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1 Introduction and Background

1.1 Introduction

Today’s municipalities are challenged by an ever-increasing demand to deliver a greater variety and a higher level of public services while maintaining low taxes and user fees.

To meet this challenge, municipal governments are continually looking for new ways to improve performance, operationally and fiscally.

In the spring of 2012, a number of municipalities in Alberta expressed an interest in benchmarking their service delivery against leading practices as a way to improve service. At a workshop hosted by the Town of Banff in May 2012, participating municipalities discussed the benefits of benchmarking; developed a preliminary list of guiding principles; and identified considerations related to governance, scope, data collection, resources, and risks.

Subsequent to this workshop, the Town of Banff, on behalf of a group of 13 municipalities, successfully applied to the provincial government for a Regional Collaboration Grant to fund the development of a municipal service delivery benchmarking framework. With the support of the provincial government, the Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative (ABMI) was launched in 2013.

1.2 Background

The Alberta Municipal Benchmarking Initiative is a collaboration of small and large-municipalities. Their objective is to develop and implement a framework that will enable a continuous, multi-year benchmarking process for participating municipalities. The initiative includes identifying and gathering comparable metrics and preparing benchmarking reports to prompt questions, start discussions, identify and share leading practices, and ultimately improve the municipal services provided to Albertans.

The ten service areas to be considered as part of this initiative are for efficiency and effectiveness performance measures are:

1. Drinking Water Supply (complete)
2. Wastewater Collection, Treatment and Disposal (complete)
3. Fire Protection (complete)
4. Residential Solid Waste Management (complete)
5. Police Protection, RCMP (complete), Self-Run (complete)
6. Roadway Operations and Maintenance
7. Snow and Ice Management
8. Transit
9. Parks Provision and Maintenance
10. Recreation, Facility Booking and Maintenance
A method for collecting data to ensure it is comparable between communities, and a database to hold the data and produce performance measure has been developed. The foundation of this method is a “User Manual” for each service area, containing:

- Definitions for cost and service data, and
- Definitions for the calculations of performance measures, for both efficiency and effectiveness.

To ensure an “apples to apples” comparison, participating municipalities work to agree on the content of the user manual.

1.3 Participating Municipalities

The municipalities currently participating in the Police Self-Run section of the Project are the cities of Lethbridge and Medicine Hat.

1.4 Governance Structure

To guide and drive the project, a model has been developed consisting of:

- A governance committee consisting of six municipal leaders
- A working committee with representatives from each of the participating municipalities
- A finance group with representatives from each of the participating municipalities
- A subject matter expert (SME) group for each service area with representatives from each of the participating municipalities

**Governance Committee** - The governance committee was created to provide overall guidance and oversight, and to ensure that the work conducted is in the best interest of the group of municipalities as a whole as opposed to an individual municipality. The committee is: Robert Earl (Chair), Town of Banff, Paul Schulz, City of Airdrie, Lisa de Soto, Town of Canmore, Corey Wight, Lethbridge, Brian Mastel, Medicine Hat and one vacant position.

**Working Committee** - Each of the participating municipalities is represented on the working committee. Its members’ primary role is liaising between the project manager and the respective municipality. They oversee the completion of activities within the municipality, support the identification of SMEs needed for the development of the Database User Manual, and assist with the gathering of relevant data.

**Finance Group** – The primary role and responsibility of the Finance Group is to collect and enter data for a calculation to allocate overhead to each service area, collect and enter data for amortization of assets in each service area, and assist service area SMEs on collection of cost data for each service area.
The Finance Group also ensures all data is accurate by confirming the financial data to the municipality’s non-consolidated financial statements.

**Subject Matter Expert Group (SME)** – The primary role and responsibility of the SME groups is to provide subject matter expertise in the development of the service definitions, performance measures, and collection of data for the benchmarking pilot project.

**The CAOs’ Role** – In addition to the governance committee, the CAOs from each of the participating municipalities were asked to confirm their commitment to this pilot project, to be the executive sponsor for their respective municipality, to champion this pilot project within their municipality, and ensure that all participating municipalities are informed of the activities and outcomes.
1.5 Benefits of Benchmarking

The anticipated benefits from this benchmarking project are:

- Helps tell the municipal “performance story”
- A sound business practice used in the government and private sectors
- Sets the stage for sharing knowledge and best practices among the municipal sector
- Understanding of trends within each municipality
- Identification of opportunities for change to improve efficiency or effectiveness of municipal services
- Formation of objective evidence that shows the differentiation between municipalities and provides information for Municipal CAOs to address questions from Council, staff, and the community on service efficiency and effectiveness
- Encouragement of continuous improvement initiatives and a better understanding of the drivers that impact performance results
- Encourages continuous improvement, and
- Awareness of the value of collaboration between municipalities.
- Supports results-based accountability

1.6 Definitions

**Efficiency** – Efficiency is a measure of productivity based on dividing the quantity of output (measured in units of deliverables) by the quantity of resources input (usually measured in person hours or dollars).

**Effectiveness** – Effectiveness is a measure of the value or performance of a service relative to a goal, expressed as the actual change in the service. An effectiveness measure compares the output of a service to its intended contribution to a higher level goal.
2 Policing Self Run

2.1 System Description

2.1.1 Municipal Policing Self Run Services

Community Policing Services aim to increase public safety through excellence in the prevention, intervention and suppression of crime and disorder. In Alberta, municipalities can operate and fund a municipal police service or contract with the RCMP for policing. The decision to establish a self-run service is considered by a municipality when the population is >30,000 and there is a need for full-time specialized services.

Self-run policing, for Lethbridge and Medicine Hat, offers the advantages of;

- Faster response times to situations because the full range of services is available locally (minutes vs. hours), e.g. bomb squad, tactical, canine and investigative
- Strategic and nimble adjustment/adaptation to unique and changing local community needs as a result of long term ongoing relationships
- A local police commission as a governance body that can relate to overall strategic objectives and unique community needs
- In-depth investigation capabilities incorporating local community experience leads to high clearance rates
- Long term commitment to the community due to local employment of sworn officers and support staff

Self-run policing involves a complex combination of services provided by reactive, preventative and investigative sworn officers supported by a management team of sworn officers and dedicated administrative staff, e.g. human resources, IT specialists and data analysis specialists. The range of services can include;

1. **Patrol Unit**, patrolling of all roads and lanes in the municipality to maintain public order
2. **Traffic Unit**, enforcement of provincial regulations and city bylaws, investigation of all serious motor vehicle collisions, injuries and fatalities, escort of over-dimensional loads and funerals, joint force check stops
3. **Specialized Traffic Enforcement Unit**, photo radar to monitor school and playground zones, high density, high collision traffic areas, dangerous locations
4. **High Visibility Response Team (HVRT)**, compliments the Patrol Teams with officers riding specialized mountain bikes in summer to areas where typical police vehicles cannot go
5. **Community Resources Unit**, crime prevention, e.g. school resource officers, Crime Stoppers, presentations on fraud prevention, basic safety
information and crime prevention through environmental design to community groups

6. **Major Crimes Unit**, crime analysis and investigation, including "plain clothes", of computer crimes, economic crime (frauds/thefts), family crime (domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse/exploitation), general crime investigations (homicides, home invasions, robberies), organized crime, polygraph lie detection, priority street crimes (prevention of repeat offences)

7. **Integrated Intelligence Unit**, identifies criminal groups and gathers information from a variety of sources to provide target packages, strategic/tactical threat assessments and target group profiles for the Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit

8. **Combined Forces Special Enforcement Unit**, investigates and disrupts the organized illegal drug trade in Medicine Hat and surrounding region

9. **Forensic Identification Unit**, provides forensic services for the entire police, e.g. crime scene photograph and video investigation, detection, collection, preservation and correlation of trace evidence, management of seized exhibits and property

10. **Tactical Unit**, provides enhanced patrol or tactical support for high risk arrests, barricaded subject and high risk search warrants, maintains expertise in specialty impact munitions, chemical agents, forced entry, and firearms

11. **Explosives Disposal Unit**, responds to complaints involving found explosives, military ordinance or improvised explosive devices

12. **Crisis Negotiation Unit**, persuading barricaded suspects, hostage takers and persons threatening suicide, to surrender

13. **Canine Unit**, attends scenes of crimes that are in progress or those that have just occurred, e.g. break and enters, theft from autos, assaults and robberies.

14. **Exhibit/ Property Control Unit**, control and storage of all exhibits and property seized as evidence, found, or held for safekeeping, e.g. firearms, counterfeit money and drugs

15. **Victim Assistance**, 24 hour support for victims of crimes, accidents and other crises

16. **Armourer Unit**, controls and services firearms

17. **Detention Centre**, operation of a detention facility

### 2.1.2 Factors Influencing Policing Self-Run Services

**Size of System**: Number, size and complexity of the roadways system for policing.

**Urban Diversity**: Breadth of policing services needed to serve the population.

**Demographics**: Average age of the community (younger vs. older), transient population, immigration, unemployment due to the type of industry/commercial and economic conditions.
2.1.3 Policing Self-Run Narrative Data (See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

The narrative data shows differences and similarities between municipalities for this service area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Roads Patrolled (KM)</th>
<th>Municipal Population (#)</th>
<th>Developed Area (square KM)</th>
<th>Population Density (population per square KM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>89,074</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>1,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>90,417</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>1,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>93,004</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>1,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>61,180</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>61,793</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>62,405</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>1,018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Total Policing Costs 1 ($/capita and population served) – Efficiency

This chart shows total cost of providing policing services per capita based on municipal population and population served. The cost types are; direct costs (the costs to operate the service), indirect costs (costs to manage and support the policing operations), overhead (a calculated allocation of total overhead to this service based on proportion of direct costs to the municipality), and amortization (depreciation cost of all assets owned by the municipality and used to deliver the service). Municipalities are in order from lowest to highest cost based on the average of 2012, 2013, 2014 results.
### 2.2.1 Total Policing Data (See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Direct Costs ($)</th>
<th>Indirect Costs ($)</th>
<th>Overhead Costs ($)</th>
<th>Amortization Costs ($)</th>
<th>Total Costs ($)</th>
<th>Municipal Population (#)</th>
<th>Cost per Capita ($)</th>
<th>Population Served (#)</th>
<th>Cost Per Population Served ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$22,671,427</td>
<td>$6,958,333</td>
<td>$2,784,424</td>
<td>$768,775</td>
<td>$33,182,959</td>
<td>89,074</td>
<td>$373</td>
<td>96,567</td>
<td>$344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$23,699,695</td>
<td>$8,088,598</td>
<td>$2,842,205</td>
<td>$748,940</td>
<td>$35,379,438</td>
<td>90,417</td>
<td>$391</td>
<td>97,943</td>
<td>$361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$25,250,634</td>
<td>$8,278,766</td>
<td>$2,990,204</td>
<td>$738,488</td>
<td>$37,258,092</td>
<td>93,004</td>
<td>$401</td>
<td>100,530</td>
<td>$371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$14,380,776</td>
<td>$4,971,290</td>
<td>$2,536,001</td>
<td>$532,534</td>
<td>$22,420,601</td>
<td>61,793</td>
<td>$363</td>
<td>66,895</td>
<td>$335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.2 Lessons Learned

1. The average total cost/population served is 8% less than the average total cost/capita. Both municipalities have only a small decrease for population served. The overall average total cost/capita is $381 and the overall average total cost/ population served is $352.

2. The average cost/capita is similar for the two municipalities. The average cost/capita for Medicine Hat is 4% less than Lethbridge. The average cost/capita for Medicine Hat is $371 and for Lethbridge is $388. The overall average for municipal population is $379.

3. The average total cost/population served is similar for the two municipalities. The cost/population served for Medicine Hat is 4% less than Lethbridge. The average total cost/population served for Medicine Hat is $342 and for Lethbridge is $358. The overall average for population served is $350.

4. The trend in cost/population served for the two municipalities is increasing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2012 to 2013</th>
<th>2013 to 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. These results are to be expected because both municipalities offer similar policing services.
2.3 Total Policing Cost 2 ($/total policing staff) – Efficiency

This chart shows total cost of providing policing services, as above in section 2.2, per total number of policing staff. Total policing staff is dedicated sworn officers (reactive + investigative) + preventative sworn officers + administrative sworn officers + civilian support staff. The cost types are: direct costs, indirect costs, overhead, and amortization. Municipalities are in order from lowest to highest cost based on the average of 2012, 2013, 2014 results.
### 2.3.1 Policing Data (See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Direct Costs ($)</th>
<th>Indirect Costs ($)</th>
<th>Overhead Costs ($)</th>
<th>Amortization Costs ($)</th>
<th>Total Costs ($)</th>
<th>Total Policing Staff (#)</th>
<th>Cost per Staff ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$22,671,427</td>
<td>$6,958,333</td>
<td>$2,784,424</td>
<td>$768,775</td>
<td>$33,182,959</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>$160,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$23,699,695</td>
<td>$8,088,598</td>
<td>$2,842,205</td>
<td>$748,940</td>
<td>$35,379,438</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>$168,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$25,250,634</td>
<td>$8,278,766</td>
<td>$2,990,204</td>
<td>$738,488</td>
<td>$37,258,092</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>$176,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$14,169,752</td>
<td>$5,224,757</td>
<td>$2,478,854</td>
<td>$581,857</td>
<td>$22,455,220</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$167,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$14,380,776</td>
<td>$4,971,290</td>
<td>$2,536,001</td>
<td>$532,534</td>
<td>$22,420,601</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>$166,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$14,991,309</td>
<td>$5,457,804</td>
<td>$2,917,245</td>
<td>$495,048</td>
<td>$23,861,406</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$179,409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NOTES:
1. Cost per policing staff increases when collective agreements are settled.

#### 2.3.2 Lessons Learned
1. The average total cost/total policing staff is similar for the two municipalities. The average total cost/total policing staff for Medicine Hat is only 2% more than Lethbridge. The average total cost/total policing staff for Medicine Hat $171,021 and for Lethbridge is $168,452. The overall average total cost/total policing staff is $169,737.

2. The trend in cost/ total policing staff for the municipalities is increasing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 to 2013</th>
<th>2013 to 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Total Policing Cost 3 ($/dedicated officer) – Efficiency

This chart shows the total cost of providing policing services per dedicated officer. Dedicated officers are the reactive and investigative sworn officers, e.g. those in the policing operation that are the “boots on the street”, visible to the community delivering the service. Municipalities are in order from lowest to highest cost based on the average of 2012, 2013, 2014 results.
2.4.1 Policing Data (See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Direct Costs ($)</th>
<th>Indirect Costs ($)</th>
<th>Overhead Costs ($)</th>
<th>Amortization Costs ($)</th>
<th>Total Costs ($)</th>
<th>Dedicated Officers (#)</th>
<th>Cost per Officer ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$22,671,427</td>
<td>$6,958,333</td>
<td>$2,784,424</td>
<td>$768,775</td>
<td>$33,182,959</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>$245,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$23,699,695</td>
<td>$8,088,598</td>
<td>$2,842,205</td>
<td>$748,940</td>
<td>$35,379,438</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$266,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$25,250,634</td>
<td>$8,278,766</td>
<td>$2,990,204</td>
<td>$738,488</td>
<td>$37,258,092</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>$278,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$14,169,752</td>
<td>$5,224,757</td>
<td>$2,478,854</td>
<td>$581,857</td>
<td>$22,455,220</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>$252,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$14,380,776</td>
<td>$4,971,290</td>
<td>$2,536,001</td>
<td>$532,534</td>
<td>$22,420,601</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$243,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$14,991,309</td>
<td>$5,457,804</td>
<td>$2,917,245</td>
<td>$495,048</td>
<td>$23,861,406</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$280,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
1. Dedicated officers are the number of reactive and investigative sworn officers, using actual strength (not budgeted/authorized strength), actively providing policing services in the municipality, i.e. in the municipal contingent, policing within the municipal boundaries.

2.4.2 Lessons Learned
1. The average total cost/dedicated officer is similar for the two municipalities. The average total cost/dedicated officer for Medicine Hat is only 1% lower than Lethbridge. The average total cost/dedicated officer for Medicine Hat is $258,910 and for Lethbridge is $263,285. The overall average total cost is $261,098.

2. The trend in cost/dedicated officer for the two municipalities is increasing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 to 2013</th>
<th>2013 to 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 Crime Rate (Criminal Code charges/1,000 population served and dedicated officer) – Effectiveness

This chart shows Criminal Code (CC) charges per 1,000 of population served. It also shows the CC charges being handled per dedicated officer (red line). The actual number of CC charges may vary officer to officer. After initial investigation, CC crimes opened in a file may be downgraded to a non-criminal file (unfounded) while others can be upgraded to a CC crime file. Municipalities are in order from lowest to highest crime rate based on the average of 2012, 2013, 2014 results.
2.5.1 Crime Rate Data (See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CC Charges (#)</th>
<th>Population Served (#)</th>
<th>CC Charges per 1,000 Population Served (#)</th>
<th>Dedicated Officers (#)</th>
<th>CC Charges per Dedicated Officer (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>96,567</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7,334</td>
<td>97,943</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8,842</td>
<td>100,530</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>66,282</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>66,895</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>67,508</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
1. For Medicine Hat the number CC charges/population served is influenced by an influx of population to a nearby military base.
2. For Lethbridge the number CC crimes/population served is influenced by the demographics of surrounding and local population, and a significant transient population.

2.5.2 Lessons Learned
1. The average CC charges per 1,000 population served is 29% lower for Medicine Hat compared to Lethbridge. The average CC charges per 1,000 population served for Medicine Hat is 58 and for Lethbridge is 81. The overall average CC charges/population served 70.

2. The average CC charges/dedicated officer is 27% lower for Medicine Hat compared to Lethbridge. The average CC charges/dedicated officer for Medicine Hat is 44 and for Lethbridge is 60. The overall average CC charges/dedicated officer 52.
2.6 Crime Severity Index – Effectiveness

This chart shows the Crime Severity Index (CSI). The CSI is prepared annually by Statistics Canada and tracks changes in the severity of police-reported crime from year to year. The CSI is standardized to "100" for Canada using 2006 as a base year. Municipalities are compared to the Alberta CSI (red line). Municipalities are in order from lowest to highest CSI based on the average of 2012, 2013, 2014 results.
### 2.6.1 Crime Severity Index Data (See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Municipal CSI (#)</th>
<th>Provincial CSI (#)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-11.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>19.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

1. The CSI is standardized to "100" for Canada using 2006 as a base year.
2. The “relative seriousness” component of the CSI is very sensitive to and distorted by the inclusion of even one homicide.
3. The CSI is recognized as a standard measure of policing across Canada.  

### 2.6.2 Lessons Learned

1. The average CSI is lower for Medicine Hat compared to Lethbridge. The average CSI for Medicine Hat is 67 and for Lethbridge is 89. The provincial average CSI is 86.
2. The municipal CSI numbers reflect the other statistics in this report for the differences in crime rates between Lethbridge and Medicine Hat.
2.7 Weighted Clearance Rate (%) – Effectiveness

The clearance rate is the percentage of CC crimes that are cleared in a calendar year. A CC crime can be cleared by making a charge or by other means. Municipalities are in order from lowest to highest clearance rate based on the average of 2012, 2013, 2014 results.
### 2.7.1 Clearance Rate Data (See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clearance Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. Clearance rate is affected by the type of crime.
   - Property crimes are more frequent and less severe. These crimes are often committed with little evidence of who committed the crime. This means they are more difficult to investigate and clear.
   - Personal crimes that are downgraded from criminal code crimes have a higher clearance rate. This is because perpetrators are sometimes found at the scene of the crime and can be apprehended or there is a witness to the crime.
2. Higher workloads can lead to a lower clearance rate because some files, especially for property crimes, may have to be set aside for attention later due to new, higher priority files e.g. personal crimes.

### 2.7.2 Lessons Learned
1. The average clearance rates are the same for the two municipalities at 59%. This relates to similar services and investigative processes being used to clear crimes.
   2. Medicine Hat saw a 15% drop in clearance rate 2013 to 2014. In 2014, Medicine Hat began counting all crime regardless of severity. This meant including more small crimes, e.g. property crimes that are more difficult to get a charge and clear.
2.8 Policing Service Level (total policing staff/1,000 population served) – Effectiveness

This chart shows the number of total policing staff per 1,000 of population served. Total policing staff includes dedicated sworn officers + preventative sworn officers + administrative sworn officers + civilian staff. The chart also shows the ratio (red line) of all other support staff (preventative sworn officers + administrative sworn officers + civilian staff) to total policing staff using the axis on the right. Municipalities are in order from lowest to highest based on the average of 2012, 2013, 2014 results per 1,000 population served.
### 2.8.1 Policing Service Level Data (See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dedicated Officers (#)</th>
<th>Other Policing Staff (#)</th>
<th>Total Policing Staff (#)</th>
<th>Ratio, Other to Total (%)</th>
<th>Population Served (#)</th>
<th>Total Staff per 1000 Population Served (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>96,567</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>97,943</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>100,530</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66,282</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>66,895</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>67,508</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. The number of dedicated officers excludes officers that are externally funded.

**2.8.2 Lessons Learned**
1. The total policing staff per 1,000 population served is similar for the two municipalities at about 2.0. This is due to offering similar services.

2. The ratio of other staff to manage and support the service (preventative officers, administrative officers and civilian staff) to total staff is similar for the two municipalities. The average ratio for Medicine Hat 34% and for Lethbridge is 36%.
2.9 Policing Activity 1 (calls for service/1,000 population served and dedicated officer) – Effectiveness
This chart shows policing activity; the number of calls for service per 1,000 of population served and dedicated officer (red line). The actual number of calls may vary officer to officer. Municipalities are in order from lowest to highest crime rate based on the average of 2012, 2013, 2014 results.
## 2.9.1 Calls for Service Data (See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Calls for Service (#)</th>
<th>Population Served (#)</th>
<th>Calls for Service per 1,000 Population Served (#)</th>
<th>Dedicated Officers (#)</th>
<th>Calls for Service per Dedicated Officer (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>31,048</td>
<td>96,567</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30,323</td>
<td>97,943</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32,497</td>
<td>100,530</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>27,365</td>
<td>66,282</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>26,742</td>
<td>66,895</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>24,679</td>
<td>67,508</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. Calls for service represents the demand for the policing service from the public.  
   Includes
   - All Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) event types routed through a Public Safety Communications Centre as a police agency
   Excludes
   - Officer-initiated events, e.g. subject stops, street checks, traffic stops, and pursuits
   - Miss-dialed 911 calls, pocket dials, etc.
   - Calls for service responded to by Bylaw officers

## 2.9.2 Lessons Learned
1. Medicine Hat has on average 23% more calls for service per 1,000 population served compared to Lethbridge. The average calls for service per 1,000 population served for Medicine Hat is 393 and for Lethbridge is 318. Overall the average is 355.

2. Medicine Hat has on average 27% more calls for service per dedicated officer compared to Lethbridge. The average calls for service per dedicated officer for Medicine Hat is 296 and for Lethbridge is 233. Overall the average is 265.
2.10 Policing Activity 2 (General Occurrences/1,000 population served and dedicated officer) - Effectiveness

This chart shows policing activity or caseload as the number of general occurrences (GOs) opened for any reason, per 1,000 of population served and dedicated officer (red line). The actual number of GOs may vary officer to officer. Municipalities are in order from lowest to highest crime rate based on the average of 2012, 2013, 2014 results.
### 2.10.1 Caseload Activity Data (See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total GOs (#)</th>
<th>Population Served (#)</th>
<th>Total GOs per 1,000 Population Served (#)</th>
<th>Dedicated Officers (#)</th>
<th>Total GOs per Dedicated Officer (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>52,364</td>
<td>96,567</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>47,665</td>
<td>97,943</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>51,334</td>
<td>100,530</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>12,178</td>
<td>66,282</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11,298</td>
<td>66,895</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>27,466</td>
<td>67,508</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

1. Medicine Hat changed how general occurrences were accounted for in 2014. In 2014, all occurrences were accounted for, i.e. minor occurrences were now included in the count.
2. A GO is an incident on which police action is taken. A GO can take from minutes to months to conclude. GOs can be;
   - Generated from calls for service from the general public or initiated by dedicated officers
   - Generated internally

### 2.10.2 Lessons Learned

1. The trend for Lethbridge is stable for both GOs per population served and per dedicated officer.
2. More data is needed to draw conclusions on caseload activity per population served and caseload activity per dedicated officer.
2.11 Policing Activity 3 (tickets/1,000 population served and reactive officer) - Effectiveness

This view of activity or caseload is the number tickets written per 1,000 population served and reactive officer (red line). The actual number of tickets may vary officer to officer. Municipalities are in order from lowest to highest workload based on the average of 2012, 2013, 2014 results.
## 2.11.1 Policing Activity 2 Data

(See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tickets Written (#)</th>
<th>Population Served (#)</th>
<th>Tickets per 1,000 Population Served (#)</th>
<th>Reactive Officers (#)</th>
<th>Tickets per Reactive Officer (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>19,058</td>
<td>96,567</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>15,583</td>
<td>97,943</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>16,513</td>
<td>100,530</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>13,251</td>
<td>66,282</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>13,813</td>
<td>66,895</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>10,222</td>
<td>67,508</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

1. The total number of tickets written depends on the number of officers available for traffic duty. The number available may be reduced due to:
   - Being understaffed, e.g. Medicine Hat was in this situation in 2014 and added officers in 2015
   - Officers on leave of absence
   - Officers on modified duties because of injury
   - Officers who only write tickets, “when you can...” after other higher priority investigations are dealt with.

2. The number of tickets per 1,000 population served has decreased for both municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2012 to 2013</th>
<th>2013 to 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The average tickets per reactive officer for Medicine Hat is 17% more than Lethbridge. The average tickets per reactive officer for Medicine Hat is 199 and for Lethbridge is 169. The overall average tickets per reactive officer is 184.

4. The number of tickets per reactive officer has decreased for both municipalities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2012 to 2013</th>
<th>2013 to 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.12 Policing Workload (General Occurrences/dedicated officer) - Effectiveness

Policing workload is the total number of GOs (CC crime GOs + all other GOs) per dedicated officer from CHROMS. The chart also shows the ratio of CC GOs to the total number of GOs (red line). The actual number of GOs may vary officer to officer. Municipalities are in order from lowest to highest workload based on the average of 2012, 2013, 2014 results.
2.12.1 Policing Workload Data (See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Criminal Code Crimes (#)</th>
<th>Other GOs (#)</th>
<th>Total GOs (#)</th>
<th>Ratio, CC GOs to Total GOs (%)</th>
<th>Dedicated Officers (#)</th>
<th>Total GOs per Dedicated Officer (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>44,487</td>
<td>52,364</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>7,334</td>
<td>40,331</td>
<td>47,665</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8,842</td>
<td>42,492</td>
<td>51,334</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>8,323</td>
<td>12,178</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>7,645</td>
<td>11,298</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>27,466</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
1. Medicine Hat changed how general occurrences were accounted for in 2014. In 2014, a report was generated on all occurrences, i.e. minor occurrences were included in the count.

2.12.2 Lessons Learned
1. Ignoring 2012 and 2013 for Medicine Hat;
   • The average GOs per dedicated officer is now closer for the two municipalities. The GOs per dedicated officer for Medicine Hat in 2014 is 323 and the average 2012 – 2014 for Lethbridge is 376. More data is needed to determine trends and comparability.
   • Criminal Code GOs are about 15% of total GOs and this is similar for the two municipalities.
   • For Lethbridge, the trend of Criminal Code GOs as a percentage of total GOs is stable.
2.13 Policing Self-Run Service Data

This data consolidates the information about policing services for each municipality. (See Section 3 for definitions of each column heading)

**Part 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sworn Officers Reactive (Dedicated) (# FTE)</th>
<th>Sworn Officers Investigative (Dedicated) (# FTE)</th>
<th>Sworn Officers Preventative (# FTE)</th>
<th>Sworn Officers Administrative (# FTE)</th>
<th>Total Sworn Officers (# FTE)</th>
<th>Civilian Staff (# FTE)</th>
<th>Total Policing Staff (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Weighted Clearance Rate (%)</th>
<th>Municipal CSI (#)</th>
<th>Provincial CSI (#)</th>
<th>Calls for Service (#)</th>
<th>Total GOs (#)</th>
<th>Criminal Code Crimes (#)</th>
<th>Motor Vehicle Collisions (#)</th>
<th>Tickets Written (#)</th>
<th>Municipal Population (#)</th>
<th>Population Served (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>85.81</td>
<td>31,048</td>
<td>52,364</td>
<td>7,877</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>19,058</td>
<td>89,074</td>
<td>96,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>84.75</td>
<td>30,323</td>
<td>47,665</td>
<td>7,334</td>
<td>3,409</td>
<td>15,583</td>
<td>90,417</td>
<td>97,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>97.00</td>
<td>85.73</td>
<td>32,497</td>
<td>51,334</td>
<td>8,842</td>
<td>3,479</td>
<td>16,513</td>
<td>93,004</td>
<td>100,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>74.92</td>
<td>85.81</td>
<td>27,365</td>
<td>12,178</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>13,251</td>
<td>61,180</td>
<td>66,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65.56</td>
<td>84.75</td>
<td>26,742</td>
<td>11,298</td>
<td>3,653</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>13,813</td>
<td>61,793</td>
<td>66,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>62.01</td>
<td>85.73</td>
<td>24,679</td>
<td>27,466</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>10,222</td>
<td>62,405</td>
<td>67,508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.14 Lessons Learned, General

1. The effectiveness of investigations was considered for inclusion in the report. While it could be measured as the average time to complete an investigation (hours/investigation), because there is a wide variation in time required to complete investigations, e.g. traffic vs. homicide, it was concluded that, while some attempts to measure effectiveness have been tried, it would be too difficult to collect data that could be used in benchmarking.

2. For future consideration, collect data on police activity when no GO report is generated, e.g. pro-active preventative activity and after hours patrolling.

3. For future consideration, show a performance measure for the cost of labour as a percentage of total direct costs.
3 Database Manual, Policing Self-Run

Community Policing Services aim to increase public safety through excellence in the prevention, intervention and suppression of crime and disorder. In Alberta, municipalities can operate and fund a municipal police service or contract with the SELF RUN for policing. The decision to establish a self-run service is considered by a municipality when the population is >30,000 and there is a need for full-time specialized services.

Data Definitions – Narrative

The Narrative includes general information that describes characteristics unique to each municipality.

1. Roads Patrolled Length (KM)
   Total centreline length, in KM, of all roadway types patrolled;
   • Arterial
   • Collector
   • Local
   • Private
   • Parking lanes
   • Back lanes
   • Emergency Lanes

2. Developed Area (KM²), to municipal boundaries
   Area developed within municipal boundaries, in square KM.

3. Population Density (#/KM²)
   The number of people per square KM of developed area
Data Definitions – Cost
All costs for Benchmarking are OPERATING COSTS ONLY. Capital costs are not to be included.

1. **Total Policing Direct Costs ($/year)**
Direct costs are all operating to provide the activities of the policing service department.

**NOTE 1:** Direct costs are those for the activities without which there would be no service provided

**NOTE 2:** Self-run (municipally funded/managed) policing services are necessarily complex due to the wide variety of activities needed to fully serve a municipality.

**NOTE 3:** Establishing a self-run service is considered by a municipality when the population is >30,000 and the need for full-time specialized services. For populations <30,000, municipalities can contract with the SELF RUN for policing services.

Includes costs for these activities by Reactive, Preventative and Investigative sworn officers:

18. **Patrol Operations**
19. **Crime Prevention**, e.g. Community Resources Unit, school services
20. **Criminal Investigation**, e.g. crime analysis, domestic, economic, organized crime, violent crime
21. **Combined Forces**, e.g. intelligence, internet child exploitation, I-TRAC (Integrated Threat & Risk Assessment), municipal enforcement
22. **Plain Clothes Investigation**, e.g. major crime
23. **Forensic Identification** (IDENT)
24. **Victim Services**, e.g. administration, crisis support
25. **Occupational Health & Safety**
26. **Canine Service**
27. **Tactical Service**
28. **Negotiation**, e.g. critical incidents
29. **Explosives Disposal**, e.g. EDU
30. **Armourer Services**
31. **Commissionaires**, e.g. staffing for cell block, front counter. Excludes photo radar, impound documentation service
32. **Premier’s Initiative**, e.g. the cost component over and above the Police Officer Grant
33. **Detention**, e.g. operation of a detention facility

**NOTE:** Most detention facilities are within municipal buildings and costs can be calculated using dedicated floor area as part of total building area. LBG has new stand-alone facility.

34. **Operate buildings**, e.g. power, natural gas, inspections, repairs/maintenance of buildings.
35. **Repair/maintenance of vehicles/equipment**, e.g. used for policing and applies only to municipally owned vehicles/equipment (not for externally leased).

**Examples of Direct Cost items**

Includes

1. **Labour**, wages and benefits of Reactive, Preventative and Investigative sworn officers, Staff Sargent and below, including Administrative Sargent including overtime and court time.
Overtime includes,
- Regular
- Enhanced policing, e.g. seasonal (extra policing officers for summer), events (such as New Year’s Eve)

2. Contract costs, 3rd party, used for Reactive, Preventative and Investigative sworn officers, e.g. legal, prisoner security, external leasing of vehicles/equipment

3. Other Direct Costs
   Consumables used, materials and small equipment (not capitalized for amortization)
   Examples
   - Ammunition/firearms, breathalysers, uniforms
   - Communications equipment, cell phones

4. On-Duty Training and Conferences,
   - Wages and benefits for those taking and providing training
   - Program fees, travel and accommodation, wages and benefits for those taking and providing training, includes cost to “back-fill” the positions of those involved in Off-Duty Training

5. Buildings/Facilities Operation, e.g. power, natural gas, inspections, repairs/maintenance of buildings.

These costs are the variable costs of the Facilities Department.

6. Repair/maintenance/fuel for vehicles/equipment, e.g. used for policing and applies vehicles/equipment leased from the Fleet Department (not externally leased). These costs are the variable costs of the Fleet Department.

7. Specialized services, e.g. drug teams

Excludes
1. ALERT wages, costs (leased vehicles)
2. NWEST
3. ICE
4. FASD (LBG only has this)
5. Dispatch Service (process differs widely among municipalities => not comparable)
6. Operate a vehicle impounding facility (process differs widely among municipalities => not comparable)
7. By-law services
8. Licencing/permits
9. 911 service
10. Photo-radar (process differs widely among municipalities => not comparable)
11. Commissions (oversight tracking, complaints)
12. Summer students
2. **Indirect Costs ($/year)**

Indirect costs are all costs for the activities to support the Policing Services department.

**NOTE**: Indirect costs are for those activities that support direct delivery of the service without which the service would in a short time be disrupted.

Includes costs for these activities:

1. **Management**, e.g. wages and benefits of Administrative sworn officers, plus office costs for the Chief and other senior sworn officers (operational managers)
2. **Administration**, e.g. support staff, legal, analysts, professional standards, exhibits/property management, FOIP
3. **Communications**, e.g. media handling, public relations
4. **Recruiting**, e.g. for officer positions
5. **Payroll**, if not by Human Resources or Finance
6. **Records Management**, e.g. police information checks (PIC)
7. **Dedicated IT**
8. **Quartermaster Stores**
9. **Financial Services**
10. **Training and Conferences**, e.g. soft-skills (if not covered by HR budget), training for support staff
11. **Memberships**, e.g. Alberta Association of Police Governance (AAPG)
12. **Travel**, e.g. e.g. for support staff
13. **Planning**, e.g. for the activities of Policing Services department
14. **Insurance**
15. **Utilities**

Excludes

1. **Chaplin Services**

2. **Overhead Costs ($/year) FINANCE**

Overhead costs are all operating costs of activities necessary for the continued functioning of the municipality but not directly associated with the services being offered.

**NOTE**: Overhead costs are for activities that keep the municipality operating without which all other services provided would eventually be disrupted.

Includes

1. Facilities Department fixed costs to manage the department (variable costs are Direct Costs)
2. Fleet Department fixed costs to manage the department (variable costs are Direct Costs)
3. Costs for all other overhead departments, e.g. senior administration, human resources, IT, security, engineering, planning, financial services, Council
4. **Tax funded debt interest.**
Allocation

1. Total Overhead Costs are allocated to each Service Area using a calculation in the database. The calculation includes these factors:
   - Fleet – number and value of vehicles for the service as a portion of total municipal fleet
   - Facilities – floor space area in sq. ft. occupied by the service as a portion of total municipal facilities area
   - All Other Overhead – number of FTEs as a portion total number of FTEs and service area total cost as a portion of total municipal cost

3. Amortization Costs – Policing Assets ($/year) FINANCE
Amortization costs for policing capital assets owned by the municipality.

Includes
1. Vehicles
2. Equipment
3. Buildings

Includes
1. ALERT wages, costs (leased vehicles)
2. NWEST
3. ICE
4. FASD (LBG only has this)
5. Dispatch Service (process differs widely among municipalities => not comparable)
6. Operation of a vehicle impounding facility (process differs widely among municipalities => not comparable)
7. By-law services
8. Licencing/permits
9. 911, if separate
10. Photo-radar (process differs widely among municipalities => not comparable)
11. Commissions (oversight tracking, complaints)
12. Summer students

The total of these costs will be used by Finance to ensure all operating costs for the Policing service area accounted for as recorded in the municipality’s annual Non-Consolidated Financial Statements.

4. Out of Scope Costs ($/year) FINANCE
Out of Scope Costs are all operating costs for activities not captured in the Direct Costs.
Data Definitions – Service

The Service Data describes characteristics of the service common to each municipality.

1. Community Policing Services
Community Policing Services aim to increase public safety through excellence in the prevention, intervention and suppression of crime and disorder.

**NOTE**: Due to the wide range of activities included in policing, the SME group decided not to develop a comprehensive list to describe the service area.

2. Policing Staff (#)
The total is the number of sworn officers plus all other staff FTEs that provide policing services in the municipality.

Includes

1. **All sworn officers** (See Definition 3 below)
2. **All civilian staff**, The number of civilian staff (not sworn officers) FTEs employed by the municipality and involved in the policing service e.g. administrator support staff, special services
3. **Commissionaires**

3. Sworn Officers (#)
Police officer FTEs that have been sworn, badged and carry firearms that, within the laws of their jurisdiction, have the authority to make arrests or refer such arrest for a criminal prosecution.

Includes

1. Officers – Reactive (#)
The number of sworn officers involved in “Reactive” activities. Reactive includes, e.g. patrol, traffic, canine

2. Officers – Investigative (#)
The number of sworn officers involved in “Investigative” activities. Investigative includes, e.g. crime investigations; major, organized, priority street crime, economic, forensic

3. Officers – Preventive (#)
The number of sworn officers involved in “Preventive” activities. Preventive includes, e.g. school resource officers, cultural liaison, family violence

4. Officers – Administrative (#)
The number of sworn officers involved in “Administrative” activities.
Includes
1. Chief
2. Deputy Chief
3. Inspectors
4. Staff Sergeants assigned to Administrative roles
5. Officers for professional standards
6. Officers for training
7. Officers for policy
8. Officers for court liaison
9. Officers for recruiting
10. Officers for human resources

4. Dedicated Officers (#)
Dedicated officers are the number of Reactive and Investigative sworn officers, using actual strength (not budgeted/authorized strength), actively providing policing services in the municipality, e.g. the number of dedicated officers in the municipal contingent, policing within the municipal boundaries.

Includes
1. Officers on the street
2. Officers answering calls for service
3. GIS (General Investigation Service)
4. Traffic Unit
5. Domestic Violence Unit
6. Premier’s Initiative (provincial grant) Officer

Excludes
1. Rural contingent
2. Leave of absence
3. Parental leave
4. Long-term disability

5. Calls for Service
Call for Service represents the demand for policing service from the public.

Includes
- All Computer Aided Dispatch (CAD) event types routed through a Public Safety Communications Centre as a police agency event

Excludes
- Officer-initiated events; subject stops, street checks, traffic stops, and pursuits.
- Miss-dialed 911 calls, pocket dials, etc.
- Calls for service responded to by By-law

6. General Occurrence (GO) in the Records Management System
A GO is an occurrence on which police action is taken. A GO can take anywhere from minutes to months to conclude.
Includes

1. GOs generated from calls for service from the general public or initiated by dedicated officers
2. GOs generated internally

**NOTE 1:** The number of GOs recorded each year may vary over 2012 to 2014 due to changing approaches to counting multiple related incidents either as the total number or as one because they were related, e.g. 15 vehicle break-ins sometimes counted a one if they were in close proximity (one neighborhood). From 2015 forward, they will be recorded as 15 separate incidents.

**NOTE 2:** In the future add a measure of, “investigations effectiveness”, e.g. average length of investigations (hours/# investigations), to reflect the wide variation in time required to complete GO investigations, e.g. traffic vs. homicide.

**Examples of Criminal Code Crimes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Offences Related to Death</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Offensive Weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Robbery</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Disturbing the peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other Sexual Offences</td>
<td>2. Theft of Motor Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Assault</td>
<td>3. Theft Over $5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kidnapping/Hostage/Abduction</td>
<td>4. Theft Under $5,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Extortion</td>
<td>5. Possession Stolen Goods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Criminal Harassment</td>
<td>6. Fraud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Uttering Threats</td>
<td>7. Arson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Motor Vehicle Collision (MVC) Activity, CROMS (#)**
The activity is the number of MVCs investigated within municipal boundaries annually.

8. **Criminal Code (CC) Crimes (#)** Reference: Statistics Canada Table 252-0088
CC Crimes is a count of all CC crimes reported to and by police.
Includes

1. Criminal Code offences

Excludes

1. "Crime Rate" that is a measure of the volume of crime coming to the attention of the police divided by the population of interest
9. **Weighted Crime Clearance Rate (%)**
   Reference: Statistics Canada Table 252-0088
   The Clearance Rate is the percentage of CC offences cleared in a calendar year, as reported to the federal government’s Statistics Canada annually.

   Includes
   1. Number of crimes solved (clearances) by charging accused persons
   2. Number of crimes solved (clearances) “otherwise”

   **NOTE:** Personal crimes have the highest clearance rate. Property crimes are difficult to solve because they rarely have witnesses and are often committed by transients who cannot be easily tracked down.

10. **Crime Severity Index,**
    The Crime Severity Index, prepared annually by Statistics Canada, tracks changes in the severity of police-reported crime from year to year. It takes into account not only the change in volume of a particular crime, but also the relative seriousness of that crime in comparison to other crimes. The Crime Severity Index helps answer such questions as: is the crime coming to the attention of police more or less serious than before; and, is police-reported crime in a given city or province more or less serious than in Canada overall?

    The Index is standardized to "100" for Canada using 2006 as a base year.

    **NOTE 1:** The CSI varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction depending on how crime is handled in the courts in each jurisdiction

    **NOTE 2:** The SME Group agreed to include the CSI, recognizing it is a standard measure of policing across Canada.

    **NOTE 3:** The Group requested that in the Benchmarking Final Report, the CSI be shown with the caveat that the “relative seriousness” component is distorted by homicides.

    **NOTE 4:** The CSI numbers for municipalities will be shown in the Benchmarking Report in relation to the Alberta Crime Severity Index (2014) = [http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/legal51a-eng.htm](http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-som/l01/cst01/legal51a-eng.htm)

11. **Municipal Population (#)**
    Includes
    1. Municipal population is the number of permanent residents as measured by the most recent municipal census.
Excludes
1. Non-resident population, e.g. second home owners, temporary workers
2. Average visitor population (Banff, Canmore)

12. Population Served (#)
Population served is the number of people needing protection by the municipality police service.

Includes
1. Municipal population
2. Non-resident population (second home owners, temporary workers)
3. Average visitor population (Banff, Canmore)
3.1 Benchmark Performance Measures (PM) Calculations

All calculations are made in the database system based on finalized data input from municipalities.

**Efficiency**

1. Total Policing Cost 1 ($/capita and population served)

\[
\frac{\text{Total Policing Direct Costs} + \text{Indirect Costs} + \text{Prorated Overhead Costs} + \text{Amortization Costs for Policing Assets}}{\text{Municipal Population and Population Served}}
\]

2. Total Policing Services Cost 2 ($/total policing Staff)

\[
\frac{\text{Total Policing Direct Costs} + \text{Indirect Costs} + \text{Prorated Overhead Costs} + \text{Amortization Costs for Policing Assets}}{\text{Total Number of Policing Staff}}
\]

3. Total Policing Services Cost 3 ($/dedicated officer)

\[
\frac{\text{Total Policing Direct Costs} + \text{Indirect Costs} + \text{Prorated Overhead Costs} + \text{Amortization Costs for Policing Assets}}{\text{Number of Dedicated (Reactive + Investigative) Officers}}
\]

4. Labour Cost vs. Total Direct Cost (%)

\[
\frac{\text{Labour Direct Costs}}{\text{Total Policing Direct Costs}} \times 100
\]
Effectiveness

5. Crime Rate (# Criminal Code General Occurrences/1,000 Population Served and Dedicated Officer)

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Criminal Code GOs}}{\left(\frac{\text{Population Served}}{1,000}\right) \text{and Number of Dedicated Officers}}
\]

6. Crime Severity Index (as reported to Statistics Canada, base is 100 for 2006) Reference the Alberta CSI

\[
\text{Crime Severity Index (Municipal and Provincial)}
\]

7. Weighted Clearance Rate (%) (as reported to Statistics Canada)

\[
\text{Weighted Clearance Rate}
\]

8. Policing Service Level (Total Policing Staff /1,000 Population Served)

\[
\frac{\text{Total Number of Dedicated Officers} + \text{all other Staff (Management Sworn Officers} + \text{Other Civilian Staff}}{\left(\frac{\text{Population Served}}{1,000}\right)}
\]

9. Policing Activity 1 (Calls for Service/1,000 Population Served and Dedicated Officer)

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Calls for Service}}{\left(\frac{\text{Population Served}}{1,000}\right) \text{and Number of Dedicated Officers}}
\]
10. Policing Activity 2 (Total # GOs/1,000 Population Served)

\[
\frac{\text{Total Number of GOs per year}}{\text{Population Served} \div 1,000}
\]

11. Policing Activity 3 (# Tickets Written/1,000 Population Served and Reactive Officer)

\[
\frac{\text{Number of Tickets Written per year}}{(\text{Population Served} \div 1,000)\text{and Number of Reactive Officers}}
\]

12. Policing Workload (Total # GOs/Dedicated Officer)

\[
\frac{\text{Number of CC GOs} + \text{number of all other GOs per year}}{\text{Number of Dedicated Officers}}
\]