

# **Public Opinions on Municipal and Regional issues in the Capital Region**

# Background


- “Amalgamation Yes” commissioned Angus Reid Global (ARG) to survey respondents in the capital region of Vancouver Island to gauge their thoughts, feelings and opinions regarding reducing the number of municipalities in the region through amalgamation
- The following results were collected from 441 respondents in the 13 communities that comprise the capital region between July 16 – 17, 2014
- A probability sample of this size would carry a margin of error of a +/- 4.7%, 19 times out of 20

# Sample Composition Overview



Age		
18 – 34 Years	35 – 54 Years	55+ Years
26%	34%	40%

Education		
High school or less	College/ Technical	University
13%	33%	54%

Income		
<\$50K	\$50 – 99K	\$100K+
8%	22%	70%



# Sample Composition Overview - Continued



\*Numbers are from BC Stats 2011 Census (most current wave)

*\*Note: Due to individual municipal sample sizes, only differences between Saanich and Victoria respondents are discussed throughout this report*

# Important Issues Facing the CRD Today

★	Sewage/waste water management	56%
★	Coordination between municipalities	52%
★	Transportation – traffic, transit	44%
	Cost of living	40%
	Regional economy/growth strategy	24%
	Tax rates	22%
	Opportunities/jobs for youth	12%
	Government	11%
	Emergency services – police and fire	11%
	Crime	8%
	Arts and Culture	4%
	Other	12%


Q2. "What do you think are the three most important issues facing the Capital Region today?"

The three most frequent responses are:  
"sewage/waste water management" (56%)  
"coordination between municipalities" (52%)  
and "transportation" (44%)

- Those aged 55+ are more likely to respond that "sewage/waste water management" is an important issue compared to their 18–34-year-old counterparts
- Those aged 18–34 and 35–55 are more likely to respond that "cost of living" is an issue compared to those aged 55+



# Satisfaction with Quality of Services



Q3. "Generally speaking, how satisfied are you with the overall quality of services provided by your current municipal government?"


- 77 per cent of respondents say they are either "very" (20%) or "moderately" (58%) satisfied with the quality of services provided by their own current municipal government
- 22 per cent of respondents are either "moderately" (15%) or "very" (7%) dissatisfied



- **Saanich respondents are more likely than Victoria respondents to respond that they are "very satisfied"**

- Those aged 55+ are more likely to respond that they are "very satisfied" compared to their 18 – 34 year old counterparts
- Households earning more than \$100K are also more likely than households earning less to respond that they are "very satisfied"

# Value for Tax Dollar




Q4. "How would you rate your current municipal government in terms of the overall value it provides to respondents for their tax dollars?"

- **29 per cent** of respondents say they get **"excellent"** or **"very good"** value for their tax dollars compared to **12 per cent** who say they get **"poor"** or **"very poor"** value
- **36 per cent** say they get **"good"** value
- **22 per cent** say they get **"only fair"** value


- Those earning a household income of \$100K+ are more likely than those earning less to respond that they get **"excellent"** value for their tax dollars

- Those aged **35 – 54** and **55+** are more likely than those aged 18 – 34 to respond that they get **"very good"** value for their tax dollars
- Those aged **35 – 54** are more likely than those aged 18 – 34 to respond that they get **"only fair"** value
- Those aged **18 – 34** are more likely than those aged 55+ to respond that they get **"poor"** value

# Overall Satisfaction with the CRD



Overall, **respondents are split with regards to their satisfaction with the CRD**: fewer people responded they are “very satisfied” (2%) with the CRD, compared to more who said are “very dissatisfied” (26%)



Very satisfied	2%
Moderately satisfied	41%
Moderately dissatisfied	27%
Very dissatisfied	26%




- **Saanich respondents are, overall, more likely to respond that they are dissatisfied with the CRD when compared with Victoria respondents**

Q5a. “Thinking now about the Capital Regional District (CRD), how would you rate your own satisfaction with the CRD?”




# Rating the CRD: Value provided to taxpayers



Q5b. "How would you rate the CRD in the following areas: The overall value the CRD provides to the region's taxpayers?"

- **43 per cent** of respondents say they get **"only fair"** value from the CRD
- **32 per cent** who say they get **"poor"** (14%) or **"very poor"** (18%) value;
- **19 per cent** say they get **"very good"** (18%) or **"excellent"** (1%) value; **5 per cent** are **"not sure"**
- Those aged 55+ are more likely to respond that the value is **"poor"** compared to their 35 – 54 year old counterparts; 55+ year olds are also more likely to respond **"very poor"** when compared with those aged 18 - 34
- Households earning between \$50 – 99K are more likely than households earning \$100K+ to respond **"only fair"**

# Rating the CRD: How well the CRD works with your municipality




Q5b. "How would you rate the CRD in the following areas: How well the CRD works with your own individual municipality?"

- **39 per cent** of respondents say the CRD does a **"fair"** job of working with their own individual municipality
- **28 per cent** say they are doing a **"poor"** (15%) or **"very poor"** (13%) job
- **17 per cent** who say they are doing a **"very good"** (16%) or **"excellent"** (2%) job;
- **16 per cent** are **"not sure"**

- Those aged 35 – 54 are more likely to respond that the CRD is doing an overall good job in working with their own individual municipality compared to their 55+ year old counterparts

# How well do individual municipalities work together at the CRD level?




Q5b. "How well individual municipalities work together at the CRD level?"

- **49 per cent** of respondents say individual municipalities are doing a **"poor"** (26%) or **"very poor"** (23%) job of working together at the CRD level
- **32 per cent** say they do a **"fair"** job; **11 per cent** are **"not sure"**
- **8 per cent** say they are doing a **"very good"** (8%) job
- **0 per cent** say an **"excellent"** job is being done

- Those aged 35 – 54 are more likely to respond that the CRD is doing an overall good job in working with their own individual municipality compared to their 55+ year old counterparts

# Do you think an increased role\* for the CRD is a good or bad idea?



- **47 per cent** of respondents say an increased role\* for the CRD is a **“good” (35%)** or **“very good” (12%)** idea
- **35 per cent** say it is a **“bad” (16%)** or **“very bad” (19%)** idea; **18 per cent** are **“not sure”**



- Respondents from **Saanich** are more likely to say this is a **“very bad idea”** compared to Victoria respondents;



- Conversely, **Victoria** respondents are more likely to say this is a **“very good idea”**

*\*Q5c. “Some people have talked about an increased role for the Capital Regional District (CRD) – with board members elected directly by voters, and with specific responsibilities and taxation powers. Overall, do you think this type of increased role for the CRD is a good idea or a bad idea?”*

# Perceived Main Benefits of Amalgamation

Reduced governance costs (e.g. paying fewer city councilors)	43%
Better regional planning and decision making	39%
Better coordination of emergency services	31%
Fewer politicians/Less government	28%
Reduced costs for services/Save money	24%
Less conflict between individual municipalities	23%
Fairer cost sharing for large projects	21%
Better management of regional waste and sewage	18%
More efficient service delivery	17%
More access to funding from provincial/federal levels of government	10%
More/better infrastructure	9%
Other	5%


**43 per cent** of respondents say **reduced governance costs** would be a main benefit of amalgamation, followed by **better regional planning and decision making (39%)**



- Saanich respondents are more likely to say “fewer politicians/less government” would be a main benefit of amalgamation compared to Victoria respondents;




- Conversely, more Victoria respondents are likely to see “fairer cost sharing for large projects” as a benefit




# Perceived Drawbacks of Amalgamation

Larger municipalities will dictate to smaller ones	31%
Loss of local representation	30%
Loss of local identity	29%
Risk of bigger government in the end	28%
Transition costs	23%
Hassles with unions	16%
Fewer/reduced services for smaller communities	16%
Less expertise at local level	14%
Less public participation in local government	14%
No cost savings	13%
Distracts from other priorities	5%
Other	7%

Approximately 30 per cent of respondents say negatives of amalgamation would be that **larger municipalities will dictate to smaller ones (31%)**, **loss of local representation (30%)**, **loss of local identity (29%)** and **risk of bigger government in the end (28%)**



# How many individual municipal governments should there be?



Q6c. "When you think of amalgamation, what is your own view of how many individual municipal governments we should end up with?"

- **One-quarter (26%)** of respondents say there should be only **one municipal government** in the capital region
- **21 per cent** say there should be **three**
- **7 per cent** say there should be **13 municipal governments**



- Saanich respondents are more likely to respond that there should be 13 municipal governments compared to Victoria respondents;



- Victoria respondents are more likely to respond that there should be one

# Perceived Positive Impacts of Amalgamation

Public transit	75%
Garbage and waste management	74%
The efficiency of municipal service delivery across the Capital Region	72%
Sewage treatment	69%
Value for taxpayer dollars	66%
The quality of municipal services across the Capital Region	65%
Traffic flow problems	64%
The quality of policing in your own area	63%
The quality of candidates stepping forward for civic office	56%
The character of your individual community	37%

Q7.0. "What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?"  
[Positive or Very Positive responses]

Respondents that amalgamation will have the most positive impacts on:

- **public transit (75%)**
- **garbage and waste management (74%)**
- **the efficiency of municipal service delivery across the Capital Region (72%)**



- **Victoria respondents** are more likely respond that **public transit** would be positively impacted by amalgamation than Saanich respondents





# Perceived Negative Impacts of Amalgamation

The character of your individual community	37%
The quality of municipal services you receive in your own municipality	24%
The quality of policing in your own area	22%
Value for taxpayer dollars	19%
The quality of municipal services across the Capital Region	18%
The quality of candidates stepping forward for civic office	16%
The efficiency of municipal service delivery across the Capital Region	16%
Sewage treatment	15%
Traffic flow problems	12%
Garbage and waste management	12%

Q7.0. "What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?"  
[Negative or Very Negative responses]


Respondents say amalgamation will have the most negative impacts on:

- **the character of their individual community (37%)**
- **the quality of municipal services they receive in their own municipality (24%)**
- **the quality of policing in their own area (22%)**



- **Saanich respondents** are more likely respond that **the quality of the municipal services they receive in their own municipality, the quality of policing in their own area and garbage and waste management** would be negatively impacted by amalgamation compared to Victoria respondents

# Impacts of amalgamation: The quality of municipal services you receive in your own municipality




Q7.0. "What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?"  
[The quality of municipal services you receive in your own municipality]"

- **55 per cent** of respondents say amalgamation will have a **positive** impact on the "quality of municipal services they receive in their own municipality" ("very positive", 8%; "positive", 48%)
- **24 per cent** say amalgamation will have a **negative** impact ("negative", 19%; "very negative", 6%) and **20 per cent** are **not sure**



- **Saanich** respondents are more likely to say amalgamation will have an overall **negative impact** on the "quality of municipal services they receive in their own municipality" when compared with Victoria respondents.


# Impacts of amalgamation: The quality of municipal services across the Capital Region



Q7.1. "What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?"  
[The quality of municipal services across the Capital Region]"

- **65 per cent** of respondents say amalgamation will have a **positive** impact on the "quality of municipal services they receive across the Capital Region" ("very positive", 12%; "positive", 52%)
- **18 per cent** say amalgamation will have a **negative** impact ("negative", 14%; "very negative", 4%); **17 per cent** are **not sure**


# Impacts of amalgamation: The efficiency of service delivery across the Capital Region



- **72 per cent** of respondents say amalgamation will have a **positive** impact on the “efficiency of municipal service delivery across the Capital Region” (“very positive”, 18%; “positive”, 54%)
- **16 per cent** say amalgamation will have a **negative** impact (“negative”, 11%; “very negative”, 4%) and **13 per cent** are **not sure**

Q7.2. “What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?  
[The efficiency of service delivery across the Capital Region]”

# Impacts of amalgamation: The quality of policing



Q7.3. "What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?  
[The quality of policing in your own area]"


**63 per cent** of respondents say amalgamation will have a **positive** impact on the "quality of policing in their own area" ("very positive", 16%; "positive", 47%)

**22 per cent** say amalgamation will have a **negative** impact ("negative", 15%; "very negative", 6%); **15 per cent** are **not sure**

- **Saanich respondents** are more likely to hold the belief that amalgamation will have an overall **negative** impact on the "quality of policing in their own area" when compared with Victoria respondents



# Impacts of amalgamation: Value for taxpayer dollars




Q7.4. "What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?  
[Value for taxpayer dollars]"

- **66 per cent** of respondents say amalgamation will have a **positive** impact on the "value for taxpayer dollars" ("very positive", 17%; "positive", 49%)
- **19 per cent** say amalgamation will have a **negative** impact ("negative", 11%; "very negative", 7%); **15 per cent** are **not sure**




# Impacts of amalgamation: The character of your individual community



Q7.5. "What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?  
[The character of your individual community]"

- **Respondents are split** over whether amalgamation will have a positive or negative impact on the "character of their individual community"
- **37 per cent** say amalgamation will **positively impact** the character of their individual community ("very positive", 5%; "positive", 32%)
- **37 per cent** say amalgamation will have a **negative impact** ("negative", 27%, "very negative", 11%)
- **15 per cent** are **not sure**

# Impacts of amalgamation: Traffic flow problems



Q7.6. "What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?  
[Traffic flow problems]"


- **64 per cent** of respondents say amalgamation will have a **positive** impact on "traffic flow problems" ("very positive", 12%; "positive", 52%)
- **12 per cent** say amalgamation will have a **negative** impact ("negative", 8%; "very negative", 4%)
- **One-quarter** (24%) are **not sure**

- Those aged **55+** are more likely to respond that amalgamation will have a **positive** impact on "traffic flow problems" compared to their 18 – 34 year old counterparts





# Impacts of amalgamation: Public transit



Q7.7. "What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?  
[Public transit]"


- **Three-quarters** (75%) of respondents say amalgamation will have a **positive** impact on "public transit" ("very positive", 19%; "positive", 56%)
- **9 per cent** say amalgamation will have a **negative** impact ("negative", 7%; "very negative", 2%); **16 per cent** are **not sure**



- **Victoria respondents** are more likely to say amalgamation will have an overall **positive** impact on "public transit" when compared to Saanich respondents



# Impacts of amalgamation: Garbage and waste management




Q7.8. "What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?  
[Garbage and waste management]"

- **Three-quarters (74%)** of respondents say amalgamation will have a **positive** impact on "garbage and waste management" ("very positive", 17%; "positive", 57%)
- **12 per cent** say amalgamation will have a **negative** impact ("negative", 8%; "very negative", 5%)
- **14 per cent** are **not sure**




## Impacts of amalgamation: The quality of candidates stepping forward for civic office



Q7.9. "What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?  
[The quality of candidates stepping forward for civic office]"

- **Over half** (56%) of respondents say amalgamation will have a **positive** impact on the "quality of candidates stepping forward for civic office" ("very positive", 11%; "positive", 45%)
- **16 per cent** say amalgamation will have a **negative** impact ("negative", 11%; "very negative", 4%)
- **Over one quarter** (28%) are **not sure**

# Impacts of amalgamation: Sewage treatment



Q7.10. "What kind of impact do you think amalgamation might have in each of the following areas?  
[Sewage treatment]"

- **69 per cent** of respondents say amalgamation will have a **positive** impact on "sewage treatment" ("very positive", 22%; "positive", 47%)
- **15 per cent** say amalgamation will have a **negative** impact ("negative", 9%; "very negative", 7%)
- **16% are not sure**

# Statements about Amalgamation: “Agree With”

Having 13 municipalities and a total of 91 mayors and councilors just doesn't make sense	90%
Costs for larger projects should be shared by all municipalities	84%
Amalgamation will save taxpayers money	67%
Having the CRD organization with its staff and board members is just too much expensive government	65%
All municipalities should share responsibility for ensuring the downtown Victoria core is looked after	65%
It gets lots of attention but amalgamation will never happen	47%
I'm worried about fewer services and less responsive government if we amalgamate	43%
Amalgamation just isn't at the top of my priority list when it comes to local government	43%
The status quo is working; we should leave well enough alone	16%

Q8.0. “Please indicate how you feel about each one” [Strongly Agree and Moderately Agree responses]

- **90 per cent** of all respondents **agree** that “having 13 municipalities and a total of 91 mayors and councilors just doesn't make sense”
- **84 per cent agree** that “costs for larger projects should be shared by all municipalities”



- **Victoria respondents** are more likely than Saanich respondents to **agree** that “costs for larger projects should be shared by all municipalities”



- **Saanich respondents**, on the other hand, are more likely than Victoria respondents to **agree** with each of the following:
  - “Having the CRD is just too much expensive government”;
  - “I'm worried about fewer services and less responsive government”;
  - “Amalgamation just isn't at the top of my priority list”; and
  - “The status quo is working; we should leave well enough alone”

# Statements about Amalgamation: “Disagree With”

The status quo is working; we should leave well enough alone	77%
Amalgamation just isn't at the top of my priority list when it comes to local government	53%
I'm worried about fewer services and less responsive government if we amalgamate	52%
It gets lots of attention but amalgamation will never happen	38%
All municipalities should share responsibility for ensuring the downtown Victoria core is looked after	32%
Having the CRD organization with its staff and board members is just too much expensive government	22%
Amalgamation will save taxpayers money	21%
Costs for larger projects should be shared by all municipalities	12%
Having 13 municipalities and a total of 91 mayors and councilors just doesn't make sense	9%

Q8.0. “Please indicate how you feel about each one” [Strongly Disagree and Moderately Disagree responses]

- **77 per cent** of all respondents **disagree** with the statement that “the status quo is working”
- **53 per cent disagree** that “amalgamation isn't at the top of their priority list when it comes to local government”
- **52 per cent disagree** that they're “worried about fewer services and less responsive government if amalgamation occurs”




- **Victoria respondents** are more likely to **disagree** that “the status quo is working”, that “amalgamation isn't at the top of their priority list” and that “having the CRD is too much expensive government” compared with Saanich respondents



- **Saanich respondents** are more likely to **disagree** that “amalgamation will save taxpayers money” and that “costs for larger projects should be shared among municipalities”

# Agree or disagree: Amalgamation will save taxpayers money



Q8.0. "Please indicate how you feel about each one [Amalgamation will save taxpayers money]"


- **67 per cent** of respondents **agree** that amalgamation "will save taxpayers money" ("agree strongly", 28%; "agree moderately", 39%)
- **21 per cent** of respondents **disagree** that "amalgamation will save taxpayers money" ("disagree moderately", 11%; "disagree strongly", 10%)
- **12 per cent** are **not sure**



- **Victoria respondents** are more likely to **strongly agree** that "amalgamation will save taxpayers money" compared with Saanich respondents;
- Conversely, **Saanich respondents** are more likely to **strongly disagree**



# Agree or disagree: Having 13 municipalities and 91 mayors and councilors doesn't make sense for our regional population




Q8.1. "Please indicate how you feel about each one [Having 13 municipalities and a total of 91 mayors and councilors just doesn't make sense for our regional population of 340,000]"

- **90 per cent** of respondents **agree** that "having 13 municipalities doesn't make sense" ("agree strongly", 71%; "agree moderately", 19%)
- **9 per cent** of respondents **disagree** ("disagree moderately", 5%; "disagree strongly", 4%);
- **2 per cent** are **not sure**

- Those aged **55+** are more likely than their younger counterparts to **agree strongly** with this statement
- Those aged **18 – 34** are more likely than their older counterparts to **agree only moderately** with this statement



# Agree or disagree: Having the CRD is too much expensive government



Q8.2. "Please indicate how you feel about each one [Having the CRD organization with its staff and board members is just too much expensive government]"

- **65 per cent** of respondents **agree** that "having the CRD is too much expensive government" ("agree strongly", 34%; "agree moderately", 32%)
- **22 per cent** of respondents **disagree** ("disagree moderately", 18%; "disagree strongly", 5%)
- **13 per cent** are **not sure**




- **Saanich respondents** are more likely to **strongly agree** that "having the CRD is too much expensive government"



- Conversely, **Victoria respondents** are more likely to **moderately disagree**


## Agree or disagree: Costs for large projects should be shared by all municipalities



Q8.3. "Please indicate how you feel about each one [Costs for large projects should be shared by all municipalities]"

- The majority (**84%**) of respondents **agree** that "costs for large projects should be shared by all municipalities" ("agree strongly", 45%; "agree moderately", 40%)
- **12 per cent** of respondents **disagree** ("disagree moderately", 9%; "disagree strongly", 3%); **3 per cent** are **not sure**

## Agree or disagree: All municipalities should share responsibility for ensuring the downtown Victoria core is looked after




Q8.4. "Please indicate how you feel about each one [All municipalities should share responsibility for ensuring the downtown Victoria core is looked after]"

- **65 per cent** of respondents **agree** that "all municipalities should share responsibility for ensuring the downtown Victoria core is looked after" ("agree strongly", 33%; "agree moderately", 32%)
- **32 per cent** of respondents **disagree** ("disagree moderately", 22%; "disagree strongly", 10%); **3 per cent** are **not sure**



- **Victoria respondents** are more likely to **strongly agree** with statement.

## Agree or disagree: I'm worried about fewer services and less responsive government if we amalgamate




Q8.6. "Please indicate how you feel about each one [I'm worried about fewer services and less responsive government if we amalgamate]"

- **43 per cent** of respondents **agree** that they are "worried about fewer services and less responsive government if they amalgamate" ("agree strongly", 14%; "agree moderately", 29%)
- **(52%)** of respondents **disagree** ("disagree moderately", 31%; "disagree strongly", 21%)
- **5 per cent** are **not sure**



- **Saanich respondents** are, overall, more likely to **agree** with this statement compared to Victoria respondents

# Agree or disagree: Amalgamation isn't at the top of my priority list



Q8.7. "Please indicate how you feel about each one [Amalgamation just isn't at the top of my priority list when it comes to local government]"

- **43 per cent** of respondents **agree** that "amalgamation isn't at the top of my priority list" ("agree strongly", 16%; "agree moderately", 27%)
- **Half (53%)** of respondents **disagree** ("disagree moderately", 30%; "disagree strongly", 23%)
- **4 per cent** are **not sure**




- **Saanich respondents** are, overall, more likely to **agree** that "amalgamation isn't at the top of my priority list" compared to Victoria respondents;



- **Victoria respondents** are more likely than Saanich respondents to **disagree**


# Agree or disagree: The status quo is working; leave well enough alone



Q8.8. "Please indicate how you feel about each one [The status quo is working; we should leave well enough alone]"

- **16 per cent** of respondents **agree** that "the status quo is working; leave well enough alone" ("agree strongly", 5%; "agree moderately", 11%)
- **Three-quarters (77%)** of respondents **disagree** ("disagree moderately", 37%; "disagree strongly", 41%);
- **7 per cent** are **not sure**


# Agree or disagree: Amalgamation will never happen



Q8.9. "Please indicate how you feel about each one [It gets lots of attention but amalgamation will never happen]"

- **Almost half (47%)** of respondents **agree** that "though it gets lots of attention, amalgamation will never happen" ("agree strongly", 10%; "agree moderately", 37%)
- **38 per cent** of respondents **disagree** with the statement "amalgamation will never happen" ("disagree moderately", 28%; "disagree strongly", 10%)
- **15 per cent** are **not sure**

# Overall, are you in favour or opposed to amalgamation?



Q9. "Overall, are you in favour or opposed to reducing the number of municipalities in the Capital Region through amalgamation?"


- **84 per cent** of respondents are **in favour** of amalgamation ("strongly in favour", 50%; "moderately in favour", 34%)
- **12 per cent** of respondents are **opposed** to amalgamation ("moderately opposed", 6%; "strongly opposed", 6%)
- **4 per cent** are **not sure**



- **Victoria respondents** are more likely to be **strongly in favour of amalgamation** compared with **Saanich** respondents (55% vs 33%)



# Do you support or oppose a non-binding referendum on amalgamation?



Q10. "Regardless of your view on amalgamation, do you support or oppose your own municipality holding a non-binding referendum on amalgamation with the civic elections this coming November?"

- **89 per cent** of respondents **support** a non-binding referendum
- **11 per cent** of respondents **oppose** a non-binding referendum




- **94% of Victoria respondents** support a non-binding referendum



- **89% of Saanich respondents** support a non-binding referendum

# Do you support or oppose a cost-benefit study and analysis on amalgamation?



Q11. "And, setting aside your own view on amalgamation, do you support or oppose having an independent, comprehensive cost-benefit study and analysis of amalgamation generally and the best specific options for the Capital Region?"

- **80 per cent** of respondents **support** a cost-benefit study on amalgamation
- **20 per cent** of respondents **oppose** a cost-benefit study on amalgamation



- **82% of Victoria** respondents **support** a cost-benefit study on amalgamation



- **77% of Saanich** respondents **support** cost-benefit study on amalgamation

# Key Findings

- **Overall, 84 per cent of respondents are in favour of amalgamation (50% are strongly in favour; 34% moderately in favour)**
- 89 per cent of respondents support a non-binding referendum on amalgamation
- 80 per cent support having an independent, comprehensive cost-benefit study and analysis of amalgamation
- The top 3 most important issues facing the CRD today, according to respondents are: “sewage/waste water management” (56%); “coordination between municipalities” (52%); and “transportation” (44%)
- Over one quarter (26%) of respondents say there should be only one municipal government; 25 per cent say there should be four or five; 21 per cent say there should be three; 7 per cent say there should be 13

# Key Findings - Continued

## **Amalgamation Pros:**

- The top main benefits of amalgamation, as perceived by respondents, are: “reduced governance costs (e.g. paying fewer city councilors)” (43%); and “better regional planning and decision making” (39%)
- The top perceived positive impacts of amalgamation are: “public transit” (75%); “garbage and waste management” (74%); and “the efficiency of municipal service delivery across the Capital Region” (72%)

## **Amalgamation Cons:**

- The top main negatives of amalgamation, as perceived by respondents, are: “larger municipalities will dictate to smaller ones” (31%); “loss of local representation” (30%); “loss of local identity” (29%); and “risk of bigger government in the end” (28%)
- The top perceived negative impacts of amalgamation are: “the character of your individual community” (37%); “the quality of municipal services you receive in your own municipality” (24%); and “the quality of policing in your own area” (22%)

# Key Findings - Continued

## **Satisfaction Levels:**

- Over three quarters (77%) of respondents are satisfied with the quality of services provided by their current municipal government
- 65 per cent of respondents say they get between “good” and “excellent” value for their tax dollars
- 62 per cent of respondents say the CRD gives them between an “only fair” and “good” value
- Just over half (56%) say the CRD does between an “only fair” and “good” job of working with their own individual municipality
- Almost half (49%) say individual municipalities are doing an overall “poor” job of working together at the CRD level
- Almost half (47%) say an increased role for the CRD is a good idea; 35 per cent think it is a bad idea
- Respondents are split regarding their overall satisfaction with the CRD: 43 per cent are satisfied, 54 per cent are dissatisfied

# Key Findings - Continued

## Agree or Disagree:

- 90 per cent of respondents agree that “having 13 municipalities and a total of 91 mayors and councilors just doesn’t make sense”
- 84 per cent agree that “costs for larger projects should be shared by all municipalities”
- Over half agree that: “amalgamation will save taxpayers money” (67%); “having the CRD organization with its staff and board members is just too much expensive government” (65%); and “all municipalities should share responsibility for ensuring the downtown Victoria core is looked after” (65%)
- 77 per cent of respondents do **not** agree that “the status quo is working; we should leave well enough alone”
- Over half do **not** agree that: “amalgamation just isn’t at the top of my priority list when it comes to local government” (53%); and “I’m worried about fewer services and less responsive government if we amalgamate” (52%)



Shachi Kurl, Vice President  
[shachi.kurl@angus-reid.com](mailto:shachi.kurl@angus-reid.com)

Jesse Ross, Research Assistant  
[jesse.ross@angus-reid.com](mailto:jesse.ross@angus-reid.com)