



**A Summary of the Position of
The Corporation of the City of Mississauga on Restructuring
Governance and Operations at the Region of Peel**

6th January, 2005

A Summary of the Position of The Corporation of the City of Mississauga on Restructuring Governance and Operations at the Region of Peel

The City of Mississauga has three areas of concern:

- Mississauga taxpayers are currently subsidizing Brampton and Caledon for programs delivered by the Region of Peel
- Duplication and overlap of services that exist between the City and the Region is additional bureaucracy and wasteful of Mississauga taxes
- Representation of the taxpayers of Mississauga at the regional level is not proportionate to the assessment base or population

In response to these issues, Mississauga needs:

1. Implementation of a revised cost sharing model where costs are allocated based on use
2. The transfer of funding and delivery of local programs to the member municipalities
3. Implementation of a representation-by-population model
4. The continuation of the regional council model for certain programs

These concerns have been articulated through many reports and correspondence in its 30 year history, but the City's continued evolution to a mature, large urban centre have brought these issues to a head and have spearheaded the most recent persistent efforts to have Mississauga's long standing grievances addressed.

The City of Mississauga is currently the 3rd largest city in Ontario, the 6th largest in Canada and 24th within Canada and the US. When examining the top twenty-five cities in Canada, the top 13 are all single tier municipalities with the exception of Mississauga. They have clearer **transparency**, **accountability** and **consistency** of focus on issues and how they impact their citizens.

When the large municipalities gather together to network and discuss important policy matters, Mississauga is not able to fully engage in the debate as its jurisdiction is limited by the powers conferred at the regional level. Mississauga needs a seat at the top table with the rest of the major Canadian Cities.

Mississauga is often recognized for its fiscal responsibility and unprecedented growth. It is also a net importer of labour, has been ranked the safest City in Canada for the past five years, recognized as one of the top 100 employers in Canada over the past five (5) years and is home to 57 Fortune 500 Canadian Head Offices. The City has now reached the stage where new development is slowing and the maintenance of the City is foremost on the municipal agenda. Mississauga is facing significant financial pressures including the long term impact of downloading and an ageing infrastructure. The taxpayers face significant property tax increases and even then, this will not address the real financial needs.

In many ways Mississauga has become a distinct major Canadian City, and the time has come to modernize the regional responsibilities to reflect this. Councillors from Mississauga need to focus on big city issues, not small town ones and certainly not have the small town vote on the big city issues.

The Mayor and Members of Council have consistently applied the same diligence to commenting on Regional issues as they have with running the City. They are well informed and have years of City and Regional Council experience. The changes being proposed will be consistent with the City's strategic plan and follow the natural evolution of a mature city. Through a series of reports and public consultations they have prepared for a future where Mississauga will be able to operate as a large city at the national level, be represented appropriately at the regional level and more efficiently provide services at the local level.

The Mayor and Members of Council of the City of Mississauga are committed to the success of this process. They have studied these issues in detail over a number of years, have consulted widely with their citizens and have prepared workable plans for the Province to assist in ensuring practical solutions that result in more efficient government are reached.

Recommendations

A revised cost sharing model should be implemented where costs are allocated based on use

Alternatives to weighted assessment in the Province of Ontario do exist and are attached as **Schedule 1**.

1. Regional roads costs should be shared on the basis of lane kilometres;
2. Children's Services should be shared on the basis of active clients;
3. Public Health should be shared on the basis of population;
4. Long Term Care costs should be shared based on location of facilities;
5. Housing costs should be based on the location of units;
6. Ambulance services costs should be shared on the basis of calls for service;
7. Revenues from Payments-In-Lieu of taxes should accrue back to the area municipality in which the facilities that generate the payments are located
8. Ontario Works costs should be shared on the basis of active clients;
9. Ontario Disability Support Program costs should be shared on the basis of active case files
10. Policing costs should be shared on the basis of population;
11. Conservation Authority costs should be shared on their prescribed formula;
12. Assessment Services costs should be shared on the basis of their prescribed formula.
13. Regional Councillor salaries for each municipality should be apportioned to that municipality.

Schedule 2 demonstrates the financial impact of each of these recommendations with a net reduction to Mississauga taxpayers of \$24m annually.

Funding and delivery of local programs should be transferred to the member municipalities, creating efficiencies and eliminating duplication and overlap

1. Transfer operational control and financial responsibility over all roads within their boundaries excluding those under provincial jurisdiction to area municipalities;
2. Following a rationalization in Caledon, Mississauga would be prepared to support roads in Caledon that are truly regional;
3. Authority and responsibility under the Planning Act should be transferred to lower-tier municipalities and those municipal official plans should be done in the context of a Greater Golden Horseshoe Growth Management Plan;
4. Regional comments to the local area municipalities on development applications should be limited to only areas of regional responsibility and should come directly from the operational departments and the agencies. This would result in timelier processing of development applications, elimination of duplication in planning activities and cost savings as the result of fewer staff resources being required.
5. That responsibility for disabled passenger transportation systems (TransHelp) be given to the lower tier municipalities to be provided as part of their current bus passenger transportation systems.

A representation-by-population model should be implemented for Regional Council membership

Mississauga has long advocated the principle that each municipality in Peel should have representation by population. Brampton's representation should grow as the population warrants this. There should not however be any model implemented that introduces **representation before the population exists.**

Today, **Mississauga has population without representation.** We cannot go to a **system of representation without population for Brampton.** Apart from the fact that such a model does not make sense, clearly Mississauga was not treated in this manner for the past 30 years.

Caledon is overrepresented both by population and in comparison to its peers across the GTA and appropriate realignment cannot be achieved until that is addressed. **Schedule 3** demonstrates the representation by municipality at the regional level across the GTA.

The composition of Peel Regional Council needs to be amended to reflect this approach. However, recognizing that a transition period will be required, we agree to allow Caledon's representation to decline over time as Brampton's is increased. Since it appears to be clear that no one will support Mississauga having a majority at Regional Council, we will accept a balanced Council (i.e. the combined number of Brampton and Caledon councillors will be equal to that of Mississauga. Our current proposal is:

Mississauga - 12 councillors, effective 2006
Brampton - 8 councillors effective 2006
Caledon - 4 councillors, effective 2006

There is a need to proceed expeditiously with these changes so that the process set out in sections 218 and 222 of the *Municipal Act, 2001* can be completed in time for implementation by the 2006 municipal election. Accordingly, all necessary public meetings, by-laws and subsequent appeals must be completed before January 1, 2006.

Implementation

The timing of this review is fortuitous because it measures with the Province's review of both the Planning Act and the Municipal Act 2001. In this respect, any changes that may be necessary as a result of this review can easily be included in the other two processes for legislative change. The thrust of the required changes in Peel is also entirely consistent with the review of the Toronto Act currently being undertaken by the Province, which was not in their election platform, but which we fully support.

Conclusion

The City of Mississauga simply seeks the status of other cities in Ontario, including cities like London, Kingston and Windsor. We are the level of government that is closest to the people, and we want to serve our residents and businesses in a manner that is most efficient and responsive to their needs. We believe that can be best achieved through the recommendations contained in this summary.

As Mississauga looks to the future, uppermost in our thoughts are the facts that:

1. It has been long recognized by the private sector and governments alike that cities can no longer continue to operate on the property tax alone.
2. Property taxes were never intended to be spent outside of the municipality they were collected in.
3. Similar to many mature cities, Mississauga faces tax increases and as such we can no longer continue to financially support Brampton and Caledon.

Schedule 1
Municipal Services Cost Allocation Agreements

City of Windsor and County of Essex

Ontario Works	60% of costs apportioned based on weighted assessment and 40% based on actual net cost per the municipal residence of the client
Child Care	60% of costs apportioned based on weighted assessment and 40% based on actual net cost per the municipal residence of the client
Land Ambulance	Weighted assessment
Social Housing	60% of costs apportioned based on weighted assessment and 40% based on actual net cost based on unit location

City of London and County of Middlesex

Ontario Works	Caseload Cost
Child Care	Caseload Cost
Land Ambulance	Weighted assessment
Social Housing	Weighted assessment

City of St. Thomas and County of Elgin

Ontario Works	Caseload Cost
Child Care	Caseload Cost
Land Ambulance	Population
Social Housing	Actual number of units ratio
Public Health	Population

City of Stratford, Town of St. Marys and Perth County

Ontario Works	Caseload Cost
Child Care	Caseload Cost
Land Ambulance	Population
Social Housing	Weighted assessment

City of Brantford and Brant County

Ontario Works	Caseload Cost
Child Care	Caseload Cost
Land Ambulance	Population
Social Housing	50% population and 50% based on location of unit
Public Health	Population
Homes for the Aged	Population

City of Guelph and Wellington County

Ontario Works	Caseload Cost
Child Care	Caseload Cost
Land Ambulance	Population
Social Housing	75% City and 25% County
Public Health	Population

County of Norfolk and County of Haldimand

Ontario Works	50% based on caseload and 50% based on weighted assessment
Child Care	50% based on caseload and 50% based on weighted assessment
Social Housing	Weighted assessment
Public Health	Households

City of Barrie, City of Orillia and Simcoe County

Ontario Works	Caseload Cost
Child Care	Caseload Cost
Land Ambulance	Weighted assessment
Social Housing	Actual cost based on unit location

City of Kingston and County of Frontenac

Ontario Works	Caseload Cost
Child Care	Caseload Cost
Land Ambulance	Population
Social Housing	Actual number of units ratio

City of Peterborough and County of Peterborough

Ontario Works	Caseload Cost
Child Care	Childcare spaces
Land Ambulance	Population
Social Housing	Weighted assessment
Public Health	Population

City of Cornwall and County of Stormont, Dundas & Glengary

Ontario Works	Caseload Cost
Child Care	Caseload Cost
Land Ambulance	Actual cost
Social Housing	Actual number of units ratio
Public Health	Population

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

[illegible]

Schedule 3 - Representation by Municipality Across the GTA

MUNICIPALITY	POPULATION (2001 Census)	% of Regional Population	Local Representation	Pop by Regional Rep	Regional Representation	% of Regional Rep
City of Oshawa	139,051	27%	11	17,381	8	28%
City of Pickering	87,139	17%	7	21,785	4	14%
Town of Ajax	73,753	15%	7	24,584	3	10%
Town of Whitby	87,413	17%	8	21,853	4	14%
Municipality of Clarington	69,834	14%	7	23,278	3	10%
Township of Brock	12,110	2%	7	6,055	2	7%
Township of Scugog	20,173	4%	7	10,087	2	7%
Township of Uxbridge	17,377	3%	7	8,689	2	7%
Durham Region	506,901 *				29	**
Town of Aurora	40,167	6%	9	40,167	1	5%
Town of East Gwillimbury	20,555	3%	5	20,555	1	5%
Town of Georgina	39,263	5%	7	19,632	2	10%
Township of King	18,533	3%	7	18,533	1	5%
Town of Markham	208,615	29%	13	41,723	5	24%
Town of Newmarket	65,788	9%	9	32,894	2	10%
Town of Richmond Hill	132,030	18%	9	44,010	3	14%
City of Vaughan	182,022	25%	9	45,506	4	19%
Town of Whitchurch -Stouffville	22,008	3%	7	22,008	1	5%
York Region	729,254 *				21	**
City of Burlington	150,836	40%	7	21,548	7	33%
Town of Halton Hills	48,184	13%	11	16,061	3	14%
Town of Milton	31,471	8%	11	10,490	3	14%
Town of Oakville	144,738	39%	13	20,677	7	33%
Halton Region	375,229			17,868	21	**
City of Mississauga	612,925	62%	10	61,293	10	45%
City of Brampton	325,428	33%	11	54,238	6	27%
Town of Caledon	50,595	5%	10	10,119	5	23%
Peel Region	988,948				22	**

* Regional population numbers include people living in areas of these regions that do not fall within one of the member municipalities (eg Indian Reserves)

** Regional representation numbers include the Chairperson of that Region