



RMA
RURAL MUNICIPALITIES
of ALBERTA

APPS Transition Study

Engagement Guide for RMA Members

January 2022



Introduction

In October 2021, the Government of Alberta released the [Alberta Provincial Police Service \(APPS\) transition study](#), which was developed by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP (PwC). The transition study was the result of a recommendation made by the [Fair Deal Panel](#), which states that the creation of a provincial police force that replaces the RCMP should be explored.

The study consists of three separate reports:

- ◆ The [APPS Transition Study Final Report](#) – provides an overview of the current state of policing in Alberta and the proposed APPS model.
- ◆ The [APPS Current State Report](#) – provides a detailed examination of the current state of policing in Alberta, including information on costs, deployment, compensation, equipment, shared services, etc.
- ◆ The [APPS Future State Report](#) – provides a detailed explanation of the proposed APPS service delivery model, including several recommendations related to governance, deployment, costing, training, etc.

Prior to making any final decisions on whether to replace the current model of RCMP contract municipal policing with an APPS, as well as any details as to how an APPS model will be structured, the Government of Alberta has committed to engaging with municipal and non-municipal stakeholders. More details on the engagement process are found on the following page.

How to Use this Document

Because the three reports contain nearly 400 pages of information, the RMA has developed this engagement guide to support members in effectively participating in engagement sessions. It is important to note that the engagement guide does not recommend specific positions on any aspect of the proposed transition, but rather is intended to ensure that members have a general understanding of the key themes and issues found in the reports. Each theme in the document includes four sections:

- ◆ Background – the key details in the report for each theme.
- ◆ RMA priorities – the aspects of each theme likely to be most important to the RMA and its members.
- ◆ Recommended questions – while members are encouraged to ask any questions they have of the proposed model, the RMA has developed recommended questions for each theme on aspects of the reports likely to be most important to the RMA and its members. You are encouraged to ask these questions during the engagement session.
- ◆ Further reading – looking for more detailed information on a certain issue in the engagement guide? This section will point you to which report and page number this information is available on.

The Government of Alberta has also provided a reading list for those preparing to participate in engagement sessions. The reading list recommends sections of the various reports that participants should consider reviewing prior to engagement sessions.

Given the length and detail of the final reports, there are many areas of the proposed transition that this guide does not cover. Members are encouraged to review the reports themselves and bring up any other questions or concerns they may have during the engagement.

Engagement Process

The Government of Alberta (GOA) is undertaking a significant engagement process specifically with municipal stakeholders. In total, 43 in-person and virtual sessions are scheduled between January 10 and April 1, 2022. Each session will run for two and a half hours.

Sessions are open to municipal elected officials and staff, and there is no restriction as to which session an individual attends. According to the GOA, all sessions will follow an identical process and cover identical information.

Registration is now open for engagement sessions and can be accessed at the following link:
<https://rmalberta.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Instructions-MA.pdf>.

Although next steps following the upcoming engagement process are not yet known, the GOA has indicated that, pending Ministerial direction, it plans to conduct further, more focused engagement on specific themes and issues based on what is learned during the initial engagement sessions.

Ongoing RMA Support

With the amount of content in the reports and the large number of engagement sessions scheduled, the RMA expects certain themes and trends to emerge related to areas of focus for members. The RMA plans to connect with members regularly throughout the engagement process, as well as attend several of the engagement sessions to monitor discussions and input. Based on this, the RMA may provide members with additional resources or information on specific issues within the reports.

If you have any specific questions on the reports or areas for which you would be interested in receiving further information or analysis, contact RMA Policy Advisor Warren Noga at warren@RMAAlberta.com.

Theme: Governance and Oversight

Background

The proposed model includes a detailed provincewide governance structure outlining the role of the Government of Alberta, a provincial chief of police, an arm's length provincial police commission, several executive level committees, local detachments and specialized service branches, and local commissions comprised of municipal and community representatives.

As the complete governance model is extremely detailed, this section will highlight some of the most notable aspects.

Further Reading

- ◆ Provincial commission: p. 52 – 54, 60 – 63 (future state report)
- ◆ Chief of police: p. 63 (future state report)
- ◆ Local policing committees: p. 64 – 65 (future state report)

Provincial Commission

While the review process considered several options for how provincewide governance of an APPS should be structured, the final report recommends creating the APPS as an arm's length agency governed by a ministry-appointed police commission. According to the report, this approach will ensure that the APPS operates independently of political interference and will prevent the provincial government from giving direct orders to the APPS, which is allowed in some other jurisdictions.

Additionally, the report argues that the commission model would allow for diverse provincewide representation and ensure that provincewide policing priorities and strategies reflect the composition of the commission itself.

Chief of Police

The proposed model features a Chief of Police responsible for translating the strategic direction provided by the commission into operational direction distributed throughout the organization. The Chief will be accountable to the commission, not the Minister. The Chief's office will also include a series of deputy chiefs responsible for delivering specific operational outcomes within their portfolio of services. Examples of these portfolios include traffic operations, community policing, and others.

Role of Local Policing Committees

The report also states that through this structure, local policing committees will be formed and will have the ability to provide direct input into local policing priorities as well as provincial priorities through communication with the provincial commission. The report recognizes that such committees may not be practical in every municipality and that further research is required to determine the "right" number of committees and committee structure. The report recommends that the municipality be responsible for determining the structure of the relationship with the detachment based on community need, but is silent on if or how municipalities should be financially supported for this responsibility or empowered to require accountability from the local detachment.

RMA Priorities

- ◆ Provincial-level police governance and oversight should be reflective of communities receiving policing services. Rural and municipal perspectives should be included in any provincial governance model.
- ◆ Rural Alberta faces unique policing challenges. Provincial priority-setting should include consideration of rural challenges and include a sub-committee specifically focused on addressing rural issues and challenges.
- ◆ It is crucial that all municipalities have an opportunity to provide input into local policing priorities.
- ◆ Municipal capacity and resources vary widely, therefore a one-size-fits-all approach to municipality-detachment collaboration is not acceptable. Municipalities must have flexibility to engage with detachments in a way that works for them.
- ◆ Detachments must have some accountability to the local municipality and community.
- ◆ Local policing committees should include a combination of municipal and community representatives.
- ◆ Municipalities should not be required to financially support the operation of local policing committees. The APPS budget should include a grant to municipalities for this purpose to ensure municipal financial capacity is not a barrier to community input.

Recommended Questions

- ◆ How will provincial police commission members be selected? Will this be a political process or a competency-based process? Who would be responsible for recruitment and selection? How will the provincial commission be funded and administratively supported?
- ◆ How will local police committees be structured? What level of flexibility will be available for communities to populate and operate police committees as they see fit?
- ◆ What accountability mechanisms will be developed to require detachment leaders to consider and report on direction provided by local committees?
- ◆ How will detachments serving multiple communities balance input received from various local policing committees?
- ◆ How will local policing committees provide input on provincial policing priorities to the provincial commission? How will the commission be accountable to local committees?

Theme: Staffing and Human Resources

Background

The proposed model would see significant changes on the human resources side of policing. While these elements, outside of officer staffing level, are not typically in the public view, it is important to understand them and their potential impact on service delivery.

Staffing Levels

The transition study uses RCMP staffing levels as of June 2020 as its definition of the “current state.” This level serves as the benchmark for comparing current and proposed APPS staffing levels, recognizing that actual staffing levels at the end of 2021 and entering 2022 are likely higher due to recent staffing increases through the police funding model. Under the current model, 3,038 officers are supplied through contract policing. This includes 1,480 through the Provincial Police Service Agreement (PPSA) and 1,312 through Municipal Police Service Agreements (MPSAs). Additionally, 190 civilian members and 743 public service employees are employed by the RCMP in the province.

The PwC reports propose two different future states. The first (Model A) proposes the creation of two levels of officers. Level 1 Officers would be trained to respond to all calls, while Level 2 Officers would be trained to respond to non-violent or non-urgent calls. The second (Model B) future model proposes only using Level 1 Officers.

Both Models A and B would see the total number of police employees increase from 3,971 to 4,189. Model A proposes 1,613 Level 1 Officers, 1,540 Level 2 Officers, and 1,036 public service employees (support members, nurses, and social workers). Model B would see the same number of total officers as Model A, with the difference being that all 3,153 officers would be Level 1. Model B proposes the same number of public service employees as Model A. No details are provided on the specific scopes of Level 1 and Level 2 Officers in Model A.

Deployment and Staffing Approaches

Under the current RCMP policing model, staffing requirements for detachments are determined by the RCMP’s Human Resources Committee based on recommendations from the RCMP “K” Division. The model used to determine staffing is primarily based on the historical number of calls for service in each detachment.

The proposed APPS approach to deployment and staffing does not appear to propose a detailed approach or formula to determine staffing levels at each detachment. Instead, the report emphasizes the importance of diverse skills and a community policing-based approach when determining workforce requirements for various detachments. In particular, the reports recommend recruiting individuals to serve as officers in their own communities to ensure police understand local customs and issues.

The reports provide no details on if or how specific staffing levels in different areas of the province will change from the status quo.

Further Reading

- ◆ Current state staffing: p. 46 – 54 (current state report)
- ◆ Proposed APPS staffing models: p. 68, 77, 80 – 81 (final report)

RMA Priorities

- ◆ Any change to the policing service delivery model should increase the number of officers in rural areas to address concerns regarding service levels.
- ◆ If a two-tier officer model is selected, it is critical that the ratio of Level 1 to Level 2 Officers is consistent between rural and urban areas. Urban areas should not receive a greater share of Level 1 Officers.
- ◆ More information is required on the limitations of Level 2 Officers, and how the model utilizing two levels of officers will impact service levels in comparison to the current model. While there can certainly be a role for two levels of officers, it is unclear how the balance of levels was determined and what service level impacts this may cause.
- ◆ Significantly more details are required as to how detachments will be staffed under the proposed model. The current state report identifies the RCMP process for determining detachment staffing requirements, and to allow for full consideration of the proposed approach the same level of information is required.
- ◆ While prioritizing local recruitment of officers may have some benefits, this could also introduce risks of increasing conflict and tension in communities and placing officers in a difficult position of policing their friends, neighbours, and relatives. More research is required on the pros and cons of this community-oriented approach, and how it aligns to community policing practices used elsewhere.

Recommended Questions

- ◆ The staffing levels under both Models A and B suggest that municipalities with an MPSA will no longer be able to contract their policing from the RCMP. Is this what is being proposed?
- ◆ Will the HR programs and policies detailed in the current state report be implemented by a future APPS? If not, how will they be replaced?
- ◆ Is it possible to provide effective policing under Model A, which would see the total number of officers trained to the Level 1 standard decrease by approximately 50%? How would the distribution of Level 1 and Level 2 Officers be determined?
- ◆ How will staffing requirements in rural detachments be determined? What method will be used and will it be different from the current RCMP approach?
- ◆ How will conflicts of interest and personal relationships be addressed in a model that emphasizes policing by local residents in small and rural communities?

Theme: Mental Health

Background

The proposed APPS model includes a focus on enhancing mental health and addictions support as a core aspect of police service delivery. In fact, the theme of “community policing” is present throughout the operating model, with a major aspect of that theme linked to collaboration between the APPS and various community members and stakeholders to effectively address mental health issues. This focus is reflected in an emphasis on formal and informal engagement with local organizations specializing in mental health support, as well as embedding similar supports within frontline police service delivery and making it a foundation of training for APPS officers.

Further Reading

- ◆ Mental health specialists: p. 70 (final report), p. 24, 84 (future state report)
- ◆ Mental health training: p. 78 (future state report)
- ◆ Officer support: p. 72 (final report), p. 96 (future state report)

Mental Health Specialists within the APPS

The report recommends hiring nurses, mental health professionals, and social workers to work directly in the APPS and respond to distress calls with police officers. The recommendation would reduce the need for partnering with various organizations to provide such support. These resources would be deployed through the development of a tiered response model, which would ensure that mental health experts are deployed to situations that require their expertise and may be complex or time-consuming, while allowing officers to remain available for urgent criminal calls.

The report calls for the formation of 65 teams of peace officers and mental health professionals to be dispatched provincewide as part of the APPS to respond to such issues. It is recommended that these teams be based out of regional hubs throughout the province.

Mental Health Officer Training

The report recommends an officer training program that combines education on core policing principles alongside Indigenous cultural awareness, customer service concepts, and people management skills. An increased focus on mental health training for officers is also recommended. Specifically, APPS officers would be trained to better understand the link between brain development and the risk for mental and physical illnesses that often drive mental health and addictions related calls for service.

Mental Health Supports for Officers

The report recommends that the APPS establish a comprehensive mental health and well-being approach to support members. This program should consist in part of regional APPS wellness units available to provide support to APPS members and their families. Wellness should also be embedded as a core component of the organizational culture.

RMA Priorities

- ◆ It is critical that mental health supports, both to Albertans and APPS members, be accessible in rural areas of the province at a level that is equitable to that of larger centres.
- ◆ More detail and clarity is required as to the role of other provincial and federal employers, unions, and employee associations in enabling the embedment of nurses, social workers, and mental health experts within the frontline APPS. Potential challenges and barriers to this integration must be understood.

Recommended Questions

- ◆ On what factors will the deployment of mental health teams be based? Will there be situations where mental health teams encounter dangerous or unpredictable situations?
- ◆ What measures will be put in place to ensure that the relatively small number of mental health teams are able to provide an equitable level of service throughout the province, especially in rural areas?
- ◆ How will response decisions be negotiated between frontline officers and mental health teams? If disagreement exists on how to approach a specific situation, whose approach takes precedence?
- ◆ How will APPS mental health teams collaborate with local mental health related organizations and experts regarding specific calls? How will the APPS' regional teams effectively leverage local knowledge?

Theme: Deployment

The proposed model would deploy APPS resources using a hub model, in which one detachment acts as a main regional hub, and other nearby detachments operate on a zoned deployment model with distinct capabilities. The overall distribution of detachments would remain, at worst, equivalent with the current number of detachments in operation in the province under the RCMP model. The proposed model would also leverage current specialist units such as ALERT to work with regional hubs and local detachments to address specialized or high-risk criminal activity.

Hub Model

The reports recommend establishing a hub model in which select detachments will serve as regional hubs. Those detachments will host certain specialized services available to the entire region, as well as act as “service centres” by also co-locating with other local and regional social services to support increased collaboration and allow individuals to access multiple services under one roof. Detachments not identified as hubs will provide basic police services. The reports are silent on how many hubs would be established and where they would be located.

Specialized Units

The report recommends that the APPS invest in enhanced and expanded specialized units, both to address major and organized crime more effectively, and to ensure local detachments can focus on community policing. The first example of this proposed shift is an increased investment in ALERT. Under the proposed model, ALERT would expand its current scope of services and take on responsibilities for human trafficking, financial crimes, and cybercrimes. The proposed model would increase the capacity of ALERT by 18%.

A second recommended change to specialized units relates to the consolidation of traffic operations from the Alberta Sheriffs into the APPS. This would replace the current model in which both RCMP and Alberta Sheriffs provide traffic services with a simplified model which would eliminate administrative duplication and increase efficiency.

“Smart Owner” Service Deployment Model

In addition to changes to ALERT and the role of sheriffs, the proposed model would rely on a “smart owner” model to collaborate with municipal police services to provide other specialized services on a regional basis. According to the report, a smart owner model uses metrics such as demand for service, cost of ownership, and collaboration opportunities to determine the need for the APPS to invest resources.

According to the report, the current system duplicates specialist services across the RCMP and Edmonton and Calgary police services, resulting in unnecessary costs and over-provision of certain important but low demand services, such as tactical teams and explosive device response. Under the proposed model, the APPS would use a smart owner approach to contract with the Edmonton and Calgary police services to utilize many of their existing specialized services on a regional basis, with the Edmonton Police Service acting as the hub for northern Alberta and the Calgary Police Service acting as the hub for southern Alberta. According to the report, detailed analysis and negotiation on the expansion of current Edmonton / Calgary services, as well as the cost borne by the APPS, is still required.

Further Reading

- ◆ Hub model: p. 69 (final report), p. 82 – 83 (future state report)
- ◆ Specialized units: p. 70 – 71 (final report), p. 85 – 87 (future state report)
- ◆ “Smart owner” model: p. 71 (final report), p. 87 – 89 (future state report)

RMA Priorities

- ◆ The development of a hub model for the deployment of specialized services must occur in close consultation with rural municipalities to ensure that hubs are not simply awarded to larger population centres but rather situated based on demand for specific service types.
- ◆ While a hub model has the potential to provide more equitable specialized services between rural and urban areas, it must be developed in a way that ensures specialized services are spread throughout the province.
- ◆ While the consolidation of specialized services under a single provincial organization has the potential for efficiencies, such consolidation cannot result in reduced transparency as to how these services are delivered or how service levels are determined.
- ◆ The proposed smart owner approach is concerning, as details are lacking on the extent to which the specialized services available in Edmonton and Calgary would need to be expanded to be available to rural areas far from those cities, as well as whether service levels would decline as the distance from each city increases. More information is required on the costs and risks of the smart owner approach as opposed to standalone APPS delivery of the specialized services.

Recommended Questions

- ◆ What metrics will be used to identify hub detachments?
- ◆ Will all hub detachments offer identical specialized services, or will there be different levels of hubs with different types of services available?
- ◆ Are all existing detachments physically capable of serving as hubs? If not, will the costs of upgrading existing infrastructure be used as a consideration in the selection of hubs?
- ◆ Will municipalities with hubs located within their boundaries have more input into regional specialized services than those without hubs? How will community policing and hub-based specialized service delivery be separated in terms of municipal and community input?
- ◆ How will centralized specialized services (such as those delivered through ALERT) be evaluated at the regional and local level? Will municipalities or local policing committees have a voice into the effectiveness of these specialized units?
- ◆ How will the “smart owner” approach to contracting with the Edmonton and Calgary police services work in practice? Who makes deployment decisions? Who maintains equipment and resources?
- ◆ How will the APPS and the Edmonton and Calgary police services be accountable to rural communities for ensuring service levels delivered through the smart owner approach are adequate?
- ◆ What happens if the Edmonton and / or Calgary Police Service is unwilling to enter into a collaborative agreement with the APPS? What would be the costs of delivering specialized services to rural areas under a standalone APPS model?
- ◆ What if the municipal police budgets or capacities in Edmonton or Calgary change significantly and their scope of specialized services is reduced? Would the APPS incur increased costs or would provincewide availability of those specialized services also be impacted?

Theme: Integration

Background

The final model emphasizes integrating APPS with existing services in a variety of ways. The reports focus on the integration of training, information sharing processes, forensics capacity, and dispatch among APPS and other service providers.

Training

The reports highlight the training required for police officers, including firearms training, driver training, as well as cultural sensitivity and customer service training. The current state report discusses how the RCMP takes advantage of a national network of shared resources to train officers at facilities across Canada. The final report suggests such training should be pursued by the APPS through partnerships with other policing organizations, the Canadian Armed Forces, and existing driving schools.

Information Sharing

Police services handle a large volume of information and data, some of which needs to be shared with other organizations. The current RCMP model is not integrated with the records systems used by the Edmonton (EPS) and Calgary (CPS) police services. Under the proposed model, the APPS would create a new records management system to handle their data needs. Additionally, the *Police Act* would be modified to require all municipal police forces to work with the APPS to integrate their systems.

Forensics

Investigations conducted by the RCMP which require forensic analysis utilize several RCMP labs across Canada. These labs handle the forensic analysis for the RCMP, along with forensic analysis for municipal and First Nations police services across Canada. As a result, there are delays in obtaining results as these labs handle evidence, which is triaged nationally for many police jurisdictions and RCMP divisions.

The PwC reports recommend that Alberta adopt a model similar to that used in Ontario. This model sees the Ontario Provincial Police use a variety of provincial, private, and public sector labs in addition to federal government labs. The report argues that doing so will increase the overall forensic lab capacity while working within existing institutions.

Dispatch

The discussion regarding dispatch integration appears to focus on the integration of Real Time Operations Centres (RTOCs). Both the EPS and CPS have RTOCs, which are used to coordinate police response. The PwC future state report (p. 25) discusses how RTOCs are more applicable in urban settings, but would be of use to the APPS on an as needed basis. Therefore, the PwC reports recommend that the APPS would work with EPS and CPS to integrate into the existing RTOCs to coordinate dispatch.

Further Reading

- ♦ Training: p. 65, 76 (final report), p. 21, 47, 78, 97 – 98 (future state report)
- ♦ Information sharing: p. 83, 112 (current state report), p. 26 – 27, 46 – 48 (future state report)
- ♦ Forensics: p. 72 (final report), p. 23 and 89 (future state), p. 115 – 116, 118 – 119 (current state)
- ♦ Dispatch: p. 74 (final report), p. 17, 23, and 25 (future state), p. 68, 128, and 151 (current state)

RMA Priorities

- ◆ Integrating APPS into existing services must not come at a cost to municipalities that provide those services. While the report specifically references integrating services with Edmonton and Calgary, the principle of not passing costs on to municipalities is important to emphasize.
- ◆ The reliance on EPS and CPS for training, RTOCs, and other services under the proposed model must consider that these organizations do not have experience in policing rural areas.
- ◆ A single, integrated information-sharing model accessible to all police services and associated bodies across the province would be a positive development.

Recommended Questions

- ◆ Have the stakeholders identified to work with in an integrated manner indicated their support for this model?
- ◆ The areas of operations to be integrated with other organizations represent a significant change from the current system. Who will provide oversight to this transition?
- ◆ Under the proposed APPS information-sharing model, would community peace officers have full access to information needed to perform their duties safely and effectively?
- ◆ What upfront capital and long-term operational costs would be associated with building and maintaining an Alberta-specific police training regime?

Theme: Costs

Background

The final report includes two costing models based on operating models A and B, summarized in the “staffing and human resources” section above. The total cost for Model A (which includes two levels of officers) in year one of an APPS is roughly \$734.5 million and option B (one tier of officer) is \$758.9 million. This is in comparison to a total cost of \$783 million under the current RCMP model (including Albert Sheriffs).

Further Reading

- ◆ Detailed current state policing costs: p. 38 – 43 (current state report)
- ◆ APPS costing model: p. 100 – 108 (future state report)

Human Resourcing Costs

In both the current model and proposed models A and B, salaries and benefits are by far the largest cost category, comprising roughly 70% of total costs. The individual salary estimates for Level 1 Officers are based on a combination of estimates related to current RCMP salary increase as a result of unionization, as well as benchmarks for comparable positions in Edmonton and Calgary. The report does not provide details as to the basis for the salary estimates for Level 2 Officers.

Equipment and Real Estate Costs

Equipment costs account for about 12% of total costs under the APPS model and include costs linked to criminal operations, fleet, communications, and informatics. The estimate assumes that the APPS will take advantage of lower cost lab services through contracts with provincial government and post-secondary institutions, as well as lower cost communication equipment due to a “simpler IT environment” than that operated by the RCMP, which will offset increased costs linked to the formation of a centralized provincial communications model.

Administration Costs

Administration costs account for about 10% of the total costs in the APPS model. These include administration, professional services, travel, governance, media, etc. The cost model assumes that many of these models can be incorporated into existing Government of Alberta (GOA) shared services teams. The report also notes that the projection of shared service and administrative efficiency opportunities is limited, as the areas of the GOA responsible for shared services have not been engaged on detailed shared services requirements at this point.

Transition Costs

The final report includes a transition cost model intended to capture all costs associated with shifting from the current RCMP service delivery model to the APPS. The report estimates the total transition costs at \$366 million over a six-year period, with \$241 million in operating and \$125 million in capital expenditures. The largest single transition cost category relates to RCMP transition, which basically equates to the point in time when both the RCMP and APPS will be actively providing services in the province as service is gradually transitioned from one provider to the other. The second largest is real estate, although the report lacks detail on what drives real estate costs, this is presumably linked to the transition of responsibility for physical detachments and other spaces from the RCMP to APPS.

RMA Priorities

- ◆ To allow for a full understanding of the formation and delivery of the APPS, detailed information on the extent of shared service agreements with the Government of Alberta, municipal police services, and other entities is required. It is problematic to base cost comparisons between the status quo and APPS on assumptions.
- ◆ It is concerning that cost responsibilities among federal, provincial, and municipal levels of government for the APPS are considered beyond the scope of PwC's work, especially as the cost responsibilities for the current RCMP model are prominently displayed in the report. Understanding how the municipal share of costs for an APPS will be allocated among municipalities of various types and sizes, as well as whether they will be tied to service levels, is crucial to allowing municipalities to properly evaluate the proposed transition.
- ◆ More information on the potential risks and unforeseen costs associated with the restructuring process would be appreciated. Similar recent municipal transitions elsewhere in Canada have faced significant cost overruns relative to projections, and with the lack of recent precedent for a full-scale provincial transition, the level of accuracy of transition costs is likely quite low. A cost range or consideration of potential cost overruns would increase the report's credibility.
- ◆ With costs so heavily based on estimates, assumptions, and point-in-time comparisons, a cost range including a low and high estimate would increase confidence in the cost projections.

Recommended Questions

- ◆ How accurate will the cost comparisons found in the report between the current RCMP model and the proposed APPS models be if an actual transition would likely not occur until 2025? How might RCMP cost drivers and projected APPS cost drivers change in the minimum of three years until the actual transition will occur?
- ◆ As municipalities are major stakeholders on this issue and directly impacted by the proposed change in terms of both service delivery and finances, why was the municipal cost allocation for the APPS model deemed out of scope for the PwC report? Can the GOA consult with municipalities on this aspect of the APPS model prior to making any final decisions on a transition?
- ◆ Why are there so many assumptions built into the cost model related to shared services and the formation of provincial communication networks, etc.? As these aspects would rely heavily on collaboration with the Government of Alberta, why were the relevant provincial entities not consulted more thoroughly during the report development?
- ◆ How will a heavy reliance on existing Government of Alberta administrative systems impact the ability of those systems to support other provincial business that they already support?

Other Issues

Based on discussions with the APPS engagement team, it is likely that not all issues of importance to RMA members will be addressed during the engagement due to the volume of information within the reports. However, members should still be aware of these considerations and be willing to raise them during the engagement session. The table below provides a short overview and page reference (if applicable) of other issues that may be relevant to members.

Issue	Description / Impacts	Page Number
Community safety strategies	<p>The report recommends working with municipalities to develop community safety strategies, referencing the Ontario model where municipalities are mandated to complete the strategies. The strategies are a way in which detachments and communities collaborate to develop actions related to social development, prevention, risk intervention, and incident response.</p> <p>Questions related to community safety strategies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Would community safety strategies be mandatory? ◆ Who would be responsible for the costs of developing and updating the strategies? ◆ What accountability mechanisms would be built into the strategies? ◆ How is “community” defined for the purposes of the strategies? Does this include only the municipality or other stakeholders? ◆ How do the strategies align with local policing committees? 	<p>p. 79 – 80 (future state report)</p>
Co-location of services	<p>The report recommends co-locating policing services with other provincial and community services by basing the services in the same building and a shared work environment. This will allow the partner organizations to work more closely to support early intervention and direct an individual to the services needed to support a positive outcome.</p> <p>Questions related to co-location of services include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ Are there risks in closely linking social services with police that may result in vulnerable individuals being less likely to access social service agencies? ◆ How would this approach be implemented when the current location of police service and other provincial and community services vary greatly across the province? Is the cost of physically re-locating services (presumably into detachments) included in the transition cost estimates? If so, how accurate is the cost projection? ◆ Will municipalities and service providers have an option as to whether they want to co-locate services? ◆ How would this approach impact existing municipal and non-profit property-related costs such as leases, building maintenance, etc.? 	<p>p. 82 – 83 (future state report)</p>

<p>Rural service levels</p>	<p>The future state report repeatedly references the need to improve and standardize rural service levels. While this is an important recognition, the reports include minimal detail as to how the APPS would define, measure, and improve service levels. The report does link initiatives such as increasing the capacity of ALERT, shifting to a hub-based detachment model, and coordinating more closely with community service agencies as approaches to improve service levels.</p> <p>If properly implemented, these all are likely to improve overall service levels. However, the report includes no information on how success in this area would be measured, benchmarks to define “good” and “bad” service levels, or, perhaps most importantly, specific information on the number of actual frontline police officers that would be available in rural areas under the APPS model. The reports also provide no information on core service level areas such as response times.</p> <p>Questions related to rural service levels include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ What factors will be used to define service levels under the APPS? ◆ How will the changes and recommendations proposed in the APPS report specifically enhance services in rural areas? ◆ How would the APPS define a “rural” and “urban” area for the purposes of service level tracking? ◆ What metrics or analysis were used to verify that the changes outlined in the report will actually improve service levels in rural areas? 	<p>Throughout reports</p>
------------------------------------	--	---------------------------