographically</li> <li>- May impact Province of Nova Scotia funded positions</li> <li>- Causes 11% reduction in the size of the Provincial Police Service by eliminating 110 RCMP positions</li> </ul>

**Projected three year cost: \$245,453,338**

### Model C – HRP to police all of HRM

#### Advantages:

- 1 service provider for one municipality is simple to understand and administer
- Better working relationship at senior levels
- Increased cohesiveness with one agency
- Best option financially with potential for larger cost savings in the long run
- Best option for Board of Police Commissioners oversight

#### Disadvantages:

- Loss of critical mass – RCMP loses all 178 positions in HRM
- Loss of one vehicle for communication between the federal level and HRM
- Community/Political impact – disruption to communities
- Will increase the cost of provincial policing & may impact Province of Nova Scotia funded positions

15

### Model C – HRP to police all of HRM (cont'd)

#### Advantages:

- Greatest control over policing operations and budgets for HRM
- Eliminates the overhead/duplication of admin costs between HRP and RCMP
- The manner in which the *Police Act* governs HRP
- Interested RCMP members would be guaranteed positions with HRP

#### Disadvantages:

- Loss of whatever advantages there may be in continuing to leverage resources, experience, and assets between the RCMP and HRP as co-service providers
- Increasing the geographic scope of HRP will increase HRM's exposure to legal liability and cost should policing error occur

**Projected three year cost: \$232,321,450**

16

### Model D - RCMP to police all of HRM

#### Advantages:

- 1 service provider for one municipality is simple to understand and administer
- Better working relationship at senior levels
- Increased cohesiveness with one agency
- Eliminates the overhead/duplication of admin costs between HRP and RCMP
- Reduced policing costs to province

#### Disadvantages:

- Advisory committee – role of the Board of Police Commissioners very different under this scenario
- Community/Political impact and disruption
- Reduced control over budget by Board and Regional Council
- Transition costs are very high to (1) wind up pension and other contractual obligations to HRP members, and (2) to acquire and upgrade infrastructures to RCMP national standards

17

### Model D - RCMP to police all of HRM (cont'd)

#### Advantages:

#### Disadvantages:

- Need for redeployment of existing employees by the Municipality
- Cost of Service highest in Model D
- No guarantee of positions for HRP members (HRP members would need to apply for positions with RCMP)
- Difficulty in going back to Municipal police force

**Projected three year cost: \$353,782,704**

18

## Budget Implications

Model	3 Year Cost	Projected Increased Cost Compared to Model C
Model A Status Quo 70/30	240,056,340	7,734,890
Model A Status Quo 90/10	256,272,197	23,950,747
Model B Redefined Urban Core 90/10	245,453,338	13,131,888
Model C All HRP	232,321,450	
Model D All RCMP	353,782,704	121,461,254

19

## SUMMARY

- 1) Budget Implications: All HRP Model C projected to cost \$7.7 million less over 3 years than Status Quo
- 2) Service not an issue
- 3) Enhanced Oversight/Control
- 4) 'One Police Force for One Municipality'

20