

## REPORT CARD ON REGIONAL MUNICIPAL SERVICES IN THE CAPITAL REGION.

Based on the CISCI Report (July 2017).

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

- 1) **Accountability.** Are those delivering the service directly accountable to the taxpayer.
- 2) **Efficiency.** Is the service being provided in a timely manner at a reasonable cost?
- 3) **Co-ordination.** Are those delivering the service well co-ordinated
- 4) **Suitability.** Is the service meeting the expectations of the taxpayer?
- 5) **Quality.** Is the service meeting the delivery standards?

### SERVICE EVALUATION

- 1) **POLICING. Evaluation D.** Fragmented. New 911 system will help.
- 2) **FIRE PROTECTION. Evaluation E.** 17 Separate operations. No common dispatch centre. Full integrations required.
- 3) **EMERGENCY PLANNING. Evaluation F.** Hopeless fragmented. Totally fails to meet the needs of a region in a high earthquake risk zone.
- 4) **EMERGENCY DISPATCH. Evaluation D.** Recently implemented system only covers Police and 911 Call Answer, but not fire protection.
- 5) **TRANSPORTATION. Evaluation D.** Transit Commission service adequate. No Regional Transportation Plan. No regional accountability or oversight.
- 6) **WATER SUPPLY. Evaluation B.** Good service, administered by CRD, but expensive. Decision-makers not accountable to taxpayers.
- 7) **SANITARY WASTEMANAGEMENT (Peninsula). Evaluation B.** Good service but not directly accountable to the taxpayer  
**SAANITARY WASTEMANAGEMENT (Core). Evaluation E.** New treatment system being built but bio-wastes plan undecided. Very expensive. Source control fragmented.
- 8) **STORM SEWER MANAGEMENT. Evaluation D.** Many combined sewer systems exist resulting in storm water entering sewage treatment system. Age of pipelines a major concern.
- 9) **RECREATION. Evaluation C.** Community delivered. Better co-ordination required.
- 10) **PARKS. Evaluation B.** Good Service but decision makers not always accountable to taxpayers.
- 11) **SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT. Evaluation C.** Wide variety of service delivery levels. Recycling poor in some areas. Landfill capacity a concern. Kitchen waste shipped out of Region.
- 12) **LIBRARIES. Evaluation C** Service provided by two Regional Districts
- 13) **LAND USE PLANNING. Evaluation F.** No Regional Growth Strategy. No consistency in zoning designations. There are 110 bylaws in the region dealing for land use and building codes.

- 14) **HOUSING. Evaluation D.** Regional affordable housing strategy in place but delivery not accountable. New Regional Housing First Program will improve this service.
- 15) **BYLAW ADMINISTRATION. Evaluation F.** Hopelessly fragmented. Wide range of variation in the 104 Building codes and Land Use Bylaws in the Region.
- 16) **ADMINISTRATION. Evaluation F.** Very expensive. Fragmented, complex and inconsistent.

**NOTE:** The CISGI report paid scant attention to Arts and Culture, notwithstanding it is an area of focus of the CRD. It is a source of ongoing concern that not all 13 municipalities support CRD Arts and Culture financially. As a result, the CRD lacks the resources necessary to fund their operational initiatives which benefit the entire region. Furthermore, there is no unified body to advocate for cultural facilities appropriate to a Capital Region. For example, Greater Victoria lacks a performing arts centre worthy of its size and status. The region has a stable economy and educated population that would support such a facility, but due to the lack of cooperation and participation among local municipalities, it cannot gain the consensus or raise the capital necessary to build one. **Evaluation F**