



# PORT MOODY POLICE BOARD

## Regular Meeting AGENDA

**DRAFT**

Date:	March 4, 2024
Location	Port Moody Public Safety Building 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor EOC, 3051 St. Johns Street Port Moody, BC - 5:00 pm

*\*Indicates Attachment*

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:** Port Moody Police Board carries out our business on the ancestral and unceded homelands of the kʷikʷəłəm (Kwkwetlem), səliłwətał (Tsleil-Waututh), xʷməθkʷəyəm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), qícəy (Katzie), qʷa: ń ʔəń (Kwantlen), qiqéyt (Qayqayt), and Stó: lō (Sto:lo) Peoples, and extends appreciation for the opportunity to work on this territory.

### 2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA\*

- **THAT the Agenda for the Regular Police Board meeting of 04 March 2024 be adopted.**

### 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES\*

- **THAT the Minutes of the 05 February 2024 Regular Police Board meeting be approved.**

### 3. DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

- No Delegations or Presentations this month.

### 4. STANDING ITEMS/UNFINISHED BUSINESS

#### 4.1 Community Concerns/Considerations

- **THAT (any) community concerns/considerations be received for information.**

### 5. NEW BUSINESS

#### 5.1 Request for Extension to Term for E-comm Board of Directors Representative

- **THAT the Port Moody Police Board supports a twelve-month extension to Director Madden's term on the E-Comm Board of Directors as the representative of the Class 'A' Syndicate of Independent Police Boards.**

#### 5.2 Date of April 2024 Police Board meeting

- ***\* Decision required on date of April meeting***

## **6. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE**

### **6.1 Governance Committee**

- **THAT the March 2024 Governance Committee Report be received; and**
- **THAT the Port Moody Police Board approves the following proposed resolutions to be forwarded to the British Columbia Association of Police Boards consideration at the Associations 2024 Annual General Meeting:**

#### **1. E-Comm funding and cost pressures**

**WHEREAS over the past several years participating police agencies have experienced significant cost pressures resulting from E-Comm cost escalations which have significantly surpassed rate of inflation, and**

**WHEREAS E-Comm is projecting cost pressures continue in the future at a rate higher than rate of inflation,**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT (1) BCAPB advocate for a cell phone levy as a source of funding for E-Comm costs that would offset the need for increase in participating municipal police departments' fees, and (2) BCAPB advocate that E-Comm Board implements cost control measures to contain E-Comm fee increases to rate of inflation.**

#### **2. Police Academy class size limitations**

**WHEREAS certain BC municipalities are planning significant increases in the size of their sworn member complement, and**

**WHEREAS BC is projecting unprecedented population growth over the next several years that will necessitate further increases in municipal police forces, and**

**WHEREAS Police Academy capacity at Justice Institute of BC already constitutes a constraint on the ability to timely recruit and train the required number of police officers,**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT BCAPB lobby the Provincial government to have Justice Institute of BC increase the capacity of Police Academy to ensure that such capacity meets the growing needs of municipal police departments over the coming years.**

#### **3. Regional Model**

**WHEREAS the Province's contract with RCMP expires in 2032 and the potential of implementation of Regional Model has been considered, and**

**WHEREAS should the Province move towards implementation of Regional Police Model, such a transition will have a significant impact on municipal police departments,**

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT BCAPB advocate with the Provincial government a creation of all-party Committee to outline next steps in consideration of suitability of Regional Police Model in BC.**

6.2 Finance Committee\*

- **THAT the March 2024 Finance Committee report be received for information.**

6.3 Human Resource Committee

- In Camera item this month

7. INFORMATION ITEMS\*

7.1 Report received: Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General Policing and Security Branch *Police Resources in British Columbia, 2022.*

8. Introduction of Ms. Anna Mathewson, Port Moody City Manager

9. PUBLIC INPUT

Thank you to Dave Fox for his dedicated six years of service to the citizens of Port Moody and the Port Moody Police Department as a full-term Police Board member.  
*Dave – you will be missed!*

10. ADJOURNMENT

**PORT MOODY POLICE BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING  
MINUTES**

**DRAFT**

**Monday, February 5, 2024 5:00 pm  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor EOC, Public Safety Building  
3051 St. Johns Street, Port Moody, BC**

Minutes of the PORT MOODY POLICE BOARD Regular Meeting held 05 February 2024, Port Moody, British Columbia	
<b>PRESENT:</b>	Manjit Aujla David Fox Chloe Goodison Shahid Hussain Olga Kuznyetsova, Acting Chair Darren Radford
<b>REGRETS:</b>	Mayor Meghan Lahti
<b>STAFF:</b>	C/Cst. Dave Fleugel, DC Cst. Leslie Stevens, Insp. Manj Kaila, Insp. Travis Carroll, Shane Archibald, Kim Tsok, Jeannie Ziraldo  Rhonda Hnatiuk, Recording Secretary
<b>GUESTS</b>	No guests this month
<b>CALL TO ORDER</b>	1. <b><u>CALL TO ORDER</u></b>  Olga Kuznyetsova, Acting Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm.  The Territorial acknowledgement was recited.
<b>AGENDA for 05 February 2024</b>	2. <b><u>APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA</u></b>  Moved. Seconded and Carried.  <b>THAT the Agenda for the Regular Meeting of the Port Moody Police Board held on 05 February 2024 approved.</b>
<b>Minutes of the REGULAR MEETING held 08 January 2024</b>	3. <b><u>ADOPTION OF MINUTES</u></b>  Moved. Seconded and Carried.  <b>THAT Regular Meeting minutes of 08 January 2024 be approved with correction to Chloe Goodison's name in item 6.1,</b>
<b>DELEGATIONS/ PRESENTATIONS</b>	4. <b><u>DELEGATIONS/PRESENTATIONS</u></b>  No Delegations or Presentations this month.

<b>STANDING ITEMS/UNFINISHED BUSINESS</b>	5.	<b><u>STANDING ITEMS/UNFINISHED BUSINESS</u></b>
<b>Community Concerns/Considerations</b>	5.1	<p>Community Concerns/Considerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No community concerns or considerations this month.</li> </ul>
<b>NEW BUSINESS</b>	6.0	<b><u>NEW BUSINESS</u></b>
British Columbia Association of Police Boards (BCAPB) 2024 Conference and AGM	6.1	<p>British Columbia Association of Police Boards (BCAPB) 2024 Conference and AGM</p> <p>Moved. Seconded and Carried.</p> <p><b>THAT the BCAPB 2024 Conference Invitation and notice of AGM be received; <i>and</i></b></p> <p><b>THAT all Police Board members be approved to attend the BCAPB 2024 Conference and AGM; <i>and</i></b></p> <p><b>THAT the AGM Call for Resolutions be referred to the Governance Committee for consideration and recommendation; <i>and</i></b></p> <p><b>THAT the Port Moody Police Board approves the BCAPB Conference sponsorship request in the amount of \$575.00.</b></p>
<b>REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE</b>	7.	<b><u>REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE</u></b>
<b>GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE REPORT</b>	7.1	<p>Governance Committee</p> <p>In Camera report this month.</p>
<b>FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT</b>	7.2	<p>Finance Committee</p> <p>Manjit Aujla, Chair of the Finance Committee, reviewed the February 2024 Finance Committee report for information. The 2024 – 2028 Operating Budget was included for approval.</p> <p>Moved. Seconded and Carried.</p> <p><b>THAT the February 2024 Finance Committee report be received for information; <i>and</i></b></p> <p><b>THAT the Police Board approve the 2024 – 2028 Operating Budget and that a memo is drafted, signed by the Chair and submitted to the City.</b></p>
<b>HUMAN RESOURCE COMMITTEE</b>	7.3	<p>Human Resource Committee</p> <p>In Camera report this month.</p>

<b>INFORMATION ITEMS</b>	8.	<b><u>INFORMATION ITEM(S)</u></b>
	8.1	2024 Polar Plunge for Special Olympics  PMPD is hosting the 2024 Polar Plunge for Special Olympics at Rocky Point on March 2 <sup>nd</sup> .
<b>PUBLIC INPUT</b>	9.	<b><u>PUBLIC INPUT</u></b>  No public input this month.
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	10.	<b><u>ADJOURNMENT</u></b>  Meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm
<b>NEXT MEETING DATE</b>	11.	<b><u>NEXT MEETING DATE</u></b>  The next Regular Meeting: <b><u>Monday, March 4, 2023: 5:00 pm</u></b> , 3 <sup>rd</sup> Floor EOC Port Moody Public Safety Building 3051 St. Johns Street, Port Moody, BC

\_\_\_\_\_  
Olga Kuznyetsova, Acting Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Rhonda Hnatiuk Recording Secretary

# Metro Vancouver Transit Police Board



February 15, 2024

**Via Email c/o:** [shyanne.bergen@abbypd.ca](mailto:shyanne.bergen@abbypd.ca), [ddyer@nwpolice.org](mailto:ddyer@nwpolice.org),  
[Rhonda.Hnatiuk@portmoodypolice.com](mailto:Rhonda.Hnatiuk@portmoodypolice.com), [JaclynAddison@wvvpd.ca](mailto:JaclynAddison@wvvpd.ca)

Mayor Ross Siemens, Chair, Abbotsford Police Board  
Mayor Patrick Johnstone, Chair, New Westminster Police Board  
Mayor Meghan Lahti, Chair, Port Moody Police Board  
Mayor Mark Sager, Chair West Vancouver Police Board

Dear Board Chairs of the "Class A" Syndicate,

## **Re: Request for Extension to Term for E-Comm Board of Directors Representative**

George Madden from the Metro Vancouver Transit Police Board is the current representative for our Class A Syndicate of the independent Police Boards ("the Syndicate"). Two years ago our collective Boards agreed to an alphabetical rotational model which designates a member for approval by the Syndicate to serve on the E-Comm Board of Directors on behalf of the Syndicate and that within such rotation, each respective Police Board be responsible for recommending a designate for two consecutive years. George has been an effective representative, advocating and working on behalf of our Police Boards. In addition to his work on the Board, George also serves on E-Comm's Governance Committee as well as the Governance Review Steering Committee. As you may be aware, E-Comm is currently undergoing an extensive Governance Review for which George is in the midst of Committee work. With George's two-year term coming to an end in June, Doug Campbell, the E-Comm Board Chair, has contacted me to enquire if the Independent Police Boards would be willing to extend George's current term by 12-months. Here is an excerpt of his message to me:

As a member of the Governance Committee, George is now serving on the Governance Review Steering Committee. In addition, he plays an outsize role as a key, knowledgeable and experienced director who has been helping us improve our financial oversight and stakeholder relationship management.

I believe that his continuity for another 12 months would be of substantial benefit to EComm 911, and ultimately of benefit to your member organizations. By June 2025, most of the initiatives should be complete and it would make sense from our perspective to appoint a new representative.



# Metro Vancouver Transit Police Board



Marnie, again, this is a highly unusual request but stability on my board is required at this time. I respectfully request that you and the Independent Police Boards give this due consideration. I would be pleased to discuss this request with you.

George is agreeable to the extension, only if it is supported by the Syndicate. The Metro Vancouver Transit Police Board is supportive of a 12-month extension for George Madden and accordingly passed the following motion at our Board meeting last week:

**It was MOVED and SECONDED**

THAT the South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority Police Service Designated Policing Unit Board supports a twelve-month extension to Director Madden's term on the E-Comm Board of Directors as the representative of the Class 'A' Syndicate of Independent Police Boards.

It is kindly requested that you discuss with your respective Police Boards and let us know by March 31, 2024 if you support a **12-month extension** to George Madden's term on the E-Comm Board of Directors as the representative of the "Class A" Syndicate of Independent Police Boards. If you have any questions or would like further information, please contact me through our Police Board Secretary, Taryn Barton: [taryn.barton@transitpolice.bc.ca](mailto:taryn.barton@transitpolice.bc.ca) or 604 515 8387.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Marnie Larson".

Marnie Larson

Chair, Metro Vancouver Transit Police Board





## PMPD BOARD COMMITTEE REPORT

### COMMITTEE NAME:

Governance Committee

(ESTIMATED TIME 10.00 Minutes)

### MEMBERS:

Present: Olga Kuznyetsova, Darren Radford, Chloe Goodison

### GUESTS:

Chief D. Fluegel  
Kyle Stamm (Aspire Strategy)

### REPORTING DATE:

February 25, 2024

### COMMITTEE UPDATE:

Committee meeting was held on February 23, 2024 via Zoom.

**I. Strategic Plan update.** Kyle Stamm, Aspire Strategy has presented an update on 2024-2027 Strategic Plan work. Strategic Plan surveys have been sent out. Response rates are as follows:

Public: 250 responses

Staff: 21 out of 47

Senior Leadership: most responses were received

Board: 3 out of 7

North Star session is scheduled on Monday, February 26 to discuss mission, goals and measures, and identify any additional information that will need to be gathered.

Strategic Plan session will be held with the Board on Monday, March 4, immediately following the Board meeting. The session will include Board as well as Senior Staff. Approximate duration – 90 minutes.

**Action:** Olga to send out a reminder to Board members to complete the survey.

### II. BCAPB Resolutions

The Committee and the Chief discussed the potential BCAPB resolutions. The proposed resolutions are included in the Recommendations / Motions section of this Report.

### III. Board Governance Manual Update

The updated timeline for Board Governance Manual update:

February-March: Governance Committee review of the draft Manual

April 8 Board meeting: report to the Board on key items / significant changes

April: Board review of the draft Manual

May 6 Board meeting: Board feedback on the draft Manual

#### **IV. Board Evaluation Process**

Board evaluation process will take place in April, according to Board calendar. The proposed Board evaluation process materials will be distributed by Darren by a separate e-mail. This process was discussed in previous Board meetings. Final feedback will be sought at April Board meeting, and the Board self-evaluation process will be completed during the month of April.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS / MOTIONS:**

1. For receipt, information and discussion.
2. That the Board approves the following proposed resolutions to be forwarded to BCAPB AGM:

##### **1. E-Comm funding and cost pressures**

WHEREAS over the past several years participating police agencies have experienced significant cost pressures resulting from E-Comm cost escalations which have significantly surpassed rate of inflation, and

WHEREAS E-Comm is projecting cost pressures continue in the future at a rate higher than rate of inflation,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT (1) BCAPB advocate for a cell phone levy as a source of funding for E-Comm costs that would offset the need for increase in participating municipal police departments' fees, and (2) BCAPB advocate that E-Comm Board implements cost control measures to contain E-Comm fee increases to rate of inflation.

##### **2. Police Academy class size limitations**

WHEREAS certain BC municipalities are planning significant increases in the size of their sworn member complement, and

WHEREAS BC is projecting unprecedented population growth over the next several years that will necessitate further increases in municipal police forces, and

WHEREAS Police Academy capacity at Justice Institute of BC already constitutes a constraint on the ability to timely recruit and train the required number of police officers,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT BCAPB lobby the Provincial government to have Justice Institute of BC increase the capacity of Police Academy to ensure that such capacity meets the growing needs of municipal police departments over the coming years.

##### **3. Regional Model**

WHEREAS the Province's contract with RCMP expires in 2032 and the potential of implementation of Regional Model has been considered, and

WHEREAS should the Province move towards implementation of Regional Police Model, such a transition will have a significant impact on municipal police departments,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT BCAPB advocate with the Provincial government a creation of all-party Committee to outline next steps in consideration of suitability of Regional Police Model in BC.

**From:** [Darren Radford](#)  
**To:** [Meghan Lahti](#); [David Fleugel](#); [Manjit Aujla](#); [Chloe Goodison](#); [Olga Kuznyetsova](#); [Shahid Hussain](#); [PB David Fox](#)  
**Cc:** [Rhonda Hnatiuk](#)  
**Subject:** Board Effectiveness and Evaluation  
**Date:** February 29, 2024 4:26:52 PM  
**Attachments:** [Board Self Evaluation Questionnaire v0.2 Issued.docx](#)

---

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Chair Lahti, Chief and Board members,

On behalf of the Governance Committee, attaching the last version of the Board Evaluation model compiled Feb 2023!

## Background

Inputs:

- Template/question set used by Board pre 2023
- Formal model/question set from ICD (Institute of Corporate Directors)

Actions:

- Governance committee compiled from original version of police board template and ICD best practice questions
- Review by the then governance committee members (Chloe, Shahid and I) and some edits made by that group

This version is a reflection of where we got - at the time, essentially proposed final.

Next Steps:

I read over this today and thought of the Watson Board training and Board Manual revisions - all post Feb 2023 of course

With both those lenses applied, this still fundamentally stands as fit for purpose ...however, section B seems to have several questions on financial stewardship but does not explicitly call out risk, strategy and/or human resource management to the same level. I would humbly suggest we should review with a view to a small update to section B to ensure a balanced reflection of key board accountabilities...

Discuss more at Board mtg

Warmest  
Darren

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message and any accompanying documents contain confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose. This message is private and protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying or distribution, or the taking of any action based on the contents of this information, is strictly prohibited.

## A tool for improving governance practices

All board members should answer all the questions. When completed individually the results of Sections A, B, C and D should be compiled, shared and discussed by the whole Board to determine an average group answer to each question and an overall section rating. The Chief and Senior Management should also complete Section D. Section E should be answered by Board members alone but not shared with the group. This questionnaire also includes Section F, which provides feedback [optional] to the Chair of the Board.

*Circle the response that best reflects your opinion. The rating scale for each statement is: Strongly Disagree (1); Disagree (2); Agree (3); Strongly Agree (4).*

### A. COMPOSITION AND STRUCTURE

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
The Board has the skills; experience and expertise it needs to fulfill its responsibilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Board members generally understand the programs and policies of the Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
New Board members receive adequate orientation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Board members receive ongoing training and information as needed to fulfill its roles and responsibilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The number and organization of Board committees are correct to facilitate the work of the Board	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board has clear terms of reference for its roles, duties and responsibilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Each Board committee has terms of reference that clearly identify its roles and responsibilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*My overall rating (add together the total of the numbers circled):*

Excellent (21-28) Satisfactory (16-20) Poor (7-15)

## B. HOW WELL HAS THE BOARD DONE ITS JOB?

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
Board meeting packages contain the right information to prepare Board members for the meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board uses an annual calendar to plan its meetings and work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Board meeting minutes are clear and accurate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Debate and discussion at Board meetings are strategic and focus on priority items	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is effective, open communication between the Board and management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is appropriate monitoring of follow-up on action items	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board effectively reviews the resources needed by the Department and approves a comprehensive budget strategy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board has sufficient financial information to determine the financial position of the department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There are adequately documented financial policies outlining such matters as spending authorities, contract & purchasing process, delegations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The regular financial reports facilitate the Board's monitoring role	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board effectively evaluates the Department's financial performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board understands and ensures compliance with relevant legislation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Each Board committee has terms of reference that clearly identify its roles and responsibilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Board committees perform their functions well and report regularly to the Board	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*My overall rating (add together the total of the numbers circled):*

Excellent (42-57) Satisfactory (30-41) Poor (12-29)



## C. HOW WELL HAS THE BOARD CONDUCTED ITSELF?

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
The Chair ensures that all members are kept up to date with key issues and developments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Board agenda packages are circulated in advance of each meeting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Board members arrive well- prepared for meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Attendance at board meeting is good	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Debate and discussion at Board meetings are frank and open	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Board members are respectful of each other's views	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chair is effective in facilitating discussions and decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chair encourages all members to participate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel my views are listened to by the Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel my views are listened to by other Board members	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The rules of meeting conduct as stated in the Board Manual are followed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board is fully engaged in the budget process- it is not a rubber stamp	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is a good understanding of the Board's role by its members	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board understands the distinction between its responsibilities and those of management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board never interferes in purely operational matters	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individual Board members never interfere in purely operational matters	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board has clear conflict of interest and code of conduct policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*My overall rating (add together the total of the numbers circled):*

Excellent (51-68) Satisfactory (38-50) Poor (17-37)

## D. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE CHIEF AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT TEAM

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
There is a good understanding of the Board's role by the Chief Constable ("Chief") and Senior Management Team ("SMT")	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chief and SMT respect the governance role of the Board	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chief keeps the Board fully informed of important operational matters that will affect its deliberations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chief advises the Board on the operational and cost implications of policies it considers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board provides the Chief with opportunities to review his concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board considers succession planning and development for the Department	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SMT presentations at Board meetings are relevant and concise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board never interferes in purely operational matters	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individual Board members never interfere in purely operational matters	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is a clear understanding where the role of the Board ends and that of the Chief/SMT begins	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is good two-way communication between the Board and Chief/SMT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board trusts the judgment of the Chief/SMT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board provides adequate direction to the Chief/SMT by reviewing and setting policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board has developed formal criteria and a process for evaluation of the Chief	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board, or a Committee of the Board has formally evaluated the Chief within the past 12 months	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board evaluates the Chief on the accomplishment of approved strategic objectives and adherence to policy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
The Board provides feedback and shows its appreciation to the Chief/SMT on a regular basis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board ensures the Chief/SMT are encouraged and enabled to take advantage of professional development opportunities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Board discussion and communication with the Chief/SMT is clear and sufficient	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*My overall rating (add together the total of the numbers circled):*

Excellent (57-76) Satisfactory (42-56) Poor (19-41)

Looking at my answers for the above sections A, B, C and D, how might the Board do its job better?

## E. MY PERFORMANCE AS AN INDIVIDUAL BOARD MEMBER (NOT TO BE SHARED)

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
I am aware of what is expected of me as a Board member	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have a good record of meeting attendance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I read the minutes, reports and other materials in advance of our Board meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am familiar with the contents of the Board Manual and Department's governing policies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I frequently encourage other Board members to express their opinions at Board meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am encouraged by other Board members to express my opinions at Board meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am a good listener at Board meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I follow through on things I have said I would do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I maintain the confidentiality of all Board decisions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
When I have a different opinion than the majority, I raise it	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I support Board decisions once they are made even if I do not agree with them	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I promote the work of our organization in the community whenever I have a chance to do so	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I stay informed about issues relevant to our mission and bring information to the attention of the Board	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
What additional information or skills do I need to be a better Board member?				
-				
-				
-				

*My overall rating (add together the total of the numbers circled):*

Excellent (39+) Satisfactory (29-38) Poor (13-28)

## F. FEEDBACK TO THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD (OPTIONAL)

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Agree (3)	Strongly Agree (4)
The Chair is well prepared for board meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chair helps the board stick to the agenda	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chair tries hard to ensure that every board member has an opportunity to be heard	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chair is skilled at managing different points of view	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chair demonstrates versatility in facilitating board discussions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chair knows how to be direct with an individual board member when their behavior needs to change.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chair helps the board work well together	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chair demonstrates good listening skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Board supports the Chair	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chair is effective in delegating responsibility amongst Board members	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Chair ensures the board is aware of his/her organizational activities outside of our Board meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

*My overall rating (add together the total of the numbers circled):*

Excellent (33+) Satisfactory (25-32) Poor (11-24)



## PMPD BOARD COMMITTEE REPORT

### COMMITTEE NAME:

Finance Committee

(ESTIMATED TIME 10.00 Minutes)

### MEMBERS:

Manjit Aujla, David Fox and Olga Kuznyetsova

### REPORTING DATE:

March 4, 2024

### COMMITTEE UPDATE:

#### **1. Year to date Statement of Revenue and Expenses to January 31, 2024**

The year to date January 31, 2024 Statement of Revenue and Expenses is attached. The budget figure included in the report is based on the budget that was approved by the Police Board on February 5, 2024. Should any changes be made to the budget, the report will need to be updated. The report indicates a surplus of \$120,505. The main source of the surplus is lower salaries and operating expenses.

Overall Salaries are favorable as of January 31st, both member and civilian wages are under budget. Member wages are under budget primarily due to members at pay steps below 1<sup>st</sup> class constable, vacancies and overtime savings. Civilian wages are under budget due to lower guard wages.

Operating expenses are under budget at this point – which is primarily timing related as typically operating expenses trend lower at the beginning of the year. Budget savings are largely in Administration as well as small savings noted in Patrol, Major Crime and Vehicles. Administration costs are lower due to less spending on legal, internal audit and IT related costs. Patrol costs are under budget due to less spending on firearms, uniforms and professional services which is partially offset by higher JIBC recruit training and member training costs. Major Crime costs are under budget due to less spending on investigations and training. Vehicle costs are under budget due to fuel savings.

Revenues are on budget for January – however the most significant revenue item is traffic fine revenues which is not typically received until July. Until the traffic fine revenue is received it is assumed to be on budget. Other revenue is higher than expected due to a grant received from the Province to fund Naloxone.

## **2. Reserve Accounts**

There is no reserve account information for this month.

## **3. Audit**

The Senior Management Team is recommending that the department hire a consultant to undertake an Organizational review. This would involve reviewing the staffing resources in conjunction with the department's processes and structure. A potential funding source for this review could be the audit budget line. The Chief Constable will make a request for this funding. The audit budget for 2024 is \$27,327.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS / MOTIONS:**

1. For receipt, information and discussion.
2. For receipt, information and discussion.
3. For receipt, information and discussion.



**Port Moody Police Department  
Revenue and Expenses  
For the period ended January 31, 2024**

	YTD Actual Adjusted*	YTD Budget**	YTD Variance to Budget	Annual Budget**	Prior Year YTD Actuals	Current Year Actuals vs. Prior Year Actuals Variance	
<b>Revenues</b>							
Traffic Fine Revenue	\$ 38,083	\$ 38,083	\$ -	\$ 457,000	\$ 47,165	\$ (9,082)	[1]
Revenue from Tenant	5,126	5,126	-	61,510	5,126	0	
Front Counter	4,010	3,750	260	45,000	4,797	(787)	
Victim Services	6,660	6,660	-	79,916	5,786	874	
Keep of Prisoners	-	557	(557)	6,689	-	-	
Other	8,347	-	8,347	-	9,261	(914)	[2]
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>62,226</b>	<b>54,176</b>	<b>8,050</b>	<b>650,115</b>	<b>72,135</b>	<b>(9,909)</b>	
<b>Expenses</b>							
<b>Salaries</b>							
Members	\$ 718,567	\$ 794,592	\$ 76,026	\$ 9,535,108	\$ 739,508	\$ 20,941	[3]
Civilians	177,345	183,726	6,381	2,204,711	152,017	(25,328)	[4]
<b>Total Salaries</b>	<b>895,911</b>	<b>978,318</b>	<b>82,407</b>	<b>11,739,819</b>	<b>891,525</b>	<b>(4,386)</b>	
<b>Operating Expenses</b>							
Administration	\$ 35,228	\$ 53,397	\$ 18,168	\$ 640,760	\$ 29,468	\$ (5,760)	[5]
Cell Block	769	557	(212)	6,689	900	131	[6]
Major Crime	1,868	8,396	6,528	100,751	3,812	1,944	[7]
Civic Building	35,605	33,272	(2,333)	399,266	30,431	(5,174)	
ECOMM	79,036	79,956	920	959,471	67,711	(11,325)	
Communications	3,084	483	(2,600)	5,800	-	(3,084)	
Community	6,512	5,908	(604)	70,890	5,713	(799)	
Emergency Reponse Team - Integrated	8,557	8,557	-	102,687	7,642	(915)	
Front Counter	-	167	167	2,000	-	-	
Identification	16,694	16,694	-	200,323	14,786	(1,908)	
Integrated Homicide - Integrated	14,804	14,804	-	177,646	14,373	(431)	
Police Dog Services - Integrated	11,497	11,497	-	137,963	10,673	(824)	
Patrol	31,380	34,785	3,405	417,415	16,121	(15,259)	[8]
Traffic	-	142	142	1,706	-	-	
Victim Services	360	1,581	1,221	18,976	527	167	
Community Action Team	-	863	863	10,352	704	704	
Vehicles	49,737	54,121	4,385	649,455	48,246	(1,491)	[9]
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>295,131</b>	<b>325,179</b>	<b>30,048</b>	<b>3,902,150</b>	<b>251,107</b>	<b>(44,024)</b>	
<b>Total Expenses</b>	<b>1,191,042</b>	<b>1,303,497</b>	<b>112,455</b>	<b>15,641,969</b>	<b>1,142,632</b>	<b>(48,410)</b>	
<b>Net Impact</b>	<b>\$ 1,128,816</b>	<b>\$ 1,249,322</b>	<b>\$ 120,505</b>	<b>\$ 14,991,854</b>	<b>\$ 1,070,497</b>	<b>\$ (58,319)</b>	

\* These financial statements have been adjusted to include estimates for significant accruals and prepaid amounts.

\*\* 2024 Budget based on budget approved by Police Board on February 5, 2024. Final Budget is still subject to approval by City Council.

**Notes:**

[1] Traffic fine revenue is typically received at the end of June. Accrue budgeted amount since actual amount unknown at this time.

[2] Other income includes funding from the Province for Narcan (\$5K) which will have a corresponding expense & salary rebills for staff to work weekend during tenant construction (corresponding expense)

[3] Member salaries are under budget due to member vacancies, members at pay steps below 1st class constable as well as overtime savings.

[4] Civilian salary savings due to lower guard wages.

[5] Administration is under budget due to lower spending to date on legal expenses, internal audit, and IT related costs.

[6] Cell Block expenses higher than budget due to filling guard shifts with Contractor vs. internal guard staff (done when no internal guard staff are available). This expense offsets with lower guard wages.

[7] Major Crime costs are under budget due to less spending on investigation costs & training.

[8] Patrol expenses are under budget due to less spending on firearms, uniforms and professional services which is partially offset by higher spending on JIBC recruit training and member training.

[9] Vehicle costs are lower than budgeted due to fuel savings.



Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General  
Policing and Security Branch

## Police Resources in British Columbia, 2022

### Table of Contents

Structure of Policing in British Columbia.....	2
British Columbia Policing Jurisdictions .....	7
Indigenous Policing Services Statistics, 2022 .....	8
Municipal Police Statistics, 2022 .....	10
Provincial Police Statistics, 2022 .....	12
Police Statistics Summary, 2022 .....	15
Government Contributions to Policing, 2022 .....	16
British Columbia Authorized Strength by Responsibility 2013-2022 .....	17
Authorized Strength by Jurisdiction, 2013-2022 .....	18
Key Impacts on Crime Statistics .....	27
Police Resource Definitions and Data Qualifiers .....	28

Date Prepared: December 2023

Effective Jan 1, 2019, new CCJS scoring rules and provincial PRIME policy changes were introduced regarding how incidents are categorized. Incidents of crime that could not be substantiated when followed up by the police are no longer considered “unsubstantiated,” unless police find evidence to show the offence did not occur. Consequently, more crimes are now being categorized as “founded,” contributing to increases in the number of occurrences for many jurisdictions beginning in 2019.

**\*Caution should be used in comparing police jurisdiction  
crime data, policing costs, authorized strengths, or case loads.**

***Variances in crime statistics in recent years may be attributable in part to changes in  
reporting practices and as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.***

***Please refer to the Police Resource Definitions and Data Qualifiers on page 28.***

**Additional police and crime statistics information can be found on the PSB website:**  
<https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/justice/criminal-justice/policing-in-bc>

## Structure of Policing in British Columbia

Policing in Canada is a shared responsibility between federal, provincial/territorial, and municipal governments. Under the *Constitution Act, 1867*, the federal government has the exclusive authority to enact legislation regarding criminal law and procedure. In addition, the federal government is responsible for providing a federal police service to enforce federal statutes and to protect national security. The *Constitution Act, 1867*, delegates responsibility for the administration of justice, which includes policing, to provincial governments. Each province has a Police Act that sets out the terms by which police are governed. Provinces may delegate responsibility for policing within municipal boundaries to the municipality. Under the BC *Police Act*, municipalities 5,000 population and over are responsible for providing policing and law enforcement services within their municipal boundaries.

In BC, policing is provided mainly by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police 'RCMP' (federal, provincial and municipal services), municipal police departments, and one Indigenous Self-Administered Police Service. Notably, there are integrated teams operating throughout the province; these teams provide specialized policing services and are funded and/or resourced from two or more policing jurisdictions or agencies.

In addition, there are also several agencies that provide supplemental policing in BC; that is, they are mandated to provide policing in geographic areas already served by provincial or municipal police agencies but for a specific purpose. For example, in the Lower Mainland area of the province, the South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority Police Service (SCBTAPS) provides policing on and around the transit system which is supplemental to the jurisdictional police. Similarly, the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific Railway police agencies provide specialized law enforcement on any property within 500 metres of lands that the railway company owns, possesses, or administers.

### Federal Service

The RCMP is Canada's national police service. Established under the *RCMP Act*, the RCMP serves as the federal police service across Canada including within British Columbia. The RCMP falls within the portfolio of the Minister of Public Safety Canada and operates under the direction of the RCMP Commissioner. As the federal police service, the RCMP enforces federal statutes across the province and is responsible for border integrity, national security, drugs and organized crime, financial crime, and international policing.

In 2022, the authorized strength of the federal service in British Columbia was 947 member positions which included 126 protective policing positions.

### Provincial Service

Under the *Police Act*, the provincial government must provide policing and law enforcement to rural/unincorporated areas and municipalities under 5,000 population. Effective April 1, 2012 the Province signed a new 20-year *Provincial Police Service Agreement* (PPSA) with the Government of Canada to contract the RCMP as BC's Provincial Police Service. Under the terms of the PPSA, the provincial government pays 70% of the cost-base described in the Agreement with the federal government paying the remaining 30%<sup>1</sup>.

A portion of the provincial cost is recovered through the Police Tax. In 2007, municipalities under 5,000 population and unincorporated areas began to pay the Police Tax which covers a portion of the costs of the General Duty and General Investigative Services (GD/GIS) provided by the Provincial Police Service (RCMP). In 2022, the Police Tax generated a total of \$28M which was 27 per cent of the Province's estimated 70 per cent share of rural and small community GD/GIS costs. The Police Tax is under the purview of the Ministry of Finance. Revenues go into the Province's Consolidated Revenue Fund.

The Provincial Police Service can be broken into two main categories: detachment policing and the provincial police services. Detachment policing provides local police services to municipalities under 5,000 population and unincorporated areas throughout the province by means of uniformed patrols, response-to-call duties, investigative services, community-based policing, traffic enforcement, and administrative support to provincial detachments.

In addition to detachment policing, the Provincial Police Service maintains the capacity and expertise to resolve the highest risk incidents; target organized crime, gang & gun violence, and serial crimes; and respond to large scale, provincial emergencies or events. This would also include capital-intensive equipment such as boats and aircrafts.

In 2022, 799 member positions were assigned to provide GD/GIS at provincial detachments, serving a population of 687,663 including 82 municipalities with populations below 5,000 persons in addition to unincorporated areas. The total authorized strength of BC's Provincial Police Service was 2,602.

### **Municipal Policing**

Under the *BC Police Act*, a municipality is responsible for the provision of policing and law enforcement services when its population exceeds 5,000 persons. The municipality also becomes responsible for bearing all the costs relating to its municipal police services. These municipalities must provide their policing by one of the three models outlined in the *Police Act* - their own municipal police department, contract with an existing municipal police department, or contract with the provincial government for the RCMP to establish a municipal police unit (MPU).

In 2022, there were 80 municipalities in BC responsible for providing policing services within their municipal boundaries. 12 municipalities were policed by municipal police departments, 67 were policed solely by municipal police units (RCMP), and one municipality was undergoing a municipal police model transition<sup>2</sup>.

### **Municipal Police Units<sup>2</sup>**

In addition to the *Provincial Police Services Agreement* (PPSA), the provincial and federal governments signed the *Municipal Police Service Agreement* (MPSA), a master agreement which enables the provincial government to sub-contract the Provincial Police Service (RCMP) to municipalities and describes the terms and conditions for the provision of a municipal police unit. To establish a municipal police unit, with the RCMP as the service provider, each municipality must sign a *Municipal Police Unit Agreement* (MPUA) with the provincial government.

In accordance with these agreements, municipalities with an RCMP municipal police unit benefit through a cost shared arrangement with the federal government<sup>1</sup>. Per the terms of the MPSA and the MPUA, municipalities between 5,000 and 14,999 population pay 70% of the RCMP costs while municipalities 15,000 population or higher pay 90%. The remaining 30% and 10%, respectively, are paid by the federal government<sup>1</sup>. Municipalities are responsible for 100% of certain costs, such as accommodations (i.e., the detachment) and support staff.

The RCMP operates regional and integrated detachments in many areas of the province. An integrated detachment is comprised of two or more provincial and/or municipal police units. For example, the North Vancouver Detachment houses three policing units: two municipal (North Vancouver District and North Vancouver City) and one provincial (North Vancouver Provincial). Typically, integrated detachments operate on a post-dispatch system which means members are not restricted to a specific jurisdiction and respond to calls in any of the policing jurisdictions served by the detachment. In the example of North Vancouver Detachment, members of the three policing jurisdictions regardless of whether the member is assigned to the North Vancouver City Municipal Unit or the North Vancouver Provincial Unit etc., will respond to calls in all of the policing jurisdictions served by the detachment. In integrated detachments, members from each policing unit report to one detachment commander.

The regional detachment structure adds another layer to integration. Regional detachments offer a central point of management, coordination, and comptrollership for multiple integrated or stand-alone detachments in a defined area. For example, the Kelowna Regional Detachment is comprised of the Kelowna Municipal Unit, West Kelowna Municipal Unit, Peachland Municipal Unit, Kelowna Provincial Unit and the Lake Country Municipal Unit. These units operate from multiple bases in the area, i.e., Kelowna Municipal Unit operates out of a detachment in the City of Kelowna, the West Kelowna Integrated Detachment houses the West Kelowna Municipal Unit, the Peachland Municipal Unit, and the Kelowna Provincial Unit and the Lake Country Detachment houses the Lake Country Municipal Unit. These types of arrangements allow for specialized and/or administrative police services to be delivered regionally.

In 2022, a total of 67 municipalities<sup>2</sup> in BC were policed solely by RCMP municipal police units, with a combined total authorized strength of 3,275 member positions.

There were 35 municipalities between 5,000 and 14,999 population with RCMP municipal police units, with a total strength of 462 member positions. There were 32 municipalities with a population of 15,000 or higher that had RCMP municipal police units, with a total strength of 2,813 member positions. *(Note: Includes adjusted strength figures for MPUs participating in Lower Mainland District Integrated Teams).*

### ***Municipal Police Model in Transition***

In February 2020, Ministerial approval was provided to the City of Surrey that it may provide its policing and law enforcement services by means of a municipal police department. The implementation of Surrey's police model transition is two-pronged: 1) the establishment of the Surrey Police Service (SPS), and 2) the integrated police model transition period. Combined, implementation of these two components would culminate in the SPS being the City's police agency of jurisdiction, fully staffed with SPS officers, and all transition provisions completed.

Since late 2020, the SPS and the Surrey Police Board have been carrying out the necessary work to establish the police agency including: hiring staff, developing departmental policies and procedures, establishing contract/agreement relationships for goods and services; acquiring equipment and information management/technology (IM/IT) infrastructure; and building those IM/IT platforms. Throughout 2022, this work has continued.

With respect to police resources, as of December 31, 2022, the SPS had hired 350 sworn officers and 60 civilian support staff. In addition, 188 of SPS' officers were operationally deployed within the Surrey RCMP detachment and at least 160 Surrey RCMP members were demobilized. The remaining SPS officers and civilian staff that were not deployed within the Surrey RCMP were performing management/supervisory roles, functions required to establish the SPS, and/or were awaiting deployment.

On April 13, 2022, per the terms of the City's MPUA, the City requested a decrease of 170 Regular Members assigned to the Surrey RCMP Municipal Unit. Per the terms of the MPSA, the provincial Minister wrote to the federal Minister similarly requesting this decrease on behalf of the City. As a result, the Surrey RCMP Municipal Unit's total authorized strength has been decreased from 843 to 673 members.

As of December 31, 2022, the total strength for SPS and Surrey RCMP Municipal Unit was a combined 1,023<sup>3</sup> member positions.

### ***Municipal Police Departments***

Twelve (12) municipalities in BC are policed by eleven municipal police departments as established under section 23 of the *Police Act*. The municipal police departments are: Vancouver, Victoria (which polices the municipalities of Victoria and Esquimalt), Saanich, Central Saanich, Oak Bay, Delta, Abbotsford, New Westminster, West Vancouver, Nelson and Port Moody. Notably, the City of Surrey is continuing to transition to its own municipal police department, the SPS. During this part of the transition, the Surrey RCMP Municipal Unit currently remains the Police of Jurisdiction (POJ).

Municipal police departments are governed by a police board, whose role is to provide general direction to the department, in accordance with relevant legislation and in response to community needs. Each police board consists of civilians and is chaired by the municipality's mayor; one board member is appointed by the municipal council and up to seven people appointed by the provincial government. Municipalities which provide their policing by means of a municipal police department are responsible for 100% of all their policing costs.

In 2022, the combined total authorized strength of the 12 municipal police departments responsible under the *Police Act* for providing policing services was 2,498 officer positions *(Note: Includes adjusted strength figures, representing the sworn officers from Municipal Police Departments, for municipalities participating in Lower Mainland District Integrated Teams).*

## Indigenous Policing Services

### *Self-Administered Policing Services*

Stl'atl'imx Tribal Police is the only Indigenous Self-administered Police Service in British Columbia and is governed by the Stl'atl'imx Tribal Police Board whose members are selected from each of the ten communities it serves. Police officers recruited by the police board are either experienced officers or graduates of the Justice Institute of British Columbia, Police Academy. All officers are appointed under the *Police Act*. In 2020, the Stl'atl'imx Tribal Police signed a historical 10-year agreement and increased their authorized strength to 14 police officer positions.

### *Enhanced Policing Services to First Nations Communities*

Through the First Nations and Inuit Policing Program (FNIPP), both the federal and provincial governments provide funding to support culturally responsive policing services that are in addition to the level of operational policing services already provided to the community. The FNIPP was established in 1991 to provide enhanced policing services that are professional, dedicated and culturally responsive to First Nations and Inuit communities and are designed to enable greater input over the delivery of policing services within their communities.

### *Indigenous Policing Services (formerly First Nations Community Policing Services)*

In April 2020, the *Framework Agreement* between the federal government and the provincial government for RCMP FNCPS in British Columbia was amended, with an increase in member positions. Communities who were successful in their submissions to Canada and British Columbia for additional resources are in the process of signing amendments to their Community Tripartite Agreements (CTAs) to reflect additional resources to their communities. In 2022, the total authorized strength for First Nations policing under this Agreement is 117.5 member positions through 59 CTAs (Renewal of 55 CTAs, 4 Former Aboriginal Community Constable Program (ACCP) Agreements being transitioned to CTAs, 1 Program Administrator and 1 Recruiter position). Each FNCPS Unit is established under a tripartite agreement between the provincial government, the federal government and the participating First Nation communities. The provincial share of funding the FNCPS is 48% and the federal share is 52%. See page 8 and 9 for a listing of FNCPS positions by Community and RCMP Detachment.

### *Integrated First Nations Police Units*

In 2007, a policing agreement was signed by the provincial government, the West Vancouver Police Board, and the Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh First Nations to create the Integrated First Nations Policing Unit. This Unit is comprised of a total of five positions staffed by members from Squamish and North Vancouver municipal police units (RCMP) and the West Vancouver Police Department and one member funded under the FNIPP. This policing arrangement provides enhanced, dedicated services to reserve lands located in North Vancouver, West Vancouver and the Squamish Valley.

### *Tsawwassen Quadripartite Agreement*

In 2019, a new five-year policing agreement was signed between the federal government, the provincial government, the City of Delta, and the Tsawwassen First Nation (TFN) to enable the Delta Police Department to deliver enhanced policing to the Tsawwassen First Nation. The funding of this agreement is shared by the provincial and federal governments, 48% and 52% respectively. There is currently one member providing enhanced policing services to TFN under this Agreement.

## Integrated Teams in BC

There are a number of integrated teams in the province. These teams may be “integrated” in one or more ways:

- They are comprised of police officers/members from more than one police agency or members from at least two levels of policing (i.e., federal, provincial, municipal); and/or
- Multiple governments (i.e., federal, provincial, municipal) contribute to funding the team.

In addition, integrated teams provide services to more than one policing jurisdiction. In BC, there are three broad categories of integrated teams: federal, provincial and regional/municipal.

**Federal Integrated Teams:** includes members from municipal, provincial, and/or other federal agencies (Canadian and US) which are funded primarily by the federal government. Most Federal integrated teams are managed under the Federal Policing program. Such multi-disciplined groups deal with National Security, Transnational Organized Crime, Money Laundering, Integrated Market Enforcement, Drug Enforcement and Border Integrity.

**Provincial Integrated Teams:** may include members/sworn officers from municipal, provincial, and/or federal agencies but are funded primarily by the provincial government. The provincial teams include Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit (CFSEU), Hate Crime Task Force, Integrated Sexual Predator Observation Team (ISPOT), Integrated Witness Protection Services, and the Unsolved Homicide Unit.

**Regional Integrated Teams:** may include members/sworn officers from municipal, provincial, and/or federal police agencies. These teams are formed to provide specialized services to specific regions of the province and are funded by the participating jurisdictions according to predetermined funding formula. For example, the RCMP's Lower Mainland District (LMD) Police Dog Service provides service to all municipal and provincial policing jurisdictions, served by the RCMP, in the LMD, as well as to the Abbotsford, Delta, New Westminster, and Port Moody Municipal Police Departments.



## British Columbia Policing Jurisdictions

### **RCMP ISLAND DISTRICT**

Alert Bay Prov  
Campbell River Mun  
Campbell River Prov  
Colwood Mun  
Comox Mun  
Comox Valley Prov  
Courtenay Mun  
Duncan Mun  
Duncan Prov  
Gabriola Island Prov  
Ladysmith Mun  
Ladysmith Prov  
Lake Cowichan Prov  
Langford Mun  
Metchosin Mun  
Nanaimo Mun  
Nanaimo Prov  
Nootka Sound Prov  
North Cowichan Mun  
North Saanich Mun  
Oceanside Prov  
Outer Gulf Islands Prov  
Parksville Mun  
Port Alberni Mun  
Port Alberni Prov  
Port Alice Prov  
Port Hardy Prov  
Port McNeill Prov  
Powell River Mun  
Powell River Prov  
Quadra Island Prov  
Qualicum Beach Mun  
Salt Spring Island Prov  
Sayward Prov  
Shawnigan Lake Prov  
Sidney Mun  
Sidney Prov  
Sooke Mun  
Sooke Prov  
Texada Island Prov  
Tofino Prov  
Ucluelet Prov  
View Royal Mun  
West Shore Prov

### **RCMP LOWER MAINLAND DISTRICT**

Agassiz Prov  
Barnston Island Prov<sup>4</sup>  
Boston Bar Prov  
Bowen Island Prov  
Burnaby Mun  
Chilliwack Mun  
Chilliwack Prov

Coquitlam Mun  
Coquitlam Prov  
Hope Mun  
Hope Prov  
Kent Mun  
Langley City Mun  
Langley Township Mun  
Maple Ridge Mun  
Mission Mun  
Mission Prov  
North Vancouver City Mun  
North Vancouver District Mun  
North Vancouver Prov  
Pemberton Prov  
Pitt Meadows Mun  
Port Coquitlam Mun  
Richmond Mun  
Ridge Meadows Prov  
Sechelt Mun  
Squamish Mun  
Squamish Prov  
Sunshine Coast Prov  
University Prov  
Whistler Mun  
Whistler Prov  
White Rock Mun

### **RCMP NORTH DISTRICT**

Alexis Creek Prov  
Anahim Lake Prov  
Atlin Prov  
Bella Bella Prov  
Bella Coola Prov  
Burns Lake Prov  
Chetwynd Prov  
Dawson Creek Mun  
Dawson Creek Prov  
Dease Lake Prov  
Fort St. James Prov  
Fort St. John Mun  
Fort St. John Prov  
Fraser Lake Prov  
Houston Granisle Prov  
Hudson's Hope Prov  
Kitimat Mun  
Kitimat Prov  
Lisims/Nass Valley Prov  
Mackenzie Prov  
Masset Prov  
McBride Prov  
New Hazelton Prov  
Northern Rockies Prov  
One Hundred Mile House Prov  
Prince George Mun  
Prince George Prov

Prince Rupert Mun  
Prince Rupert Prov  
Queen Charlotte City Prov  
Quesnel Mun  
Quesnel Prov  
Smithers Mun  
Smithers Prov  
Stewart Prov  
Takla Landing Prov  
Terrace Mun  
Terrace Prov  
Tsay Keh Dene Prov  
Tumbler Ridge Prov  
Valemount Prov  
Vanderhoof Prov  
Wells Prov  
Williams Lake Mun  
Williams Lake Prov

### **RCMP SOUTHEAST DISTRICT**

Armstrong Mun  
Armstrong Prov  
Ashcroft Prov  
Barriere Prov  
Castlegar Mun  
Castlegar Prov  
Chase Prov  
Clearwater Prov  
Clinton Prov  
Coldstream Mun  
Columbia Valley Prov  
Cranbrook Mun  
Cranbrook Prov  
Creston Mun  
Creston Prov  
Elkford Prov  
Enderby Prov  
Falkland Prov  
Fernie Mun  
Fernie Prov  
Golden Prov  
Grand Forks Prov  
Kamloops Mun  
Kaslo Prov  
Kelowna Mun  
Kelowna Prov  
Kimberley Mun  
Kimberley Prov  
Keremeos Prov  
Lake Country Mun  
Lillooet Prov  
Logan Lake Prov  
Lumby Prov  
Lytton Prov

Merritt Mun  
Merritt Prov  
Midway Prov  
Nakusp Prov  
Nelson Prov  
Oliver Mun  
Oliver Prov  
Osoyoos Mun  
Osoyoos Prov  
Peachland Mun  
Penticton Mun  
Penticton Prov  
Princeton Prov  
Revelstoke Mun  
Revelstoke Prov  
Salmo Prov  
Salmon Arm Mun  
Salmon Arm Prov  
Sicamous Prov  
Slocan Lake Prov  
Spallumcheen Mun  
Sparwood Prov  
Summerland Mun  
T'Kumlups Prov  
Trail & Greater District Prov  
Trail Mun  
Vernon Mun  
Vernon Prov  
West Kelowna Mun

### **MUNICIPAL POLICE MODEL IN TRANSITION** Surrey Mun<sup>2,3</sup>

### **MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS**

Abbotsford Mun  
Central Saanich Mun  
Delta Mun  
Nelson Mun  
New Westminster Mun  
Oak Bay Mun  
Port Moody Mun  
Saanich Mun  
Vancouver Mun  
Victoria Mun  
West Vancouver Mun

### **INDIGENOUS SELF-ADMINISTERED POLICE SERVICE**

Stl'atl'imx Tribal Police

*Mun = Municipal  
Prov = Provincial*

## Indigenous Policing Services Statistics, 2022

### FIRST NATIONS COMMUNITIES POLICED BY DETACHMENT

Detachment	Auth.Strength	Detachment	Auth.Strength
<b>Agassiz &amp; Chilliwack - Upper Fraser Valley<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Dease Lake</b>	<b>2</b>
Chehalis First Nation		Dease River First Nation	
Sto:lo (Scowlitz First Nation)		Iskut First Nation	
Kwantlen First Nation, Soowahlie First Nation, Shxw'ow'hamel First Nation, Seabird Island First Nation, Chawathil First Nation, Kwaw-kwaw-Apilt First Nation, Cheam First Nation		Tahltan Council	
<b>Ahousaht / Tofino</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Enderby</b>	<b>1</b>
Ahousaht First Nation		Spallumcheen	
<b>Alert Bay</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Fort St. James</b>	<b>4</b>
Da'Naxda'xw First Nation		Nak'azdli First Nation	
Gwawaenuk First Nation		Tl'azt'en First Nation	
Namgis First Nation		<b>Fort St. John</b>	<b>3</b>
Tlowitsis First Nation		Blueberry River First Nation	
Tsawataineuk First Nation		Doig River First Nation	
<b>Alexis Creek</b>	<b>3</b>	Halfway River First Nation	
Alexis Creek First Nation		<b>Kamloops</b>	<b>4</b>
Stone First Nation		Kamloops First Nation	
Xeni Gwet'in First Nation		Skeetchestn First Nation	
Anaham First Nation		Whispering Pines / Clinton First Nation	
<b>Anahim Lake</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Keremeos</b>	<b>1</b>
Ulkatcho First Nation		Lower Similkameen	
<b>Bella Bella</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>West Kelowna</b>	<b>3</b>
Heiltsuk First Nation		Westbank First Nation	
Oweekeno First Nation		<b>Kitimat</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Bella Coola</b>	<b>1</b>	Kitimaat First Nation (Haisla)	
Nuxalk First Nation		<b>Ladysmith</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Burns Lake</b>	<b>3</b>	Chemainus First Nation	
Burns Lake First Nation		<b>Lake Cowichan</b>	<b>1</b>
Cheslatta Carrier First Nation		Titidaht First Nation	
Nee-Tahi-Buhn First Nation		<b>Lisims/Nass Valley</b>	<b>3</b>
Skin Tyee First Nation		Nisga'a	
Wet'su'wet'en First Nation		<b>Lytton</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Campbell River</b>	<b>1</b>	Cooks Ferry Indian Band	
Campbell River First Nation		Kanaka Bar Indian Band	
Cape Mudge First Nation (We Wai Kai)		Lytton First Nation	
Homalco First Nation		Nicomen Indian Band	
<b>Chase</b>	<b>1</b>	Siska Indian Band	
Little Shuswap Lake		Skuppah Indian Band	
Neskonlith		<b>Mackenzie</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chetwynd</b>		McLeod Lake Indian Band	
Saulteau	<b>0.5</b>	<b>Masset</b>	<b>2</b>
West Moberly First Nation	<b>0.5</b>	Old Masset Village Council	
<b>Cranbrook</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Merriitt</b>	<b>4</b>
Akisqu'nuk First Nation		Coldwater Council	
Lower Kootenay First Nation		Lower Nicola Council	
St. Mary's First Nation		Nooaitch Council	
Tobacco Plains Indian Band		Shackan Council	
		Upper Nicola Council	
		<b>Nanaimo</b>	
		Nanoose First Nation	<b>0.5</b>
		Snuneymuxw Council	<b>1.5</b>

## FIRST NATIONS COMMUNITIES POLICED BY DETACHMENT, CONTINUED

Detachment	Auth.Strength	Detachment	Auth.Strength
<b>New Hazelton</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Quesnel</b>	<b>2</b>
Gitanmaax First Nation		Alexandria Council	
Gitanyow First Nation		Kluskus Council (Lhoosk'uz Dene Govt)	
Gitsegukla First Nation		Nazko Council	
Gitwangak First Nation		Red Bluff Council (Lhtako Dene Nation)	
Glen Vowell First Nation		<b>Sidney / North Saanich</b>	<b>2</b>
Hagwilget First Nation		Pauquachin First Nation	
Kispiox First Nation		Tsartlip First Nation	
<b>North Cowichan</b>	<b>4</b>	Tsawout First Nation	
Cowichan Tribes		Tseycum First Nation	
<b>North Vancouver</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Smithers</b>	<b>2</b>
Burrard (Tsleil-Waututh) First Nation		Moricetown First Nation	
Squamish First Nation		Fort Babine First Nation	
<b>Northern Rockies</b>	<b>2</b>	Lake Babine Nation	
Fort Nelson First Nation		<b>Sunshine Coast</b>	<b>2</b>
Prophet River First Nation		Sechelt Council	
<b>Oliver</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Surrey</b>	<b>1.5</b>
Osoyoos First Nation		Semiahmoo First Nation	
<b>One Hundred Mile House</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Takla Landing</b>	<b>2</b>
Canim Lake Council		Takla Lake First Nation	
<b>Penticton</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Terrace</b>	<b>1</b>
Penticton Indian Band		Kitselas First Nation	
<b>Port Alberni</b>		Kitsumkalum First Nation	
Hupacasath First Nation	<b>2</b>	<b>Tsay Keh Dene</b>	<b>2</b>
Tseshah First Nation		Kwadacha First Nation	
Huu-ay-aht First Nation	<b>2</b>	Tsay Keh Dene First Nation	
Uchucklesaht First Nation		<b>Ucluelet</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Port Hardy</b>	<b>2</b>	Toquaht First Nation	
Gwa'Sala-Nakwaxda'xw First Nation		Yuulu?il?ath First Nation	
Kwakiutl First Nation		<b>Vanderhoof</b>	<b>1</b>
Quatsino First Nation		Saik'uz First Nation	
<b>Port McNeil (Tahsis)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Vernon</b>	<b>1</b>
Ka:'yu:'k't'h / Che:k:tlas7et'h' First Nation		Okanagan First Nation	
<b>Powell River</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Westshore</b>	<b>1</b>
Sliammon Council		Esquimalt Council	
<b>Prince Rupert</b>		Songhees Council	
Gitxaala First Nation	<b>3</b>	<b>Williams Lake</b>	
Gitga'at First Nation		Canoe Creek First Nation	<b>2</b>
Kitasoo First Nation	<b>2</b>	Esk'etemc First Nation	
Lax-kw'alaams First Nation	<b>3</b>	Soda Creek Council	<b>2</b>
<b>Queen Charlotte</b>	<b>2</b>	Williams Lake Council	
Skidegate Council		<b>"E" Division</b>	
		Program Administrator	<b>1</b>
		Recruiter	<b>1</b>

## Municipal Police Statistics, 2022

### MUNICIPAL POLICE UNITS (RCMP): 5,000 TO 14,999 POPULATION

Municipality	Population	Auth. Strength	Adjusted Strength <sup>6</sup>	Pop Per Officer	CCC Offences	Crime Rate	Case Load	Total Costs <sup>7</sup>	Cost Per Capita
Armstrong Mun	5,671	4	4	1,418	227	40	57	\$602,488	\$106
Castlegar Mun	8,750	13	13	673	962	110	74	\$2,082,227	\$238
Coldstream Mun	11,890	7	7	1,699	304	26	43	\$1,419,035	\$119
Comox Mun <sup>8</sup>	15,373	12	12	1,325	563	37	49	\$2,111,118	\$137
Creston Mun	5,693	7	7	813	530	93	76	\$1,111,209	\$195
Dawson Creek Mun	13,220	25	25	529	2,300	174	92	\$4,836,321	\$366
Duncan Mun <sup>48</sup>	5,363	8	8	670	1,016	189	127	\$875,307	\$163
Fernie Mun	6,270	6	6	1,045	245	39	41	\$1,228,994	\$196
Hope Mun <sup>6</sup>	6,699	14	15	436	1,261	188	82	\$2,545,403	\$380
Kent Mun <sup>6</sup>	6,948	6	7	1,061	368	53	56	\$1,358,501	\$196
Kimberley Mun	8,394	8	8	1,049	338	40	42	\$1,322,387	\$158
Kitimat Mun	8,647	20	20	432	950	110	48	\$3,679,894	\$426
Ladysmith Mun	9,352	8	8	1,169	499	53	62	\$1,484,406	\$159
Merritt Mun	7,617	17	17	448	1,253	165	74	\$3,112,468	\$409
Metchosin Mun <sup>48</sup>	5,142	3	3	1,714	74	14	25	\$401,462	\$78
North Saanich Mun	12,671	11	11	1,152	382	30	35	\$2,121,883	\$167
Oliver Mun <sup>48</sup>	5,619	5	5	1,124	409	73	82	\$814,558	\$145
Osoyoos Mun	5,630	6	6	938	404	72	67	\$1,193,479	\$212
Parksville Mun	14,094	17	17	829	1,244	88	73	\$2,786,217	\$198
Peachland Mun	6,159	4	4	1,540	211	34	53	\$887,627	\$144
Powell River Mun	14,148	20	20	707	1,306	92	65	\$2,960,889	\$209
Prince Rupert Mun	13,175	36	36	366	2,187	166	61	\$6,706,193	\$509
Qualicum Beach Mun	9,397	8	8	1,175	259	28	32	\$1,232,006	\$131
Quesnel Mun	10,198	23	23	443	2,285	224	99	\$4,701,396	\$461
Revelstoke Mun	8,439	14	14	603	496	59	35	\$2,014,940	\$239
Sechelt Mun <sup>6</sup>	11,233	12	13	873	1,064	95	83	\$2,609,691	\$232
Sidney Mun	12,569	16	16	786	613	49	38	\$2,851,681	\$227
Smithers Mun	5,725	11	11	520	946	165	86	\$2,316,676	\$405
Spallumcheen Mun	5,693	4	4	1,423	185	32	46	\$848,016	\$149
Summerland Mun	12,924	9	9	1,436	667	52	74	\$1,449,947	\$112
Terrace Mun	13,384	28	28	478	2,702	202	97	\$4,917,633	\$367
Trail Mun	8,207	14	14	586	1,013	123	72	\$2,208,740	\$269
View Royal Mun	12,606	13	13	944	543	43	41	\$1,835,465	\$146
Whistler Mun <sup>6</sup>	13,537	25	25	541	875	65	35	\$4,397,803	\$325
Williams Lake Mun	11,385	25	25	455	2,195	193	88	\$5,003,014	\$439
<b>Total</b>	<b>331,822</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>462</b>	<b>719</b>	<b>30,876</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>\$82,029,074</b>	<b>\$247</b>

### MUNICIPAL POLICE UNITS (RCMP): 15,000 POPULATION OR HIGHER<sup>2</sup>

Municipality	Population	Auth. Strength	Adjusted Strength <sup>6</sup>	Pop Per Officer	CCC Offences	Crime Rate	Case Load	Total Costs <sup>7</sup>	Cost Per Capita
Burnaby Mun <sup>6</sup>	270,264	301	320	845	14,675	54	46	\$73,815,519	\$273
Campbell River Mun	37,683	45	45	837	5,619	149	125	\$8,798,890	\$233
Chilliwack Mun <sup>6,9</sup>	101,677	146	159	640	10,337	102	65	\$33,898,331	\$333
Colwood Mun	20,782	21	21	1,009	1,165	56	57	\$4,851,955	\$233
Coquitlam Mun <sup>6,9</sup>	159,355	168	176	904	7,416	47	42	\$38,852,492	\$244
Courtenay Mun	29,984	31	31	955	4,278	143	136	\$6,744,469	\$225
Cranbrook Mun	21,894	28	28	782	2,331	106	83	\$6,031,424	\$275
Fort St. John Mun	22,335	38	38	588	2,884	129	76	\$9,186,051	\$411
Kamloops Mun	103,159	142	142	726	14,818	144	104	\$31,136,988	\$302

## MUNICIPAL POLICE UNITS (RCMP): 15,000 POPULATION OR HIGHER, CONTINUED

Municipality	Population	Auth. Strength	Adjusted Strength <sup>6</sup>	Pop Per Officer	CCC Offences	Crime Rate	Case Load	Total Costs <sup>7</sup>	Cost Per Capita
Kelowna Mun	153,402	222	222	691	19,699	128	89	\$47,824,425	\$312
Lake Country Mun <sup>48</sup>	17,372	18	18	965	752	43	42	\$2,821,584	\$162
Langford Mun	49,318	61	61	808	2,587	52	42	\$12,328,477	\$250
Langley City Mun <sup>9</sup>	30,084	51	57	532	4,712	157	83	\$14,815,230	\$492
Langley Township Mun <sup>6,9</sup>	142,717	159	170	839	8,667	61	51	\$37,302,616	\$261
Maple Ridge Mun <sup>6,9</sup>	96,684	105	114	846	6,713	69	59	\$25,943,802	\$268
Mission Mun <sup>6</sup>	43,706	53	57	760	4,187	96	73	\$14,768,654	\$338
Nanaimo Mun <sup>9</sup>	104,443	158	158	661	12,932	124	82	\$33,405,957	\$320
North Cowichan Mun	33,358	32	32	1,042	2,801	84	88	\$7,059,742	\$212
North Vancouver City Mun <sup>6,10</sup>	62,641	68	69	913	4,385	70	64	\$14,998,521	\$239
North Vancouver District Mun <sup>6,10</sup>	95,164	87	87	1,094	3,212	34	37	\$19,807,936	\$208
Penticton Mun	36,821	55	55	669	7,211	196	131	\$11,092,887	\$301
Pitt Meadows Mun <sup>6,9,11</sup>	20,399	23	25	830	1,038	51	42	\$5,598,143	\$274
Port Alberni Mun	19,526	34	34	574	3,317	170	98	\$8,895,265	\$456
Port Coquitlam Mun <sup>6,9</sup>	65,240	76	80	817	3,491	54	44	\$16,310,430	\$250
Prince George Mun	82,103	143	143	574	15,083	184	105	\$30,712,797	\$374
Richmond Mun <sup>6,12</sup>	222,954	286	292	764	12,197	55	42	\$67,693,103	\$304
Salmon Arm Mun	20,109	21	21	958	1,552	77	74	\$4,543,318	\$226
Sooke Mun <sup>48</sup>	15,991	14	14	1,142	765	48	55	\$2,135,936	\$134
Squamish Mun <sup>6,9</sup>	24,165	26	28	867	1,684	70	60	\$6,257,418	\$259
Vernon Mun	45,526	56	56	813	5,906	130	105	\$14,529,305	\$319
West Kelowna Mun	38,745	34	34	1,140	2,118	55	62	\$7,647,262	\$197
White Rock Mun <sup>6</sup>	21,807	26	27	812	1,562	72	58	\$6,974,021	\$320
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,209,408</b>	<b>2,728</b>	<b>2,813</b>	<b>785</b>	<b>190,094</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>\$626,782,948</b>	<b>\$284</b>

## MUNICIPAL POLICE MODEL IN TRANSITION<sup>2,3</sup>

Municipality	Population	Auth. Strength	Adjusted Strength <sup>6</sup>	Pop. Per Officer	CCC Offences	Crime Rate	Case Load	Total Costs <sup>7</sup>	Cost Per Capita
Surrey RCMP (POJ)		673	673					\$156,537,753	
Surrey Police Service		350	350					\$66,469,188	
<b>Surrey Mun Total</b>	<b>633,373</b>	<b>1,023</b>	<b>1,023</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>39,278</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>\$223,006,941</b>	<b>\$352</b>

## MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS<sup>2</sup>

Municipality	Population	Auth. Strength <sup>13</sup>	Adjusted Strength <sup>6</sup>	Pop. Per Officer	CCC Offences	Crime Rate	Case Load	Total Costs <sup>7,13</sup>	Cost Per Capita
Abbotsford Mun <sup>6,9</sup>	168,608	210	217	776	7,927	47	36	\$59,901,204	\$355
Central Saanich Mun	18,689	23	23	813	479	26	21	\$5,086,018	\$272
Delta Mun <sup>6,9,14</sup>	115,605	194	197	587	4,649	40	24	\$45,463,138	\$393
Nelson City Mun	11,467	20	20	573	976	85	49	\$4,659,264	\$406
New Westminster Mun <sup>6</sup>	85,708	114	117	734	5,187	61	44	\$30,536,741	\$356
Oak Bay Mun <sup>15</sup>	19,211	21	21	915	500	26	24	\$6,043,544	\$315
Port Moody Mun <sup>6</sup>	36,792	52	54	686	966	26	18	\$13,204,559	\$359
Saanich Mun	125,853	165	165	763	4,622	37	28	\$39,352,521	\$313
Vancouver Mun <sup>6</sup>	707,667	1,348	1,348	525	44,911	63	33	\$373,932,988	\$528
Victoria Mun <sup>16</sup>	115,545	255	255	453	11,550	100	45	\$63,911,556	\$553
West Vancouver Mun <sup>6,9</sup>	48,792	79	82	597	2,518	52	31	\$19,178,587	\$393
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,453,937</b>	<b>2,481</b>	<b>2,498</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>84,285</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>\$661,270,120</b>	<b>\$455</b>

Participating LMD Integrated Team municipalities and their adjusted strength figures, including the Municipal Police Units (RCMP) Regular Members and Municipal Police Department's sworn officers, are *italicized* in the Municipal Police Statistics, 2022 table. The adjusted strength has been used to calculate population per officer and case load.

See *Endnotes and Police Resource Definitions and Data Qualifiers* on page 23 and page 28, respectively for additional explanatory notes.

## Provincial Police Statistics, 2022

### INDIGENOUS SELF-ADMINISTERED POLICE SERVICES

Policing Jurisdiction	Population	Auth. Strength	CCC Offences	Crime Rate	Case Load
Stl'atl'imx Tribal Police Service	3,121	14	339	109	24
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,121</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>24</b>

### JURISDICTIONS POLICED BY THE PROVINCIAL POLICE SERVICE (RCMP)

Policing Jurisdiction	Population	Assigned GD/GIS	CCC Offences	Crime Rate	Case Load
Agassiz Prov	4,102	9	600	146	67
Alert Bay Prov	1,335	4	162	121	41
Alexis Creek Prov	1,540	6	72	47	12
Anahim Lake Prov	669	4	79	118	20
Armstrong Prov <sup>17</sup>	525	3	18	34	6
Ashcroft Prov	3,936	6	382	97	64
Atlin Prov	543	3	98	180	33
Barnston Island Prov <sup>4</sup>	205	1	2	10	2
Barriere Prov	4,261	4	170	40	43
Bella Bella Prov	1,837	5	262	143	52
Bella Coola Prov	2,173	4	240	110	60
Boston Bar Prov	678	3	148	218	49
Bowen Island Prov	4,058	3	98	24	33
Burns Lake Prov	6,074	12	814	134	68
Campbell River Prov	5,951	8	1,081	182	135
Chase Prov	9,164	9	708	77	79
Chetwynd Prov	5,529	10	603	109	60
Chilliwack Prov	6,477	9	676	104	75
Clearwater Prov	4,607	6	216	47	36
Clinton Prov	1,932	4	115	60	29
Columbia Valley Prov	11,121	11	804	72	73
Comox Valley Prov	30,126	19	1,301	43	68
Coquitlam Prov	3,195	3	61	19	20
Cranbrook Prov	7,496	4	332	44	83
Creston Prov	8,831	6	338	38	56
Dawson Creek Prov	7,443	6	392	53	65
Dease Lake Prov	1,231	7	104	84	15
Duncan Prov	10,907	21	1,856	170	88
Elk Valley Detachment <sup>18</sup>	9,772	13	385	39	30
<i>Elkford Prov</i>	2,857	3	83	29	28
<i>Fernie</i>	2,192	4	123	56	31
<i>Sparwood</i>	4,723	5	179	38	36
Enderby Prov	7,593	8	403	53	50
Falkland Prov	3,130	3	68	22	23
Fort St. James Prov	4,262	14	1,211	284	87
Fort St. John Prov	14,621	10	609	42	61
Fraser Lake Prov	2,816	5	192	68	38
Gabriola Island Prov	4,624	3	166	36	55
Golden Prov	7,890	11	403	51	37
Hope Prov	1,496	5	235	157	47
Houston Granisle Prov <sup>19</sup>	4,716	11	768	163	70
Hudsons Hope Prov	1,291	3	46	36	15
Kelowna Prov	18,559	16	1,887	102	118
Keremeos Prov <sup>20</sup>	5,320	6	377	71	66

## JURISDICTIONS POLICED BY THE PROVINCIAL POLICE SERVICE (RCMP), CONTINUED

Policing Jurisdiction	Population	Assigned GD/GIS	CCC Offences	Crime Rate	Case Load
Kimberley Prov	2,512	2	52	21	26
Kitimat Prov	478	4	60	126	15
Kootenay Boundary Regional <sup>21</sup>	55,156	53	2538	46	48
<i>Castlegar</i>	6,734	3	267	40	89
<i>Grand Forks</i>	9,336	10	421	45	42
<i>Kaslo</i>	2,551	3	179	70	60
<i>Midway</i>	2,926	4	203	69	51
<i>Nakusp</i>	3,620	4	244	67	61
<i>Nelson</i>	12,895	6	428	33	71
<i>Salmo</i>	2,843	4	167	59	42
<i>Slocan Lake</i>	2,059	3	144	70	48
<i>Trail &amp; Greater District</i>	12,192	8	485	40	61
Ladysmith Prov	6,722	5	491	73	98
Lake Cowichan Prov	6,945	10	478	69	48
Lillooet Prov	3,020	7	390	129	56
Lisims-Nass Valley Prov	1,918	5	380	198	76
Logan Lake Prov	2,933	3	163	56	54
Lumby Prov	6,745	5	183	27	37
Lytton Prov	1,857	4	21	11	5
Mackenzie Prov	3,746	10	516	138	52
Masset Prov	1,952	7	427	219	61
McBride Prov	1,803	4	81	45	20
Merritt Prov	3,936	5	254	65	51
Mission Prov	4,906	5	300	61	60
Nanaimo Prov	15,644	8	816	52	102
New Hazelton Prov	5,890	12	855	145	71
Nootka Sound Prov	1,906	6	122	64	20
North Vancouver Prov <sup>22</sup>	51	2	433	8,490	217
Northern Rockies Prov <sup>46</sup>	4,901	16	969	198	61
Oceanside Prov	28,633	12	1,149	40	96
Oliver Prov <sup>20</sup>	4,739	8	688	145	89
One Hundred Mile House Prov	14,664	14	741	51	53
Osoyoos Prov <sup>20</sup>	2,596	4	166	64	44
Outer Gulf Islands Prov	5,275	5	159	30	32
Pemberton Prov	5,253	9	230	44	26
Penticton Prov <sup>20</sup>	12,587	8	722	57	93
Port Alberni Prov	8,478	8	458	54	57
Port Alice Prov	722	2	32	44	16
Port Hardy Prov	5,727	13	1,151	201	89
Port McNeill Prov	4,498	9	303	67	34
Powell River Prov	5,944	5	296	50	59
Prince George Prov <sup>23</sup>	14,612	7	433	30	62
Prince Rupert Prov	1,829	8	202	110	25
Princeton Prov	5,849	7	496	85	71
Quadra Island Prov	4,059	4	215	53	54
Queen Charlotte City Prov	2,639	5	159	60	32
Quesnel Prov	13,831	10	612	44	61
Revelstoke Prov	733	2	64	87	32
Ridge Meadows Prov <sup>24,25</sup>	10	3	14	--	5
Salmon Arm Prov	10,652	5	482	45	96
Salt Spring Island Prov	11,828	8	533	45	67



## JURISDICTIONS POLICED BY THE PROVINCIAL POLICE SERVICE (RCMP), CONTINUED

Policing Jurisdiction	Population	Assigned GD/GIS	CCC Offences	Crime Rate	Case Load
Sayward Prov	773	3	56	72	19
Shawnigan Lake Prov	20,088	11	809	40	74
Sicamous Prov	4,244	6	262	62	44
Sidney Prov	3,942	4	235	60	59
Smithers Prov	8,147	6	443	54	74
Sooke Prov	5,487	4	340	62	85
Squamish Prov <sup>26,27</sup>	2,143	6	113	53	19
Stewart Prov	437	4	47	108	12
Sunshine Coast Prov	21,632	22	1,086	50	49
T'Kumluvs Prov <sup>23,28</sup>	10,441	9	846	81	94
Takla Landing Prov <sup>28</sup>	205	2	87	424	44
Terrace Prov <sup>23,28</sup>	8,042	8	428	53	54
Texada Island Prov <sup>28</sup>	1,177	2	49	42	25
Tofino Prov <sup>29</sup>	3,926	8	548	140	69
Tsay Keh Dene Prov	581	4	278	478	70
Tumbler Ridge Prov	2,240	5	88	39	18
Ucluelet Prov	2,937	4	195	66	49
University Prov	18,554	17	1,235	67	73
Valemount Prov	1,598	6	153	96	26
Vanderhoof Prov	8,946	13	874	98	67
Vernon Prov	13,103	9	474	36	53
Wells Prov	347	3	28	81	9
West Shore Prov	5,040	4	211	42	53
Whistler Prov	294	4	26	88	7
Williams Lake Prov <sup>30</sup>	13,124	9	529	40	59
<b>Total</b>	<b>687,663</b>	<b>799</b>	<b>46,756</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>59</b>

See *Endnotes and Police Resource Definitions and Data Qualifiers* on page 23 and page 28, respectively for additional explanatory notes.

## Police Statistics Summary, 2022

Policing Jurisdiction	Population	Auth. Strength <sup>31</sup>	Pop. Per Officer	CCC Offences	Crime Rate	Case Load
<b>MUNICIPAL POLICE UNITS (RCMP) TOTAL</b>	<b>2,541,230</b>	<b>3,275</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>220,970</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>67</b>
<i>Between 5,000 and 14,999 Population</i>	331,822	462	719	30,876	93	67
<i>15,000 Population or Higher<sup>2</sup></i>	2,209,408	2,813	785	190,094	86	68
<b>MUNICIPAL POLICE MODEL IN TRANSITION<sup>2,3</sup></b>	<b>633,373</b>	<b>1,023</b>	<b>619</b>	<b>39,278</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS</b>	<b>1,453,937</b>	<b>2,498</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>84,285</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>PROVINCIAL POLICE SERVICE (RCMP)</b>	<b>687,663</b>	<b>799<sup>32</sup></b>	<b>861</b>	<b>46,756</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>INDIGENOUS SELF-ADMINISTERED POLICE SERVICES</b>	<b>3,121</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>24</b>

See *Endnotes and Police Resource Definitions and Data Qualifiers* on page 23 and page 28, respectively for additional explanatory notes.

## Government Contributions to Policing, 2022

Type of Service <sup>33</sup>	Auth. Str. <sup>31</sup>	Population <sup>34</sup>	Total Police Costs Paid By:			
			Mun Govt <sup>35</sup>	Prov Govt <sup>36</sup>	Fed Govt <sup>37</sup>	Total
<b>Municipal Police Units (RCMP)<sup>38</sup></b>						
35 Units 5000 to 14,999 Population	462	331,822	\$82,029,074	-	\$26,941,126	\$108,970,200
32 Units 15,000 Population or Higher <sup>2</sup>	2,813	2,209,408	\$626,782,948	-	\$59,911,048	\$686,693,996
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,275</b>	<b>2,541,230</b>	<b>\$708,812,022</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$86,852,174</b>	<b>\$795,664,196</b>
<b>Municipal Police Model in Transition<sup>2</sup></b>						
<b>Total<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>1,023</b>	<b>633,373</b>	<b>\$223,006,941</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$16,299,098</b>	<b>\$239,306,039</b>
<b>11 Municipal Police Departments<sup>39</sup></b>						
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,498</b>	<b>1,453,937</b>	<b>\$661,270,120</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$878,917</b>	<b>\$662,149,037</b>
<b>Provincial Police Service (RCMP)</b>						
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,602</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$470,427,279</b>	<b>\$201,611,686</b>	<b>\$672,038,965</b>
<b>Indigenous Self-Administered Police Services<sup>40</sup></b>						
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3,121</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$1,361,368</b>	<b>\$1,474,815</b>	<b>\$2,836,183</b>
<b>Indigenous Policing Services<sup>41,42</sup></b>						
<b>Total</b>	<b>117.5</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$11,584,788</b>	<b>\$12,550,187</b>	<b>\$24,134,975</b>
<b>BRITISH COLUMBIA TOTAL</b>	<b>9,530</b>	<b>5,319,324</b>	<b>\$ 1,593,089,083</b>	<b>\$483,373,435</b>	<b>\$319,666,877</b>	<b>\$2,396,129,395</b>

See *Endnotes and Police Resource Definitions and Data Qualifiers* on page 23 and page 28, respectively for additional explanatory notes.

## British Columbia Authorized Strength<sup>43</sup> by Responsibility 2013-2022

POLICING RESPONSIBILITY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
<b>DIVISION ADMINISTRATION<sup>44</sup> (RCMP)</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>RCMP FEDERAL SERVICE</b>	<b>1,021</b>	<b>1,058</b>	<b>1,038</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>1,059</b>	<b>1,044</b>	<b>1,038</b>	<b>965</b>	<b>957</b>	<b>947</b>
<i>Federal Criminal Law</i>	886	906	905	918	928	911	903	835	827	821
<i>Protective Policing</i>	135	152	133	132	131	133	135	130	130	126
<b>PROVINCIAL POLICE SERVICE<sup>45</sup> (RCMP)</b>	<b>2,602</b>	<b>2,602</b>	<b>2,602</b>	<b>2,602</b>	<b>2,602</b>	<b>2,602</b>	<b>2,602</b>	<b>2,602</b>	<b>2,602</b>	<b>2,602</b>
<i>Provincial, District &amp; Specialized Resources</i>	1,834	1,830	1,830	1,827	1,829	1,829	1,827	1,801	1,794	1,803
<i>Provincial Detachments – General Duty &amp; General Investigation Service</i>	768	772	772	775	773	773	775	801	808	799
<b>MUNICIPAL POLICE UNITS<sup>2</sup> (RCMP)</b>	<b>3,429</b>	<b>3,468</b>	<b>3,606</b>	<b>3,672</b>	<b>3,730</b>	<b>3,799</b>	<b>3,876</b>	<b>3,931</b>	<b>3,972</b>	<b>3,187</b>
<b>MUNICIPAL POLICE MODEL IN TRANSITION<sup>2,3</sup></b>										<b>1,023</b>
<b>MUNICIPAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS</b>	<b>2,407</b>	<b>2,405</b>	<b>2,407</b>	<b>2,422</b>	<b>2,429</b>	<b>2,440</b>	<b>2,447</b>	<b>2,478</b>	<b>2,476<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>2,481</b>
<b>FIRST NATIONS COMMUNITY POLICE SERVICES<sup>41</sup></b>	<b>108.5</b>	<b>108.5</b>	<b>108.5</b>	<b>108.5</b>	<b>108.5</b>	<b>108.5</b>	<b>112.5</b>	<b>117.5</b>	<b>117.5</b>	<b>117.5</b>
<b>INDIGENOUS SELF-ADMINISTERED POLICE SERVICES</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>SOUTH COAST BRITISH COLUMBIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY POLICE<sup>46</sup></b>	<b>167</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>184</b>
<b>VANCOUVER INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT<sup>47</sup></b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>BRITISH COLUMBIA TOTAL</b>	<b>9,868</b>	<b>9,958</b>	<b>10,070</b>	<b>10,159</b>	<b>10,239</b>	<b>10,312</b>	<b>10,400</b>	<b>10,418</b>	<b>10,450</b>	<b>10,683</b>

See *Endnotes and Police Resource Definitions and Data Qualifiers* on page 23 and page 28, respectively for additional explanatory notes.

## Authorized Strength by Jurisdiction, 2013-2022

Policing Jurisdiction	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Abbotsford Mun	209	204	204	204	206	210	212	213	211	210
Agassiz Prov <sup>48</sup>	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	9
Alert Bay Prov	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Alexis Creek Prov	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Anahim Lake Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Armstrong Mun <sup>48</sup>	--	--	--	--	3	3	4	4	4	4
Armstrong Prov <sup>48</sup>	5	6	6	6	3	3	3	3	3	3
Ashcroft Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	6	6
Atlin Prov	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Barnston Island Prov <sup>4</sup>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1
Barriere Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Bella Bella Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Bella Coola Prov	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Boston Bar Prov	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Bowen Island Prov	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Burnaby Mun	277	277	277	277	277	285	297	301	301	301
Burns Lake Prov	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	12	12	12
Campbell River Mun	43	43	43	43	43	45	45	45	45	45
Campbell River Prov	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	8	8	8
Castlegar Mun	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
Central Saanich Mun	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
Chase Prov	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Chetwynd Prov	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Chilliwack Mun	107	107	108	110	120	125	132	138	143	146
Chilliwack Prov	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	9
Clearwater Prov	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Clinton Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Coldstream Mun	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Columbia Valley Prov	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
Colwood Mun	17	17	17	17	17	17	18	18	20	21
Comox Mun <sup>49</sup>	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Comox Valley Prov	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
Coquitlam Mun	152	152	156	162	162	162	166	168	168	168
Coquitlam Prov	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Courtenay Mun	30	30	30	30	30	30	31	31	31	31
Cranbrook Mun	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26	28	28
Cranbrook Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Creston Mun <sup>48</sup>	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Creston Prov	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Dawson Creek Mun	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Dawson Creek Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	6	6	6
Dease Lake Prov	6	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Delta Mun	170	173	173	180	185	190	191	194	194	194
Duncan Mun <sup>48</sup>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	8
Duncan Prov <sup>48</sup>	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	25	26	21

## Authorized Strength by Jurisdiction, 2013-2022, Continued

Policing Jurisdiction	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Elk Valley Detachment <sup>48,50</sup>	18	18	18	18	13	13	13	13	13	13
<i>Elkford Prov</i>	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
<i>Fernie Prov</i>	9	9	9	9	4	4	4	4	4	4
<i>Sparwood Prov</i>	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Enderby Prov	6	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Falkland Prov	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Fernie Mun <sup>48</sup>	--	--	--	--	5	5	6	6	6	6
Fort St. James Prov	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	14	14	14
Fort St. John Mun	34	34	36	36	38	38	38	38	38	38
Fort St. John Prov	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Fraser Lake Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Gabriola Island Prov	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Golden Prov	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
Hope Mun	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	14
Hope Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Houston Granisle Prov <sup>51</sup>	6	9	9	9	9	9	9	11	11	11
Hudsons Hope Prov	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Kamloops Mun	124	124	136	136	136	142	142	142	142	142
Kelowna Mun	177	179	185	191	191	195	203	214	222	222
Kelowna Prov <sup>48</sup>	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	16	16	16
Kent Mun <sup>48</sup>	5	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Keremeos Prov <sup>20</sup>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Kimberley Mun	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Kimberley Prov	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Kitimat Mun	15	16	18	18	18	18	18	20	20	20
Kitimat Prov	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	4	4
Kootenay Boundary Regional Detachment <sup>21</sup>	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53	53
<i>Castlegar Prov</i>	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
<i>Grand Forks Prov</i>	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
<i>Kaslo Prov</i>	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
<i>Midway Prov</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
<i>Nakusp Prov</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
<i>Nelson Prov</i>	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
<i>Salmo Prov</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
<i>Slocan Lake Prov</i>	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
<i>Trail &amp; Greater District Prov</i>	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Ladysmith Mun	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	8	8	8
Ladysmith Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Lake Country Mun	12	12	12	12	12	13	13	18	18	18
Lake Cowichan Prov <sup>48</sup>	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Langford Mun	29	30	30	38	42	42	51	53	58	61
Langley City Mun	50	50	50	50	51	51	51	51	51	51
Langley Township Mun	134	135	138	140	140	144	145	155	155	159
Lillooet Prov	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7

## Authorized Strength by Jurisdiction, 2013-2022, Continued

Policing Jurisdiction	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Lisims-Nass Valley Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5
Logan Lake Prov	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Lumby Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Lytton Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Mackenzie Prov <sup>48</sup>	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Maple Ridge Mun	93	94	96	97	101	102	102	103	103	105
Masset Prov	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
McBride Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Merritt Mun	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	17	17	17
Merritt Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Metchosin Mun <sup>48</sup>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3
Mission Mun	50	50	50	51	52	53	53	53	53	53
Mission Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Nanaimo Mun	145	145	145	145	145	145	145	148	151	158
Nanaimo Prov	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	8	8
Nelson City Mun	17	17	19	19	19	18	18	18	18	20
New Hazelton Prov	10	10	10	11	11	11	11	12	12	12
New Westminster Mun	108	108	108	110	110	112	112	113	113	114
Nootka Sound Prov	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
North Cowichan Mun	31	31	31	31	31	32	32	32	32	32
North Saanich Mun	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
North Vancouver City Mun	64	64	64	64	65	66	68	68	68	68
North Vancouver District Mun	91	91	91	91	90	89	87	87	87	87
North Vancouver Prov	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Northern Rockies Mun <sup>48</sup>	11	11	11	11	--	--	--	--	--	--
Northern Rockies Prov <sup>48</sup>	4	4	4	4	15	15	15	16	16	16
Oak Bay Mun <sup>15</sup>	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23	21
Oceanside Prov	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
Oliver Mun <sup>48</sup>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5
Oliver Prov <sup>20,48</sup>	9	9	9	10	10	10	10	11	11	8
One Hundred Mile House Prov	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	14	14
Osoyoos Mun <sup>48</sup>	--	--	--	--	5	5	6	6	6	6
Osoyoos Prov <sup>20,48</sup>	9	9	9	9	4	4	4	4	4	4
Outer Gulf Islands Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Parksville Mun	16	16	16	16	16	17	17	17	17	17
Peachland Mun <sup>48</sup>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Pemberton Prov	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Penticton Mun	45	45	45	45	45	46	47	47	48	55
Penticton Prov <sup>20</sup>	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	8	8	8
Pitt Meadows Mun	23	22	22	22	23	23	23	23	23	23
Port Alberni Mun	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
Port Alberni Prov	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	8	8	8
Port Alice Prov	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Port Coquitlam Mun	67	67	67	71	74	74	76	76	76	76

## Authorized Strength by Jurisdiction, 2013-2022, Continued

Policing Jurisdiction	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Port Hardy Prov	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	13	13	13
Port McNeill Prov	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Port Moody Mun	50	51	51	51	51	52	52	52	52	52
Powell River Mun	18	18	18	19	19	19	19	20	20	20
Powell River Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Prince George Mun	128	128	135	138	140	142	142	142	142	143
Prince George Prov	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Prince Rupert Mun	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36	36
Prince Rupert Prov	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	8	8	8
Princeton Prov	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Quadra Island Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Qualicum Beach Mun	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Queen Charlotte City Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Quesnel Mun	21	21	21	21	21	21	23	23	23	23
Quesnel Prov	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	10	10	10
Revelstoke Mun	12	12	12	12	13	13	14	14	14	14
Revelstoke Prov	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Richmond Mun <sup>47</sup>	211	212	212	224	235	251	270	270	284	286
Ridge Meadows Prov	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Saanich Mun	156	156	157	161	161	161	161	166	166	165
Salmon Arm Mun	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	20	20	21
Salmon Arm Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Saltspring Island Prov	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Sayward Prov	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Sechelt Mun	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	12
Shawnigan Lake Prov	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
Sicamous Prov	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Sidney Mun	14	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15	16
Sidney Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Smithers Mun	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	10	10	11
Smithers Prov	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Sooke Mun	11	11	11	12	13	13	13	13	13	14
Sooke Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Spallumcheen Mun <sup>48</sup>	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4
Squamish Mun	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	26	26	26
Squamish Prov <sup>26,27</sup>	7	7	7	7	7	7	6	6	6	6
Stewart Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Summerland Mun	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Sunshine Coast Prov <sup>48</sup>	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
Surrey Mun <sup>2,3</sup>	673	703	803	819	831	843	843	843	843	1023
T'Kumluvs Prov	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	9	9	9
Takla Landing Prov	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
Terrace Mun	25	25	25	25	25	25	28	28	28	28
Terrace Prov	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	8	8	8
Texada Island Prov	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2



## Authorized Strength by Jurisdiction, 2013-2022, Continued

Policing Jurisdiction	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Tofino Prov	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Trail Mun	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
Tsay Keh Dene Prov	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4
Tumbler Ridge Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Ucluelet Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
University Prov	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
Valemount Prov	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
Vancouver Mun	1,327	1,327	1,327	1,327	1,327	1,327	1,327	1,348	1,348	1,348
Vanderhoof Prov <sup>52</sup>	9	9	9	10	10	10	13	13	13	13
Vernon Mun	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	56	56
Vernon Prov	12	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Victoria Mun <sup>48</sup>	243	243	243	245	245	245	249	249	249	255
View Royal Mun	8	9	9	10	10	10	11	12	12	13
Wells Prov	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
West Kelowna Mun <sup>48</sup>	23	23	23	24	26	28	29	29	30	34
West Shore Prov	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4
West Vancouver Mun	81	80	79	79	79	79	79	79	79	79
Whistler Mun	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	25	25	25
Whistler Prov	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
White Rock Mun	23	23	23	23	23	25	25	25	25	26
Williams Lake Mun	24	24	24	24	25	25	25	25	25	25
Williams Lake Prov	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9

Adjusted strength figures are not available for depictions of 10-year trend data. As a result, only authorized strengths and assigned GD/GIS for the Provincial Service are used in this table.

See *Endnotes and Police Resource Definitions and Data Qualifiers* on page 23 and page 28, respectively for additional explanatory notes.

## Endnotes

1. The federal government's contribution is in recognition of the benefits it receives as a result of the policing agreements associated with the provision of RCMP policing services.
2. Since Ministerial approval under s 23(1) of the *Police Act* was provided to the City of Surrey in 2020, the City has continued to transition its policing from a municipal police unit (RCMP) to its own municipal police department, the Surrey Police Service (SPS). This version of the PRBC publication is for the 2022 calendar year, during this time the Surrey Municipal Police Unit (RCMP) remained the City's police of jurisdiction (POJ) while the Surrey Police Board and SPS continued the necessary work to build the SPS. During 2022, SPS officers continued to be gradually operationally deployed within the Surrey Municipal Police Unit, while Surrey RCMP Members were gradually demobilized as part of the integrated RCMP/SPS transition period. Previously reported under the 'Municipal Police Units (RCMP)' section of this document, the Surrey Municipal Police Unit (RCMP) is excluded from the total 67 municipalities whose policing services are provided by the RCMP in this publication and is represented separately under 'Municipal Police Model in Transition' sections to reflect the integrated RCMP/SPS policing model until its completion, providing transparency throughout the transition process. *Note: The Surrey RCMP MPU authorized strengths and SPS sworn officer numbers, as well as the cost expenditures were reported by each police service separately, whereas crime statistics was reported for the municipality of Surrey.*
3. The authorized strength for the Surrey Municipal Police Unit reflects the combined resources from both Surrey's RCMP Municipal Police Unit and SPS, which includes additional resources needed for the establishment of SPS and/or awaiting operational deployment within the Surrey Municipal Police Unit. Caution should be used when reviewing Surrey's caseload as it is calculated on the total authorized strength of the two police agencies which includes these additional resources.
4. Barnston Island Prov (formerly Surrey Prov), a provincial jurisdiction, currently receives service from Surrey Municipal Unit (RCMP). With the City of Surrey's transition to the SPS, the Province created a new Provincial Police Unit, Barnston Island Prov, dedicated to the provision of policing services to Barnston Island under the terms of the PPSA. Historically, Surrey Prov statistics were included in Surrey Mun results. Reporting adjustments will be addressed in subsequent publications. As of March 2022, the Barnston Island Provincial Unit is operating from the Langley Detachment. Until technical issues are resolved over the next couple of years, calls for service for Barnston Island will still go through Surrey dispatch, and rerouted to Langley.
5. Members are based out of the Upper Fraser Valley Regional Detachment.
6. There are 6 Lower Mainland District (LMD) Integrated Teams that provide regional police services to participating LMD Municipal Police Units (RCMP), Provincial Police Service and Municipal Police Department: 1) Integrated Homicide Investigation Team (IHIT); 2) Integrated Emergency Response Team (IERT); 3) Integrated Police Dog Service (IPDS); 4) Integrated Forensic Identification Services (IFIS); 5) Integrated Collision Analyst Reconstruction Section (ICARS); and 6) Integrated Internal Investigator (III). **Adjusted strength** is a calculation that adjusts a municipal police agency's authorized strength to account for Integrated Team members who are assigned on a regional basis. For 2022, adjusted strength applies to LMD Integrated Teams participation only. This adjustment is based on a proportional allocation of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) utilization attributable to each municipality's financial contribution to LMD Integrated Teams participation for the 2022/2023 fiscal year. See page 28 for the definition of 'authorized strength'. Some LMD municipalities' authorized strength already includes or accounts for a portion of Integrated Team members; therefore, not all adjustments are a simple addition to authorized strength. The values reported have been rounded up to the nearest whole number after making the adjustments using exact values from the source data.
7. Total Costs refer to actual costs as reported by each municipality. For municipal police units (RCMP), total costs include the municipality's share of RCMP contract related costs (70% or 90%, depending on population) including integrated team costs, as well as any costs that are borne 100% by the municipality (e.g., accommodation costs). Total costs for municipal police departments refer to 100% of policing costs. As such, comparisons between municipal agencies should be made with caution.
8. BC Stats population estimates are used for the purpose of the publication; however, the Canada Census is used for determining policing responsibility under the *Police Act*. As a result, a municipality may show a population below or above the population range in their respective municipal police unit (RCMP) cost share categories.
9. Population figures include First Nations reserve populations.
10. The municipalities of North Vancouver City and North Vancouver District include three First Nations reserve lands within their boundaries. The designated land title names for these reserve lands are: Mission 1 (North Vancouver City); and, Seymour Creek 2 and Burrard Inlet 3 (North Vancouver District). Due to inconsistencies in scoring crime data to the appropriate jurisdictions the populations for these reserve lands were assigned to North Vancouver Prov (from 2006 to 2018); prior to 2006 the populations were assigned to North Vancouver District. In 2019, the populations for the reserve lands were realigned from North Vancouver Prov and added to the appropriate municipality. This realignment may result in changes in reporting; crime statistics should be used with caution.
11. In March 2020, the City of Pitt Meadows initiated a process to separate from the integrated Ridge Meadows Detachment (RCMP) and to have the Pitt Meadows Municipal Unit operate from a stand-alone detachment in the City of Pitt Meadows. Upon completion of a review by RCMP "E" Division and the development of a transition plan, the Ministry approved the City's request in October 2021 with the changes to take full effect upon completion of the detachment building (estimated late 2024).
12. In 2022, there were 30 member positions dedicated to airport security at the Vancouver International Airport. These members are administered through the Richmond Detachment (RCMP). The strength and cost data for these 30 members is excluded from the Richmond Municipal Unit because the Vancouver Airport Authority reimburses 100% of the cost of these services to the City of Richmond. Total Vancouver Airport 2022 costs were \$7,506,237.

## Endnotes, continued

13. Authorized strengths and their associated costs for the municipal departments have been adjusted to exclude secondments to other agencies as cost for these secondments would be borne by the seconded agency.
14. Population figures include Tsawwassen First Nation (TFN) land populations. Since 2007, TFN lands are policed by Delta Police Department under a Police Service Agreement between the City of Delta, Delta Police Board and TFN and not included in reported costs. For consistency with previous reporting, Delta Police Department's authorized strength includes one officer position to deliver enhanced, dedicated policing funded under the FNIPP, under an agreement with Canada, the Province of BC, City of Delta, Delta Police Board and TFN.
15. Due to a calculation error, the authorized strength for Oak Bay Police Department should have been reported as 23 in 2021.
16. The Victoria and Esquimalt Police Departments were amalgamated in 2003. In 2022, the population of Victoria was 96,390 persons and Esquimalt's was 19,155 persons. Of the total costs in 2022, \$8,736,709.71 (13.67%) was paid by Esquimalt for its policing services under the Agreement.
17. The jurisdictional boundaries for Armstrong Prov were realigned when the municipality of Armstrong became responsible for providing policing within their municipal boundary. This may have resulted in inaccurate reporting; therefore, the crime statistics should be used with caution.
18. The Elk Valley Integrated Detachment includes Elkford Prov, Fernie Prov, and Sparwood Prov. The Elk Valley Integrated Detachment authorized strength total includes one GIS member assigned to the detachment as a whole.
19. In July 2014, Houston Prov and Granisle Prov were formally amalgamated. Prior to this amalgamation, Houston/Granisle operated in an informally amalgamated manner from two Detachment offices; the main office in the District of Houston and the second in the Village of Granisle. The Granisle office remains and functions as a Community Policing Office.
20. In 2003, Oliver and Osoyoos Prov detachments were restructured into the integrated South Okanagan Detachment. From 2006 to 2012, additional GIS positions were assigned to the Detachment as a whole (in 2012, there were 4 GIS positions assigned to the South Okanagan Detachment). Effective 2013, South Okanagan Detachment de-integrated and Oliver Prov and Osoyoos Prov operate as stand-alone detachments and are reflected in this document as separate entities as they currently exist. The additional 4 GIS positions previously assigned to the South Okanagan Detachment continued to provide services to the wider region. In 2016, one of the 4 GIS shared positions was converted to a GD position and specifically assigned to Oliver. The remaining 3 GIS positions service the wider region and were split equally by adding 0.75 to the authorized strengths of Keremeos Prov, Penticton Prov, Oliver Prov and Osoyoos Prov.
21. The Kootenay Boundary Regional Detachment includes: Castlegar Prov, Grand Forks Prov, Kaslo Prov, Midway Prov, Nakusp Prov, Nelson Prov, Salmo Prov, Slocan Lake Prov, and Trail & Greater District Prov. The Kootenay Boundary Regional Detachment authorized strength total includes eight shared GD/GIS (3 officers in charge and 5 GIS) members assigned to the detachment as a whole.
22. The municipalities of North Vancouver City and North Vancouver District include three First Nations reserve lands within their boundaries. The designated land title names for these reserve lands are: Mission 1 (North Vancouver City); and, Seymour Creek 2 and Burrard Inlet 3 (North Vancouver District). Due to inconsistencies in scoring crime data to the appropriate jurisdictions, the populations for these reserve lands were assigned to North Vancouver Prov (from 2006 to 2018). In 2020, the populations for the reserve lands were realigned from North Vancouver Prov and added to the appropriate municipality. This realignment may result in changes in reporting; crime statistics should be used with caution.
23. In addition to the assigned GD/GIS outlined, the Provincial Police Service includes three Provincial Support Team (PST) units. The PST are based in Prince George, Terrace and Kamloops and were created as part of the Front-Line Resource Re-allocation initiative in 2020. These 14 positions are intended to provide temporary, mobile relief to Provincial Detachment Units throughout the Province.
24. The crime rate has not been included because it is not a meaningful indicator for Ridge Meadows Prov (due to the small residential population).
25. The integrated Ridge Meadows Detachment (RCMP) is comprised of the following jurisdictions: the City of Maple Ridge; the City of Pitt Meadows; and the Ridge Meadows provincial policing jurisdictions. In 2013/14 the RCMP revised the map boundaries that reside in PRIME-BC for each of the jurisdictions within the Ridge Meadows Detachment's area of responsibility. This realignment of jurisdictional boundaries likely resulted in changes in reporting; as a result, CCC volumes and crime rates prior to 2014 for these individual jurisdictions should be used with caution.
26. Squamish Prov includes 1 shared GD/GIS position that is assigned to the Sea-to-Sky Regional Detachment – an RCMP organizational structure that includes Whistler, Pemberton and Bowen Island in addition to Squamish.
27. Previously shown as a provincial GD position, 1 member position provides enhanced dedicated services to the Squamish First Nation reserve lands out of the Squamish Detachment. Due to RCMP changes in reporting lines, this position was re-aligned under the Integrated First Nations Unit, resulting in (-1) to Squamish Prov in 2020.
28. In the PRBC, 2021 report, the reporting for the CCC Offences, Crime Rate, and Case Load for T'Kumlups Prov, Takla Landing Prov, Terrace Prov, and Texada Island Prov were amended as follows:
  - T'Kumlups Prov: CCC Offences: 765; Crime Rate: 74; Case Load: 85;
  - Takla Landing Prov: CCC Offences: 109; Crime Rate: 534; Case Load: 55;
  - Terrace Prov: CCC Offences: 408; Crime Rate: 51; Case Load: 51;
  - Texada Island Prov: CCC Offences: 46; Crime Rate: 42; Case Load: 23.

## Endnotes, continued

29. Tofino Prov includes 2 Provincial Police Service GD positions located at the Ahousaht satellite office.
30. Cariboo Chilcotin Crime reduction resources became permanent in June 2021. This includes 6RM and 2.5PSE positions working out of North District Headquarters.
31. Authorized strength includes adjusted strength figures for jurisdictions participating in Lower Mainland District Integrated Teams.
32. Provincial Police Service represents the number of members assigned to GD/GIS functions at a detachment and does not include members assigned to specialized functions such as traffic enforcement, forensic identification or major case crimes, etc. See data qualifier on page 28.
33. Data for the South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority Police Service (SCBCTAPS) is not included in this table. In 2022, SCBCTAPS had an authorized strength of 184 positions and cost \$47,459,656 (paid for by TransLink, a private company).
34. Total Population includes 687,663 persons residing within municipalities with populations below 5,000 or unincorporated areas, served by the Provincial Police Service in 2022. This figure is not specified within the table under Provincial Police Service because it only represents rural/unincorporated detachments.
35. Total Costs for municipalities refer to actual costs for calendar year 2022 as reported by each municipality. For further information, see the Total Costs definition on page 29.
36. Police costs paid by the provincial government represent actual costs paid in fiscal year 2022/23.
37. Police costs paid by the federal government represent actual costs paid in fiscal year 2022/23 for their share of municipal police department integrated homicide investigative team (IHIT), municipal and provincial policing costs only; these figures only represent their share of the contract costs and exclude costs borne by the federal government which are over and above the contract costs. These figures also do not include the costs to Canada for Federal Service members operating in BC.
38. Total Costs for municipal police departments represent 100% of policing costs. *Note: IHIT costs (70% cost share) were added to their policing costs.*
39. Total Costs for municipal police units (RCMP) include the municipality's share of costs (70% or 90%, depending on population) for the provision of the RCMP as their service provider, as well as any costs that are borne 100% by the municipality (e.g. accommodation costs, support staff). Data for dedicated airport security positions at the Vancouver International Airport is not included in this table.
40. Total Costs paid by the provincial government include additional funding for police equipment, contract services and professional fees.
41. Authorized strength includes Aboriginal Community Constable Program members, which are gradually being converted to Community Tripartite Agreement under the Indigenous Policing Services (formerly First Nations Community Policing Services).
42. In 2022, the authorized strength was 117.5 member positions. Costs associated with enhanced police services provided by Delta Police Department to Tsawwassen First Nation (TFN), which are shared by the provincial and federal governments (48% and 52% respectively), are not included within this table. In 2022/23, the provincial government contributed \$97,979 and the federal government contributed \$106,144 for the position providing this enhanced service to TFN. The position is included in the authorized strength for Delta Police Department.
43. Adjusted strength figures are not available for depictions of 10-year trend data. As a result, only authorized strengths are used in this table. See page 28 for the definition of authorized strength.
44. Due to an RCMP calculation error, the 10-Year authorized strength figures for the Division Administration (RCMP) have been adjusted. See data qualifier 8 on page 29.
45. The authorized strength positions under Annex A of the *Provincial Police Service Agreement* (PPSA) upon signing the 2012 Agreement.
46. The South Coast British Columbia Transportation Authority Police Service (SCBCTAPS) was formed as a transit security department in October 2004 and converted to a designated police unit under the *Police Act* on December 4, 2005.
47. Vancouver Airport Authority signed a supplemental agreement to Richmond's *Municipal Police Unit Agreement* in 2012. At that time, the City of Richmond assumed the administrative and financial functions for payment of enhanced RCMP policing services to the airport through the Richmond Municipal detachment (RCMP). The airport authority reimburses Richmond 100% of the cost for the airport police. Authorized strength data for Richmond does not include Vancouver International Airport positions.
48. The following policing jurisdictions have been opened or closed subsequent to Canada Census results or detachment/departmental amalgamations. Where jurisdictions have been amalgamated, the data shown reflect the total reporting for both the present jurisdiction and the absorbed jurisdiction up to and including the year in which the jurisdictions were amalgamated.
  - 2003: Sparwood Prov, Fernie Prov and Elkford Prov were restructured into Elk Valley Detachment.  
 Oliver Prov and Osoyoos Prov were restructured into South Okanagan Detachment.  
 Sechelt Prov and Gibsons Prov amalgamated into Sunshine Coast Prov.  
 Esquimalt Police Department amalgamated with the Victoria Police Department.
  - 2004: Ditidaht First Nations Self-Administered Police Service (FNSAPS) was closed, and Lake Cowichan provincial detachment (RCMP) assumed policing responsibilities for the area.

## Endnotes, continued

- 2007: As a result of the 2006 Canada Census, the Township of Spallumcheen and the District of Mackenzie went under 5,000 population. Spallumcheen reverted to a provincial police service jurisdiction effective April 1, 2007. Mackenzie reverted to a provincial police service jurisdiction on April 1, 2008.
- 2009: The District of West Kelowna incorporated in 2007 with a population exceeding 15,000. The District continued to be policed by the provincial service as part of Kelowna Prov until they signed a *Municipal Police Unit Agreement* effective April 1, 2009. According to the 2006 Canada Census, the District of Kent went over 5,000 population. The District was policed by Agassiz Prov until they signed a *Municipal Police Unit Agreement* effective April 1, 2009.
- 2010: The former Northern Rockies Regional District incorporated as the first regional municipality in BC in 2009. The Northern Rockies Regional Municipality continued to be policed by the provincial service as part of Fort Nelson Prov until they signed a *Municipal Police Unit Agreement* effective April 1, 2010. The municipality was policed by Northern Rockies Mun from April 1, 2010 to March 31, 2012 (see also below) and the remaining area was policed by Northern Rockies Prov during this time (for the purposes of this table “Fort Nelson Prov” figures are reported under “Northern Rockies Prov”).
- 2012: According to the 2011 Canada Census, the municipalities of Creston, Peachland and Spallumcheen went over 5,000 population and, as a result, became responsible for providing policing and law enforcement services within their municipal boundaries. Each of these municipalities signed a *Municipal Police Unit Agreement* with the provincial government for the provision of RCMP to act as their municipal police unit effective April 1, 2012. Prior to 2012, Creston was policed by Creston Prov; Peachland was policed by Kelowna Prov; and Spallumcheen was policed by Armstrong Prov. In addition, due to 2011 Canada Census results, Northern Rockies Regional Municipality (NRRM) fell below 5,000 population, and responsibility for policing the municipality reverted back to the Provincial Police Service (Northern Rockies Prov) effective April 1, 2012.
- 2013: NRRM appealed their Census population figure with Statistics Canada. An investigation was conducted and Statistics Canada revised NRRM's Census count to 5,290. As a result, NRRM again became responsible for policing within its municipal boundaries effective April 1, 2013.
- 2017: According to the 2016 Canada Census, the municipalities of Armstrong, Fernie and Osoyoos went over 5,000 population and, as a result, became responsible for providing policing within their municipal boundaries, effective April 1, 2017. In addition, due to 2016 Canada Census results, Northern Rockies Regional Municipality (NRRM) fell below 5,000 population, and responsibility for policing the municipality reverted back to the Provincial Police Service (Northern Rockies Prov) effective April 1, 2017.
- 2022: According to the 2021 Canada Census, the municipalities of Duncan, Metchosin and Oliver went over 5,000 population and, as a result, became responsible for the provision of policing and law enforcement services within their municipal boundaries, effective April 1, 2022. Prior to 2012, Duncan was policed by Duncan Prov; Metchosin was policed by West Shore Prov; and Oliver was policed by Oliver Prov.
- 2022: According to the 2021 Canada Census, the municipalities of Sooke and Lake Country went over 15,000 population, as a result, were reclassified to municipal police unit having populations of 15,000 and over.
49. In 2017, Comox Mun reduced its authorized strength to 11.3 members to reflect the deeming of civilian members into the Federal public service. The deeming date has been postponed by the Federal government and therefore, the authorized strength remains at 11.6 members (shown as 12).
50. The Elk Valley Detachment includes three provincial policing jurisdictions: Elkford Prov, Fernie Prov, and Sparwood Prov. Starting in 2010, the Elk Valley Detachment authorized strength total included one GIS member assigned to the detachment as a whole.
51. In July 2014, Houston Prov and Granisle Prov were formally amalgamated. Prior to this amalgamation, Houston/Granisle operated in an informally amalgamated manner from two Detachment offices; the main office in the District of Houston and the second in the Village of Granisle. The Granisle office remains and functions as a Community Policing Office.
52. In 2020, Vanderhoof Prov increased by 3 members; 1 converted from a specialized position and 2 officers reallocated from within the Provincial Service.

## Key Impacts on Crime Statistics

Comparisons of crime statistics between jurisdictions, provinces, and years should be made with caution, as many factors influence police-reported crime statistics other than actual changes in crime, such as: global events, demographic changes, social and economic trends, police reporting practices, public reporting practices to police, technological advancements, legislative amendments, local police service priorities, and social perceptions and attitudes towards certain crimes.

## Factors Influencing Crime

For broader national context on crime trends, please refer to the Statistics Canada publication accompanying this year's data release:

- Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2022 <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/230727/dq230727b-eng.htm>

Other reporting and analysis is available on the Statistics Canada Crime and Justice Statistics page: [https://www.statcan.gc.ca/en/subjects-start/crime\\_and\\_justice](https://www.statcan.gc.ca/en/subjects-start/crime_and_justice)

Past articles can also be accessed through the Juristat publication archive: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/catalogue/85-002-X#wb-auto-2>

## Impact of Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Scoring Rule Changes

In January 2018, Statistics Canada updated the definition of “founded” incidents to improve the tracking of offences with complex characteristics, such as sexual assault, and to address broader inconsistencies in how crime statistics were reported in the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) survey.

Police agencies across BC implemented these scoring rule changes in January 2019 which may have affected BC's crime data for 2019. It is anticipated that police services will become increasingly accustomed to the new standards and, as they do so, data should become more comparable.

More information about the UCR Survey and these scoring rule changes can be found at:

<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2018001/article/54973-eng.htm>

<https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2020001/article/00010-eng.htm>



## Police Resource Definitions and Data Qualifiers

- **Population figures** are estimates prepared annually by BC Stats, based on the results of the Canada Census which is conducted every five years. These estimates reflect only the permanent residential population of a jurisdiction. Where a jurisdiction serves as a resort, business or entertainment centre, it may have substantial “part-time” or transient/seasonal populations in addition to its permanent resident population, such as tourists, cabin owners, commuters, students, and seasonal staff. These temporary populations groups are counted in population figures within the jurisdiction of their place of residence and not the jurisdiction in which they may be temporarily visiting or working. Note: the 2022 population estimates provided by BC Stats were based on the Statistics Canada 2021 Census boundary geographies adjusted in accordance with current police jurisdiction boundaries.
- **Authorized strength** represents the maximum number of positions that the detachment or department has been authorized to fill as of December 31st of each calendar year. The authorized strength for both municipal police units (RCMP) and municipal police department jurisdictions (Mun) represents the number of sworn officers/members and sworn civilian officers/members assigned to a detachment or department, but does not include non-sworn civilian support staff, bylaw enforcement officers, the RCMP Auxiliary program or municipal police department reserve police officers. The authorized strength for Provincial Service jurisdictions (Prov) represents the number of sworn members assigned to General Duty and General Investigation Service (GD/GIS) functions at a detachment but does not include members assigned to specialized functions such as traffic enforcement, forensic identification, or major case crimes, etc. The assigned strengths for provincial police service jurisdictions are obtained from RCMP “E” Division Headquarters. The authorized strengths for municipal police jurisdictions, service by the RCMP, are obtained from Annex A of each municipality’s *Municipal Police Unit Agreement (MPUA)*. (**Note:** Due to inconsistencies in counting Integrated Team members some Lower Mainland District (LMD) municipalities’ authorized strengths are not comparable and may reflect some, none or all integrated team members. Policing and Security Branch is working with the RCMP and LMD municipalities to achieve consistency in Annex A, authorized strengths. For 2022, a separate “adjusted strength” figure for these municipalities has been calculated to show the net adjustment to authorized strength to account for Integrated Team members. Adjusted strength figures are not included in tables showing ten-year authorized strength trends). Authorized strengths for municipalities policed by municipal police departments are collected annually from each department. The exact values from the source data were used, however values reported have been rounded up to the nearest whole number, unless otherwise shown. Due to the differences in the organizational structure of each type of unit and methods of collecting authorized strength data, comparisons between provincial police service, municipal police units, and municipal police department jurisdictions should be made with caution.
- **Adjusted strength** is a calculation that adjusts a municipal authorized strength to account for Integrated Team members who are assigned on a regional basis. For 2022, adjusted strength, which includes Municipal Police Units (RCMP) Regular Members and Municipal Police Departments’ sworn officers, applies to LMD Integrated Team participation only. The Integrated Teams member adjustment is based on a proportional allocation of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) utilization attributable to each municipality’s financial contribution to the LMD teams for the fiscal year 2022/2023. Some LMD municipalities’ authorized strength already includes or accounts for a portion of Integrated Team members; therefore, not all Integrated Teams’ adjustments are a simple addition to authorized strength. The values reported have been rounded up to the nearest whole number after making the adjustments using exact values from the source data.
- **Case loads** are defined as the number of *Criminal Code* offences (excluding drugs and traffic offences) per authorized strength/sworn officer. They represent the workload per officer, and as a result, are often a better indicator of the demand for police services than either a jurisdiction’s population or its crime rate. The case load is calculated by dividing the total number of *Criminal Code* offences in the calendar year by the authorized strength/sworn officer as of December 31<sup>st</sup> of the same calendar year. (**Note:** The adjusted strength has been used to calculate the case loads for municipal units participating in Lower Mainland District Integrated Teams). Please refer to recent changes in the impact on UCR scoring rules on page 27.

## Police Resource Definitions and Data Qualifiers, Continued

- **Total Criminal Code Offences** includes property, violent, and other crimes (excluding drugs and traffic offences). **Number of offences** represents only those crimes reported to, or discovered by the police which, upon preliminary investigation, have been deemed to have occurred or been attempted; these data do not represent nor imply a count of the number of charges laid, prosecutions conducted, information sworn, or convictions obtained. These data have been recorded by the police utilizing the Uniform Crime Reporting 2 (UCR2) Survey scoring rules and guidelines. If a single criminal incident contains a number of violations of the law, then only the most serious violation is counted for purposes of this statistic. Please refer to recent changes in the impact on UCR scoring rules on page 27.
- **Crime rate** is the number of *Criminal Code* offences or crimes (excluding drugs and traffic) reported for every 1,000 persons. It is a better measure of trends in crime than the actual number of offences because it accounts for population differences. A high crime rate may indicate that a municipality is a “core city”, i.e., a business and/or entertainment centre for many people who reside outside, as well as inside, the municipality. As a result, “core cities” may have large part-time or temporary populations which are excluded from both their population bases and their crime rate calculations. Please refer to recent changes in the impact on UCR scoring rules on page 27.
- **Total Costs** refer to actual costs as reported by each municipality, collected annually from the PSB administered Municipal Police Expenditure Survey. For municipalities policed by the RCMP, total costs include the municipality’s share of RCMP contract costs, including integrated team costs, (i.e., either 70% or 90% depending on population) plus those costs borne 100% by the municipality which are over and above the contract costs, such as support staff and accommodation. Total costs do not include costs for bylaw enforcement or victim services programs, capital expenditures (such as major construction projects), or revenues. There is some variation between jurisdictions with respect to the cost items that are included in their policing budgets and reflected in total costs, so caution should be used if comparisons are being made. As a result of variances in reporting practices, in 2017, the Municipal Policing Expenditure Survey was amended to include amortization/depreciation costs as part of the Accommodation costs. Previous iterations of the survey and scoring rules did not specifically articulate the inclusion of the amortization/depreciation costs and was added to standardize practices from all municipalities.
- The data contained in this report may vary when compared with previous reports produced by Policing and Security Branch. Where variances occur, the report produced at the latest date will reflect the most current data available.
- Populations, crime rates and case loads are only three of the many factors used to determine the strength and organization of a police agencies. A number of other factors, such as size and accessibility of the area to be policed and traffic volume are also taken into consideration. In addition, case loads and crime rates do not reflect the time spent by police providing general assistance to the public, participating in crime prevention programs, or enforcing traffic laws.
- Comparisons between municipal police departments, RCMP municipal and RCMP provincial services should be made with caution.

### DATA SOURCES:

Crime:	Statistics Canada. 2022. Incident-based crime statistics, by detailed violation and police services, British Columbia, annual, 1998 to 2022 (Table 35-10-0184-01). Released and accessed on July 27, 2023. <a href="https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=3510018401">https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=3510018401</a>
Populations:	BC Statistics, Ministry of Labour, Citizens' Services and Open Government, BC.
Police Costs and Resources:	Royal Canadian Mounted Police, “E” Division; Policing and Security Branch; Municipal Police Departments; Municipalities.
DATE:	December 2023