



# Police Funding Model Review – Member Guide

May 2025



# Table of Contents

- INTRODUCTION** **3**
  - PFM – A Quick Overview 3
  - Review Process 4
  - Existing Resources 4
  - How to Use this Document 4
  - Strategic Approach to Advocacy 4
  
- THEME 1: LINK THE PFM TO SERVICE LEVELS** **6**
  - Overview 6
  - Key Data and Information 6
  - Recommendations 6
  
- THEME 2: REDEVELOP THE PFM THROUGH A RURAL LENS** **8**
  - Overview 8
  - Key Data and Information 8
  - Recommendations 8
  
- THEME 3: COST CONTRIBUTIONS SHOULD EQUATE TO INPUT AND ACCOUNTABILITY** **11**
  - Overview 11
  - Recommendations 11
  
- OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS** **13**
  
- TELL YOUR STORY: MEMBER ACTION** **13**
  
- NEXT STEPS** **14**

# Introduction

The Police Funding Model (PFM) was implemented by the Government of Alberta in 2020. It requires rural and small urban municipalities that receive police services under the Provincial Police Services Agreement (PPSA) to contribute a share of the total cost of the PPSA. Since its inception, RMA has advocated for changes to the PFM to address several critical deficiencies, including the following:

- ◆ The PFM is inequitable to rural municipalities, as many pay significantly more towards policing in comparison to urban neighbours despite similar or lower populations and a lower level of service.
- ◆ The PFM lacks any connection between cost contributions and service levels; in its current form, the PFM functions more as a download than a provincial/municipal partnership.
- ◆ The PFM contains no transparency or accountability provisions as to how municipal funds are spent or if/how they have contributed to improved policing service levels.

As the Police Funding Model Regulation, which establishes the PFM, expires in 2026, the Government of Alberta is engaging with municipal stakeholders on possible changes to the PFM model. According to the Government of Alberta, the intent of the review is to “identify potential changes to ensure the police funding model promotes long-term fairness, shared fiscal responsibility and sustainability.”

## PFM – A Quick Overview

In January, 2025, RMA released a [detailed overview of the current PFM formula](#). At a high level, the intent of the PFM is to require municipalities that receive local policing under the Provincial Police Services Agreement (PPSA) to contribute to offset a portion of the Government of Alberta’s PPSA costs. The PFM formula and overall annual municipal allocation amounts are both established through the [Police Funding Regulation](#) (PFR). The PFR establishes the total annual amount required to be contributed by all PPSA municipalities as follows:

- ◆ 2020-21: \$23,250,000 (10% of province’s PPSA costs)
- ◆ 2021-22: \$34,900,000 (15% of province’s PPSA costs)
- ◆ 2022-23: \$46,500,000 (20% of province’s PPSA costs)
- ◆ 2023-24: \$69,800,000 (30% of province’s PPSA costs)
- ◆ 2024-25: \$69,800,000 (30% of province’s PPSA costs)
- ◆ 2025-26: \$69,800,000 (30% of province’s PPSA costs)

The PFR also establishes the specific method by which the contribution required of each of the 291 municipalities subject to the PFM (as of 2020) is determined. The contribution formula includes the following:

- ◆ Equalized assessment (50% weighting)
- ◆ Population (50% weighting)
- ◆ Shadow population (applied as subsidy)
- ◆ Crime Severity Index (applied as subsidy)
- ◆ Lack of detachment in municipality (applied as subsidy)

Together, equalized assessment and population are the primary determiners of the amount each municipality contributes to the PFM by being added together after they are each individually calculated. The other components - shadow population, CSI, and detachment subsidy, are considered “modifiers” intended to reduce how much a municipality pays if a large portion of the people who spend time in their community are not

taxpayers, if the CSI is higher than average, or if a detachment is not located in the municipality. Shadow population, CSI and the detachment subsidy are also individually calculated and added together. The total of all the modifiers is subtracted from the total equalized assessment and population calculation.

## Review Process

At this point, there are minimal details available as to how the review process will proceed. It is RMA's understanding that municipalities will receive a survey, and that some sort of interviews or focus groups will proceed. When a survey or other guiding questions become available, RMA will provide further guidance to members if the questions posed warrant messaging different from what is included in this document.

## Existing Resources

RMA has previously released several resources related to the PFM, including the following:

- ◆ [Original RMA Submission on Police Funding Model Engagement](#) (October 2019): provides an overview of RMA's original input on the proposed model and shows the link to issues that persist currently.
- ◆ ["What we Heard": Police Funding Model Member Survey](#) (October 2024): a summary of member perspectives on the PFM, including perceived value and linkage to service levels changes.
- ◆ [Police Funding Model member resource](#) (January 2025): a detailed overview of how the PFM contribution formula works currently as well as high level RMA priorities for change.

## How to Use this Document

This document provides members with high-level guidance relating to key concerns with the current PFM and recommendations for change to better link the contribution formula to service level improvements, enhancements in local input, and accountability to municipalities that aligns with their financial investment in policing. RMA members are encouraged to utilize local examples of challenges in policing or community safety to help support the case for change. Members are encouraged to advocate for some or all recommendations in this document, as well as others that are local priorities. The more common messaging and ideas provided to government through the engagement process, the more likely it is that they will be implemented.

It is important to note that action on some of the recommendations below may render others unnecessary. For example, if the Government of Alberta proceeds with changes to the PFM contribution formula to shift to a focus on population density and crime severity as the primary allocation factors, recommended changes to existing subsidies built into the formula, and the subsidies themselves, may no longer be necessary. As it is currently unclear as to the scope of the changes being considered by the Government of Alberta, the guide includes recommendations that would represent fundamental changes to the formula as well as others that would have smaller, but still positive, impacts for rural municipalities.

## Strategic Approach to Advocacy

As information has not yet been provided as to the scope and structure of the survey or interview/focus groups, it is unknown if or how the themes and recommendations below can be utilized for participation through those mechanisms. RMA suggests that members share their views on the PFM through multiple means:

- ◆ Participation in formal engagement: complete the survey and participate in interviews/focus groups to the greatest extent possible.

- ◆ Written submission to MNP and/or Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Services: a direct letter or similar submission emphasizing your perspectives on policing, public safety, and the PFM will ensure that information not suited to the survey and interview/focus group process will still be shared.
- ◆ Written submission or discussion with local MLAs: it is likely that MLAs have limited familiarity with the PFM and the engagement. Sharing concerns and priorities for change in this way may increase the likelihood of the rural municipal perspective being considered within government.
- ◆ Share opportunity to participate and PFM information with residents: the likely increase in PFM contributions in future years combined with the lack of connection between PFM costs and service levels mean that this issue is likely to resonate with residents. It is unclear whether the engagement will allow for public input, but if not, resident letters to the Minister or MLAs can be impactful.

# Theme 1: Link the PFM to Service Levels

## Overview

One of the primary justifications for the introduction of the PFM was the promise that it would lead to increased frontline policing services in Alberta’s rural and small urban municipalities. However, many municipalities are now paying more for policing without seeing a corresponding improvement in service levels. In fact, since the PFM was developed in 2019, the police to civilian ratio in Alberta has actually decreased, as has the number of police officers per 100,000 people. RMA member survey responses support this broader provincial trend, as most respondents have not observed the increase in service levels that they were promised through the PFM.

The disconnect between funding contributions and service enhancements raises serious concerns about the effectiveness of the PFM in actually contributing to new rural positions and an overall increase in policing resources in rural Alberta. If rural and small urban municipalities are required to contribute more, they should see tangible benefits in their communities, including:

- ◆ More officers available to respond to calls
- ◆ Shorter police response times
- ◆ Reduced officer vacancies
- ◆ Greater visibility of law enforcement in rural areas

While some or all of these metrics could likely be used to monitor the effectiveness of the PFM moving forward, the key point is that without specific and measurable service level improvements, municipalities are essentially subsidizing provincial policing costs without receiving the direct benefits of enhanced service.

## Key Data and Information

- ◆ From 2019 to 2023, the overall police to civilian ratio in Alberta has declined from 2.6 officers per 100,000 people to 2.2 officers per 100,000 people ([Stats Canada](#)).
- ◆ From 2019 to 2023, the total number of police officers in Alberta increase from 7,687 to 7,977. However, the amount actually decreased from 2022 to 2023 ([Stats Canada](#)).
- ◆ From 2019 to 2023, Alberta’s authorized police officer strength increased from 7,888 to 8,213. Overall staffing was consistently 200-300 officers below the authorized strength level throughout these years ([Stats Canada](#)).
- ◆ RMA members reported a perceived slight decrease in local service levels during the PFM timeframe (2020 – 2024) ([RMA Member Survey Summary](#)).
- ◆ Among 22 municipalities that provided RMA with specific data on local vacancy rates, 236 of 314 (75.2%) of provincial positions within those municipalities were filled when the survey was completed ([RMA Member Survey Summary](#)).

## Recommendations

- ▶ ***Recommendation 1: A defined portion of funds contributed through the PFM must be used to fund frontline positions serving the municipalities that contribute to the PFM***

Upon the launch of the PFM in 2020, the former Minister of Justice and Solicitor General and other GOA officials repeatedly stated that the PFM would directly lead to more “boots on the ground” in rural Alberta and directly

fund frontline policing positions in municipalities policed by the PPSA. Unfortunately, these public commitments have not been matched in practice, as RMA has learned from the RCMP that significant portions of PFM funding is used for specialized positions located in central areas such as Edmonton. While specialized positions certainly contribute to community safety across the province, they do not enhance day-to-day police presence in rural Alberta. More troublingly, RMA has also learned that portions of PFM funds are used to support general capital and operational costs for the RCMP.

This recommendation would ensure that contributing municipalities can directly trace how their funding contributions are used to contribute to an increased police presence within their municipalities. As outlined in sections below, it may be impractical that 100% of every municipality's contribution remain local, but a significant portion must. If the PFM is truly intended to represent a partnership between municipalities, the Government of Alberta and the RCMP, linkages between local contributions and local services must be clear and defined. Anything less will result in continuation of the PFM as a simple download.

▶ ***Recommendation 2: Municipal contribution rates must be directly linked to reaching and maintaining a defined level of service that meets local needs***

If the PFM transitions into a model in which most funds contributed by a municipality are earmarked for enhancing local service levels, this amount should, at least in part, be based on the cost of enhancing service to a defined level, and maintaining it at that level thereafter. In other words, municipalities should have a clear and up-to-date understanding of their current service levels, what is an adequate service level based on a specific methodology, and the path by which the Government of Alberta and RCMP will follow to use PFM funding to reach and maintain that level. This approach would greatly enhance PFM transparency and accountability, and would introduce a clear and measurable "local lens" into the process as municipalities can understand exactly how their contributions are being used. It would replace the current formula, which is highly arbitrary and based almost entirely on a municipality's financial capacity rather than service needs, with a model that actually drives towards specific benchmarks that are relevant at a local level.

▶ ***Recommendation 3: If vacant frontline positions cannot be filled, contributing municipalities should be refunded their PFM contribution proportional to the number of local vacancies.***

It is inexcusable that PFM contributions are currently being used for routine capital and operational needs. In conjunction with recommendation 2 above, if the RCMP is unable to utilize locally-contributed PFM funding to fill or maintain local positions, that funding should be refunded to the contributing municipality.

# Theme 2: Redevelop the PFM Through a Rural Lens

## Overview

Despite the fact that rural municipalities contribute the vast majority of funds collected through the PFM under the current formula, there are no components of the formula itself or requirements as to how the GOA/RCMP use the funds collected that recognizes unique challenges and costs associated with providing policing services in rural Alberta. In fact, many components of the formula are outright hostile to rural municipalities, either by treating them as a “piggy bank” with no recognition of their rural crime challenges, or by arbitrarily excluding them from receiving certain subsidies available to small urban municipalities.

As mentioned above, if the PFM is intended to formalize a partnership between PPSA municipalities, the Government of Alberta, and the RCMP for policing under the PPSA, contributing municipalities must understand how their contributions are being used and should not be arbitrarily required to contribute a disproportionate share of costs for reasons unrelated to the service they are receiving.

## Key Data and Information

- ◆ RMA’s 69 rural municipal members have contributed 81% of the funds collected by the Government of Alberta under the PFM (data provided to RMA from Government of Alberta).
- ◆ RMA’s 69 rural municipal members comprise 73.4% of the population of all municipalities contributing to the PFM (data provided to RMA from Government of Alberta).
- ◆ The average RMA member contributed \$709,235 to the PFM in 2024-25 (data provided to RMA from Government of Alberta).
- ◆ The average of all contributing municipalities (rural and urban) was \$207,395 in 2024-25 (data provided to RMA from Government of Alberta).
- ◆ 100% of the 49 respondents to RMA’s member survey indicated that the PFM required them to respond to increased policing costs by making fiscal adjustments in other areas.
  - ◇ 59% indicated that they increased property tax rates.
  - ◇ 26.5% indicated that they decreased investment in other community services ([RMA Member Survey Summary](#)).

## Recommendations

- ▶ ***Recommendation 4: Significantly reduce the weighting of or eliminate the use of equalized assessment in the PFM contribution formula***

Equalized assessment currently comprises 50% of the PFM formula. Equalized assessment is intended to reflect a municipality’s fiscal capacity. This assumption and heavy usage in the formula is problematic for two reasons:

- ◆ At a fundamental level, equalized assessment is an inaccurate measure for a municipality’s ability to pay for any service. Equalized assessment is intended to serve as a proxy for a municipality’s property tax base and overall level of revenue. However, this metric fails to consider that properties require infrastructure and services, and a larger assessment base typically equates to increased municipal costs to provide services.

Equalized assessment also does not directly translate into the amount of taxes collected. This varies significantly among municipalities based on their mill rates, as well as due to the fact that several provincial policy decisions in recent years have reduced the amount of taxes paid on oil and gas assets, as explained in RMA's [Below the Drill](#) campaign.

- ◆ Equalized assessment has virtually no linkage or connection to policing need, particularly in rural municipalities with the majority of the assessment base consists of non-residential properties. Weighing equalized assessment so heavily within the formula is a blatant download, as it is completely unrelated to the level of service required in a given community.

RMA's preferred approach would be to eliminate the use of equalized assessment from the PFM contribution formula moving forward. For a "people service" such as policing, its use is both inaccurate and illogical and simply downloads costs arbitrarily.

► ***Recommendation 5: Include population density as a factor within the PFM contribution formula***

The current formula weighs population and equalized assessment equally, with population serving as a proxy for the demand for service. In general, municipalities with higher populations are required to pay a larger portion of PFM costs. Rural municipalities have very low population densities, and relatively low populations when compared to all municipalities in the province. However, within the context of the PFM, rural municipalities are again penalized as they comprise most of the population base impacted by the PFM. This is primarily because the population of urban municipalities that receive policing under the PPSA is capped at 5,000, while no population cap exists for rural municipalities. As a result, the average population of an urban PPSA municipality is 919, while the average population of a rural PPSA municipality is 8,096. This results in a second disproportionate burden being placed on rural municipalities because the population indicator does not consider population density and the challenges of providing policing (or any service) across sparsely populated rural municipalities in comparison to densely populated urban municipalities. In other words, rural municipalities are paying a disproportionate share of PFM costs due to their larger share of population, with no consideration of how the characteristics or geography of the population impacts the level of policing service available or corresponding service costs.

In the RMA member survey, most respondents believed that the PFM formula could be improved by ensuring that the ratio of police officers is linked to municipal population. Further, 96% of respondents to the survey believe that the ratio of officers should be proportionate to the square kilometers of a municipality. These factors combined create the basis for a focus on population density as a primary measure for policing costs.

These findings highlight the need to consider the number of officers per square kilometer as a primary factor in the PFM formula. By doing so, the model would more accurately reflect the unique challenges faced by rural municipalities, which often encompass vast areas with low population densities. This adjustment could lead to a more equitable distribution of policing costs, alleviating the financial burden on sparsely populated regions.

It is no surprise that providing the same level of service in a large rural area and a condensed town is simply not possible. Although rural communities should not be expected to accept a lower level of service, there is a general understanding that a resident's location determines the level of service that they will receive. If the level of service is inherently lower, the cost of that service should also be lower. Under the current formula, the opposite is true.

Revising the PFM to prioritize population density over equalized assessment and total population would create a fairer system that acknowledges the distinctive characteristics of rural municipalities. This change would ensure

that policing costs are allocated in a manner that aligns with the actual needs of these communities and create a baseline service level that can be maintained through the PFM costs.

▶ ***Recommendation 6: Enhance support for tracking of shadow populations and expand eligibility to include more municipalities with temporary/non-resident populations***

Only two municipalities currently receive the shadow population subsidy, despite many municipalities across the province accommodating shadow populations to varying degrees. As shadow populations can be difficult to track and report, and fluctuate seasonally or year-to-year based on local conditions, this metric tends to advantage municipalities with greater capacity to track this information.

The shadow population subsidy should have enhanced tracking mechanisms implemented by the province and be expanded to include more municipalities with temporary or non-resident populations. By addressing the discrepancies with the current shadow population weighting in the PFM formula, municipalities can better direct costs for services to where it is needed most for the overall needs of the community.

▶ ***Recommendation 7: Utilize Crime Severity Index data to drive investment in service level enhancements in communities that most require them***

The Crime Severity Index (CSI) measures both the volume and severity of reported crimes in a municipality. Within the current contribution formula, the CSI is used to provide subsidies for municipalities with higher CSI rates. It is unclear why municipalities with higher CSI rates should receive a subsidy that reduces their PFM contributions, as these municipalities should presumably require a higher level of policing service. This is another example in which the current formula detaches cost contributions from service levels.

RMA member survey respondents rated crime severity and crime frequency as equally important considerations for changes to the PFM formula. Rather than using the CSI to reduce contributions from municipalities that likely require more policing resources, the CSI metric should be used to support investment in increased policing resources for high-crime rural municipalities.

One way to shift the use of CSI to contribute to enhanced service levels in high-need municipalities is by utilizing it as a core component of the formula. For example, one potential approach is to dedicate 75% of a municipality's PFM contribution to frontline policing in that municipality (as explained in recommendation 1), with the other 25% of all municipal contributions pooled and allotted to high-need municipalities based on CSI. While the specific methodology as to how best to allocate the 25% portion could be determined in the engagement process, this or a similar approach would balance a link between the need for local cost contributions to be used for local services with the reality that some communities may require higher levels of policing support to address especially high crime rates. It is crucial that this mechanism maintains an increased level of transparency related to what municipalities receive enhanced support and its impact on crime rates.

▶ ***Recommendation 8: If the formula continues to utilize a detachment subsidy, rural municipalities should be eligible for the subsidy***

Currently, the detachment subsidy provides a reduction in the required formula contribution for urban municipalities without a detachment within their boundaries. Despite the subsidy being one of the only components of the current contribution formula with a link to service levels (based on an assumption that a larger distance from a detachment equates to a lower level of service), rural municipalities are not eligible for the subsidy. There is no policy reason for this exclusion aside from an overall view of rural municipalities as the recipients of a download and if this subsidy remains in the formula, this exclusion should be removed.

# Theme 3: Cost Contributions Should Equate to Input and Accountability

## Overview

Local input into policing is an essential aspect of effective police governance. Most RMA member survey participants noted that they were able to provide input into policing through regular communication with their local detachments. However, respondents also indicated a need for significantly more accountability that PFM contributions will ensure a corresponding level of local input into policing. Respondents also identified that a local advisory board would be the preferred method of input into policing. For many years, RMA has advocated for changes to the *Police Act* to require local detachments to be more accountable to the municipalities that they serve. Unfortunately, recent legislative changes have done the opposite by removing the ability of municipalities that receive police services under the PPSA to form policing committees, and instead forming a single provincewide board to somehow represent their collective interests.

Starting on March 1, 2025, small and rural communities policed by the RCMP under the PPSA are represented by the Provincial Police Advisory Board (PPAB). The PPAB is intended to represent the interests and concerns of Albertans in these communities, support integrated safety planning, and liaise with Alberta's government, the RCMP, and municipalities to align policing priorities and resources to help address local concerns and challenges. However, the PPAB is only comprised of 15 members as appointed by the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Services. There are many concerns regarding the PPAB's ability to adequately represent the needs of approximately 300 municipalities that receive policing through the PPSA, especially when it is unclear how appointments to the board have been determined.

While there are many reasons (mentioned throughout this document) as to why the current PFM is a download, the lack of municipal input into local policing priorities is likely the most blatant. Requiring municipalities to contribute to a larger portion of an escalating cost, while weakening their ability to seek accountability at the local level is disrespectful and unfair to municipalities and rural communities.

## Recommendations

- ▶ ***Recommendation 9a: Amend the Police Act to empower municipalities policed under the PPSA to hold accountable local detachments for integrating local input into policing***

Even when formal policing committees could be formed under previous iterations of the *Police Act*, they were not widely used because they lacked any ability to hold detachments accountable for implementing or even considering input provided. Many members described policing committees as “personality-driven;” if a detachment commander saw value in working with the municipality, they were highly effective, but if another individual took over the detachment commander role and viewed the committee as unnecessary, there was no mechanism to require accountability, or even collaborative discussion.

- ▶ ***Recommendation 9b: Develop a dedicated funding mechanism to support municipal formation of policing committees***

RMA also heard from members that many municipalities were unable to form policing committees due to the costs associated with compensating committee members and associated administrative and capacity impacts. Given that municipalities now have no choice but to contribute to general policing costs through the PFM, many smaller municipalities are now even less likely to have the financial capacity to form a policing committee. In

conjunction with recommendation 9a above, the Government of Alberta should provide municipalities with financial support to create a level playing field in terms of opportunities for municipalities to provide local input into policing.

▶ ***Recommendation 9c: Establish a legislative mechanism to ensure that the Provincial Police Advisory Board regularly engages with and shares information with local police committees***

If the above recommendations are implemented, it will be crucial that local police committees not only engage with detachments, but rather have a clear communication path with the new centralized PPAB. Under this mode, the PPAB may actually be a valuable entity to gather and combine various local concerns and ideas to inform provincewide strategic planning. However, this expectation and the mechanism by which it occurs must be formalized in legislation to ensure consistency as PPAB and local policing committee members change over time.

▶ ***Recommendation 10: Legislatively require that PPSA municipalities receive an annual report on local service levels and use of their PFM contributions***

The lack of transparency in PFM reporting makes it difficult for municipalities to objectively assess whether they are getting value for their contributions. If municipalities are paying more for policing, they should have clear evidence showing how those funds are enhancing safety and service levels.

As per RMA's PFM member survey, most rural municipalities have not seen noticeable service enhancements, leading to frustration over whether PFM contributions are making a difference in their communities. By adopting evidence-based, locally informed reporting, the Government of Alberta can improve trust, accountability, and the effectiveness of rural policing, ensuring that the PFM truly delivers on its promise of enhancing frontline law enforcement.

This approach will also allow for proper monitoring and evaluation of the PFM approach overall and should drive more informed updates in future years.

## Other Recommendations

### ► **Recommendation 11: The PFM must be redesigned in the context of an Independent Agency Police Service**

In spring 2025, the Government of Alberta passed Bill 49: [the Public Safety and Emergency Services Statutes Amendment Act, 2025](#). Bill 49 amends the *Police Act* to further empower the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Services to form an independent policy agency. When formed, this entity would exist as an additional police service delivery option for municipalities currently receiving policing under the PPSA.

While the addition of a second parallel provincial police service provider introduces a wide range of questions related to policing costs, governance, accountability, service level consistency, local input and other areas, it creates specific complexities in relation to the PFM. In particular, it is unclear how the PFM would be impacted if some municipalities choose to receive policing from a provincial agency. Would this result in their PFM contributions being transferred to the provincial agency? Would it result in reduced funding being directed to the RCMP? Would this reduction in funding lead to decreases in RCMP service levels? Would it require municipalities remaining in the PPSA to contribute more through the PFM to support continued RCMP services?

The PFM contribution formula must be designed in a way that protects municipalities from having their contribution requirements raised to offset possible lost contributions from municipalities that choose to no longer receive policing through the PPSA, and instead enter into a contract with the IAPS. The Minister has framed the introduction of the IAPS as another policing option for municipalities. If this is the case, its introduction must not harm or place undue pressure on municipalities that choose not to pursue this option. If the PFM's total contributor base shrinks as a result of the IAPS, the province must commit to offsetting the lost PFM revenue.

### ► **Recommendation 12: The Municipal Government Act must be amended to designate the PFM levy as a requisition**

In Fall 2024, RMA members passed [Resolution 4-24F](#), calling for an amendment to the *Municipal Government Act* (MGA) to classify the PFM levy as a requisition. This resolution was driven by concerns over the transparency of PFM costs and the need for residents to be fully aware of their contributions toward policing services.

Currently, municipalities are required to pay into the PFM, but the funding is collected without clear visibility to residents on their property tax notices. By amending Section 326(1) of the MGA, municipalities would gain the authority to clearly list the PFM levy as a separate requisition on tax notices, ensuring that residents understand exactly how much they are contributing to provincial policing services.

## Tell Your Story: Member Action

There has been a lack of clarity surrounding what PFM funds have been used for across the province. RMA's PFM survey provided a sense of the scope of rural municipality's experiences with the PFM. However, surveys do not provide the nuanced understanding needed to paint a full picture of the effects of the PFM on communities.

As mentioned in the Introduction, there is an opportunity for members to impact the direction of the engagement by emphasizing the local fiscal impacts of the PFM and the lack of connection to service level changes. Telling your story to government and the firm contracted to operate the engagement has the potential to shift the focus of this engagement from one framed as a provincewide program to one with unique and

significant local impacts in every rural community. In addition to the themes and recommendations above, RMA encourages members to utilize answers to the following questions as part of their local advocacy on this issue:

- ◆ How did your municipality pay for PFM costs?
- ◆ Was your municipality able to budget for the new PFM costs, or did it require changes to other spending? If so, what were those changes, and what effect did those changes have on your residents?
- ◆ How would you describe provincial police service levels in your municipality today compared to when the PFM was introduced?
- ◆ What is the impact of provincial police vacancies in your municipality?
- ◆ What could be done to improve provincial police vacancies?
- ◆ How did PFM costs impact your municipality's investment into other policing/public safety related services?
- ◆ How would your municipality like to see PFM accountability improved?
- ◆ How would your municipality like to see PFM accountability to rural municipalities improved?
- ◆ How would you describe your municipality's outlook on the PFM?

RMA encourages members to share their story regarding the cost of the PFM and the service levels of provincial policing that they are experiencing as a result of the PFM. These stories will show the GOA the true impact that the PFM has had on communities and their safety.

## Next Steps

RMA is currently seeking details from MNP on specifics of the engagement process and will keep members informed as more is learned. Any specific questions or concerns can be sent to [AlbertaPoliceFundingModelReview@mp.ca](mailto:AlbertaPoliceFundingModelReview@mp.ca).

Please reach out to [RMA's Policy and Advocacy team](#) to discuss this document or a broader approach to advocacy on this issue.