The Council of the Regional Municipality of Peel

REVISED AGENDA

Date: Thursday, May 23, 2019
Time: 9:30 AM
Place: Council Chamber, 5th Floor
Regional Administrative Headquarters
10 Peel Centre Drive, Suite A
Brampton, Ontario

For inquiries about this agenda or to make arrangements for accessibility accommodations including alternate formats, please contact:

Christine Thomson at (905) 791-7800, ext. 4582 or at christine.thomson@peelregion.ca.

Agendas and reports are available at www.peelregion.ca/council
1. ROLL CALL

2. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   3.1. May 9, 2019 Regional Council meeting

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

5. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS SPONSORED BY A MEMBER OF COUNCIL

6. CONSENT AGENDA

7. DELEGATIONS
   7.1. Mark MacDonald, Partner, Government and Public Sector, Global Leader, Public Finance Management; Mohamed Bhamani, Associate Partner, Government and Public Sector; and, Mauricio Zelaya, Senior Vice President, Economics Leader, Economic Advisory, Ernst and Young, Providing an Overview of the Ernst and Young Report Related to the Provincial Review of Regional Government (As requested at the May 9, 2019 Regional Council meeting)

8. STAFF PRESENTATIONS
   8.1. Update on the Region of Peel Inflow and Infiltration Reduction and Mitigation Strategy
        Presentation by Anthony Parente, Acting General Manager, Water and Wastewater Divisions
   8.2. Peel Public Health Strategic Priorities for the Future (Related to 17.1)
        Presentation by Dr. Jessica Hopkins, Medical Officer of Health
   8.3. Regional Council Public Awareness Campaign on Provincial Budget Cuts (As requested at the May 9, 2019 Regional Council meeting)
        Presentation by Bethany Lee, Manager, Strategic Client Communication

9. ITEMS RELATED TO HUMAN SERVICES
   Chaired by Councillor M. Medeiros or Vice-Chair Councillor G.S. Dhillon
   9.1. Emergency Shelter and Outreach Services with Our Place (Peel) (Document 2019-344N)
10. COMMUNICATIONS

11. ITEMS RELATED TO PLANNING AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT
   Chaired by Councillor M. Palleschi or Vice-Chair Councillor A. Thompson

12. COMMUNICATIONS

12.1. Tom Mrakas, Councillor, Town of Aurora, Email dated May 10, 2019, Requesting Endorsement of the OMB Reform Working Group Motion Opposing the Proposed Changes Outlined in Bill 108, More Homes, More Choice Act, 2019 (Referral to Public Works recommended) (Related to 12.2 and 12.3)

12.2. Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Email dated May 16, 2019, Providing an Update on the Provincially Significant Employment Zones (Receipt recommended) (Related to 12.1 and 12.3)

12.3. Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Letter dated May 16, 2019, Providing a Copy of the Provincial Plan titled “A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019” (Referral to Public Works recommended) (Related to 12.1 and 12.2) (A copy of the Provincial Plan is available from the Office of the Regional Clerk for viewing)

13. ITEMS RELATED TO ENTERPRISE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES
   Chaired by Councillor C. Fonseca or Vice-Chair Councillor K. Ras

13.1. Funding of Capped Tax Increases – 2019 (Related to By-law 36-2019)

13.2. 2018 Treasury Report (For information)

13.3. Public Awareness Campaign on Provincial Budget Cuts (As requested at the May 9, 2019 Regional Council meeting) (Now Listed as 8.3)


13.5. Report of the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC-3/2019) meeting held on May 2, 2019

13.6. Report of the ROPA 30 Appeals Oversight Committee (R30AOC-1/2019) meeting held on May 9, 2019

13.7. Diversity, Equity and Anti-Racism Committee Terms of Reference

14. COMMUNICATIONS
15. **ITEMS RELATED TO PUBLIC WORKS**  
*Chaired by Councillor A. Groves or Vice-Chair Councillor P. Fortini*

15.1. Drinking Water Quality Management Systems Update (For information)

15.2. Waste Management School Education Programs Update

16. **COMMUNICATIONS**

16.1. Stephanie Smith, Legislative Coordinator, Corporate Services, City of Mississauga, Email dated April 30, 2019, Providing a Copy of the City of Mississauga Recommendation GC-00192-2019 and Report titled “Review of Bicycle Traffic Signal Installations” (Referral to Public Works recommended)

17. **ITEMS RELATED TO HEALTH**  
*Chaired by Councillor J. Downey or Vice-Chair Councillor D. Damerla*

17.1. The Changing Landscape of Health in Peel: A Comprehensive Health Status Report 2019 (For information) (Related to 8.2)

17.2. Update on 2019/2020 Peel Public Health Funding and Geographic Boundaries (For information)

18. **COMMUNICATIONS**

19. **OTHER BUSINESS**

20. **NOTICE OF MOTION/MOTION**

21. **BY-LAWS**

Three Readings

By-law 36-2019: A by-law to establish percentages by which tax decreases are limited for 2019 for properties in the commercial, industrial and multi-residential property classes. (Related to 13.1)

22. **IN CAMERA MATTERS**

22.1. May 9, 2019 Regional Council Closed Session Report

22.2. Closed Session Report of the ROPA 30 Appeals Oversight Committee (R30AOC-1/2019) meeting held on May 9, 2019
22.3. Expropriation Proceedings - Regional Road 14 (Mayfield Road) Widening from Regional Road 7 (Airport Road) to Regional Road 150 (Coleraine Drive) - City of Brampton, Ward 10 and Town of Caledon, Wards 2, 4 and 5 (A proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality or local board)

22.4. Legal Framework Governing Mandated Provision of Services by The Region (For Information) (Advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose) (As requested at the May 9, 2019, Regional Council Meeting)

23. BY-LAWS RELATING TO IN CAMERA MATTERS
   By-law 37-2019

24. BY-LAW TO CONFIRM THE PROCEEDINGS OF COUNCIL

25. ADJOURNMENT
Regional Chair Iannicca called the meeting of Regional Council to order at 9:31 a.m. in the Council Chamber, Regional Administrative Headquarters, 10 Peel Centre Drive, Suite A, Brampton.

1. ROLL CALL

Members Present:  P. Brown       M. Mahoney
                 G. Carlson       S. McFadden
                 D. Damerla*     M. Medeiros
                 G. S. Dhillon    M. Palleschi
                 J. Downey        C. Parrish
                 C. Fonseca       K. Ras
                 P. Fortini       R. Santos
                 A. Groves        I. Sinclair
                 N. Iannicca      R. Starr
                 J. Innis         A. Thompson
                 J. Kovac         P. Vicente

Members Absent:  B. Crombie       Due to other municipal business
                 S. Dasko         Due to other municipal business
                 P. Saito         Due to illness

Also Present:    S. VanOfwegen, Acting Chief Administrative Officer;
                 C. Matheson, Commissioner of Corporate Services; P. Caza,
                 Acting Commissioner of Finance and Chief Financial Officer;
                 S. Baird, Commissioner of Digital and Information Services;
                 P. O'Connor, Regional Solicitor; S. Jacques, Chief Planner;
                 G. Kocialek, Acting Commissioner of Public Works; J. Sheehy,
                 Commissioner of Human Services; N. Polsinelli, Commissioner
                 of Health Services; Dr. J. Hopkins, Medical Officer of Health;
                 K. Lockyer, Regional Clerk and Director of Legal Services;
                 C. Thomson, Legislative Specialist; S. Valleau, Legislative
                 Technical Coordinator; H. Gill, Legislative Technical Coordinator

2. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST - Nil
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

3.1 April 25, 2019 Regional Council meeting

Moved by Councillor Parrish,
Seconded by Councillor Ras;

That Resolution 2019-370 contained in the minutes of the April 25, 2019 Regional Council meeting be amended to include the following:

“And further, that staff report to the Planning Advisory Committee on possible incentives for working with the development community in the interests of climate change measures.”

And further, that the minutes of the April 25, 2019 Regional Council meeting be approved, as amended.

Carried 2019-379

Moved by Councillor Parrish,
Seconded by Councillor Ras;

That the Regional Chair include his remarks to the Provincial Advisors related to the provincial review of Regional government, along with those of the three local municipal Mayors, on a future Regional Council agenda.

Carried 2019-380

Councillor Parrish inquired as to when the Regional Chair would be providing Regional Council with a summary of his discussion with the Provincial Advisors related to the provincial review of Regional government.

Regional Chair Iannicca responded that he would include his remarks, along with those of the three local municipal Mayors, on a future Regional Council agenda.

4. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Moved by Councillor Parrish,
Seconded by Councillor Ras;

That the agenda for the May 9, 2019 Regional Council agenda include a communication from the Deputy Premier and Minister of Health and Long-Term Care regarding Funding to Support Cannabis Enforcement, to be dealt with under Items Related to Health – Item 16.3;

And further, that the agenda for the May 9, 2019 Regional Council meeting include an oral update from the Acting Chief Administrative Officer regarding the
Ernst and Young work relating to the Provincial Review of Regional Government, to be dealt with under Other Business – Item 19.1;

And further, that the agenda for the May 9, 2019 Regional Council meeting include an oral update from the Commissioner of Health Services regarding local Ontario Health Teams, to be dealt with under Other Business – Item 19.2;

And further, that the agenda for the May 9, 2019 Regional Council meeting include an In Camera item regarding a personal matter about an identifiable individual including municipal or local board employees, to be dealt with under In Camera Matters – Item 22.3;

And further, that the agenda for the May 9, 2019 Regional Council meeting be approved, as amended.

Carried 2019-381


5. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS SPONSORED BY A MEMBER OF COUNCIL - Nil

6. CONSENT AGENDA

Moved by Councillor Vicente,
Seconded by Councillor Thompson;

That the following matters listed on the May 9, 2019 Regional Council Agenda be approved under the Consent Agenda:

10.1. Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Email dated May 2, 2019, Regarding Bill 108, the Proposed More Homes, More Choice Act: Ontario’s Housing Supply Action Plan

11.1. 2019 Tax Capping Policy - Selection of Options

11.2. Transfer of Region of Peel Additional One-Time Federal Gas Tax Allocation - 2019

11.3. Report of the Region of Peel Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC-2/2019) meeting held on April 18, 2019

12.2. Ken Seiling and Michael Fenn, Special Advisors, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Regional Government Review, Email dated April 18, 2019, Regarding Participation in the Regional Government Review
12.3. Sacha Smith, Manager of Legislative Services and Deputy Clerk, City of Mississauga, Email dated May 1, 2019, Providing a Copy of the City of Mississauga General Committee Recommendation and Report titled “Region of Peel Purchasing By-law and Contracts with Deloitte LLP and Watson & Associates Economics Ltd.”

12.4. Carey Herd, Town Clerk, Town of Caledon, Letter dated May 1, 2019, Regarding Regional Government Review

12.5. Carolyn Parrish, Regional Councillor, City of Mississauga, Letter dated May 1, 2019, Regarding Comments on the Regional Government Review

14.1. Rob Bradford, Executive Director, Toronto and Area Road Builders Association, Letter dated April 17, 2019, Requesting Endorsement of the Proposed Municipal Aggregates and Asphalt Recycling Policy

14.2. Dean Kotwal, Senior Legal Counsel, Metrolinx, Letter dated March 29, 2019, Regarding the Termination of the Service Delivery Agreement for the Smart Commute Program

15.3. Review of the Region of Peel Project Lifesaver Program

16.1. Karen Redman, Chair, Mayors and Regional Chairs of Ontario of Single Tier Cities and Regions (MARCO), Briefing Note dated May 1, 2019, Providing MARCO’s Response to the Province’s Proposed Restructuring of Public Health and Emergency Medical Services, and Public Health Funding Reductions

16.2. Alison Blair, Executive Director, Emergency Health Services Office, Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care, Letter received May 7, 2019, Advising of the 2019/20 Land Ambulance Budget Allocation for The Regional Municipality of Peel

17.1. Community Investment Program Update

17.3. File Your Taxes for Free! Get Your Benefits Now Initiative

17.4. Report of the Region of Strategic Housing and Homelessness Committee (SHHC-2/2019) meeting held on April 18, 2019

18.1. Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Letter dated April 17, 2019, Regarding Housing and Homelessness Programs Transfer Payments for 2019-2020
RESOLUTIONS AS A RESULT OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

10.1. Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Email dated May 2, 2019, Regarding Bill 108, the Proposed More Homes, More Choice Act: Ontario’s Housing Supply Action Plan

Received 2019-383

11.1. 2019 Tax Capping Policy - Selection of Options

Moved by Councillor Vicente,
Seconded by Councillor Thompson;

That a by-law be presented for enactment authorizing the Region of Peel to apply the optional tools for tax capping available to it under subsection 329.1(1) of the Municipal Act, 2001, as amended, (“Act”) and Ontario Regulation 73/03, as amended, as recommended in the report of the Commissioner of Finance and Chief Financial Officer titled "2019 Tax Capping Policy-Selection of Options";

And further, that the subject by-law remove property in the commercial, industrial and multi-residential property classes from capping and clawback of 2019 taxes for municipal and school purposes, by exempting property from the application of Part IX of the Act in accordance with Ontario Regulation 73/03, as amended and as recommended in the subject report.

Carried 2019-384

Related to Resolution 2019-429
11.2. **Transfer of Region of Peel Additional One-Time Federal Gas Tax Allocation - 2019**

Moved by Councillor Vicente,  
Seconded by Councillor Thompson;

That the one-time federal gas tax top-up to be received by the Region of Peel for the 2019 fiscal year be substantially allocated to the Cities of Brampton and Mississauga and the Town of Caledon as per the allocation method passed by Regional Council on April 11, 2019 (Resolution 2019-322);

And further, that the necessary by-law be presented for enactment;

And further, that the indemnity agreements that form Schedule A to the By-law be executed by the duly authorized signing officers of the Regional Corporation to enable the transfer of the funds to the lower-tier municipalities;

And further, that the one-time federal gas tax top-up amount to be retained by the Region of Peel be used to fund the Anaerobic Digestion Facility as prescribed by the Municipal Funding Agreement for the Transfer of Federal Gas Tax Funds between the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and the Region of Peel, dated April 1, 2014.

Carried 2019-385

Related to Resolution 2019-429

11.3. **Report of the Region of Peel Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC-2/2019) meeting held on April 18, 2019**

Moved by Councillor Vicente,  
Seconded by Councillor Thompson;

That the report of the Region of Peel Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC-2/2019) meeting held on April 18, 2019 be adopted.

Carried 2019-386

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST - Nil**
3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**RECOMMENDATION AAC-5-2019:**

That the agenda for the April 18, 2019, Region of Peel Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting be approved.

Approved 2019-387

4. **DELEGATIONS - Nil**

5. **REPORTS**

5.1. **Food Handler Certification Training - Addressing the Accessibility Needs of Clients**

Presentation by Dr. Lawrence Loh, Associate Medical Officer of Health

Received 2019-388

5.2. **Annual Accessibility Status Report 2018**

Received 2019-389

Related to Resolution 2019-390

**RECOMMENDATION AAC-6-2019:**

That the Region of Peel Accessibility Advisory Committee Chair write a letter to the Accessibility Directorate of Ontario, on behalf of the Committee, to advocate for enforcement of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act with respect to private businesses in order to improve opportunities for persons with disabilities through the removal and prevention of barriers to ensure their right to participate and access services.

Approved 2019-390

Related to Resolution 2019-389

5.3. **2019 Legislative Review of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005**

Received 2019-391
**Related to Resolution 2019-392**

**RECOMMENDATION AAC-7-2019:**

That staff report back to a future Region of Peel Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting on the barriers to implementation of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005 on all forms of residential buildings with respect to the Ontario Building Code and the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990.

*Approved 2019-392*

**Related to Resolution 2019-391**

5.4. **Accessibility Planning Program Update - April 18, 2019**

*Received 2019-393*

6. **COMMUNICATIONS**

6.1. **Raj Chopra, Committee Member**, Providing an Update on the Provincial Health Care Standards Development Committee (Oral)

*Received 2019-394*

6.2. **Judi Lytle, Accessibility Coordinator, Capital Works Department, City of Burlington**, Email dated March 7, 2019, Regarding the Honourable David C. Only, Lieutenant Governor, 2019 Legislative Review of the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005

*Received 2019-395*

6.3. **Coalition for Persons With Disabilities**, Flyer received March 20, 2019, Regarding Connections 2019 Resource Fair and Career Corner for Persons with Disabilities

*Received 2019-396*

12.2. **Ken Seiling and Michael Fenn, Special Advisors, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Regional Government Review**, Email dated April 18, 2019, Regarding Participation in the Regional Government Review

*Received 2019-397*
12.3. **Sacha Smith, Manager of Legislative Services and Deputy Clerk, City of Mississauga**, Email dated May 1, 2019, Providing a Copy of the City of Mississauga General Committee Recommendation and Report titled “Region of Peel Purchasing By-law and Contracts with Deloitte LLP and Watson & Associates Economics Ltd.”

Received 2019-398

12.4. **Carey Herd, Town Clerk, Town of Caledon**, Letter dated May 1, 2019, Regarding Regional Government Review

Received 2019-399

12.5. **Carolyn Parrish, Regional Councillor, City of Mississauga**, Letter dated May 1, 2019, Regarding Comments on the Regional Government Review

Received 2019-400


Referred to Public Works 2019-401

14.2. **Dean Kotwal, Senior Legal Counsel, Metrolinx**, Letter dated March 29, 2019, Regarding the Termination of the Service Delivery Agreement for the Smart Commute Program

Received 2019-402

15.3. **Review of the Region of Peel Project Lifesaver Program**

Moved by Councillor Vicente,
Seconed by Councillor Thompson;

That the Region of Peel transition existing Project Lifesaver Peel participants to an updated wandering support technology of their choosing;

And further, that the Region of Peel support the transition by reviewing Global Positioning Services (GPS) options with participants and their caregivers, covering the cost of a one-time purchase of their chosen GPS technology and the first year’s associated fees, and ensuring participant and family referrals for ongoing support to appropriate community agencies will be completed.

Carried 2019-403
16.1. Karen Redman, Chair, Mayors and Regional Chairs of Ontario of Single Tier Cities and Regions (MARCO), Briefing Note dated May 1, 2019, Providing MARCO’s Response to the Province’s Proposed Restructuring of Public Health and Emergency Medical Services, and Public Health Funding Reductions

Received 2019-404

16.2. Alison Blair, Executive Director, Emergency Health Services Office, Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care, Letter received May 7, 2019, Advising of the 2019/20 Land Ambulance Budget Allocation for The Regional Municipality of Peel

Received 2019-405

17.1. Community Investment Program Update

Received 2019-406

Related to Resolution 2019-418

17.3. File Your Taxes for Free! Get Your Benefits Now Initiative

Received 2019-407

17.4. Report of the Region of Strategic Housing and Homelessness Committee (SHHC-2/2019) meeting held on April 18, 2019

Moved by Councillor Vicente,
Seconded by Councillor Thompson;

That the report of the Strategic Housing and Homelessness Committee (SHHC-2/2019) meeting held on April 18, 2019 be adopted.

Carried 2019-408

1. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

RECOMMENDATION SHHC-7-2019

That the agenda for the April 18, 2019 Strategic Housing and Homelessness Committee meeting, be approved.

Approved 2019-409
3. **DELEGATIONS**

4. **REPORTS**

4.1. **Housing Master Plan Mapping of Needs**
Presentation by Aileen Baird, Director, Housing Services and Sue Ritchie, Manager, Housing Supply

*Received 2019-410*

5. **COMMUNICATIONS**

6. **IN CAMERA MATTERS**

6.1. **Update on the Housing Master Plan (A proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality or local board)**

*Received 2019-411*

18.1. Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Letter dated April 17, 2019, Regarding Housing and Homelessness Programs Transfer Payments for 2019-2020

*Received 2019-412*

**AGENDA ITEMS SUBJECT TO DISCUSSION AND DEBATE**

7. **DELEGATIONS** - Nil

_Councillor Damerla arrived at 9:39 a.m._

8. **STAFF PRESENTATIONS**

8.1. **Approach to the Development of the 2020 Budget**
Presentation by Norm Lum, Director, Business and Financial Planning

*Received 2019-413*

Related to Resolution 2019-414
Moved by Councillor Thompson,
Seconded by Councillor Brown;

That the development of the 2020 budget be guided by a 2.9 per cent net tax levy target, as outlined in Appendix I of the report of the Commissioner of Finance and Chief Financial Officer titled “Approach to the Development of the 2020 Budget”;

And further, that staff provide a summary report on the impact and risks of the Provincial funding announcements on Regional services;

And further, that staff work with the external agencies to meet the proposed 2020 budget targets as outlined in the subject report;

And further, that the timelines for the 2020 Budget deliberations as outlined in Appendix II of the subject report be approved;

And further, that the external agencies be requested to report to Regional Council in June 2019 on risks to service levels associated with achieving the budget target, and to meet the proposed timelines for 2020 budget;

And further, that staff develop an advocacy plan and campaign and report back to the next meeting of Regional Council;

And further, that staff advocate and work with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), the Mayors and Regional Chairs of Ontario of Single Tier Cities and Regions (MARCO), the Large Urban Mayors Caucus of Ontario (LUMCO), and the Municipal Finance Officers’ Association of Ontario (MFOA), for provincial funding to help transition to changes in the Provincial funding and cost shared models;

And further, that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to AMO, MARCO/LUMCO and MFOA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favour</th>
<th>P. Brown; G. Carlson; D. Damerla; G.S. Dhillon; J. Downey; C. Fonseca; P. Fortini; A. Groves; J. Innis; J. Kovac; M. Mahoney; S. McFadden; M. Medeiros; M. Palleschi; C. Parrish; K. Ras; R. Santos; I. Sinclair; R. Starr; A. Thompson; P. Vicente Total</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain (counted as a no vote)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent (from meeting and/or vote)</td>
<td>B. Crombie; S. Dasko; P. Saito</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carried 2019-414

Related to Resolution 2019-413
Norm Lum, Director, Business and Financial Planning, provided an overview of the estimated provincial budget impact on the Region of Peel budget for Regionally controlled services over the next three years, as well as for external agencies including the Conservation Authorities and Peel Regional Police. It is expected that for 2020 – 2021, total provincial funding will decrease by $45.1 million. As a result of the recent provincial funding announcements, the three-year tax supported impact forecast has been adjusted from 4.5 per cent in 2020 to 8 per cent; 3.8 per cent in 2021 to 4.4 per cent; and, 3.3 per cent will remain in 2022. The pre-provincial impact forecasts include infrastructure levies with an assumed 1.1 per cent for assessment growth.

Norm Lum reviewed the timelines for staff to report to Regional Council with further details related to the provincial funding impact and transition pressures on individual services, as well as, the consolidated impact and options and risks to achieving budget targets.

The Commissioner of Health Services was requested by Councillor Thompson to report to a future meeting of Regional Council with information related to the impact of provincial changes to the paramedics services model that could be shared with AMO. He also suggested that the union representing Paramedics be requested to support the advocacy effort.

Councillor Brown suggested that the service agencies that will be impacted by provincial funding cuts be informed of the potential ramifications to their services, once it is clear what actual programs and services will be impacted. He stated that the Region of Peel should embark on an aggressive public awareness campaign on the costs to taxpayers and ensure the message gains the attention of local MPPs.

Councillor Parrish proposed that a letter detailing the Region of Peel’s model for seniors dental services be sent to the Minister of Health and Long Term Care to promote understanding that Peel’s model is cheaper and helps new dentists establish their practice in communities.

Councillor Innis indicated her support for a substantial communication strategy, similar to the one implemented for the development charges issue, that includes social media, town hall meetings and telephone town halls.

Councillor Thompson stated the importance of ensuring residents understand that the impact to property taxes is a result of provincial funding announcements and not a result of municipal decisions.

Councillor Groves suggested that the funding cuts related to flood mitigation be included in the advocacy campaign.

Councillor Medeiros stated that union representatives and labour groups should be engaged, as well as ensuring the campaign includes outreach to ethnic media.

Councillor Brown referenced the reduction in funding for prisoner transport and requested that the Regional Solicitor report to the May 23, 2019 Regional Council meeting with the ramifications to the Region of Peel should it provide services only to the level for which provincial funding is provided.
Councillor Parrish requested that the report from the Regional Solicitor consider the impact that reducing the prisoner transport program could have on court backlogs, as well as the potential for criminal cases to be stayed due to delays to their court dates.

8.2. Modernization of Ontario Public Health Units in the 2019 Ontario Budget
Presentation by Jessica Hopkins, Medical Officer of Health

Received 2019-415

Related to Resolution 2019-416

Moved by Councillor Downey,
Seconded by Councillor Thompson;

That the Chair of the Board of Health (Regional Chair) write a letter to the Minister of Health and Long-Term Care with copies to the Town of Caledon, the City of Brampton, the City of Mississauga, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO), Mayors and Regional Chairs of Ontario (MARCO), MPPs representing Region of Peel ridings, the Association of Local Public Health Agencies, and Chairs of Ontario’s Boards of Health to:

- Request that the Province maintain the mandate and core functions of local public health, as described in the Ontario Public Health Standards, 2018;
- Request that the Province ensure that public health remains responsive to local community needs and is enabled to work collaboratively with local municipalities and community organizations;
- Request that the Province achieve and maintain the 75 per cent provincial and 25 per cent municipal funding formula for Peel Public Health, ensuring sufficient funding levels to meet community needs;
- Request that financial implications for municipalities be mitigated, prevented, and that the Province fully fund any costs associated with Peel Public Health’s transition to a regional public health entity;
- Request that the Province consult with municipalities and public health agencies on the modernization of Ontario’s public health units.

And further, that the resolution from MARCO regarding public health funding cuts, be endorsed.
In Favour | P. Brown; G. Carlson; D. Damerla; G.S. Dhillon; J. Downey; C. Fonseca; J. Innis; J. Kovac; M. Mahoney; S. McFadden; M. Medeiros; C. Parrish; K. Ras; R. Santos; I. Sinclair; R. Starr; A. Thompson; P. Vicente | Total | 18

Opposed

Abstain | (counted as a no vote)

Absent | (from meeting and/or vote) | B. Crombie; S. Dasko; P. Fortini; A. Groves; M. Palleschi; P. Saito | 6

Carried  2019-416

Related to Resolution 2019-415

Dr. Jessica Hopkins, Medical Officer of Health, noted that May 6 to 12, 2019 is National Nursing Week and she introduced Natalie Lapos, Supervisor, Chronic Disease and Injury Prevention, who shared her story of working as a nurse and the satisfaction of applying her skills and knowledge in public health, with focus on preventing illness. Natalie’s current focus is on healthy built environments and walkability, which has a direct impact in residents by promoting communities where being physical active is easy and safe.

Dr. Hopkins stated that changes announced by the provincial government aim to achieve a savings of $200 million annually by 2021 – 2022. Ontario’s 35 local public health units will be replaced by ten new regional health entities. For cost-shared programs, funding provided by the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care is currently 75 per cent and 25 per cent is provided by the Region, although historical provincial underfunding has resulted in the Region covering 34 per cent. As of April 1 2019, funding will shift to 70 per cent provincial and 30 per cent Regional funding; and, on April 1, 2021, will further shift to 60 per cent provincial and 40 per cent Regional. This will likely entail reductions in the total provincial allocation to public health. The 2019 Ontario budget also includes investment in a new low-income seniors’ dental program across Ontario, but the allocation for Peel is still unknown. With respect to governance changes, there will be autonomous boards of health that will have municipal and provincial representation.

The Medical Officer of Health expressed concern regarding the funding cuts, noting that studies have shown that for every dollar invested in public health programming, eight dollars is saved in avoided health and social care costs.

Councillor Downey suggested that, in addition to the recommendation contained within the report listed as item 8.2 on the May 9, 2019 Regional Council agenda, Regional Council also endorse the resolution from the Mayors and Regional Chairs of Ontario of Single Tier Cities and Regions (MARCO) regarding public health funding cuts.

8.3. **Community Investment Program Review**

Presentation by Sonia Pace, Director, Community Partnerships; and Melissa Toney, Supervisor, Community Development

Received  2019-417
Related to Resolution 2019-418

Moved by Councillor Santos,
Seconded by Councillor Kovac;

That the recommendations from the Community Investment Program Review as described in the report of the Commissioner of Human Services titled “Community Investment Program Review” be endorsed;

And further, that the program enhancements described in the subject report be implemented in 2020;

And further, that the Commissioner of Human Services be delegated authority to approve and allocate budgeted funds in accordance with the enhanced 2020 Community Investment Program guidelines;

And further, that the Director responsible for the Community Investment Program be delegated authority to execute agreements and other related documents with the recipients of the Community Investment Program funds, on business terms satisfactory to the Commissioner of Human Services and on legal terms satisfactory to the Regional Solicitor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favour</th>
<th>P. Brown; G. Carlson; D. Damerla; G.S. Dhillon; J. Downey; C. Fonseca; P. Fortini; A. Groves; J. Innis; J. Kovac; M. Mahoney; S. McFadden; M. Medeiros; M. Palleschi; C. Parrish; K. Ras; R. Santos; I. Sinclair; R. Starr; A. Thompson; P. Vicente</th>
<th>Total 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain (counted as a no vote)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent (from meeting and/or vote)</td>
<td>B. Crombie; S. Dasko; P. Saito</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carried 2019-418

Related to Resolution 2019-417 and 2019-406

Sonia Pace, Director, Community Partnerships, stated that the focus of the Community Investment Program (the Program) is to build the capacity of Peel’s not-for-profit sector to better service Peel’s residents and neighbourhoods and increase positive community impact. The Program aims to strengthen not-for-profit organizations through investing in agencies’ core operational needs and internal business practices. The Region of Peel’s non-profit sector is an integral part of its human services system continuum and is vital in supporting the needs of residents.
Melissa Toney, Supervisor, Community Development, provided an overview of Program enhancements for 2020 which will help to achieve greater alignment with Region of Peel priorities; increase clarity on eligible funding amounts and items; and, streamline the application and fund review processes.

9. **ITEMS RELATED TO PLANNING AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT**  
   Chaired by Councillor M. Palleschi

10. **COMMUNICATIONS**

   This item was dealt with under Consent.

11. **ITEMS RELATED TO ENTERPRISE PROGRAMS AND SERVICES**  
    Chaired by Councillor C. Fonseca

12. **COMMUNICATIONS**

12.1. **R.F. Powers, Chair, Niagara Escarpment Commission**, Letter dated April 12, 2019, Requesting that the Region of Peel Provide at Least Three Names to be Considered for Appointment to the Niagara Escarpment Commission, Upon Expiry of the Appointment of the Current Representative on November 3, 2019

   Received 2019-419

   Moved by Councillor Thompson,  
   Seconded by Councillor Groves;

   That Regional Councillor Johanna Downey and Area Caledon Councillors Lynn Kiernan and Christina Early be nominated for the position of Region of Peel representative on the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC);

   And further, that the names of the nominees be forwarded to the Province of Ontario for final appointment.
In Favour | P. Brown; G. Carlson; D. Damerla; J. Downey; C. Fonseca; P. Fortini; A. Groves; J. Innis; J. Kovac; M. Mahoney; S. McFadden; M. Medeiros; M. Palleschi; C. Parrish; K. Ras; R. Santos; I. Sinclair; R. Starr; A. Thompson; P. Vicente | Total | 19

Opposed |

Abstain | (counted as a no vote) |

Absent | (from meeting and/or vote) | P. Brown; B. Crombie; S. Dasko; G.S. Dhillon; P. Saito | 5

Carried 2019-420

13. **ITEMS RELATED TO PUBLIC WORKS**

14. **COMMUNICATIONS**

These items were dealt with under Consent.

15. **ITEMS RELATED TO HEALTH**

*Chaired by Councillor J. Downey*

15.1. **2019 Vector-Borne Disease Update**

Received 2019-421

Councillor Ras noted that there has been an increase in the number of pets who have been affected by ticks and she inquired if the Region of Peel provides information to residents on maintaining their properties to reduce the presence of ticks and if residents can report ticks found on pets.

Dr. Jessica Hopkins, Medical Officer Health, responded that Public Health’s mandate is only to accept ticks found on humans for testing, and that staff conduct “tick dragging” to identify areas where ticks have established. She stated that Health staff utilizes social media to communicate information on ticks to residents and that staff could work with colleagues in veterinarian medicine to help ensure information is provided to their clients.

At the request of Councillor Innis, the Medical Officer of Health undertook to speak to local veterinarians about sharing information with Peel Public Health regarding ticks and Lyme disease in pets.

15.2. **Healthy Menu Choices Act Compliance**

Deferred to a future meeting of Regional Council 2019-422
In response to a question from Councillor Ras, the Medical Officer of Health advised that the Healthy Menu Choices Act requires Public Health Inspectors to conduct inspections in restaurants with more than 20 locations in Ontario to assess caloric information for standard food items they sell; however, provincial funding to ensure compliance with the Act ended as of March 2019.

Councillor Ras suggested that Regional Council pass a resolution to cease inspections of businesses for caloric information in the absence of provincial funding.

The Regional Solicitor suggested that the implications of such a resolution be included a future report regarding the impact of service reductions as a result of provincial funding announcements.

16. COMMUNICATIONS

16.3. Christine Elliott, Deputy Premier and Minister of Health and Long Term Care, Letter dated March 29, 2019, Advising of One Time Funding for the 2018 – 19 Funding Year to Support Cannabis Enforcement

Received 2019-423

In response to questions from Councillor Palleschi, the Medical Officer of Health explained that the funding is for public health enforcement of the Smoke Free Ontario Act, which also includes cannabis. This is part of Peel Public Health’s regular accountability agreements with the Ministry. Regarding questions on whether the funding was enough, the Medical Officer of Health undertook to report to a future meeting of Regional Council with details related to the use of provincial funding related to cannabis enforcement under the Smoke Free Ontario Act.

Councillor Santos requested that the future report include whether other health units received additional cannabis funding.

17. ITEMS RELATED TO HUMAN SERVICES

Chaired by Councillor M. Medeiros

17.2. Update on the Strategy to Address Human Sex Trafficking In Peel Region

Moved by Councillor Groves,
Seconded by Councillor Downey;

That staff be authorized to undertake advocacy activities to pursue provincial funding in support of the Strategy to Address Human Sex Trafficking, including targeted outreach to relevant Cabinet Ministers, senior staff at the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Ministry of Community and Social Services, the Provincial Anti-Human Trafficking Coordination Office and Peel MPPs, to discuss operational budget shortfalls for sex trafficking programming and other supportive housing services in Peel Region.
In Favour  | P. Brown; G. Carlson; D. Damerla; G.S. Dhillon; J. Downey; C. Fonseca; P. Fortini; A. Groves; J. Innis; J. Kovac; M. Mahoney; S. McFadden; M. Palleschi; C. Parrish; K. Ras; R. Santos; I. Sinclair; R. Starr; A. Thompson; P. Vicente | Total 20  
---|---|---
Opposed  |
Abstain  | B. Crombie; S. Dasko; M. Medeiros; P. Saito | 4  
Absent  | (counted as a no vote)  
( from meeting and/or vote)  
---|---|---
Carried  | 2019-424  

Councillor Downey commended Region of Peels staff for their work in supporting victims of human sex trafficking.

At the request of Councillor Groves, the Commissioner of Human Services undertook to explore opportunities for federal funding related to support for victims.

Councillor Fonseca noted that at the last meeting of the Board of Directors of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Board voted to include advocacy for human sex trafficking as part of its supportive housing advocacy efforts.

18. **COMMUNICATIONS**

This item was dealt with under Consent.

19. **OTHER BUSINESS**

19.1. **Stephen VanOfwegan, Acting Chief Administrative Officer**, Oral Update Regarding the Ernst and Young Work Relating to the Provincial Review of Regional Government

Received 2019-425

Moved by Councillor Parrish, 
Seconded by Councillor Santos;

That the report from Ernst and Young related to the Provincial Review of Regional Government be submitted to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing by the provincial deadline of May 21, 2019;

And further, that the report be made publicly available the same day as it is submitted to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing;
And further, that the report be included on the May 23, 2019 Regional Council agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favour</th>
<th>P. Brown; G. Carlson; D. Damerla; G.S. Dhillon; J. Downey; C. Fonseca; P. Fortini; A. Groves; J. Innis; J. Kovac; M. Mahoney; S. McFadden; M. Medeiros; M. Palleschi; C. Parrish; K. Ras; R. Santos; I. Sinclair; A. Thompson; P. Vicente</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opposed</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abstain (counted as a no vote)</th>
<th>B. Crombie; S. Dasko; P. Saito; R. Starr</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absent (from meeting and/or vote)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carried 2019-426

Prior to providing an update on the work being conducted by Ernst and Young, Stephen VanOfwegen, Acting Chief Administrative Officer (CAO), clarified information provided earlier in the meeting as part of the discussion related to item 8.1, noting that provincial funding cuts related to prisoner transport represent approximately 7 per cent of the provincial funding cuts for Peel Regional Police.

At the request of Members of Council, staff was requested to include details related to the other provincial funding cuts, as well as, a list of provincial funding reductions, by service, in the future report to Regional Council requested under Item 8.1.

The Acting CAO advised that Ernst and Young’s work relating to the Provincial Review of Regional Government is progressing and they are making every effort to meet the May 21, 2019 deadline for completion. He requested Regional Council’s direction with respect to allowing the report, with a full presentation, to be a “walk on” item for the May 23, 2019 Regional Council meeting.

The Regional Chair advised that the Provincial Advisors were not able to confirm whether late submissions would be considered.

The Acting CAO noted that the Steering Committee comprised of representatives from the Region of Peel and three local municipalities needs to endorse Ernst and Young’s work prior to its submission to Regional Council.

Councillor Parrish stated that the scope of the work was agreed to by the four municipalities and therefore, the completed work would not require the steering committee’s endorsement. She proposed that it be submitted to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing upon its completion and prior to its receipt by Regional Council and by the Provincial Advisor’s deadline for submissions.

Councillor Vicente suggested that the report be made available to the public the same day that it is submitted to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.
19.2. **Nancy Polsinelli, Commissioner of Health Services**, Update Regarding Local Ontario Health Teams (Oral)

Nancy Polsinelli, Commissioner of Health Services, advised that the provincial government has initiated a process of Health System transformation that is re-orienting how health care is structured and funded locally. With the eventual dissolution of the Local Health Integration Networks (LHINs), local health service partners are being asked to create Ontario Health Teams (OHTs). This includes mobilizing and coordinating integrated health care delivery for a specific geographic population and that population is being defined by each OHT. The deadline to submit initial expressions of interest for the first round of consideration is due May 15, 2019; however, it is important to note that this process will be repeated over the next several years until full provincial coverage is achieved.

The Region of Peel has been in discussions with both William Osler Health System and Trillium Health Partners who have been facilitating planning sessions for OHTs locally. As part of this shared expression of interest, local partners interested in forming an OHT are requested to sign a Memo of Understanding (MOU). The Region of Peel will be signing an MOU to establish an OHT covering the geographic area of Brampton, Bramalea, north Etobicoke, west Woodbridge and Malton through a process led by William Osler Health System. Region of Peel staff are also discussing the appropriate involvement with the Mississauga OHT, led by Trillium Health Partners and most recently, discussions have begun with the Dufferin Caledon OHT, led by Headwaters Healthcare Centre.

The MOU represents a good-faith commitment to pursue a mutually developed expression of intent to achieve an OHT designation with the province. The MOU does not bind the Region of Peel to be part of the OHT in the future, rather it allows the Region to be engaged in the process; provides a platform to influence how local OHTs take shape; and, optimizes the Region's role within a new health system structure. Currently, Councils and Boards are not being asked to sign an MOU however, as the process evolves, it is likely that the legal involvement with an OHT will require Council’s endorsement and support. Staff will report to Regional Council prior to entering into a binding agreement. Staff will continue to work through the Health System Integration Committee (HSIC) and with Regional Council directly for support and guidance to better understand and confirm the implications to governance, funding and service delivery.
20. NOTICE OF MOTION/MOTION

20.1. Motion Regarding Federation of Canadian Municipalities Resolution for Next Term of Council

Moved by Councillor Parrish,
Seconded by Councillor Ras;

Whereas the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) represents the interests of municipalities on policy and program matters that fall within federal jurisdiction;

And whereas, FCM’s Board of Directors is comprised of elected municipal officials from all regions and sizes of communities to form a broad base of support and provide FCM with the prestige required to carry the municipal message to the federal government;

Therefore be it resolved, that the Council of the Region of Peel endorse Councillor Fonseca to stand for election on FCM’s Board of Directors for the current term of Council (2018 – 2022).

In Favour
- G. Carlson;
- D. Damerla;
- J. Downey;
- C. Fonseca;
- A. Groves;
- J. Innis;
- J. Kovac;
- M. Mahoney;
- S. McFadden;
- M. Palleschi;
- C. Parrish;
- K. Ras;
- I. Sinclair;
- R. Starr;
- A. Thompson

Total
- 15

Opposed
- P. Brown;
- G.S. Dhillon;
- P. Fortini;
- M. Medeiros;
- R. Santos;
- P. Vicente

Total
- 6

Abstain
- (counted as a no vote)

Absent
- (from meeting and/or vote)
- B. Crombie;
- S. Dasko;
- P. Saito

Total
- 3

Carried 2019-428

Councillor Santos noted that the City of Mississauga has publicly stated its desire to separate from the Region of Peel and she inquired how Councillor Fonseca would represent the best interests of the Region, as a Mississauga Councillor, at the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM).

Councillor Fonseca stated that she has proudly advocated for the Region of Peel on issues of importance to all three local municipalities and that she would continue to do so. She stated that the issue of regional government is not discussed at FCM.

Councillor Thompson noted that the Region of Peel is entitled to a seat on FCM’s Board of Directors because it has a population of over 1M, which would not be the case should the City of Mississauga separate.
Councillor Brown stated that while he has every confidence in Councillor Fonseca’s abilities, there is concern from the City of Brampton that statements regarding the City of Mississauga’s desire to separate would be made at the FCM level.

21. **BY-LAWS**

Three Readings

By-law 33-2019: A by-law to adopt the optional tools for calculating the amount of taxes for municipal and school purposes payable in respect of property in the commercial classes, industrial classes and multi-residential property class for 2019.

By-law 34-2019: A by-law to allocate one-time federal gas tax revenue funds to the City of Brampton, the City of Mississauga and the Town of Caledon for the year 2019.

Moved by Councillor Kovac,
Seconded by Councillor Fortini;

That the by-laws listed on the May 9, 2019 Regional Council agenda, being By-laws 33-2019 and 34-2019, be given the required number of readings, taken as read, signed by the Regional Chair and the Regional Clerk, and the Corporate Seal be affixed thereto.

Carried 2019-429

Related to Resolutions 2019-384 and 2019-385

22. **IN CAMERA MATTERS**

At 12:05 p.m., in accordance with section 239(2) of the Municipal Act, 2001, as amended, the following motion was placed:

Moved by Councillor Carlson,
Seconded by Councillor Downey;

That Council proceed “In Camera” to consider an additional Oral report relating to the following:

- Closed Session Report of the Strategic Housing and Homelessness Committee meeting held on April 18, 2019
- Proposed Property Acquisition Regional Road 1 (Mississauga Road) Widening from Regional Road 107 (Bovaird Drive) to Regional Road 14 (Mayfield Road) - City of Brampton, Ward 6 (A proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality or local board)
**Additional Item 22.3.**

- A Personal Matter about an Identifiable Individual including Municipal or Local Board Employees (A personal matter about an identifiable individual including municipal or local board employees)

  Carried 2019-430

Moved by Councillor Groves,
Seconded by Councillor Kovac;

That Council proceed out of “In Camera”.

  Carried 2019-431

Council moved out of closed session at 12:17 p.m.

Moved by Councillor Ras,
Seconded by Councillor Parrish;

That the Closed Session Report of the Strategic Housing and Homelessness Committee meeting held on April 18, 2019, be received;

And further, that the recommendation contained within the confidential report relating to item 22.2, listed on the May 9, 2019 Regional Council agenda, be approved and become public upon adoption;

And further, that the oral item relating to item 22.3 listed on the May 9, 2019 Regional Council agenda, be received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Favour</th>
<th>P. Brown; G.S. Dhillon; J. Downey; C. Fonseca; P. Fortini; A. Groves; J. Innis; J. Kovac; M. Mahoney; S. McFadden; ; M. Medeiros; M. Palleschi; C. Parrish; K. Ras; R. Santos; I. Sinclair; R. Starr; A. Thompson; P. Vicente</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(counted as a no vote)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>G. Carlson; B. Crombie; D. Damerla; S. Dasko; P. Saito</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from meeting and/or vote)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  Carried 2019-432

22.1. Closed Session Report of the Strategic Housing and Homelessness Committee (SHHC-2/2019) meeting held on April 18, 2019

  Received 2019-433
22.2. **Proposed Property Acquisition Regional Road 1 (Mississauga Road) Widening from Regional Road 107 (Bovaird Drive) to Regional Road 14 (Mayfield Road) - City of Brampton, Ward 6 (A proposed or pending acquisition or disposition of land by the municipality or local board)**

Moved by Councillor Ras,
Seconded by Councillor Parrish;

That The Regional Municipality of Peel, as Purchaser, enter into an Agreement of Purchase and Sale with the Peel Regional Police Association, as Vendor, on legal terms satisfactory to the Regional Solicitor, for the purchase of a fee simple interest, permanent easement interests and a temporary easement interest in the lands described as follows:

- A fee simple interest in the lands described as Part of Lot 14, Concession 4 West of Hurontario Street, City of Brampton (formerly Township of Chinguacousy), Regional Municipality of Peel, designated as Part 1 on Reference Plan 43R-38892.

- Permanent easement interests for hydro aerial and grading purposes in the lands described as Part of Lot 14, Concession 4 West of Hurontario Street, City of Brampton (formerly Township of Chinguacousy), Regional Municipality of Peel, designated as Part 2 on Reference Plan 43R-38892.

- A temporary easement interest in the lands described as Part of Lot 14, Concession 4 West of Hurontario Street, City of Brampton (formerly Township of Chinguacousy), Regional Municipality of Peel, designated as Part 3 on Reference Plan 43R-38892.

And further, that the Office of the Regional Solicitor be authorized to complete the transaction, including the execution of all documents, Affidavits, Statutory Declarations and Undertakings required or appropriate for that purpose;

And further, that the funds be financed from Capital Project 10-4040.

Carried 2019-434

**Additional Item 22.3:**

22.3. **A Personal Matter about an Identifiable Individual including Municipal or Local Board Employees (A personal matter about an identifiable individual including municipal or local board employees) (Oral)**

Received 2019-435
23. **BY-LAW TO CONFIRM THE PROCEEDINGS OF COUNCIL**

Moved by Councillor Fonseca,
Seconded by Councillor Groves;

That By-law 35-2019 to confirm the proceedings of Regional Council at its meeting held on May 9, 2019, and to authorize the execution of documents in accordance with the Region of Peel by-laws relating thereto, be given the required number of readings, taken as read, signed by the Regional Chair and the Regional Clerk, and the corporate seal be affixed thereto.

Carried 2019-436

24. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 12:19 p.m.

________________________________________  ________________________________________
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NOTICE

Ernst & Young LLP (“EY”) prepared the attached report only for the Region of Peel (“Client”) governed by a Steering Committee comprising senior officials from the Region of Peel, City of Brampton, City of Mississauga and Town of Caledon (collectively, the “Steering Committee”) pursuant to an agreement solely between EY and Client. EY did not perform its services (the “Analysis”) on behalf of or to serve the needs of any other person or entity. Accordingly, EY expressly disclaims any duties or obligations to any other person or entity based on its use of the attached report. Any other person or entity must perform its own due diligence inquiries and procedures for all purposes, including, but not limited to, satisfying itself as to the financial condition and control environment of the Steering Committee, and any of its funded operations, as well as, the appropriateness of the accounting for any particular situation addressed by the report. EY did not perform an audit or review (as those terms are identified by the CPA Canada Handbook - Assurance) or otherwise verify the accuracy or completeness of any information provided by the Steering Committee or any of its funded operations financial statements. Accordingly, EY did not express any form of assurance on accounting matters, financial statements, assumptions used, any financial or other information or internal controls. EY did not conclude on the appropriate accounting treatment based on specific facts or recommend which accounting policy/treatment the Steering Committee, or any funded operations should select or adopt. The observations relating to all matters that EY provided to the Steering Committee were designed to assist the Steering Committee in reaching its own conclusions and do not constitute EY's concurrence with or support of Client's accounting, assumptions, or reporting or any other matters.
# Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary  
2. A. Project scope  
3. B. Approach  
4. C. Service Delivery Models - Service Line Analysis  
5. D. Assumptions  
6. E. Financial Impact analysis  
7. F. Recommended for Further Analysis
Executive Summary

The Region of Peel in collaboration with the municipalities of Brampton, Caledon and Mississauga commissioned the firm EY to conduct analysis of the potential impact of changes to governance as part of its input to the Regional Government Review being conducted by the Province of Ontario. Results of this work are presented in this Report: Financial Impact Analysis of Service Delivery Models, May 21, 2019.

- The Analysis was conducted between April 26, 2019 and May 21, 2019, and is a report provided by EY to the Region. So that the Analysis reflects a reasonable interpretation of the potential impact of alternative service delivery models, work was governed by a Steering Committee comprising each Chief Administrative Officer of the four municipalities participating in the Analysis (Brampton, Caledon, Mississauga, Peel Region) and their CFOs as Advisory Board members. The Steering Committee approved the approach, scope and assumptions framing the Analysis, enabled access to the referenced data from municipal budgets and plans, and provided review of and feedback on the Analysis throughout. Approximately 10 Steering Committee meetings were held; interviews with approximately 100 municipal officials were conducted; over 1,500 calculations of financial impact have been completed.
- The Analysis is strictly of the financial impact of potential changes to service delivery models under three scenarios: Status Quo, Amalgamation, Dissolution. Analysis is structured at the municipal service level (e.g., Roads, Transportation, Public Works, Police, Water and Wastewater, etc.), and at the consolidated level for each municipality. Detailed assumptions about the potential impact of a move to Amalgamation or Dissolution are presented in comparison to the Status Quo, focusing on the impact to net cost of service (NCOS), capital allocation, and debt allocation over a forecast period to 2028. Lower and Upper Bounds are presented to reflect alternative assumptions.
- Analysis indicates that on a consolidated basis over the forecast period, the total cost of Amalgamation ranges from a decrease of $13m to $576m ($2018), or 0.0% to 2.2% of total Status Quo NCOS. On an annualized basis, Amalgamation cost ranges from a decrease of $11m to an increase of $49m ($2018), or -0.4% to 1.8% of annualized Status Quo NCOS, calculated in year 2022 at the end of the assumed amalgamation period.
- The total cost of Dissolution on a consolidated basis over the forecast period is modeled in the range $16m to $655m ($2018), or 0.1% to 2.5% of total Status Quo NCOS. On an annualized basis, Dissolution cost is in the range of a decrease of $6m to an increase of $61m ($2018), or -0.2% to 2.2% of annualized Status Quo NCOS, calculated in year 2022 at the end of the assumed dissolution period. A key driver of dissolution costs is the way Peel Regional Police would be dissolved, and is assessed using multiple options that on its own has a range of a decrease of $1m to an increase of $52m (annualized 2022 in $2018).
- The Dissolution scenario has differential local tax impacts that result in a potential shift in tax burden as Regional services are transferred. A key driver in this is the Peel Regional Police dissolution model (two scenarios tested as outlined below). On an annualized basis at 2022, the calculated shift for Brampton ranges up to $45m ($2018); calculated shift for Caledon is as low as $53m savings($2018); calculated shift for Mississauga ranges as high as $84m ($2018).
- For the Amalgamation scenario all capital and debt would be transferred to a new municipal entity.
- For the Dissolution scenario capital and debt allocations would result in a net increase by municipality. At the completion of dissolution modeled for 2022, Brampton would gain $7.4bn in capital assets and $749m in debt; Caledon would gain $2bn in capital assets and $71m in debt; Mississauga would gain $8.8bn in capital assets and $1.1bn in debt.
- Change in overall governance structure would necessitate specific strategies and approaches to manage any transition; current and future municipal officials would need to make important policy and administrative choices in response. The Analysis indicates the key areas of potential impact, identifies further work that would need to be conducted, and presents a financial model to help municipal managers analyze the impact of specific recommendations made by the Regional Government Review and any subsequent decisions taken by the Government of Ontario.
Project Scope

Section A
A1. Project Scope

The scope of Analysis was governed by terms established by the Region of Peel in collaboration with Brampton, Caledon and Mississauga and contained within the agreed Project Charter and associated contract. The project was governed by a Steering Committee comprising the chief administrative officers of each municipality and an Advisory Board comprising the chief financial officers of each municipality and was conducted between April 26, 2019 and May 21, 2019.

The project scope comprised three main components:

1. A model to enable financial analysis of the expenditures, non-tax and non-rate revenues, and assets by major service line and of consolidated positions of the four municipalities in scope (Brampton, Caledon, Mississauga, and Peel) under three service delivery models: Status Quo, Amalgamation, and Dissolution.
   ▶ Within each service delivery scenario, feasible options were developed and assessed equally.

2. Assumptions were developed about how expenditures, non-tax and non-rate revenues, and assets might change in the Amalgamation and Dissolution scenarios compared to the Status Quo. Assumptions rely on analysis of current operations, interviews with officials from each municipality, and available relevant research.
   ▶ The assumptions and sources were approved by the Steering Committee.

3. Presentation of potential financial impact of the three service delivery models such that the impact can be reported in total across all service lines and municipalities, and disaggregated by service line and municipality, from 2019 to 2028.
   ▶ A view of the consolidated impacts of each scenario, with analysis, is provided.
Approach

Section B
B1. Main Dimensions of the Approach

The approach was approved by the Steering Committee and designed for analysis of potential service delivery model impacts. The model and analysis were created for use as a management tool for municipal officials and should enable on-going analysis. The analysis rests on defined assumptions that would need to be refined as specific dimensions of any dissolution or amalgamation event would be known. The analysis is restricted to a point-in-time assessment of what might happen under the conditions defined in the analysis; it is not a prediction of what will happen.

I. Governance

► The project was governed by the Steering Committee, which was responsible for reviewing and approving the approach, all assumptions, facilitating access to all data utilized in building the Status Quo financial model, validating that the data were utilized appropriately, and validating the analysis for the Amalgamation and Dissolution scenarios accurately reflects the underlying data and agreed assumptions.

► The Steering Committee met a total of ten (10) times during the course of the project for a total time of approximately 35 hours.

► Interviews were conducted with approximately 100 various municipal officials to clarify and validate utilization of data, to explain current service-line parameters, and to inform reasonable assumptions about potential impact of alternative service models.

II. Materiality of Analysis

► The following thresholds were established to help ensure the analysis focused on material issues:
  1. Materiality was defined as a percentage of each total municipal budget and accepted at the lowest level (i.e., smallest budget level, Caledon), and set at a level of 5%
  2. All non-material items were still included in the overall analysis, based on a higher level of assumption and modeling.
  3. Material options/assumptions required and achieved agreement and signoff from the Steering Committee for inclusion in the analysis.
B2. Main Dimensions of the Approach

III. Focus only on Financial Impact Analysis
► The analysis focuses solely on the potential financial impact of overall service delivery models (Status Quo, Amalgamation, Dissolution).
► It does not analyze the efficiency, effectiveness, productivity, equity, or any other dimension of current operations. All current service levels and forecast plans are taken as given and, unless specifically noted, are assumed to be held constant for purposes of financial impact analysis.
► This approach respects the sovereignty of current and future municipal Councils and managers to determine all choices about service levels, funding models, taxation levels, organizational and business models, management and business operations and processes, and all other dimensions of how the Region and municipalities operate.
► Risk analysis has been conducted to highlight key dimensions of financial impact.

IV. Approach to Enable Future Analysis
► The financial model was designed to enable future analysis by municipal officials. This reflects the fact that specific dimensions of how any given service delivery model (e.g., amalgamation, dissolution) might operate cannot be known at this stage, and will need to be assessed and refined in the future.
► The model is built such that inputs can be varied, assumptions can be modified, and analysis can be conducted on essentially all parameters that affect service-line and consolidated financial impacts. The analysis has been designed to provide significant flexibility for future users.

V. Reliance on Municipal Data
► The analysis is based on information and data provided by the Region of Peel, City of Brampton, Town of Caledon, and City of Mississauga. The analysis and report presents factual information as provided to EY. EY has not validated the completeness and accuracy of this information.
► The information and data provided prepared by municipal officials was based on their own information, and might include certain estimates. Actual results might differ from municipal estimates.
► All other data and information from research is referenced by source.
Service Delivery Models

Section C
C1. Service Delivery Models

The service delivery models frame the central part of the analysis. For each model the objective is to provide a consolidated view by municipality, a disaggregated view by service line, and combined views by service line and municipality. The objective is to provide analysis for each municipality of the potential financial impact of the three general models (Status Quo, Amalgamation, and Dissolution).

I. Service Line Analysis

Service lines were identified for each municipality and materiality thresholds were assessed for each service line as a proportion of total cost of service for each municipality. Service lines that represent 5% or greater of total municipal expenditures were included for the identification of detailed assumptions and analysis; remaining service lines are included based on a more general set of assumptions. Table 1 presents the list of Service Lines.

1 While under 5% of total expenditures, Fire and Waste Management are sufficiently complex to warrant a full analysis and are included in scope.

2 While under 5% of total expenditures, Land Use Planning is greater than 5% of Caledon’s total expenditures and as such is been included in scope.

3 All Other includes Libraries, Paramedics, Conservation, Culture, Public Health, Seniors Services

Table 1. Material Service Lines

Breakdown of 2018 actual* expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service lines (SL)</th>
<th>% of Total Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL1. Internal and Other Services</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2. Fire</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3. Police</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4. Housing</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5. Human and Social Services</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL6. Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL7. Land Use Planning</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL8. Transit</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL9. Waste Management</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL10. Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL11. Roads and transportation and Other Public Works (incl. storm water)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL12. All Other</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Except Region of Peel, where 2018 actual expenditures are not available and budget is used.
**II. Status Quo Model**

The Status Quo model acts as the baseline for the analysis. It reflects the current, planned and forecast dimensions for each service line and municipality. Figure 1 presents the key parameters used in the analysis.

### Figure 1. Parameters of the Status Quo Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Service Line</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL1. Internal and Other Services</td>
<td>Regional and local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2. Fire</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3. Police</td>
<td>Regional (Caledon uses OPP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4. Housing</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5. Human and Social Services</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL6. Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL7. Land Use Planning</td>
<td>Regional and local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL8. Transit</td>
<td>Local transit and regional TransHelp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL9. Waste Management</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL10. Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL11. Roads, Transportation, and other Public Works (incl. Storm water)</td>
<td>Regional and local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL12. All Other</td>
<td>Regional and local</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Amalgamation Model

The Amalgamation model essentially creates a single municipality for the provision of all current services at the overall governance level and at the individual service line level. Figure 2 presents the key parameters used in the analysis.

Figure 2. Parameters of the Amalgamation Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Service Line</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amalgamation</td>
<td>SL1. Internal and Other Services</td>
<td>Consolidation of four back-office support functions into one support function at the enterprise level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL2. Fire</td>
<td>Amalgamated fire services with composite department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL3. Police</td>
<td>Joint police board for Brampton and Mississauga (Caledon uses OPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL4. Housing</td>
<td>One police board managed by the single enterprise for all three locals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL5. Human and Social Services</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL6. Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL7. Land Use Planning</td>
<td>All services move as is to the new enterprise model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL8. Transit</td>
<td>All services move as is to the new enterprise model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL9. Waste Management</td>
<td>Centralize all transit services into one model, owner, and manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL10. Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL11. Roads, Transportation, and other Public Works (incl. Storm water)</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SL12. All Other</td>
<td>All assets and services move to new enterprise model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SL1. Internal and Other Services
SL2. Fire
SL3. Police
SL4. Housing
SL5. Human and Social Services
SL6. Parks and Recreation
SL7. Land Use Planning
SL8. Transit
SL9. Waste Management
SL10. Water and Wastewater
SL11. Roads, Transportation, and other Public Works (incl. Storm water)
SL12. All Other
C4. Service Delivery Models

III. Dissolution Model

The Dissolution model essentially splits the provision of all current Regional services to the three individual municipalities (Brampton, Caledon, Mississauga). In defined cases, a modified Status Quo model would be retained at the service line level due to the view that it represents the optimal model (e.g., a new Joint Utility Board for water and wastewater services). Figure 3 presents the key parameters used in the analysis.

Figure 3. Parameters of the Dissolution Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Service Line</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL1. Internal and Other Services</td>
<td>Regional support services dissolved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2. Fire</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3. Police</td>
<td>Separate police boards for Brampton and Mississauga, OPP contract for Caledon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4. Housing</td>
<td>Joint police board for Brampton and Mississauga, OPP contract for Caledon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5. Human and Social Services</td>
<td>Regional services delivered by the local municipalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL6. Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL7. Land Use Planning</td>
<td>Regional planning function dissolved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL8. Transit</td>
<td>Services run separately by each municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL9. Waste Management</td>
<td>Contracts re-negotiated, Brampton retains waste processing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL10. Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>Joint Utility Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL11. Roads, Transportation, and other Public Works (Incl. Storm water)</td>
<td>Regional services delivered by the local municipalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL12. All Other</td>
<td>Services delivered by the local municipalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assumptions

Section D
D1. Assumptions

Assumptions have been determined and detailed at the general and service line levels. The basis of assumption and dollar value range is analyzed in each case and each assumption has been signed off by the Steering Committee. The assumptions drive the differences between the three service delivery models and have been built into the financial model such that specific assumptions can be modified in the future to maximize analytical flexibility.

I. General Assumptions
The general assumptions applied across multiple service lines / delivery models are:

1. Wage harmonization applied to situations where employees on different current rates are harmonized to the highest comparable level for equivalent roles, responsibilities and conditions (in both the Dissolution and Amalgamation scenarios). The assumption reflects analysis of collective agreements and associated precedent by the law firm, Hicks-Morley, under contract to EY.

2. Transition costs representing the one-time activities and costs required to manage transition at the overall entity and individual service line levels, including legal advice tied to contract transition, transformation advisory activities, and change management. Allocation of transition costs to specific activities and municipalities would be determined once specific service model changes are known.

II. Service Line Assumptions

► Service line assumptions drive a significant portion of the financial impact modelled by service delivery model. Detailed analysis leading to each assumption, by service line, was conducted, and ranges for each determined.

► For those service lines that do not have a material impact on the overall financial analysis (i.e., those that are less than 5% of total expenditure by municipality), a set of general assumptions was utilized.

► Impact of service line assumptions is reported in the analysis as a Lower and Upper Bound.
Financial Impact Analysis

Section E
The financial model uses historical financial information, forecasted budgeted capital plans, wages and salaries, and full-time equivalent headcount for each municipality, with approved assumptions from the steering committee, to develop a flexible and dynamic financial model to assess the financial impact for various options under each scenario for the ten-year period 2019-2028.

## Inputs

Based on the approved assumptions, the financial model will be dynamic and provide a range of outputs based on the inputs, scenario, and options selected.

**Source data (Level 1):**
- Financial information return data
- Independent property tax levy and property assessment data

**Primary research and analysis (Level 2):**
- Capital budget data
- Stakeholder interviews and consultations conducted with the Region and lower tier municipalities
- Internal client working papers and forecasts
- Independent analysis performed by EY subject matter experts
- Independent information including academic, benchmarks, industry and public sector information

**Secondary research and analysis (Level 3):**
- Other forecasts derived from 5-year average growth by finance object

## Step 1
**Define Status Quo**

- Service area 1
- Service area 2
- Service area 3
- Service area 4
- Service area 5

## Step 2
**Select Scenarios**

- Amalgamation
- Dissolution

## Step 3
**Select Options**

- Option 1
- Option 2
- Option 3
- Option 4

## Outputs

Based on the dynamic nature of the financial model, outputs will be a direct derivation of selected assumptions, scenarios, outputs and timelines.

**Financial impact:**
- Changes in the cost of service offerings
- Changes in the capital asset cost base
- Changes to financial ratios

**Non-financial impact:**
- Changes in the ability to maintain the existing quality of service delivery
- Operational changes to the existing structure of government

**Key considerations:**
- Objective and fact based assumptions will be used for forecasting costs and benefits over time
- Identification of objective vs. subjective outcomes of each proposed option
- Selection of the most appropriate, accurate and complete input data and information available at each level of government to inform model baseline
Financial impact analysis is driven off the baseline Status Quo model that forecasts the net cost of service for each municipality for the ten-year period 2019-2028. The Status Quo forecasts reflect known budget plans for each municipality and estimated growth thereafter based on agreed assumptions.

Figure 4. Net Cost of Service – Status Quo Consolidated by Municipality

Table 2. Net Cost of Service – Status Quo Consolidated by Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>1,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>3,178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlights of Analysis

- Compound annual growth rates, by municipality in Status Quo are:
  - Brampton: 3.9%
  - Caledon: 5.5%
  - Mississauga: 3.0%
  - Region: 2.2%
- At a consolidated level, the compound annual growth rate is 2.8%
- In 2018, municipalities made up the following proportion of the aggregate service line expenditure:
  - Brampton: 19.1%
  - Caledon: 2.5%
  - Mississauga: 21.2%
  - Region: 57.2%
E3. Amalgamation: Consolidated Service Lines by Municipality

Net Cost of Service Status Quo vs. New Entity

Amalgamation consolidates all underlying service lines by municipality into a single “New Entity”. The net cost of service is represented as a range between Upper and Lower Amalgamation Bounds, reflecting defined assumptions of changes to underlying service line costs. The amalgamation period is modelled to be complete by 2022.

Figure 5. Net Cost of Service – Comparison of Status Quo to Upper and Lower Amalgamation Bounds

Table 3. Net Cost of Service – Comparison of Status Quo to Amalgamation model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net of Service</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2020 – 2028 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>655</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>699</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amalgamation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>2,819</td>
<td>2,884</td>
<td>2,951</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>3,161</td>
<td>3,235</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>2,695</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td>2,957</td>
<td>3,026</td>
<td>3,096</td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td></td>
<td>26,031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipal data; model calculations
E4. Amalgamation: Consolidated Service Lines by Municipality

Impact on FTE Costs, Assets and Liabilities, and Transition Costs

Amalgamation assumes FTEs are consolidated and wages are harmonized with corresponding impact on FTE costs. Post-amalgamation assets and liabilities are consolidated to the New Entity.

Table 4. FTE Analysis – Amalgamation reported by municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ Million, Real 2018 dollars</th>
<th>Pre-Amalgamation</th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
<th>Harmonization</th>
<th>Post-Amalgamation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total FTEs</td>
<td>FTE Costs</td>
<td>FTE Adjustments</td>
<td>FTE Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>355.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>4,595</td>
<td>495.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>934.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,099</td>
<td>1,826.3</td>
<td>(298 - 74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Capital and Debt Analysis – Amalgamation reported by municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ Million, Real 2018 dollars</th>
<th>Pre-Amalgamation</th>
<th>At Amalgamation</th>
<th>Amalgamation Complete</th>
<th>Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>8,111</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>14,804</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Entity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28,629</td>
<td>2,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipal data; model calculations

Highlights of Analysis

FTE Adjustments
- Total annualized FTE costs are modeled to increase by $26m - $57m ($2018)
- This represents a range of 1.4% to 3.1% increase over Status Quo

Capital and Debt Analysis
- All capital and debt is allocated to the new entity
Amalgamation assumes FTEs are consolidated and wages are harmonized with corresponding impact on FTE costs. Post-amalgamation assets and liabilities are consolidated to the New Entity.

Table 6. Net Cost of Service – Change in NCOS for Amalgamation v. Status Quo at the Service Line Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Line</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Amalgamated Entity</th>
<th>$ Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL1. Internal and Other</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2. Fire</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3. Police</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4. Housing</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5. Human and Social Services</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL6. Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL7. Land Use Planning</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL8. Transit</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL9. Waste Management</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL10. Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL11. Roads and transportation and Other Public Works (incl. Stormwater)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL12. All Other</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>2,819</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Cost of Service, 2022, $ Million, Real 2018 dollars
Source: Municipal data; model calculations

Highlights of Analysis

- **Annualized change in 2022 at completed amalgamation**
  - On a gross basis, the most significant reduction in annualized NCOS would come from Internal and Other Services.
  - On a gross basis, the most significant increases in annualized NCOS would come from:
    - Roads and transportation and Other Public Works
    - Fire
    - All Other
- The largest ranges are for Parks and Recreation and Land Use Planning.
E6. Dissolution: Consolidated Service Lines by Municipality
Net Cost of Service Status Quo vs. Dissolution

Dissolution allocates current Region of Peel services to the single-tier municipalities on the agreed basis with corresponding impact on Upper and Lower Dissolution Bound net costs of service. The dissolution period is modelled to be complete by 2022.

Figure 6. Net Cost of Service – Comparison of Status Quo to Upper and Lower Dissolution Bounds

Table 7. Net Cost of Service – Comparison of Status Quo to Dissolution

| Source: Municipal data; model calculations |
| Net of Service, $ Million, Real 2018 dollars |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>5,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>5,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>14,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>26,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissolution Net cost of service</th>
<th>2020 – 2028 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>1,071 – 1,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>142 – 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>1,449 – 1,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,662 – 2,686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative change from 2020 to 2028 Forecast
- The total net cost of service change ranges from a decrease of $56M to an increase of $578M
- This represents a 0.2% to 2.2% change in total net cost of service

Annualized change in 2022 at completed dissolution
- The one year net cost of service change is an decrease of $6M to an increase of $61M
- This is a (0.2%) to 2.2% change in total net cost of service in 2022

Source: Municipal data; model calculations
E7. Dissolution: Consolidated Service Lines by Municipality
Impact on FTE Costs, Assets and Liabilities, and Transition Costs

The Dissolution assumes Regional FTEs are allocated with corresponding impact on FTE costs. Post-dissolution assets and liabilities are consolidated to the single-tier municipalities.

Table 8. FTE Analysis - Dissolution reported by municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ Million, Real 2018 dollars</th>
<th>Pre-Amalgamation</th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
<th>Harmonization</th>
<th>Post-Amalgamation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total FTEs</td>
<td>FTE Costs</td>
<td>FTE Adjustments</td>
<td>FTE Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>355.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>4,595</td>
<td>495.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>934.9</td>
<td>(39) - 359</td>
<td>(6) - 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,099</td>
<td>1,826.3</td>
<td>(39) - 359</td>
<td>(6) - 53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Capital and Debt Analysis - Dissolution reported by municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ Million, Real 2018 dollars</th>
<th>Pre-Amalgamation</th>
<th>At Amalgamation</th>
<th>Amalgamation Complete</th>
<th>Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6,204</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>8,111</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>10,942</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>14,804</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>10,273</td>
<td>1,272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipal data; model calculations

Highlights of Analysis

Capital and Debt Analysis
- At the completion of dissolution modeled for 2022, the impact is a net increase as follows:
  - Brampton: Capital of $7.4bn ($2018) (c. 2.5 times higher than current) and Debt of $772m ($2018) (c. 33.6 times higher than current)
  - Caledon: Capital of $2.0bn ($2018) (c. 2.2 times higher than current) and Debt of $83m ($2018) (c. 7.1 times higher)
  - Mississauga: Capital of $8.8bn ($2018) (c. 2.0 times higher than current) and Debt of $1.0bn ($2018) (c. 7.1 times higher than current)
## E8. Amalgamation and Dissolution: Transition Costs

### Impact on Transition Costs

#### Table 10. One-time transition costs – Amalgamation and Dissolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmarking approach</th>
<th>Amalgamation</th>
<th>Dissolution²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition board budget¹</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change management, restructuring &amp; transition support</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated policy, consulting, regional systems, and supplies</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer facilitation, project management, change management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate management systems, new municipal budget system, purchasing and payable systems, record management system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use planning</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new zoning bylaws, consolidation of plans and agreements, needs assessments and other studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software integration, other associated costs</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information system integration, other associated costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and transportation and other public works</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information system integration, other associated costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Calculations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workforce adjustment costs</td>
<td>12.5 - 19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance pay</td>
<td>5 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>Immaterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated ERP system</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>104.6 - 111.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73 - 78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Case study: Hamilton amalgamation (all values in 2018 real dollars)


#### Notes:

1. Transition Board Budget includes costs associated with the setup and operation of a transition board for the new municipal structure, as well as expenses to set up the joint boards for utilities and police
2. Dissolution costs represent expenditures across all municipalities, quantified as a cumulative amount
3. One-time costs of transition in dissolution are allocated to municipalities on the basis of the proportion of the dissolved Region’s net costs of service assumed. This would be Brampton 38%, Caledon 5% and Mississauga 57%

#### One-time Transition Costs

- One-time transition costs support completion of amalgamation and dissolution by 2022
- Change management, restructuring and transition support, transition board budget, and workforce adjustment costs represent the most significant one-time transition costs

#### Notes

- Over 1,000 contracts were reviewed with no material termination costs or contract transfer costs identified
- Allocation of costs by service line or municipality would need to be determined in the future based on the specific requirements of transition
Change in net cost of service for the Dissolution model compared to the Status Quo can be reported at the service line level by municipality. Upper and Lower Dissolution Bounds are determined at the service line level based on the agreed assumptions.

### Table 11. Net Cost of Service – Change in NCOS for Dissolution v. Status Quo at the Service Line Level by Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Line</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Dissolved Entities</th>
<th>$ Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL1. Internal and Other</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>267 269</td>
<td>47 47</td>
<td>261 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2. Fire</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>83 83</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td>125 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3. Police</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>170 190</td>
<td>13 14</td>
<td>277 309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4. Housing</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>39 39</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>81 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5. Human and Social Services</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30 30</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td>32 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL6. Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>57 57</td>
<td>11 11</td>
<td>57 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL7. Land Use Planning</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL8. Transit</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>80 80</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>107 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL9. Waste Management</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>48 48</td>
<td>7 7</td>
<td>59 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL10. Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>179 179</td>
<td>15 15</td>
<td>244 244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL11. Roads and transportation and Other Public Works (incl. Stormwater)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>95 95</td>
<td>28 29</td>
<td>94 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL12. All Other</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>87 88</td>
<td>16 16</td>
<td>130 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>1,136 1,161</td>
<td>152 154</td>
<td>1,476 1,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Cost of Service, 2022, $ Million, Real 2018 dollars
Source: Municipal data; model calculations

Highlights of Analysis

**Annualized change in 2022 at completed dissolution**
- On a gross basis, the most significant reduction in annualized NCOS would come from Internal and Other Services, followed by Land Use Planning.

- On a gross basis, the most significant increases in annualized NCOS would come from:
  - Human and Social Services
  - All Other

- The range of potential impact for Peel Regional Police reflects two allocation models – one by MPAC assessment, the other by a weighted average based 50% on property count and 50% on time-weighted calls for service.
The financial metrics analysis is driven off of the baseline Status Quo model that forecasts assets, liabilities, non-tax revenue, operational expenditure and known budgeted capital expenditure for each municipality for the ten-year period 2019-2028. The Status Quo forecasts reflect known budget plans for each municipality and estimated growth thereafter based on agreed assumptions. The below analysis provides commentary on the financial health for the new amalgamated entity and each municipality as at 2022, the year assumed the proposed change in governance would be complete.

Amalgamation
- The increase in operational spending is greater than the increase in operating balance, reducing the operating balance to operational spending ratio relative to the status quo
- Increased non-tax revenues are offset by increases in operating expenditure, resulting in a decrease to non-tax revenues as a percent of operating expenditures
- Growth in non-tax revenue is much greater under amalgamation than the growth of non-tax revenue under dissolution, strengthening the operating balance overall
- The modelled newly amalgamated entity’s long-term debt to operational spending is similar to the combined financials of each municipality under the status quo scenario, with slightly higher operating expenditure, resulting in a lower ratio of long-term debt to operating expenditure

Dissolution
- An increase in operating spending offsets the increase in operating balance, reducing the operating balance to operational spending ratio relative to the status quo
- The higher cost scenario reduces operating balance relative to the operational spending, largely driven by changes in wage harmonization costs
- Given the Region’s relatively large balance of tangible capital assets and long-term debt, each respective municipalities’ long-term debt to operating expenditures increase upon receipt of its allocated share of the Region’s long-term debt
- The aggregate tangible capital assets and long-term debt do not vary materially from the Status Quo
Recommended for Further Analysis

Section F
F1. Recommended for Further Analysis

It is unknown currently whether any service delivery model changes will affect the Region of Peel. The analysis presented herein offers an indication of the potential impact under the modelled assumptions. Further analysis would be required to analyze the impact of specific changes once they become known. Key areas of further analysis are outlined below and reflect both the unknown dimensions of a future change, and the known areas for further analysis identified as part of the current assignment.

A. Response to a change in overall service delivery models and governance

Once any Provincial decision is taken that would affect service delivery model and governance changes, key issues to be addressed would include:

► Detailed examination of the Provincially mandated changes to identify the specific parameters in play. Emphasis should be on:
  1. Changes to overall legislation and regulations that establish mandate and authority for the new jurisdictions.
  2. Detailed mapping of any such changes to the Status Quo to identify specific implications for the existing municipalities and service lines.
  3. Analysis of the financial and service-level impact of mandated changes to inform transition strategies.

► Detailed transition planning will be required and should include at a minimum focus on the following:
  1. Regardless of the specifics of mandated changes, each jurisdiction should engage in detailed transition planning and risk management to ensure all obligations are appropriately discharged.
  2. Focus should be on strategies and tactics to maintain and/or enhance service levels for recipients, ensure appropriate treatment of directly and indirectly affected stakeholders, employees, commercial partners, ratepayers, taxpayers, and constituents in response to the Provincially mandated changes.
  3. Development of a transition management approach with necessary financial, staffing, workplans, schedules, engagement, communication, risk management, change management, benefits tracking, and reporting functions.
  4. Transition costs may or may not be partially or wholly funded by the province. Municipalities should seek to understand how they may be supported in such a scenario and seek to optimize any available transition support.
F2. Recommended for Further Analysis

It is unknown currently whether any service delivery model changes will affect the Region of Peel. The analysis presented herein offers an indication of the potential impact under the modelled assumptions. Further analysis would be required to analyze the impact of specific changes once they become known. Key areas of further analysis are outlined below and reflect both the unknown dimensions of a future change, and the known areas for further analysis identified as part of the current assignment.

B. Items identified as part of the current analysis

- As more information becomes available about recently announced Provincial measures affecting the four current municipalities, each municipality should assess the financial impacts of new policies and develop appropriate plans in response. For example, changes to provincial funding levels and delivery models related to areas such as public health, paramedic services, social assistance and employment, child care, housing and homelessness, and the Ontario Municipal Board should be analyzed to determine impacts. Once these impacts are known, an update to the financial impact analysis of potential service delivery model changes should be provided for the Status Quo, Amalgamation, and Dissolution scenarios.

- The identification of the means for funding any additional expenditures that have been identified in the scenarios will be the decision of elected officials. Funds can be made available a number of ways including development charges, service level and delivery changes, tax rates and ratios. Specific analysis of such decisions would need to be assessed (e.g., analysis of broader economic impact and/or the costs and benefits of potential policy changes).

- Should overall governance changes require an alternative to the Status Quo, analysis of direct impact on service levels and beneficiaries should be considered as part of analysis provided to elected officials for required specific policy choices.

- Once any specific governance changes are known, updated analysis of the key drivers of impact modelled in the current assignment should be provided, with a focus on the areas of most significant potential impact. For example these areas could include:
  1. FTE impacts and wage harmonization.
  2. Potential policy decisions to amalgamate service levels (e.g., Parks and Recreation).
  3. Various police governance and funding model choices.
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Introduction

The scope of the project was to conduct analysis of the potential financial impact of changes to governance and service delivery models as part of the Region’s input to the Regional Government Review being conducted by the Province of Ontario

- Analysis conducted between April 26 and May 21, 2019
- Collaborative approach
- A range of assumptions
- Financial impact
- Further analysis
Overall Approach: Steering Committee and Stakeholder Engagement

- The Region of Peel struck a Steering Committee that was comprised of the CAOs for the four impacted municipalities, and an Advisory Board of the municipal CFOs. The Committee met regularly to discuss scenarios and options, and to validate and reach consensus on the assumptions and values presented.

- For the purposes of developing and validating assumptions and generating values for assumptions, stakeholders were engaged across the municipalities and their respective divisions and departments.

**Divisions and Departments Consulted**

- **Region of Peel**
  - Accessible Transportation (TransHelp)
  - Corporate Services
  - Human Services
  - Housing Services
  - Public Works
  - Peel Regional Police

- **City of Brampton**
  - Brampton Transit
  - Corporate Services
  - Fire and Emergency Services
  - Community Services
  - Public Works and Engineering
  - Planning and Development Services

- **City of Mississauga**
  - Community Services - Parks, Recreation, Fire
  - Corporate Services
  - Transportation and Works - MiWay, StormWater
  - Planning and Building

- **Town of Caledon**
  - Community Services - Parks, Recreation, Fire
  - Corporate Services
  - Strategic Services
  - Finance and Infrastructure Services - Roads, Transportation

**Number of Interviews**

- 40+

**Number of Stakeholders Consulted**

- 100+
Overall Approach

Determined the in-scope service lines and materiality, and understood the key data

Conducted detailed analysis, and initiated the development of scenarios (3) and service line options and parameters

Engaged key stakeholders across the service lines in the development and testing of a range of assumptions, including two subcontractors for legal and case law (Hicks Morley), and DC advice (Hemson Consulting Ltd.)

Engaged the Steering Committee in a series of working sessions in the testing and refining of the scenarios, options, and general and specific assumptions, and generated consensus

Identified values and ranges for the assumptions for input into the financial model
Financial Model

Step 1: Define Status Quo
- Service area 1
- Service area 2

Step 2: Select Scenarios
- Amalgamation
- Dissolution

Step 3: Select Options
- Option 1
- Option 2
- Option 3
- Option 4

Inputs:
- Source data
- Primary research and analysis
- Secondary research and analysis

Outputs:
- Financial impact
- Non-financial impact

Assumptions
- Time
Summary of Findings

Total Cost of Amalgamation

- **Cumulative:** $13M to $576M, or 0.0% to 2.2% of total Status Quo Net Cost of Service to 2028
- **Annualized:** Decrease of $11M to an increase of $49M, or (0.4%) to 1.8% of annualized Net Cost of Service
- **Debt and Capital:**
  - All capital and debt would be transferred to a new municipal entity

Total Cost of Dissolution

- **Cumulative:** $16M to $655M, or 0.1% to 2.5% of total Status Quo Net Cost of Service
- **Annualized:** Decrease of $6M to an increase of $61M, or (0.2%) to 2.2% of annualized Net Cost of Service
- **Debt and Capital:**
  - **Brampton** - Gain of $7.4B in capital assets and $749M in debt
  - **Caledon** - Gain $2B in capital assets and $71M in debt
  - **Mississauga** - Gains $8.8B in capital assets and $1.1B in debt

All dollars are presented in $2018
### Police Dissolution Model

#### Service Options and Cost Allocation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Options</th>
<th>Net cost of service in 2022 ($2018)</th>
<th>Allocation Method</th>
<th>Net cost of service by municipality in 2022 ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Board</td>
<td>$461M</td>
<td>MPAC¹</td>
<td>Brampton: $170M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mississauga: $278M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caledon*: $13M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAC²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ $39M - $53M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Separate Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$501M - $514M</th>
<th>MPAC¹</th>
<th>Brampton: $185M - $190M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mississauga: $303 - $311M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caledon*: $13M - $14M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WAC²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Property Assessment Values from Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC)
2. Weighted Average Cost of Policing per property and per time for service

* In all dissolution scenarios, Caledon retains the contract with OPP
Tax Analysis: Impact

Dissolution Structure

Upon dissolution, the services and related expenditures of the Region are dissolved and allocated to the remaining municipalities. This results in an increase in the net cost of service of the dissolved municipalities, which in turn has an impact on the municipality’s taxes.

Impact of Dissolution

- Brampton: Savings from $45M to a cost of $33M* annually
- Caledon: Costs from $20M to $23M* annually
- Mississauga: Savings from $84M to a cost of $28M* annually
Development Charges: Risk Analysis

EY retained Hemson Consulting Ltd. ("Hemson") to provide Development Charge ("DC") advice on the potential financial implications of moving from the current two-tier governance model (Status Quo) to the Amalgamation or Dissolution governance models.

Two options are presented below to demonstrate the potential risk of alternative models of future development charges under a dissolution scenario.

Options:

1. Hemson's findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Annual revenue impact of DCs</th>
<th>Impact of DCs to 2028</th>
<th>Total cost of Dissolution to 2028</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hemson's findings</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>$655M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2017 Council Report</td>
<td>$11.2M</td>
<td>$110.8M</td>
<td>$755.8M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?

DISCLAIMER

Ernst & Young LLP ("EY") prepared the attached report only for the Region of Peel ("Client") governed by a Steering Committee comprising senior officials from the Region of Peel, City of Brampton, City of Mississauga and Town of Caledon (collectively, the "Steering Committee") pursuant to an agreement solely between EY and Client. EY did not perform its services (the "Review") on behalf of or to serve the needs of any other person or entity. Accordingly, EY expressly disclaims any duties or obligations to any other person or entity based on its use of the attached report. Any other person or entity must perform its own due diligence inquiries and procedures for all purposes, including, but not limited to, satisfying itself as to the financial condition and control environment of the Steering Committee, and any of its funded operations, as well as, the appropriateness of the accounting for any particular situation addressed by the report. EY did not perform an audit or review (as those terms are identified by the CPA Canada Handbook - Assurance) or otherwise verify the accuracy or completeness of any information provided by the Steering Committee or any of its funded operations financial statements. Accordingly, EY did not express any form of assurance on accounting matters, financial statements, any financial or other information or internal controls. EY did not conclude on the appropriate accounting treatment based on specific facts or recommend which accounting policy/treatment the Steering Committee, or any funded operations should select or adopt. The observations relating to all matters that EY provided to the Steering Committee were designed to assist the Steering Committee in reaching its own conclusions and do not constitute EY’s concurrence with or support of Client’s accounting or reporting or any other matters.
About EY

EY is a global leader in assurance, tax, transaction and advisory services. The insights and quality services we deliver help build trust and confidence in the capital markets and in economies the world over. We develop outstanding leaders who team to deliver on our promises to all of our stakeholders. In so doing, we play a critical role in building a better working world for our people, for our clients and for our communities.

EY refers to the global organization and may refer to one or more of the member firms of Ernst & Young Global Limited, each of which is a separate legal entity. Ernst & Young Global Limited, a UK company limited by guarantee, does not provide services to clients. For more information about our organization, please visit ey.com.

For more information, please visit ey.com/ca.

ey.com/ca

© 2019 Ernst & Young LLP. All rights reserved.
A member firm of Ernst & Young Global Limited.
Financial Impact Compared to Status Quo

Amalgamation ($ millions)

- Deloitte*
- EY High**
- EY Low**

Dissolution ($ millions)

- Deloitte*
- EY High**
- EY Low**

*Based on 10 years  **Based on 9 years

Inflation
DATE: May 16, 2019

REPORT TITLE: UPDATE ON THE REGION OF PEEL INFLOW AND INFILTRATION REDUCTION AND MITIGATION STRATEGY

FROM: Andrew Farr, Acting Commissioner of Public Works

RECOMMENDATION

That the Commissioner of Public Works be authorized to replace the existing voluntary downspout disconnection program with a mandatory, contractor supported program, beginning in eleven pilot focus areas only for 2019 and continuing in future years as approved by Council in yearly budgets.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- Infrastructure age, climate change and intensification have impacted the wastewater collection system;
- These factors result in increased flow in the system – known as inflow and infiltration;
- Staff have developed a comprehensive multiyear strategy to address the impacts of inflow and infiltration into the wastewater collection system;
- Implementation of the strategy activities has begun in three areas as proof of concept;
- Staff propose to amend the existing voluntary downspout disconnection program with a fully funded, contractor supported mandatory program in a pilot area in 2019;
- Funding approved to date will allow for the implementation of the downspout disconnection program in the pilot area and hiring of two contract staff;
- Further funding and staff resources for implementation of the strategy will be included in the 2020 and future capital and operating budgets.

DISCUSSION

1. Background

a) What is Inflow and Infiltration

*Inflow* is rain water or snowmelt that enters the wastewater collection system (sewers) through direct connections from downspouts, catch basins, and foundation drains. Due to direct connectivity to the sources, inflow reaches sewers quickly as rainfall occurs and often has a significant impact on sewer flow.

*Infiltration* is water that enters the collection system through defects (holes and cracks) in sewers, laterals, and maintenance hole chambers. Infiltration tends to show up as lost capacity that persist for several days after a rainfall event.
b) Why is Inflow and Infiltration a concern

Inflow and infiltration (I&I) consumes sanitary sewer capacity causing pipes to flow at higher levels. Coupled with the effect of extreme weather, inflow and infiltration of rainwater into the sewer system may result in surcharged sewers (i.e., flow in a pipe which exceeds its capacity). Surcharged sewers backup into residential connections and often result in basement flooding. Surcharged sewers also may result in sewage spilling into creeks, rivers and lakes causing potential environmental damage. The increased flow associated with I&I results in significant additional cost to pump and treat wastewater. I&I also consume precious sewer and treatment capacity that could be allocated to growth and intensification.

I&I issues are not unique to Peel, and have chronic impacts in many municipalities across Ontario. Climate change has placed an increased focus on the impacts of I&I as outcomes have a significant community impact. Addressing I&I is a priority for the Region.

2. Inflow and Infiltration Reduction and Mitigation Strategy

Staff have developed a comprehensive multiyear I&I reduction and mitigation strategy that supports the Region’s Strategic Plan (“Thriving” area of focus).

The strategy provided several recommendations for mitigating the effects of I&I notably conducting investigations, addressing I&I deficiencies where possible, and planning capital works to capture excess I&I where local action plans are not feasible. Many of the recommendations are in progress in I&I priority areas.

3. Strategy Implementation Update

Implementation of I&I remedial projects simultaneously throughout the Region is not practical nor financially feasible. Staff have divided the Region of Peel collection system into work areas, also referred to as “wastewater catchment blocks”. The areas are delineated according to sewer networks rather than neighborhood boundaries (see Appendix I).

Staff have prioritized work areas based on the history of basement flooding, older infrastructure and known high I&I issues. Work has commenced within three areas as a “proof of concept” to further refine the processes prescribed by the I&I strategy (Appendices II, III and IV). Implementation of the I&I strategy is an iterative process and a multi-year undertaking and will require future capital and human resources. Details of work in progress and future work plans in these priority areas are described in Appendix V.

4. Private Property Programs

Through analysis performed to date, a significant portion of I&I has been found to originate from private property sources.

The most common sources of I&I from private side include:

- **Roof downspouts** – these often have a pronounced impact on sewer surcharging.
• **Weeping tiles and sump pumps** – designed to collect water from foundation weeping tiles and window wells.
• **Medium/High density development** – including underground parking garage drainage systems which are connected to sanitary sewers

**Current Downspout Disconnection Program**

Currently, the Region has a voluntary, Peel-wide downspout disconnection program. A subsidy is provided, ranging from $25 to a maximum of $100 if a resident voluntarily disconnects the downspouts on their property.

Uptake for this program has been less than five per cent of the properties where downspouts are believed to be connected to the sanitary system. Between 2014 and 2018, a total of 5,057 downspouts (within 1,480 households) have been disconnected and funding has been provided in the total amount of $103,639.

**Proposed Downspout Disconnection Program**

Research of various downspout disconnection programs in Ontario and other jurisdictions has shown that a mandatory, targeted and fully funded downspout program that is managed by a municipality with support from a contractor results in greater uptake by residents and businesses over a voluntary program.

**Table 3 – Downspout disconnection success rates for various program types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Typical Success Rate</th>
<th>Cost per lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary including public outreach</td>
<td>Less than 5%</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary including outreach and subsidy</td>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
<td>$40 - $100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory, fully funded and supported</td>
<td>Up to 95%</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff proposes a mandatory, focused, fully funded, downspout disconnection program. The program will be managed by Regional staff who will develop new standards including retaining an external consultant/contractor for the implementation of the program.

The program will be limited to areas where suspected downspout connectivity exists. Work is proposed to commence later in 2019.

The program will be managed by Regional staff with design, community outreach and construction by outside vendors. Regional staff will work with the community to enforce the Wastewater By-law where property owners refuse to participate in the program.

The current voluntary program will be discontinued by December 31, 2020 in the areas of the Region that are outside of the priority blocks.
UPDATE ON THE REGION OF PEEL INFLOW AND INFILTRATION REDUCTION AND MITIGATION STRATEGY

Backwater Valve Program

The Region currently offers a subsidy of up to $700 to residents for installation of backwater valves. The resident hires a qualified plumber to install a backwater valve at the exit point of the sanitary pipe under the home and applies to the Region to recover some of their cost. Residents apply for the subsidy via the Region’s website.

As backwater valves create a significant maintenance requirement for the property owner, this subsidy program will be continued, but only targeted to properties in complex areas where it is deemed necessary.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Implementation and sustainment of the I&I strategy requires a multiyear capital and resource plan.

a) Capital costs

There are sufficient funds in approved capital budgets to fund ongoing work including piloting the new downspout disconnection program to the end of 2019.

As further research and analysis is completed, and more elements of the strategy are implemented, additional capital projects will be identified and proposed as part of each annual capital budget.

b) Resource plan

In 2018, Council approved the first dedicated staff resource to the I&I program.

As part of the I&I strategy, additional resources are recommended over time to ensure successful implementation of the program. Two additional contract staff funded through approved capital projects will be utilized to advance the program in 2019.

Further resource requirements will be proposed as part of future operating budgets.

CONCLUSION

To reduce and mitigate the incidence of basement flooding resulting from sewer back-ups and to reduce the effects of climate change on infrastructure, the Region of Peel has developed a comprehensive system-wide Inflow and Infiltration Reduction and Mitigation Strategy.

Staff is proposing a mandatory fully funded downspout disconnection program in a pilot area in 2019.

Funding approved to date will allow for the implementation of the strategy program areas and a new pilot downspout disconnection program.
UPDATE ON THE REGION OF PEEL INFLOW AND INFILTRATION REDUCTION AND MITIGATION STRATEGY

Further capital funding and staff resources for implementation of the strategy will be included in the 2020 and future capital and operating budgets.

Andrew Farr, Acting Commissioner of Public Works

Approved for Submission:

D. Szwarc, Chief Administrative Officer
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Appendix I: Region of Peel Divided into 40 Wastewater Catchment Blocks
Appendix II: I&I Priority Block 26
Appendix III: I&I Priority Block 35
Appendix IV: I&I Priority Block 1
Appendix V: Strategy Program Area Updates and Future Work Plans
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Authored By: Anthony Parente, Acting General Manager, Water and Wastewater Divisions

Reviewed in workflow by:

Financial Support Unit
APPENDIX I
UPDATE ON THE REGION OF PEEL INFLOW AND INFILTRATION REDUCTION AND MITIGATION STRATEGY
REGION OF PEEL DIVIDED INTO 40 WASTEWATER CATCHMENT BLOCKS
STRATEGY PROGRAM AREA UPDATES AND FUTURE WORK PLANS

Program Area 1 – Studies and Investigations

Significant studies and investigations have commenced in the priority blocks to pinpoint the source of I&I. Table below summarized the work completed in this program area.

Table 1 - Progress made to date in Program Area 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area 1</th>
<th>Work Completed Region Wide</th>
<th>Work Completed within Priority Blocks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flow Monitoring</td>
<td>350 installed flow meters</td>
<td>80 installed flow meters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV Inspections</td>
<td>986 km</td>
<td>197 km*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Hole Inspections</td>
<td>6,923</td>
<td>2,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoke/Dye Testing</td>
<td>120 km</td>
<td>18 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive by Surveys</td>
<td>113,055 homes</td>
<td>12,234 homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Standards</td>
<td>All Region of Peel Capital Projects now follow new Capital and Rehabilitation Standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future work plan for Program Area 1:

**Flow monitoring and isolation monitoring:** The Region will continue to expand its flow and rainfall monitoring program. It is expected that by end of 2019, the Region will have approximately 400 flow monitors. These monitors will be strategically placed to isolate large catchment areas into smaller catchments in an effort to further identify specific I&I sources and to prioritize field investigation and mitigation programs. As noted I&I sources can be challenging to identify and often require significant monitoring and analysis to quantify abnormal flows on a street by street basis.

**Prioritized CCTV and Maintenance Hole Inspection Program:** The Region has completed a process to prioritize its CCTV and maintenance hole inspection programs to undertake more frequent inspection in priority catchments. The Region has also developed a new process to deploy its CCTV crews to do inspection during rainfall events. This “Wet Weather” CCTV program assists by identifying sources of I&I which manifest themselves only during rainfall events. These types of inspections help identify sources of I&I that routine CCTV inspection process are unable to identify (i.e. those that take place during dry weather).

**Smoke and Dye Testing Program:** Smoke testing consists of adding a harmless smoke agent to sanitary sewer and observing where the smoke escapes through
improper connections. For instance, smoke testing of a sanitary sewer often identifies downspout connections which allow staff to confirm the improper connection for subsequent removal. Where smoke testing is inconclusive, adding dye to suspected improper connection and observing presence in the sanitary system helps identify connectivity. In 2019, the Region is proposing to complete smoke and dye testing of approximately 50 km of sanitary sewer in the three priority blocks. These inspections will identify direct sources of inflow connected to sanitary system which will be targeted for disconnection in 2020.

Program Area 2 – Capital Improvements and Diversion/Storage

As part of Region’s state of good repair program staff have been opportunistic to add rehabilitation and repair works for I&I reduction and mitigations. Staff have also broaden the scope of works of planned capital works projects for capacity expansion and are taking advantage of the opportunity to address I&I as any reduction in I&I will free up capacity for future growth. Table below summarizes state of good repair works completed to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area 2</th>
<th>Work Completed Region Wide</th>
<th>Work Completed in Priority Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer Spot Repairs</td>
<td>63 repairs</td>
<td>0 repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer lining projects</td>
<td>196 km</td>
<td>30 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary Sewer replacement projects</td>
<td>292 km</td>
<td>17 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Hole Repairs</td>
<td>744 repairs</td>
<td>30 repairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversions/Storage projects</td>
<td>Design work in progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following diversion projects are currently underway:

- **Dixie Road Diversion** – south of the QEW - Phase 1 and phase 2 completed in early 2019 and in service. This project helps to alleviate hydraulic surcharging of the Haig Blvd sanitary sewer.
- **Cawthra Road Relief Sewer** – Burnhamthorpe Road to Dundas Street – Phase 1 under construction and phases 2, 3, 4 under detailed design. Construction will be 2020-2023.
- **Lakeshore Road Relief Sewer** – Credit River to Richards Memorial pumping station – Environmental Assessment completed and commencing design process for construction commencing 2021.
• **East-West Diversion/ Storage** – Diversion sewer along Derry Road from Bramalea to Erin Mills.
  
  • **West-East Diversion** – Complete in 2013 and in service. Utilized to balance extraneous flows along the Credit trunk sewer.

When completed, these diversions will provide capacity relief to the existing sewer network in these areas and significantly reduce the potential for basement flooding.

**Future work plan for Program Area 2:**

• State of Good Repair works such as spot repairs, lining, replacement and rehabilitation of sewers and maintenance holes from field investigations
  
  • Further diversion and storage projects
  
  • Real Time Control strategy and implementation

**Program Area 3 – Private Property Programs**

Given the importance of this program area to the residents, business and members of Council, staff have included the details for this program area in the main body of the report.

**Program Area 4 – Operational Monitoring and Data Management**

Collecting, analyzing, and managing the data required to support an I&I program is time consuming and represents a significant portion of the investment in the I&I. Various program areas generates intense amounts of data and staff have started organizing the collection and storage of data so that it can be used for effective decision making regarding the program and monitoring effectiveness. Section below describes the progress made in this area and future workplan.

**Progress made to date in Program Area 4:**

To date the Region has started to centralize the flow and rainfall monitoring data that is continuously being collected from over 350 flow and 30 rain gauges. The Region has also started to utilize the Radar data from Environment Canada and US weather services to more accurately assess rainfall volumes.

The Region continues to leverage investments made in the new Geographic Information Systems (GIS), sensor and data collection system and other asset management systems to access information to make decision regarding I&I sources and target appropriate remediation measures.

**Future work plan for Program Area 4:**

Mobile data collection: As the Region continues to mature its work in various program areas, significant amount of data is expected to be generated. A mobile data collection
program will be developed for ease of data collection and access to information for decision making.

Real time weather data: The Region plans to install local weather radar in partnership with the Conservation Authorities and neighboring municipalities to better predict intense localized rainfall and adjust sanitary sewer system operations accordingly to minimize sanity sewer surcharge and overflows to the environment.

Program Area 5 – Stakeholder Engagement

A successful I&I program requires effective engagement from many stakeholders including internal division and department, local municipalities, members of Council, external agencies, provincial ministries, the development community, the general public, and directly affected private property owners. Staff have engaged these stakeholders at various instances and the section below describes the progress made and future workplans.

Progress made to date in Program Area 5:

Increased Collaboration with External stakeholders

In 2018 staff have engaged many external stakeholders with the I&I Strategy and mitigation programs including:

- **New Construction Standards** – Staff developed new engineering and construction standards for implementation and engaged engineering consultants, the Greater Toronto Sewer and Watermain Construction Association and the development community via the Building Industry and Land Development Association. Staff have also commenced work with the Ministry of the Environment, Climate Change and Parks on new Provincial standards for the wastewater systems.

- **I&I in New Subdivision Study** - Peel staff led a study on behalf of the Regional Public Works Commissioners of Ontario to quantify I&I in new subdivision from the private side. This has created an awareness amongst the building officials and development industry. A working group of Regional staff and developers have been formed to proactively deal with I&I from the new subdivision. Staff are engaged in developing new agreements and criteria for I&I allowance in new subdivisions.

Future work plan for Program Area 5:

Staff are working towards developing a uniform messaging template and outreach standard for communicating with residents, business and stakeholders. This will include a simplified infographic and communication materials and a dedicated website for the program.

Staff are also proposing a consultant supported ambassador for the downspout disconnection program similar to the one being used for capital construction projects. The ambassador will be the key liaison with the members of public to answer any questions related to the program, communicate the value of the program and get buy-in
and follow up after the downspout disconnection is complete to resolve any issues they may have and gain feedback to further improve the program.

**I&I – Current Approved Capital projects**

**Table 3 – Current Approved I&I Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Project #</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>2019 Funding (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-2512</td>
<td>I&amp;I Studies and Investigations</td>
<td>$ 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-2100/19-2401</td>
<td>Flow Monitoring Program</td>
<td>$ 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-2301</td>
<td>I&amp;I SOGR Remediation Works and Downspout Program</td>
<td>$ 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-2307</td>
<td>Maintenance Hole Rehabilitation</td>
<td>$ 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-2252</td>
<td>Cawthra Road Trunk Sewer Diversion Phase 2</td>
<td>$ 49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-2215</td>
<td>Lakeshore Road West Trunk Sewer – Design</td>
<td>$ 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-2405/19-2410/19-2471</td>
<td>Various Trunk Sewer Rehabilitation Projects – Design</td>
<td>$ 2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inflow & Infiltration

Strategy Update

Anthony Parente,
Acting General Manager
Water and Wastewater Divisions,
Region of Peel
Public Works
What is Inflow & Infiltration, (I&I)?

**INFLOW** – Through direct connection

**INFILTRATION** – Through defects
Why is I&I a concern?

Sanitary sewers are only designed to convey wastewater.

I&I results in
• surcharging,
• basement flooding,
• environmental discharge.

Sewer Surcharge
I&I Costs Money

- Additional treatment costs
- Lost capacity in sewers
- Lost capacity for development and growth
- Insurance claim costs
- Administration costs

Beyond the money…

- Reputational risk
- Environmental impact
- Impact to our community


Sanitary vs. Storm Infrastructure

Graphic courtesy of ICLR
Surcharged Condition (Storm - Flooding)
Surcharged Condition (Sanitary)

Graphic courtesy of ICLR
I&I in Peel’s Infrastructure

All REGION OF PEEL examples
I&I is a reality, even in new construction...

NEW - Beechwood Ave

1200mm (48”)

Found by Region staff
How do we quantify I&I?

So where is it coming from?
Multi-Year I&I Strategy
Studies and Investigations
Narrowing the Scope

• Our System
  – Greater than 3,500 km of sewers
  – Greater than 55,000 maintenance holes

• Prioritizing our work
  • High I&I
  • *But also:* Flooding history
  • Age of infrastructure
  • Risk
  • Expected growth
I&I Mitigation

How will we solve I&I problems?

1. Identify Sources
2. Rehabilitate/ Restore
3. New Capital Solutions
4. Other Options

Sewer and Maintenance Hole
I&I MITIGATION
PEEL example
Identify - What’s measured gets improved

Identifying the *presence* of I&I requires two fundamental aspects:

- **Flow monitor** – essential to monitor sewer flow
- **Rain Gauge** – essential to quantify rainfall in local vicinity
Identify - Flow and rainfall monitoring

Region Wide:
- 350 flow meters
- 25 rain gauges
**Identify - How do we pinpoint sources of I&I?**

**Inspection – Pipeline and Maintenance Hole Inspection**

**Region Wide (2014-2018):**
- 986 km of sewers CCTV’d
- 67 km during wet weather
Identify - How do we pinpoint sources of I&I?

Smoke and Dye Testing

Region Wide (2014-2018):
• 60 km of smoke testing completed
**Identify - Maintenance Hole Inspection**

**Region Wide (2014-2018):**

- 6,923 manholes inspected
- 582 need rehabilitation
Capital Improvement
Rehabilitation, Diversion, Storage
Improve - New Capital Standards

- Re-developed all capital construction standard design requirements
- Incorporated Best in Class approach
- Engaged industry stakeholders in the process

Completed in 2017
Phase 2 work ongoing
Improve - New Standards in Action
Rehabilitate – Applied New Capital Standards

Before

After

Lornewood Creek
Known Basement Flooding Area
Ward 2
Completed 2018
Rehabilitate - Sewers

Before

GAP

Infiltration

After

No GAP

No Infiltration

Lornewood Creek Lining Rehabilitation
Rehabilitate - I&I Reduction
Fixing I&I isn’t always feasible

- Many challenges – Icing, private side work, outdated building code applications etc.
- *Intensification* makes I&I more challenging
- So what then? – we must accept and manage I&I
Alternative I&I Solutions

**Diversions** – Divert flow around trouble area (re-route)

**Storage** – Store excess flow (in a pipe or tank) for after rainfall is over

**Projects underway...**
- Dixie Diversion (QEW-Lakeshore)
- Haig Blvd (QEW - Lakeshore)
- West to East Diversion/Storage
- Cawthra Relief Sewer
- Lakeshore Relief Sewer
- West Trunk Diversions

I&I STORAGE pipe with flushing
Resident/
Private Property
Programs
Resident Programs - Current

Voluntary Program only

Current voluntary program is:
- Region wide
- Not focused in problem I&I areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Uptake*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peel’s Current Voluntary Program</td>
<td>$25/downspout Max $100/house</td>
<td>Less than 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on actual numbers from recent similar programs in GTA
Resident Programs - Proposed

“Mandatory, Focused, Fully Funded, Contractor Assisted-Supervised by Consultant Downspouts Disconnection program”

Proposed **mandatory** program is:

- Only applicable for residential homes
- Not applicable to ICI lands and condominiums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Uptake*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peel’s Proposed Mandatory program</td>
<td>$200/house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on actual numbers from recent similar programs in GTA
Resources

• Strategy identified need for resources to manage I&I program
• Delivery of over $75M of capital works and other various programs over next 4 years
• Will assess success after 2019/2020
• Current Focus – Data & Project Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Resource plan</th>
<th>Interim Resource Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 FTE’s</td>
<td>2 Contract Position for 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Future

Real Time Control
- Control of the Wastewater system

Predictive Storm Modeling
- Predict storms in real time
- Forecasting I&I based on real time weather data
- Divert & Store to manage I&I

Using Environment Canada radar data to generate actually rainfall amounts and predicted weather will inform real time control processes

July 6-9 2013
Summary

• Addressing I&I Region wide will take time

• Plan is in place

• Not all I&I can be removed

• Long term investment needed

• Continuous monitoring and assessment will result in improvements

• Our program aligns with the Region’s Enterprise Asset Management Program
Questions?

Thank YOU

Contact info:

Anthony Parente, P.Eng. Acting
General Manager
Water and Wastewater Divisions,
Region of Peel
Public Works
anthony.parente@peelregion.ca
DATE: May 15, 2019

REPORT TITLE: PEEL PUBLIC HEALTH STRATEGIC PRIORITIES FOR THE FUTURE

FROM: Nancy Polsinelli, Commissioner of Health Services
Jessica Hopkins, MD MHsc CCFP FRCPC, Medical Officer of Health

RECOMMENDATION

That the Peel Board of Health (Regional Council) endorse Peel Public Health’s emerging strategic topic areas as outlined in Section 2a of the report of the Commissioner of Health Services and Medical Officer of Health, titled “Peel Public Health Strategic Priorities for the Future”.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- The Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care requires Peel Public Health to have a strategic plan. Prior to the provincial public health unit modernization announcement, development of a new strategic plan was significantly underway.
- The emerging priority areas reflect health needs based on local data and input from staff, Public Health clients, and partner organizations.
- The identified emerging topic areas, once finalized, can be recommended to the new public regional public health entity as priorities and used to advocate for Peel-relevant issues.
- The new public health strategic priorities will be presented to Regional Council before the end of 2019.

DISCUSSION

1. Background

This report describes the process of identifying new Peel Public Health strategic priorities. Peel Public Health is mandated by the Ontario Public Health Standards, 2018 to have a strategic plan. As described in the “Public Health Introduction and 2014-2019 Strategic Priority Status” report on February 14, 2019, Public Health has reported to Regional Council on a regular basis regarding the status of the current plan. However, the current strategic plan needs to be replaced as it is set to conclude by the end of 2019. In 2018, Peel Public Health started the identification of priorities to inform a new strategic plan.

In April 2019, as described in the May 9, 2019 report, “Modernization of the Ontario Public Health Sector in the 2019 Ontario Budget”, the Provincial Government announced a transformation of the Ontario public health sector that could impact the current institutional structure of Peel Public Health. The province is also conducting a Regional government
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review whose results may also change the current institutional structure of Peel Public Health. Although details of these transformations are not fully known, Peel Public Health is building on the process of its original strategic plan development to identify new priorities relevant to the Peel population.

The identification of Peel Public Health priorities is an important opportunity to ensure that, regardless of the governance structure, public health initiatives are focused on the right things, adaptive to changing realities in Peel communities and are well-resourced to be successful. It will also contribute to achieving the vision of the Region of Peel Strategic Plan, Community for Life. The identification of new strategic priorities will position Peel Public Health to advocate for the health of Peel residents and highlight the level of evidence and research to position us for leadership in anticipation of any changes in the public health sector structure.

a) New Strategic Priorities

The new strategic priorities are not intended to capture all public health programs, but rather focus on the areas that require more effort to positively impact the health of Peel residents.

b) Process

Multiple sources of information have been examined to identify emerging topic areas. These sources include emerging public health evidence specific to the Peel community from the Comprehensive Health Status Report, key documents internal and external to Peel Public Health, provincial and regional mandates, assessment of current priorities, as well as stakeholder input from staff, Public Health clients, and partners in Peel.

c) Consultations

Throughout the process, Public Health consulted with partners, including other Region of Peel departments, the Chief Administrative Officers of local area municipalities, Local Health Integration Networks, hospitals, school boards, community health centres, local conservation authorities, and police services, other Ontario public health units, among others. Peel Public Health clients and staff also provided input.

Areas of importance and relevance to partners, clients and staff have informed the identification of emerging topic areas and opportunities for partnerships and collaboration.

2. Emerging Findings

a) Identified Emerging Strategic Topic Areas

Peel Public Health has identified several emerging topic areas which are currently under review. The review includes determining the right number of priorities based on population need and organizational capacity; specifying clear outcomes and deliverables; understanding where leveraging partnerships will achieve the best outcomes for the community; and implementation and monitoring considerations.
PEEL PUBLIC HEALTH STRATEGIC PRIORITIES FOR THE FUTURE

Emerging areas under the Living and Thriving areas of focus for the Region of Peel Strategic Plan include:

- Mental well-being and how to support Peel residents in maintaining and promoting their mental health.
- Chronic disease prevention and creating an environment that supports physical activity and healthy eating, while discouraging sedentary behavior and excessive screen time.
- Climate change and how to reduce related adverse health outcomes and public exposure to health hazards.
- Health equity and how we can better define Public Health’s role in identifying and reducing public health inequities.

3. Next Steps

Peel Public Health is currently examining these emerging topic areas and determining if and how these areas can develop into new strategic priorities for the future. They will become a key reference to inform public health action in any new governance scenario that emerges from either the Regional Government Review or the Ontario Public Health Sector Modernization. Public Health will provide a report to Council presenting the proposed strategic priorities for Peel before the end of 2019.

RISK ASSESSMENT

As reported in the “Public Health Introduction and 2014-2019 Strategic Priority Status” Council report on February 14, 2019, Public Health continuously assesses risks as part of the requirements under the Ontario Public Health Standards. One of the risks identified was the ability to achieve strategic objectives and priorities in the context of changing provincial governments and policies that impact programs. By identifying new strategic priorities, Peel Public Health will be better prepared to promote local public health needs of Peel residents in any scenario that results from provincial changes. Council will be informed of any new risks identified.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The approved 2019 Budget included costs for the strategic plan development activities contained in this report.

CONCLUSION

Peel Public Health is currently identifying new strategic priorities which will place Public Health in a position of advocacy and/or leadership in anticipation of changes in governance and structure to ensure positive health outcomes for Peel residents. Through a series of activities including consultations done with stakeholders, emerging topic areas have been identified. These topic areas will be examined and finalized into priorities to be recommended to the new regional public health entity.
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Nancy Polsinelli, Commissioner of Health Services

Jessica Hopkins, MD MHsc CCFP FRCPC
Medical Officer of Health

Approved for Submission:

D. Szwarc, Chief Administrative Officer

For further information regarding this report, please contact: Dr. Jessica Hopkins, Ext. 2856

Authored By: Hany Soliman Ext. 2259

Reviewed By: Financial Support Unit
Strategic Priorities to Support Public Health

Dr. Jessica Hopkins, Medical Officer of Health
Region of Peel – Public Health
May 23, 2019
Comprehensive Health Status Report objectives

• Describe the current state of health outcomes and related risk factors for Peel residents

• Track changes in health outcomes from 2008 to 2018

• Highlight important issues to inform the next 10-year Public Health Strategic Plan
Successes

- **Longer life expectancy**
  Life expectancy is higher in Peel compared to Ontario (86.1 years for females, 82.6 for males)

- **High rates of immunization**
  Incidence for diseases where Peel has high vaccine coverage has decreased

- **Decline in smoking rates**
  Smoking rates in Peel declined from 20% to 11% over a 15-year period

- **Decline in many chronic diseases**
  Rates of heart disease, stroke and lung cancer in Peel have decreased over the past 2 decades

---

Peel’s growing and aging population

20% growth since 2006
Adding an additional 300,000 people by 2031
Opportunities and emerging issues

High rates of diabetes
The incidence rate in Peel for those aged 20 to 49 years has doubled over the past 20 years.

Cancer-causing infectious pathogens
1,200 cancer diagnoses in Peel from 2003-12 were the result of human papillomavirus, hepatitis B and C infections.

No improvement in nutrition or physical activity
Only 26% of Peel residents aged 12 and older are physically active during leisure time.

High level of sedentary behaviour
67% of Peel grade 7-12 students spend more than the recommended 2 hours of recreational screen time per day.

Emerging issues
Early indicators of health impacts of climate change
Increased rate of emergency department visits for mental health conditions in youth and young adults.
Setting the Pace:
Peel Public Health Strategic Plan 2014-2019

The Public Health Way
Guide all public health decision-making:
- Focus on prevention
- Employ a population health approach where possible
- Use research evidence and data
- Balance societal good with individual autonomy
- Be ethical and publicly accountable

Infrastructure
Build organizational capability and capacity in all programs, prioritizing:
- End-to-End Public Health Practice
- Workforce Development
- Serving an Ethno-Culturally Diverse Community

Programs
Positively impact the health of Peel’s population through all programs, currently prioritizing:
- Nurturing the Next Generation
- Supportive Environments for Healthy Living
- Living Tobacco-Free

Goals of Peel Public Health
- Enhance the health status of the population
- Reduce disparities in health status within the population
- Prepare for and respond to outbreaks and emergencies
Why identify new strategic priorities now?

The existing Region of Peel – Public Health Strategic Plan (2014 – 2019) ends next year. In addition:

- The Peel community has grown and evolved substantially since we developed the current plan.
- New evidence and health trends have emerged.
- We have updated population health data, as will be reported in our Comprehensive Health Status Report.
Process of identifying strategic priorities

- Review of key documents
- New population health data
- Regional and Provincial mandates
- Assessment of current priorities
- Consultations with stakeholders, clients and staff
Emerging Strategic Topic Areas

- **Mental well-being**
  Supporting Peel residents maintain and promote their mental health

- **Chronic disease prevention**
  Supporting physical activity and healthy eating, while discouraging sedentary behavior

- **Health impacts of climate change**
  Reducing exposure to hazards and mitigating related adverse health outcomes

- **Health equity**
  Better define Public Health’s role in identifying and reducing health inequities
Recommendation

• That the Board of Health (Regional Council) endorse Peel Public Health’s emerging strategic topic areas as outlined in Section 2a of the report of the Commissioner of Health Services and Medical Officer of Health, titled “Peel Public Health Strategic Priorities for the Future”.

Next Steps

• Finalization of emerging topic areas into strategic priorities
• Work to influence the new regional public health entity to adopt the strategic priorities once finalized
DATE: May 21, 2019

REPORT TITLE: REGIONAL COUNCIL PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN ON PROVINCIAL BUDGET CUTS

FROM: Catherine Matheson, Commissioner of Corporate Services

RECOMMENDATION

That the public awareness campaign for Regional Council as contained in the report of the Commissioner of Corporate Services titled “Regional Council Public Awareness Campaign on Provincial Cuts” be approved.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- Council passed a motion on May 9, 2019 that included a request for staff to develop a public communications campaign regarding the impact of Provincial budget cuts on the residents of Peel.
- Council directed staff to report on the impact and risks to service cuts impacted by the provincial budget cuts, and which may result in a decrease in service, or an increase in tax rates in 2020. The Region may have to consider a tax increase beyond the rate of inflation.
- Residents are encouraged to share feedback with the Region, the Premier’s Office, and MPPs on the consequences of the cuts, and encourage residents to be informed and take action to share their thoughts regarding the cuts.
- Through targeted messaging and tactics, this campaign will focus on educating as many residents as possible and will continue to build as more information becomes available.

DISCUSSION

1. Background

On May 9, 2019, Council received a presentation by staff - “Approach to the Development of the 2020 Budget”. Following the presentation, a motion was passed that included a request for staff to develop a public communications campaign regarding the potential impacts to people of Peel and regional services as based on current Provincial budget cuts.

Council directed staff to develop a public awareness campaign on the critical services that are being impacted by the provincial budget cuts, which would result in a decrease in service, or an increase in tax rates in 2020.
Based on the presentation to Council on May 9, 2019, to maintain service levels, the Region may have to consider a tax increase beyond the rate of inflation. This will be highlighted in the campaign.

2. Purpose and Key Messages for the Public Awareness Campaign

The public awareness campaign will aim to raise awareness about the potential for a decrease in services, and/or an increase in tax rates in 2020 and beyond.

The public awareness campaign will take a phased approach. The campaign will begin with awareness and ask for public input. Following initial outreach, the campaign will build to focus on specific examples of how cuts in funding may impact program areas and service delivery.

The public awareness campaign aligns with the recent Mayors and Regional Chairs of Ontario of Single Tier Cities and Regions (MARCO) advocacy position, which the Region endorsed on May 9, 2019. The position calls for the Provincial Government to postpone the implementation of funding cuts to at least 2020, to allow for proper discussion with municipalities and local residents. MARCO is, as well, calling on the Government of Ontario to be transparent about its intentions and engage with cities before downloading more services.

The key messages of the public awareness campaign will be:

- Call for the Province to work with municipalities and stop the cuts. Cuts hurt people.

- The Province of Ontario has made, and continues to make, major cuts to municipal funding allocations. In 2019 the decrease in funding for 2020 amounts to approximately $38 million dollars.

- Lowering provincial funding will not make taxes lower. To maintain service levels in services such as paramedics, long term care, early years and affordable housing, policing, without enough Provincial funding, property taxes will need to increase.

- The provincial government’s cuts will have a direct cost to residents – either through service decreases or through property tax increases.

- The Region of Peel promotes efficient government. However, unexpected, severe cuts will hurt people in the Province and in the Region of Peel. A reduction in Provincial funding must be absorbed into program areas, resulting in program cuts. This is not a case of ‘tightening administration’ – programs cannot exist without administration, administration goes hand-in-hand with service delivery, and these impacts are further reaching than the normal efficiencies expected.

- Property tax rates would have to rise significantly to make up for lost funding for 2019 and 2020.
• The Region considers opportunities for efficiencies on an ongoing basis and remains committed to continuous improvement. In 2018, the Region completed 22 improvement initiatives amounting to $7.2 million in cost savings and $3.7 million in cost avoidance.

• The Region provides value to the taxpayer and is the only municipality or level of government to receive the Excellence Canada Platinum Award recognizing the outstanding achievements of organization-wide systems of management and public service delivery.

• The Region has maintained a Triple A credit rating for 23 consecutive years.

• Peel residents can contact their local MPP online, by calling or emailing their offices to share their concerns regarding the decreases in funding to Peel.

The tone of the campaign can be described as:

• Serious
• Immediate
• Action-oriented
• People-focused

Appendix I - Example Messaging.

3. Educating Residents and Tactical Rollout Plan

The public campaign will use a multi-dimensional approach, aligning traditional and digital channels to reach as many residents as possible. It will use simple language, short, compelling, action-oriented and factual messages alongside clear visuals to ensure understanding of the issue and a call to action.

Communication tactics include:

• Launch of Peelregion.ca/cutshurtpeople
• Social media campaign on Twitter and LinkedIn, including the use of graphics, as well as toolkits with resources provided to Councillors
• An email to residents through Connect to Peel
• Telephone town hall (2 dates)
• A resource toolkit for Councillors
• Letters to the editors of all local newspapers
• Print advertising
• Media relations
• An “on hold” message for callers to the Region
• Key messages for Regional call centre.
Appendix II Details Tactical Implementation Plan.

4. Starting and stopping the campaign

Starting the campaign:
The campaign will begin following endorsement by Regional Council. The campaign will be sustained through various tactics, lead ups and highlight stories over a period of weeks and months and will include new information as it becomes available.

Phasing the campaign:
As information becomes available and confirmed on program area impacts, ads and social media will shift to focus on specific areas of service.

Ending the campaign:
In the event that the Province issues a statement that they are withholding further budget cuts, rolling back budget cuts, or at any other point that Council directs, the campaign will cease.

5. Conclusion

Through this public awareness campaign, the Region is committed to communicating the consequences of the potential impacts of provincial budget cuts to services and encouraging residents to express their concerns. Measures to indicate program traction and success will be tracked.

Kathryn Lockyer for Catherine Matheson, Commissioner of Corporate Services

Approved for Submission:

D. Szwarc, Chief Administrative Officer

APPENDIX.

Appendix I – Targeted Messaging for Key Audiences
Appendix II – Detailed Communication Tactics

For further information regarding this report, please contact Lisa Duarte, Director, Marketing and Communications, ext. 4862
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When funding is taken away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up. It's that simple.

One way or another, residents will pay for Provincial funding cuts.

Go online now and ask the Province to work with us and stop the cuts.

peelregion.ca/CutsHurtPeople
When funding is taken away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up. It’s that simple.

One way or another, residents will pay for Provincial funding cuts.

Go online now and ask the Province to work with us and stop the cuts.

peelregion.ca/CutsHurtPeople
When funding is taken away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up.

It’s that simple.

One way or another, citizens will pay for provincial funding cuts.

Go online now and ask the Province to work with us and stop the cuts.

peelregion.ca/CutsHurtPeople
Peel residents deserve a balanced approach

When funding is taken away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up. It’s that simple.

One way or another, citizens will pay for Provincial funding cuts.

Go online now and ask the Province to work with us and stop the cuts.

peelregion.ca/CutsHurtPeople
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactic</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Launch of Peelregion.ca/cutshurtpeople           | • Centralized web portal containing information on budget cuts such as links to relevant documents, shareable via social media  
  • Email the Premier and MPP form – all information will also be captured by Region to obtain feedback | • Internal costs only       |
| Social media campaign                            | • Social campaign via Twitter and LinkedIn, including the use of graphics  
  • Social media toolkits with assets provided to the Chair office for distribution to Council, as well as senior regional staff | $2,000 social media advertising |
| An email to residents through Connect to Peel     | • Approximately 120,000 subscribers  
  • Bring awareness to campaign as well as inform them of the opportunity to participate in tele-town hall | • Internal costs only       |
| Telephone town hall                               | • Raise awareness with residents on the issue and ask for input  
  • For two separate dates for townhalls (recommended in order to reach as many citizens as possible) | $45,200.00                  |
| A resource toolkit for the Regional Chair, Mayors and Councillors | • Staff will provide support to the Regional Chair, Mayors and Council members by developing a resource toolkit, which will include: key messages; Questions and Answers; and visuals to serve as a reference for inquiries. | • Internal costs only       |
| Letters to the editors of all local newspapers   | • Chair to send letter to editor calling attention to cuts and the campaign, inviting citizen response | • Internal costs only       |
| Print Advertising                                | • Print advertising in local newspapers                                 | $11,000 approximately        |
### Media Relations
- Staff will prepare media materials and work with local media to support their reporting on this issue.
- In addition to proactive media relations, upon campaign launch, we expect media coverage - Regional staff will work to answer inquiries and direct to the Chair's office for political response.

### An “on hold” message for callers to the Region
- For callers to the Region who are on-hold, they will hear a message regarding the campaign.

### Key messages for Regional call centre.
- To be able to respond and direct calls knowledgeably

### Internal costs only
#CutsHurtPeople
AWARENESS. CONSEQUENCES. OPPOSITION. ACTION.

A Communication Strategy in Response to Provincial Budget Cuts

Bethany Lee
Marketing and Communications
May 23, 2019
A Strong Campaign for Peel

Peel Regional Council passed a resolution on May 9, 2019, for Communications to report back with a strong, wide-reaching campaign to raise awareness to all residents on the potential impacts of Provincial funding cuts.
Campaign Focus

AWARENESS. CONSEQUENCES. OPPOSITION. ACTION.

• To raise **awareness** about the issue of Provincial cuts specific to Peel.

• To convey to Region of Peel residents the **consequences** of the Provincial Budget cuts.

• To convey the Region’s **opposition** to the current cuts, and potential further cuts, by the Provincial government.

• To enable and generate **action** in opposition to the cuts, from residents.
Audience/Stakeholder Engagement

Primary

• Peel residents
• Premier of Ontario
• Peel MPPs
• Media

Secondary

• MARCO (Mayors and Regional Chairs of Ontario)
• AMO (Association of Municipalities of Ontario)
• Peel leaders with a voice in the community (businesses, union leadership, etc.)
• Staff
Telling the Story

“Cuts Hurt People. When you take funding away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up.”

“Provincial Cuts don’t save money. One way or another, residents will pay.”

Call to action

#CutsHurtPeople = Call for the Province to stop the cuts.
Sample Creative

#CutsHurtPeople
Cuts Hurt People

When funding is taken away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up.

It’s that simple.

One way or another, residents will pay for Provincial funding cuts.

Go online now and ask the Province to work with us and stop the cuts.

peelregion.ca/CutsHurtPeople
Cuts Hurt People

When you take funding away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up.

It’s that simple.

One way or another, residents will pay for Provincial funding cuts.

Go online now and ask the Province to work with us and stop the cuts.

peelregion.ca/CutsHurtPeople
When funding is taken away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up.

It’s that simple.

One way or another, citizens will pay for provincial funding cuts.

Go online now and ask the Province to work with us and stop the cuts.

peelregion.ca/CutsHurtPeople
Peel residents deserve a balanced approach

When funding is taken away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up. It’s that simple.

One way or another, citizens will pay for Provincial funding cuts.

Go online now and ask the Province to work with us and stop the cuts.

peelregion.ca/CutsHurtPeople
Proposed Tactics/Channels

#CutsHurtPeople
Website & Email Form

Stop the Water Bill Hike Before It's Too Late

The provincial government is considering changes that would increase your water bill to pay for water and wastewater to new houses.

What are Development Charges?
The purchase price of a new home is made up of many components – a significant portion of which is a tax referred to as Development Charges (DCs). These are one-time fees imposed by municipalities on land developers, homebuilders and institutions when they build within their boundaries.

Municipalities in Ontario use DCs to recover certain costs associated with home and business growth – things like new water and wastewater systems, roads and transportation infrastructure, community centres, parks, trails, fire and police facilities.

These funds may only be used for the purpose for which they are collected.

Why you should understand Development Charges
Development charges can cost a lot of money, but they’re also necessary. A simple way to think of this system is that growth pays for growth. It is important to understand that the people who come to live in this region will pay for the services they require to live here. Home builders will front the costs with municipalities but then these fees are passed on to the buyer as part of the cost of a new home.

If development charges are lowered, your water bill could go up by 70 per cent. We don’t want that to happen.

Email your Member of Provincial Parliament (MPP)
Follow the steps to email your MPP to voice your concerns about this potential increase.

Step 1. Find Your MPP:
Find electoral district by entering a postal code

Step 2. Select you MPP:
Amarjot Sandhu, amarjot.sandhu@pc.ola.org

Your name (optional):
Nobody
Your email:
john.doe@test.ca

Email Amarjot Sandhu, amarjot.sandhu@pc.ola.org
Social Media & Connect 2 Peel

#CutsHurtPeople

- Shareable webpage, Connect2Peel
- Share through Regional Mayor and Councillor accounts
- Tag relevant champions
- Monitor and respond
Telephone Town Halls

- Telephone Town Hall Meeting is a unique way to reach residents
- A two way communication method
- Reaches residents ‘where they are’
- Two date options, to connect with as many residents as possible
- Promote in advance
Councillor Toolkit

- Campaign approach
- Key Messages
- FAQs
- Sample tweets for use
- Snapshot of website and email form
- Campaign visuals
- List of ways to connect (tactic)
Campaign Tracking & Measurements

- Media coverage
- Sentiment
- Social campaign statistics
- Email (Connect 2 Peel) - #s opened, engagement
- Telephone town hall data

(Details of all Tactics are in Appendix)
Thank You
ITEMS RELATED TO HUMAN SERVICES
DATE: May 15, 2019

REPORT TITLE: EMERGENCY SHELTER AND OUTREACH SERVICES WITH OUR PLACE (PEEL) (DOCUMENT 2019-344N)

FROM: Janice Sheehy, Commissioner of Human Services

RECOMMENDATION

That the Region of Peel’s duly authorized signing officers be authorized to execute a service agreement with Our Place (Peel) for the provision of 20 emergency shelter beds and outreach services for youth 16-24 years of age, for the period of 24 months, in an amount not exceeding the upset limit of $2,600,000, exclusive of applicable taxes, in accordance with Procurement By-law 30-2018, on business terms satisfactory to the Commissioner of Human Services and legal terms satisfactory to the Regional Solicitor.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- Peel’s Housing and Homelessness Plan and Peel’s Action Plan Towards Ending Youth Homelessness highlights the need for more emergency shelter beds for youth.
- Our Place (Peel) owns and operates a facility in Mississauga that provides 14 emergency and six transitional beds for youth experiencing homelessness in Peel.
- Our Place (Peel) also provides aftercare supports for youth exiting the shelter system in both Mississauga and Brampton.
- The Region of Peel currently provides Our Place (Peel) with annual funding of $1.1 million. The current funding agreement with Our Place (Peel) expires on June 30, 2019.
- Staff is seeking Council approval to execute a new two-year contract with Our Place (Peel) for a period of 24 months in the amount not exceeding the upset limit of $2.6 million.
- The new contract will convert six transitional beds into emergency shelter beds, fund the existing 14 emergency shelter beds and maintain the current level of aftercare supports.
- The conversion of six transitional beds to emergency shelter beds for youth is being recommended to respond to a critical service gap in the community.
- The new contract will also standardize the age group of youth clients to 16 to 24 years of age for all facilities - Our Place (Peel), Brampton Queen Street Youth Shelter and Peel Youth Village.
- There are sufficient funds in the current Homelessness Support Service budget to fund this new contract.
DISCUSSION

1. Background

Our Place (Peel) has been working with youth in Peel since 1985. They serve more than 550 youth annually, in their owned and operated facility in Mississauga, which currently includes 14 emergency and six transitional beds. Emergency beds are temporary shelter that can be accessed by all (subject to the shelter’s eligibility criteria such as age, family composition, etc.) and provide short term housing. Transitional beds are applied for, prioritized based on client needs, require mandatory participation in support services and may be utilized for up to one year. In addition, clients in transitional housing pay rent based on the maximum shelter allowance from Ontario Works. Our Place (Peel) also provides aftercare and family reunification supports to youth exiting their facility in Mississauga and the Brampton Queen Street Youth Shelter.

The Region of Peel currently provides $1.1 million annually to Our Place (Peel) which helps to fund their emergency and transitional beds, shelter operations and aftercare supports. The Region of Peel’s current funding agreement with Our Place (Peel) expires on June 30, 2019.

Through this report, staff is seeking approval from Regional Council to execute a new 24-month funding agreement with Our Place (Peel) in an amount not exceeding the upset limit of $2.6 million. The new contract will fund the existing 14 emergency beds and convert six transitional beds to emergency beds, thereby increasing the total number to 20. The funding will also allow for the continuation of the aftercare and family reunification supports to youth exiting the Our Place (Peel) facility in Mississauga and the Brampton Queen Street Youth Shelter.

2. Rationale for New Contract

The Region of Peel’s 10-year Housing and Homelessness Plan and the Action Plan Towards Ending Youth Homelessness highlight the need for more emergency beds for youth in Peel. Currently, there are just 54 emergency beds available for youth – 14 in Mississauga, provided by Our Place (Peel) and 40 in Brampton, provided through the temporary youth shelter on Queen Street.

By renegotiating the funding agreement with Our Place (Peel), the Region has an opportunity to quickly address this need and add six emergency beds for youth in Mississauga and standardize the age range for youth for all Regional homelessness programming to 16-24. The transitional beds would be converted to emergency beds as the youth in those beds exit the system. The need for transitional beds for youth is currently being met by Peel Youth Village, which is a 48-bed transitional housing facility for youth owned by the Region in Mississauga. The admission wait times at Peel Youth Village are between one and three months, which is relatively shorty.

While zero wait time is optimal, because clients apply for transitional beds, those applicants that present with highest needs are prioritized for admission.

Our Place (Peel) is the only service provider in Peel believed to have the capacity to accommodate this change immediately and thereby respond to a critical service gap in the
community. The funding agreement will also provide for the continuation of current aftercare supports to ensure program stability. The increase in funding is required because supporting youth in emergency shelter beds is costlier than housing youth in transitional beds, due to the complexity of client issues. Supporting increased levels of youth in one facility requires different staffing levels and more intensive supports (such as higher food allowances and transportation costs to assist with the search for permanent housing). Additional funding is also required to offset the loss of revenue from the occupancy costs youth in transitional housing are required to pay for a portion of their shelter costs.

Staff recommends a 24-month funding agreement, with an amount not to exceed the upset limit of $2.6 million. Entering into a two-year contract with Our Place (Peel) allows for emergency shelter services for youth to continue without interruption, while providing staff with time to conduct market sounding. Currently the market availability of youth emergency beds is scarce.

A formal review of the market place, taking into consideration all possible service mix scenarios under the Housing and Homelessness Plan, will help to inform any opportunities for increasing the supply of youth emergency shelter services, and capacity in the market place. This review will also provide information to address the current gap of no transitional youth beds in Brampton. Further information will be provided to Council when the Housing Master Plan is presented in June 2019.

RISK IMPLICATIONS

The current contract with Our Place (Peel) ends on June 30, 2019. Council approval to execute a new two-year contract with Our Place (Peel) will ensure that much needed emergency shelter services and aftercare supports to youth will continue without interruption.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed changes to the funding agreement with Our Place (Peel) would increase the number of emergency beds for youth in Peel from 54 to 60; a gap identified in Peel’s 10-year Housing and Homelessness Plan and Peel’s Action Plan Towards Ending Youth Homelessness. Staff are confident that the transitional housing needs of youth can be met through Peel Youth Village due to the short waiting list there.

The proposed agreement includes an upset limit of $2.6 million, representing a potential increase of up to $200,000 per year, compared to the current contract. This additional cost accounts for the reduction in occupancy revenue contributed by youth to their shelter costs, additional staff, and increased supports such as food and transportation costs.

There are sufficient funds in the current Homelessness Support Service budget to fund this increase. Homelessness programming is funded by both the Province of Ontario and Region of Peel and current expenses are apportioned 60/40 provincial/regional.

CONCLUSION

Our Place (Peel) provides important emergency shelter services and aftercare supports to youth experiencing homelessness.
EMERGENCY SHELTER AND OUTREACH SERVICES WITH OUR PLACE (PEEL)
(DOCUMENT 2019-344N)

Subject to the successful conclusion of negotiations, staff is seeking authority to execute a service agreement with Our Place (Peel) for the provision of 20 emergency shelter beds and outreach services for youths 16-24 years age, for the period of 24 months. A two-year contract with an upset limit of $2.6 million per year is recommended. The new contract will ensure the continuation of aftercare supports to youth exiting the shelter system at both Our Place (Peel) and the Brampton Queen Street Youth Shelter and will provide an immediate increase in emergency shelter beds for youth experiencing homelessness in Peel.

Janice Sheehy, Commissioner of Human Services

Approved for Submission:

D. Szwarc, Chief Administrative Officer

For further information regarding this report, please contact Aileen Baird, Director, Housing Services, (905) 791-7800, ext. 1898 or aileen.baird@peelregion.ca.

Authored By: Gail Williams
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Subject: FW: ATTN: Heads of Council - Motion to oppose Bill 108
Attachments: Bill 108 motion copy.docx

Importance: High

From: TMrakas@aurora.ca <TMrakas@aurora.ca>
Sent: May 10, 2019 12:32 PM
Cc: BDeBartolo@aurora.ca
Subject: ATTN: Heads of Council - Motion to oppose Bill 108
Importance: High

Good afternoon your Worship,

As committed to each of you in my previous correspondence, enclosed is a Motion developed by the OMB Reform Working Group in response to Bill 108.

This Motion opposes the changes outlined in Bill 108 in its current state and sends a clear message to the Government of Ontario that Municipalities need to be consulted on how we grow.

Please consider adding this Motion to your Council agendas, as the Bill is in Second Reading. It is imperative that collectively our voices are heard. Local governments should have the authority to exercise greater control over planning matters in their own communities and by working together we can build a positive future and ensure planning that’s for the people.

WHEREAS the legislation that abolished the OMB and replaced it with LPAT received unanimous – all party support; and

WHEREAS All parties recognized that local governments should have the authority to uphold their provincially approved Official Plans; to uphold their community driven planning; and

WHEREAS Bill 108 will once again allow an unelected, unaccountable body make decisions on how our communities evolve and grow; and

WHEREAS On August 21, 2018 Minister Clark once again signed the MOU with the Association of Municipalities of Ontario and entered into “…a legally binding agreement recognizing Ontario Municipalities as a mature, accountable order of government.”; and

WHEREAS This MOU is “enshrined in law as part of the Municipal Act”. And recognizes that as “…public policy issues are complex and thus require coordinated responses…the Province endorses the principle of regular consultation between Ontario and municipalities in relation to matters of mutual interest”; and

WHEREAS By signing this agreement, the Province made “…a commitment to cooperating with its municipal governments in considering new legislation or regulations that will have a municipal impact”; and


Now Therefore Be it HerebyResolved That your Municipality oppose Bill 108 which in its current state will have negative consequences on community building and proper planning; and

Be it further resolved that your Municipality call upon the Government of Ontario to halt the legislative advancement of Bill 108 to enable fulsome consultation with Municipalities to ensure that its objectives for sound decision making for housing growth that meets local needs will be reasonably achieved; and

Be It Further Resolved That a copy of this Motion be sent to the Honourable Doug Ford, Premier of Ontario, The Honourable Christine Elliott, Deputy Premier, the Honourable Steve Clark, Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Honourable Andrea Horwath, Leader of the New Democratic Party, and all MPPs in the Province of Ontario; and

Be It Further Resolved That a copy of this Motion be sent to the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) and all Ontario municipalities for their consideration.

Regards,

Tom Mrakas
Councillor Town of Aurora
416-543-1624
http://www.mrakas.ca
http://www.facebook.com/mrakas4aurora
Subject: FW: Update: Provincially Significant Employment Zones

From: Minister Steve Clark <mah@ontario.ca>
Sent: May 16, 2019 8:20 AM
To: Lockyer, Kathryn <kathryn.lockyer@peelregion.ca>
Subject: Update: Provincially Significant Employment Zones

Dear Regional Chair Nando Iannicca,

On May 2, I released More Homes, More Choice: Ontario’s Housing Supply Action Plan. It lays out our government’s comprehensive plan to increase the supply of housing that is affordable and provides families with more meaningful choices on where to live, work and raise their families.

The Greater Golden Horseshoe is a critical economic driver, both provincially and nationally, with 85 per cent of the province’s population growth expected in this region by 2041. We know that we need a growth plan to not only address the current housing crisis, but to also prepare the region for the exponential growth that will occur over the next 20 years. That is why A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe is a critical part of Ontario’s Housing Supply Action Plan.

A Place to Grow addresses the needs of the region’s growing population, its diversity, its people and its local priorities. It is the result of the recent consultations on growth plan policies in the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and I would like to thank you for sharing your input during that process. All input was carefully considered in
the development of A Place to Grow and the introduction of the Provincially Significant Employment Zones. A Place to Grow will help increase housing supply, create jobs, attract investments and promote economic development. It comes into effect on May 16, 2019 and aims to provide planning flexibility at the local level.

In my letter of May 2, 2019, I outlined that we have identified 29 Provincially Significant Employment Zones that we consulted on to provide enhanced protections for existing employment areas. The 29 zones have not changed as a result of consultations; however, we have revised them to address any factual errors in the mapping based on municipal official plans that are in effect. These zones can be viewed on our web portal.

Requests for Reconsideration

During the next phase of work, we will be reviewing more than 750 requests we received during the consultation period to reconsider a particular zone and/or add new zones. As a part of this, we may require additional information from municipalities and others who submitted requests. Each request will be assessed on its own merit, and other considerations, such as local planning context and provincial interest.

To help process these reconsiderations, we will be seeking demonstrable municipal support, such as a council endorsed letter that outlines local support for the request. We will work with the parties involved to connect with the appropriate municipal officials.

Any requests for reconsideration received after May 2, 2019 should be submitted to the impacted municipality to include in its planning process or should be accompanied by a letter of endorsement from the impacted municipality when submitted to the Province. Further details on the Requests for Reconsideration process including how requests are assessed can be found online at www.ontario.ca/page/provincially-significant-employment-zones.

If you have questions about the zones, the Requests for Reconsideration process, or accessing mapping files of the existing zones, please contact ministry staff at growthplanning@ontario.ca.

Engagement on longer-term use of Provincially Significant Employment Zones

The last phase of work will look at the longer-term use of Provincially Significant Employment Zones. The ministry has already begun to consider innovative ways to use the zones to leverage economic development investments, programs and strategies both inside and outside the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Our goal is to maximize the economic opportunities that these zones can provide. This includes but is not limited to the number of jobs and people in these zones as they play a strategic and significant role in keeping Ontario economically viable both provincially and internationally.

Provincially Significant Employment Zones can be areas with high concentrations of employment, areas that are recognized to have high economic output, or areas that are understood to play an economically strategic
or significant role to the region. They will help provide stable, reliable employment across the region and opportunities for greater integration of the different facets of longer-term planning.

With our partners from the ministries of Economic Development, Job Creation, and Trade; Transportation; Infrastructure; Finance; Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs; and the province’s Open for Business Division, we will be holding stakeholder discussions this summer. These discussions will focus on ways to maximize the use of the zones as tools in investments, infrastructure planning and economic activity.

In the interim, if you have any questions, concerns or ideas, feel free to contact the representative in my office, Jae Truesdell, Senior Policy Advisor – Planning, Zoning & Development at jae.truesdell@ontario.ca. You may also contact Cordelia Clarke Julien, Assistant Deputy Minister, Ontario Growth Secretariat, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing at cordelia.clarkejulien@ontario.ca or at 416-325-5803 for any process-related matters.

Thank you once again for sharing your input. I value your feedback and look forward to continuing to work together in the months ahead.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

Steve Clark
Minister

c:

Steve Jacques, Chief Planner & Director of Planning and Growth Management

David Szwarc, CAO

Kathryn Lockyer, Regional Clerk and Director of Clerk's
May 16, 2019

Regional Clerk and Director of Clerk’s
Kathryn Lockyer
10 Peel Centre Drive
Brampton ON L6T 4B9

Dear Kathryn Lockyer,

I am pleased to provide you with A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019. This Plan is an important part of our government’s Housing Supply Action Plan that addresses the needs of the region’s growing population, its diversity, its people and its local priorities. A Place to Grow is the result of our recent consultation on policy changes to make it faster and easier for municipalities in the region to plan for growth, increase housing supply, attract investment, and create and protect jobs.

As you know, the Greater Golden Horseshoe region is essential to not only a thriving Ontario economy but also to Canada’s wealth and prosperity. As such, it is essential to manage growth in ways that put Ontarians first as we balance the need for more housing and greater stable and reliable employment, while maintaining protections for our environment and our vibrant agricultural sector.

A Place to Grow will do this by:

• Providing more flexibility for municipalities to respond to local needs;
• Increasing housing supply at a faster rate;
• Attracting new investments and jobs;
• Making the most of transit investments; and
• Protecting important environmental and agricultural assets.

A Place to Grow reflects our trust in the ability of local governments to make decisions about how their communities grow, while the province maintains protections for the Greenbelt, agriculture, and natural heritage systems. One size doesn’t fit all. We are supporting municipalities so they can respond to local needs and regional priorities.
The new Plan will come into effect on May 16, 2019. The *Places to Grow Act, 2005* provides that official plans must be amended to conform with a growth plan within three years of the effective date. The Act also provides that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing can establish an alternative timeframe for conformity.

To provide continuity in implementation, I am directing July 1, 2022 as the date for upper and single-tier official plans to be brought into conformity with this Plan.

For lower-tier municipalities, I am directing that conformity with this Plan and the applicable upper-tier official plan will be within one year of the latter taking effect.

We look forward to continuing to work together to implement A Place to Grow. If you have any questions, feel free to contact Cordelia Clarke Julien, Assistant Deputy Minister, Ontario Growth Secretariat, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing at Cordelia.ClarkeJulien@ontario.ca.

Sincerely,

Steve Clark  
Minister

Enclosure: A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe 2019

c: Chair Nando Iannicca  
Chief Planner & Director of Planning and Growth Management  
Steve Jacques  
Chief Administrative Officer and Chair  
David Szwarc
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DATE: May 21, 2019

REPORT TITLE: FUNDING OF CAPPED TAX INCREASES - 2019

FROM: Stephen VanOfwegen, Commissioner of Finance and Chief Financial Officer

RECOMMENDATION

That a by-law to establish a percentage by which tax decreases respecting the commercial, industrial and multi-residential property classes are limited for the 2019 taxation year in order to recover revenue required to fund the capped tax increases of properties in those property classes for that year, be presented for enactment.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- Regional Council is required to enact a by-law establishing the clawback factors to be used by the local municipalities in their final property tax billing for this year.
- The 2019 reduction of tax decreases (“clawback factors”) required to fund the cap on tax increases in the capped property classes are: 10.38102% for commercial, 0.00000% for industrial and 0.00000% for the multi-residential class.
- All properties in the multi-residential and industrial capped classes have reached full Current Value Assessment (CVA) based taxation in 2019 using the applicable capping parameters. Both of these property classes will be eligible to exit the capping program in 2020.
- Regional and local municipal finance staff have reviewed and confirmed the calculations to determine the clawback factors.

DISCUSSION

1. Background

Funding of Capped Tax Increases

Regional Council at its meeting on May 9, 2019 approved By-law 33-2019 which adopts all applicable optional tools of subsection 329.1 (1) of the Municipal Act, 2001 (the “Act”), and Ontario Regulation 73/03, as amended, for calculating the amount of taxes payable in respect of property in the commercial, industrial and multi-residential (capped) property classes for 2019. Section 330 of the Act allows municipalities to fund the cap for 2019 by limiting tax decreases through clawback factors within each of the capped classes. The optional tools adopted by Council are as follows:

1. The annual cap is set at 10 per cent of the prior year’s annualized capped taxes; and/or
2. The upper-limit on the annual tax increase is the greater of the amount calculated under number 1 above or 10 per cent of the property’s previous year’s annualized Current Value Assessment (CVA) based tax;

3. A $500 threshold is applied to both increasing (capped) properties and decreasing (clawback) properties after application of either 1 or 2 above in order to move all those properties that are within the $500 threshold to their full CVA based taxes;

4. Properties that reached CVA level taxes in 2018 are eligible to be removed from the capping program for the 2019 taxation year;

5. Properties that cross over from being capped properties in 2018 to clawback properties in 2019 are eligible to be removed from the capping program for the 2019 taxation year;

6. Properties that cross over from being clawback properties in 2018 to capped properties in 2019 are eligible to be removed from the capping program for the 2019 taxation year;

7. Implementation of four-year phase-out programs for the applicable capped property classes;

8. Exclude vacant land from the phase-out eligibility criteria where all properties must be within 50 per cent of CVA level taxes; and

9. Exclude reassessment related increases, for the current year, from the capping calculation.

2. Findings

a) 2019 Clawback of Tax Decreases

Regional and local municipal finance staff agreed to continue to use the Online Property Tax Analysis (OPTA) system for the 2019 capping calculation. Staff worked with OPTA staff to prepare the assessment data, as well as, the parameters that were used to calculate the 2019 clawback of tax decreases and confirms the 2019 clawback factors as follows:

**Final 2019 Clawback Factors ($000’s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial Class</th>
<th>Industrial Class</th>
<th>Multi-Residential Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capped Taxes $</td>
<td>$(50)</td>
<td>$(0)</td>
<td>$(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clawback Taxes $</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus / (Shortfall) $</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties Capped</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Properties Clawed Back</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease % Allowed</td>
<td>89.61898%</td>
<td>100.00000%</td>
<td>100.00000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clawback %</td>
<td>10.38102%</td>
<td>0.00000%</td>
<td>0.00000%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Capping / Clawback Summary

All properties in the multi-residential and industrial capped classes have reached full CVA based taxation in 2019 using the applicable capping parameters. Both of these
property classes will be eligible to exit the capping program in 2020. Additionally, the Region is eligible to implement the four-year phase-out of the capping program for the commercial class starting in 2020, as there are no capped properties taxed at less than 50 per cent of their CVA level taxes in 2019.

It should be noted that for 2019, 0.1 per cent of the properties in the commercial, industrial and multi-residential classes are capped, while 0.2 per cent of properties in these classes will have their tax decreases reduced or “clawed back”. The remaining 99.7 per cent of the properties in the capped classes will pay tax at their full CVA level. The number of properties at full CVA taxation has increased from the 99.2 per cent of properties in 2018. The details of the 2019 capping calculation by local municipality are provided in Appendix I.

c) Regional Tax Capping By-law Required

Regional Council is required to pass a by-law if, as recommended, it is to limit the tax decreases on properties in the commercial, industrial and multi-residential classes in order to fund the 2019 capping requirements.

CONCLUSION

Regional and local municipal finance staff have reviewed the capping calculation and confirm that the 2019 clawback factors required to fund the 2019 capped increases in the capped property classes are 10.38102 per cent for the commercial class, 0.00000 per cent for the industrial class and 0.00000 per cent for the multi-residential class. Regional Council’s enactment of a by-law will permit the local municipalities to apply these clawback factors to their final tax bills for the capped property classes.

Stephen VanOfwegen, Commissioner of Finance and Chief Financial Officer

Approved for Submission:

D. Szwarc, Chief Administrative Officer

APPENDICES

Appendix I – 2019 Capping / Clawback Summary

For further information regarding this report, please contact Stephanie Nagel at extension 7105 or via email at stephanie.nagel@peelregion.ca.
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### Region of Peel
#### 2019 Capping/Clawback Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th></th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th></th>
<th>Multi-residential</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Properties $</td>
<td></td>
<td>Properties $</td>
<td></td>
<td>Properties $</td>
<td></td>
<td>Properties $</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capped Tax Increases</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36,232</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,805</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Region</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49,503</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clawback of Tax Decreases</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36,139</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13,364</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Region</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49,503</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>(93)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(93)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>12,898</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>(12,805)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(12,805)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Region</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: May 14, 2019

REPORT TITLE: 2018 TREASURY REPORT

FROM: Stephen VanOfwegen, Commissioner of Finance and Chief Financial Officer

OBJECTIVE

To provide the annual results of Treasury activities in accordance with the Region of Peel’s Investment Goals and Policies (F20-05) and Debt Management Policy (F20-06); and, to provide the annual results of energy commodity hedging performance in accordance with the Energy Commodity Procurement Policy.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- For the year ended December 31, 2018, the General Fund generated gross earnings of $67.5 million, representing a yield of 2.9%.
- Earnings on cash and short-term holdings were improved through access to new deposit products.
- All investments were in accordance with the Region of Peel’s Investment Goals and Policies and statutory requirements.
- All commodity price hedging agreements during 2018 were in accordance with the Energy Commodity Procurement Policy.

DISCUSSION

1. Background

In accordance with Ontario Regulation 438/97 (as amended) of the Municipal Act, 2001, and the Region of Peel’s (“Region”) Investment Goals and Policies, the Treasurer is required to report annually on the Region’s investment portfolio, including the performance of the portfolio and its consistency with the Investment Goals and Policies set out by the Region.

Regional Council approved the adoption of the Energy Commodity Procurement Policy which outlines the framework and guidelines of the overarching strategy to manage and mitigate the risks associated with competitive energy markets.

In accordance with Ontario Regulation 653/05 (as amended) of the Municipal Act, 2001, and the Region’s Energy Commodity Procurement Policy, the Treasurer is required to report annually on the Region’s commodity hedging performance.

This report is provided in compliance with Ontario Regulation 438/97 (as amended) of the Municipal Act, 2001,
2018 TREASURY REPORT

the Region of Peel's ("Region") Investment Goals and Policies and the Region's Energy Commodity Procurement Policy.

2. Treasurer's Discretionary Authority

Policy F20-05 Investment Goals and Policies provide the Treasurer with discretionary authority to temporarily exceed investment limitations within the Region's Investment Goals and Policies. Details are provided below:

A. Sinking Fund FX Portfolio:
   During 2016, the Treasurer approved a strategic over allocation to Hydro Quebec holdings (58% versus 55%). In November 2018, the allocation reverted back to 55%.

B. Sinking Fund EB Portfolio:
   In October 2018, the portfolio had an over allocation in the bank sector of 55% versus 50% limit within the policy. The Treasurer approved the Portfolio Manager's recommendation for a tactical over allocation to the bank sector given the attractive yield relative to the target return.

3. Market Summary

During 2018, the Bank of Canada raised the overnight policy rate three times, taking the rate to 1.75%. Longer term Government of Canada interest rates fell, ending 2018 marginally below the beginning of the year. The overall market tone was mixed throughout the year, with periods of sustained volatility, turning decidedly negative during November and December. Driven by the increased uncertainty in the latter part of 2018, Government of Canada bonds generally outperformed, with provincial, municipal, and bank bonds lagging, a theme that was more pronounced in terms beyond 5 years. Looking across asset classes, Canadian fixed income indices outperformed equity in 2018. Geopolitical events, such as trade negotiations, Brexit, and civil unrest in some emerging economies tended to have short term impacts on market direction. Central Banks (e.g. Bank of Canada, U.S. Federal Reserve, and European Central Bank) also influenced markets to a significant degree, as policy outlooks impacted investor decisions.

The outlook for 2019 is mixed, with markets and economists becoming more conservative in their growth forecasts as the economy moves into what appears to be the later stages of the business cycle. It is widely expected that the Bank of Canada will remain on the sidelines, especially in an election year, but will continue to monitor economic activity and core inflation. Economists are still calling for a moderate rise in longer dated rates; however, this has been pared back significantly from estimates made during 2018.

4. Cash Management

Treasury Staff are responsible for ensuring adequate liquidity to meet the Region's day-to-day operating needs. Collaboration with the Region's program areas to develop longer term cash flow forecasts assists the team in optimizing the Region's cash position over time.

As at December 31, 2018, the General Fund portfolio carrying value (amortized book value), including cash holdings was $2,344 million and the Sinking Fund portfolio carrying value, including cash was $270 million. Cash holdings for the General Fund totaled $461 million.
as at December 31, 2018, down from $734 million as at December 31, 2017. Additional details are provided in Appendix 1.A.

Earnings on cash holdings were enhanced as Staff were able to source more attractive short-term deposit rates.

5. Debt

Under the Municipal Act, 2001 (section 401), the Region, as an upper-tier municipality, acts to issue debentures on behalf of its lower-tier municipalities, if/when required. A summary of 2018 activity and outstanding debt is as follows:

- In March 2018, a total of $53.3 million in debt was issued for Mississauga ($46.3 million) and Caledon ($7.0 million).

- As at December 31, 2018, the Region of Peel had outstanding net own-purpose debt of $1,359 million. This includes $152 million in Peel Housing Corporation’s social housing mortgages.

- In 2018, the Region did not issue external debt for its own purposes, resulting in an $80.0 million decrease in net debt due to debenture and mortgage principal payments and Sinking Fund provision payments. Appendix 1.B contains additional details.

6. Investments

General Fund

The General Fund is comprised of cash and investments held for working capital, reserves and reserve funds, and other funds of the corporation. During 2018, the General Fund generated gross earnings of $67.5 million, on a Weighted Average Portfolio Value of $2,307.9 million, resulting in an investment yield of 2.9%.

The majority of earnings were allocated to reserves ($63.2 million), and $3.3 million was allocated to operations.

Performance

For the year ending December 31, 2018, the General Fund earned $67.5 million, representing a gross yield of 2.9%. Fixed income holdings generated $53.5 million of earnings with the remaining $14.0 million from deposit interest earned on cash holdings. Included in the $53.5 million of fixed income earnings, was $1.7 million in realized gains on securities that were sold during the year – this represents a very small portion of total earnings (approximately 2.5%). The Region continues to take a long-term view of portfolio performance and balances the trade off between realizing capital gains in the short-term and the impact it may have on future earnings.

Additional performance and portfolio characteristics are provided in Appendix 1.C.
Portfolio Costs

The Treasury Division’s management expense ratio (MER) was approximately 3.8 basis points (0.038%) in 2018. The MER represents the direct operational cost of the investment portfolio relative to the size of the assets under management. This represents excellent value for money relative to alternative options.

By comparison, the ONE Fund charges a management fee of 40 basis points (0.40%) for their bond fund. If the Region were to invest the General Fund fixed income holdings into ONE Fund’s portfolio, as opposed to managing internally, the additional cost is estimated to be approximately 35 basis points (0.35%) higher, equivalent to an additional annual budget outlay of $6.0 million.

Sinking Funds

Sinking Funds are established upon issuance of sinking fund debentures, and managed separately, per Municipal Act, 2001 (section 409), with an estimated amount contributed annually to the Sinking Fund which, with interest compounded annually, will be sufficient to pay the principal of the debentures at maturity.

During 2018, the six (6) Sinking Funds generated total gross earnings of $8.2 million, with the total aggregate value of the Funds increasing from $215 million to approximately $270 million, inclusive of annual provision payments. The investment returns outperformed the target returns for four (4) Sinking Funds while two experienced shortfalls compared to the annual target return requirement. Sinking Fund EP has a deficit of $21,515 at the end of 2018 as it continues to underperform the target return. Market interest rates have fallen significantly since the debenture issuance, making it difficult to invest contributed provision payments at yields equal to or greater than target. As required by the Act, the Region will contribute the shortfall during 2019. Further details for individual Sinking Funds are contained in Appendix 1.C.

7. Energy Procurement Performance

The objectives of the Energy Commodity Procurement Policy are to establish commodity price hedging agreements that ensures regulatory compliance, provide financial flexibility and maximize procurement opportunities.

Electricity: No hedge volumes were procured for 2018.

Natural Gas: The Region of Peel and the Housing Services Corporation hedged 53% of its approximately 15.65 million m3 of natural gas requirements for 2018. The total risk mitigated from volatility in the natural gas market for the year was approximately $191,000.

Further details on energy procurement performance are in Appendix 1.E.

8. Compliance

All investments were in accordance with the Region of Peel’s Investment Goals and Policies and statutory requirements. All commodity price hedging agreements during 2018 were in accordance with the Energy Commodity Procurement Policy. Ontario Regulation 438/97 requires that a municipality report on investments held in its own securities. From time to time, the Region invests in its own securities no different than any other Portfolio
investments where the Region sees value relative to other similar securities. Appendix 1.D contains details of holdings and transactions throughout 2018.

9. Cash Management Strategy - Update

The implementation of the Cash Management Strategy is underway. During 2018, Treasury Services continued to focus on the Strategy's three key outcomes:

- Redefine the Treasury function’s mandate;
- Enhance the Treasury function’s practices; and
- Increase the potential to generate greater financial returns.

In accordance with the Strategy, the Region completed all hiring with the exception of one position, expected in 2019. Governance process changes were implemented to ensure clear roles and responsibilities, strengthening internal controls. All material processes and procedures were documented and where appropriate automated and/or enhanced. Through the multi-year implementation plan, the Region will improve and augment the current Treasury practices, focusing on opportunities that will provide long term financial flexibility to the Region of Peel. The Treasury Oversight Committee, consisting of senior Regional management, was established. The purpose of this Committee is to enhance activities of the Region and PHC, thereby strengthening risk management practices. This Committee will provide advice and/or recommendations regarding the:

- Structure and strategy of the Region’s investment portfolio and borrowing program.
- Potential amendments to the annual review of policies related to investment and debt activities.
- Review of the financial performance of debt and investment portfolios to enhance understanding and management of risks.
- Review of the funded status of sinking funds.
- Effectiveness of the policies and the achievement of the objectives of the Debt and Investment Programs.
- Other matters as determined by the CFO and Regional and PHC Treasurer(s).

The Region continues to seek opportunities to further expand the investment opportunities and borrowing strategies which is expected to reduce the Region's financial vulnerability as it strives to meet the needs of the community.

10. Prudent Investor Status – Update

In May 2017, Bill 68 Modernizing Ontario’s Municipal Legislation Act received Royal Assent in the legislature. The Bill made a number of changes to the Municipal Act, 2001 including the extension of the Prudent Investor Standard (the Standard) to municipalities, which became enabled in March 2018, through the amendment of O. Reg. 438/97.

Previously, municipal investment activities were regulated through a prescribed list under O. Reg. 438/97: Eligible Investments and Related Financial Agreements, which restricts municipal investments to highly rated Canadian bonds, money market instruments and other similar debt instruments.

The inclusion of the Standard, however, allows municipalities greater investment authority than what was previously prescribed under the Municipal Act, 2001. The Trustee Act stipulates the provisions for the Standard which can be generally viewed as a non-
prescriptive, broad authority to invest as a ‘prudent person’ would. The *Trustee Act* outlines that a Prudent Investor must:

- view risk within the context of their total portfolio;
- make investments in view of the unique circumstances of the beneficiary;
- diversify portfolio investments across assets;
- make investments with a view toward the impact of inflation; and,
- consider total return of the investments.

Through the passing of the regulation, municipalities now have the option to continue to invest through the prescribed list or choose to expand their investment opportunities by participating in the Standard.

The Region, in collaboration with other large Ontario municipalities is undertaking thorough analysis and due diligence of the options available through the Standard. This analysis is expected to provide the consortium with the costs and benefits on the various options available. This will support the Region in determining its recommended approach going forward. The working group is in the process of engaging a 3\textsuperscript{rd} party consultant to provide further independent analysis which will be used to evaluate the Region’s position with respect to the Standard.

Some highlights of the work that has been done to date include:

- Costs and benefits of permissible governance/investment structures under the Standard;
- Organizational impacts, such as accounting, reserve budgeting, and cash flow forecasting are being investigated; and,
- Historical back-testing of risk/return metrics.

The Standard became effective January 1, 2019. To date, we are not aware of any municipality that has implemented the Standard, with the exception of City of Toronto that was granted the authority in 2018. The Municipal Finance Officers’ Association, through ONE Investment is currently developing a product/service offering that would allow municipalities to access the Standard. As part of the Region’s due diligence, Staff are in regular contact with ONE Investment to understand the offering. With the landscape still evolving, the Region continues to evaluate the options and is exercising patience as solutions evolve within the industry. Staff will continue to keep Council updated with findings/recommendations. As the Region has not implemented the Standard, all investments continue to be governed by the prescribed list under Ontario Regulation 438/97 and the Region’s Investment Goals and Policies.

11. Treasurer’s Comments

It is the opinion of the Treasurer and Director of Corporate Finance that all transactions and investments during 2018 were in compliance with the Region’s Investment Goals and Policies and Ontario Regulation 438/97. Commodity hedging was also in compliance with the Region’s Energy Commodity Procurement Policy and Ontario Regulation 653/05. This report satisfies the Treasurer’s legislative requirements per Ontario Regulations 438/97 and 653/05.
2018 TREASURY REPORT

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The revenue generated through investment activities in 2018 was allocated to reserves (93%), operations (5%) and some non-program Regional bank accounts (2%).

CONCLUSION

The Region’s Investment Goals and Policies provide the Region with an effective and efficient investment management operation which maximizes the rate of return on investment while ensuring safety of principal and liquidity.

Stephen VanOfwegen, Commissioner of Finance and Chief Financial Officer

Approved for Submission:

D. Szwarc, Chief Administrative Officer
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Appendix 1 – 2018 Treasury Report

Appendix 1.A: Cash Management

2018 General Fund cash holdings reduced from $734M to $461M

Portion of cash holdings invested into longer term fixed income securities as yield levels became more attractive

General Fund cash holdings down 14% from 2017

Sinking Fund cash holdings were $13M, down $32M from 2017
- Cash levels were reduced as investments were made throughout 2018

Appendix 1.B: Debt

In 2018, the Region had outstanding net own-purpose debt of $1,359M

This includes $152M in PHC’s social housing mortgages

The Region had an $80M decrease in net debt

$1,440M 2017
$1,359M 2018

Reductions due to debenture and mortgage principal payments and Sinking Fund provision payments

Appendix 1.C: Investments – General Fund

The portfolio carrying value (amortized book value) was $2,344M

- While the allocation to cash is higher than it has been historically, the extreme flattening of the yield curve where the spread between long and short-term yields decreased, has boosted the relative attractiveness of cash holdings vis-a-vis longer term fixed income holdings.

- More specifically, the Region was able to negotiate more favourable rates on cash deposits, which are comparable to 2 to 4-year investment options at various points throughout 2018.

The total market value of holdings was $2,359M
Duration of the General Fund portfolio as of Dec 31, 2018, was 3.5 years. Maturities are structured to meet the timing of cash requirements.

All investments continue to be held in highly rated securities. Only 1% rated below AA.

### Portfolio Maturities (as of Dec 31, 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Investments</th>
<th>Cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>400M</td>
<td>200M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>500M</td>
<td>100M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>300M</td>
<td>500M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>200M</td>
<td>600M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>100M</td>
<td>700M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>50M</td>
<td>800M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>25M</td>
<td>950M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>12.5M</td>
<td>1075M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>6.25M</td>
<td>1137.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>3.125M</td>
<td>1168.625M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sector Allocation

- Provincial = 36%
- Municipal = 22%
- Banks = 21%
- Other = 21%

### Investment Returns vs. Market Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Investment Earnings ($ Millions)</td>
<td>$67.5</td>
<td>$57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Investment Returns (gross)</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Benchmark</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Add (returns – benchmark)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Historical Performance

- Market yields bottomed in 2015/2016 and have since begun moving slightly higher.
- As the market benchmark is reflective of current yields, there tends to be a lagged effect on the portfolio yields. For example, as rates move higher, short term outperformance tends to be reduced, while the opposite tends to be true as yields move lower (e.g. 2015).

### Long Term Target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Investment Returns vs. Average Inflation</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-year Average Investment Returns (gross)</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-year Average Inflation</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Add (returns – inflation)</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A major goal of the General Fund is the preservation of purchasing power over the long-run. Inflation is used as a barometer of the Portfolio’s long-term minimum return requirement.

### Values may not add due to rounding.

1. The gross fixed income investment yield is based on earned revenues (interest income, realized capital gains/losses, amortized premiums/discounts and securities lending income) as a percentage of the weighted average value net of expenses.
2. Blend of FTSE TMX indices based on target term and sector exposures.
3. Toronto CPI.
## Appendix 1.C: Investments – Sinking Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Issue Date</th>
<th>Maturity Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>% of Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DQ</td>
<td>Jun 29/10</td>
<td>Jun 29/40</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$8.9</td>
<td>$71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Oct 06/11</td>
<td>Dec 01/21</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$7.8</td>
<td>$54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>Oct 30/12</td>
<td>Oct 30/42</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$6.8</td>
<td>$41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>Jun 20/13</td>
<td>Jun 20/53</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ</td>
<td>Aug 23/13</td>
<td>Dec 02/33</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$9.1</td>
<td>$45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>Nov 02/16</td>
<td>Nov 02/26</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$13.7</td>
<td>$52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$46.7</td>
<td>$241.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective of each Sinking Fund is to meet or exceed target return

The target return is the estimated return requirement necessary to ensure that each Sinking Fund is fully funded at maturity to repay its obligation

- For Series DQ, the 2018 return was only 3 basis points (0.03%) below the target return and the series continues to be in a surplus position due to surpluses accumulated in prior years.
- Series EP continues to underperform the target return as market interest rates have fallen significantly since the debenture issuance, making it more difficult to invest contributed provision payments at yields equal to or greater than target. The Region will contribute the shortfall for Series EP which was in a small deficit position ($21,515) at the end of 2018.

## Appendix 1.D: Investments Held in Region of Peel Securities

### Region of Peel Bonds – Holdings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>% of Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 31/18</td>
<td>$2,752,357,130</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 31/17</td>
<td>$2,579,877,871</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yr. over Yr. Change</td>
<td>$172,479,360</td>
<td>$14,900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Region of Peel Bonds – Transactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>Transaction</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Coupon</th>
<th>Par Value</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>Sale</td>
<td>Jun. 21/18</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td>$6,855,000</td>
<td>$124.86</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>Jun 29/18</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>$510,000</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>Dec. 14/18</td>
<td>6.65%</td>
<td>$2,320,000</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series DQ</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series EB</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Apr. 27/18</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>$1,672,000</td>
<td>103.24</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series EC</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Nov. 05/18</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>$6,799,000</td>
<td>103.99</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series EC</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Jan. 13/18</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>$655,000</td>
<td>108.73</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series EP</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series EQ</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Apr. 30/18</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>$4,602,000</td>
<td>110.86</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series EQ</td>
<td>Purchase</td>
<td>Dec. 06/18</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>$8,675,000</td>
<td>110.14</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix 1.E: Energy Procurement

No electricity hedge volumes were procured for 2018

Projections showed that 2018 market conditions would be relatively stable and the Region’s exposure to the spot market is minimal (approximately 12% of total annual energy bill). This strategy allowed the Region to take advantage of the low spot market prices that averaged $0.02244/kWh in 2018, which was 33% less than the 2017 transaction price.

Total hedge cost of approximately $1.2M and total index cost of approximately $0.99M spent on gas

Natural gas hedge volume of 8.32 million m³ and index volume of 7.33 million m³ was purchased from both the Region of Peel’s gas supplier and the Housing Services Corporation at various delivery points at an average price of $0.1389/m³ inclusive of transaction fees.
The Region of Peel Emergency Management Program Committee met on May 2, 2019 at 1:03 p.m., in the Regional Council Chambers, 5th Floor, Regional Administrative Headquarters, 10 Peel Centre Drive, Suite A, Brampton, Ontario.

Members Present: A. Groves; J. Innis; S. McFadden; K. Ras; P. Saito; R. Santos; I. Sinclair

Members Absent: G. Carlson; N. Iannicca due to vacation

Also Present: S. VanOfwegen, Acting Chief Administrative Officer, Commissioner of Finance and Chief Financial Officer; S. Baird, Commissioner of Digital and Information Services; C. Matheson, Commissioner of Corporate Services; Michelle Wong, Acting Regional Solicitor; A. Farr, Acting Commissioner of Public Works; Stella Danos-Papaconstantinou, Director, Community Access; T. Ivanyshyn, Committee Clerk; T. Kobikrishna, Legislative Assistant

T. Ivanyshyn, Committee Clerk, presided.

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR

Councillor Saito placed the following motion.

**RECOMMENDATION EMPC-1-2019:**

That Councillor Groves be elected Chair of the Emergency Management Program Committee, for a term ending November 14, 2020, or until a successor is appointed by Regional Council.

Councillor Groves placed the following motion.

**RECOMMENDATION EMPC-2-2019:**

That Councillor Santos be elected Vice-Chair of the Emergency Management Program Committee, for a term ending November 14, 2020, or until a successor is appointed by Regional Council.

**Councillor Groves assumed the Chair.**

* See text for arrivals
* See text for departures
2. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST - Nil

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

RECOMMENDATION EMPC-3-2019:

That the agenda for the May 2, 2019 Emergency Management Program Committee include an oral update regarding plans for the upcoming Emergency Preparedness Week, to be dealt with under Other Business – Item 8.1;

And further, that the agenda for the May 2, 2019 Emergency Management Program Committee meeting, be approved as amended.

4. DELEGATIONS - Nil

5. REPORTS

5.1. Orientation to the Role of the Regional Chair and Council Members During an Emergency

Presentation by Andrew Cooper, Acting Manager, Regional Emergency Management

Received

Andrew Cooper, Acting Manager, Regional Emergency Management, provided an overview of the Region of Peel Emergency Management Plan and the role of the Regional Chair as legislated by the Emergency Management and Civic Protection Act R.S.O. He also provided an overview of the emergency declaration process and a summary of annual reported events.

In response to a question from Councillor Sinclair, Andrew Cooper stated that a declaration of emergency could be called during the partial or full activation escalation stage of an emergency event.

In response to a question from Councillor Sinclair regarding provincial and federal support during a declared emergency, Andrew Cooper noted that the Canadian Forces may be requested through the Office of the Fire Marshal and Emergency Management and their federal partners. Should the Canadian Forces be deployed, they are done so under a standing Operation (Operation LENTUS) for natural disasters.

In response to a question from Councillor Ras regarding 94 internal emergency events reported in 2018, Andrew Cooper clarified that protocols for dealing with internal events were developed and activated in 2018. The protocols were not tracked prior to 2018.
5.2. 2019 Regional Emergency Management – Work Plan Overview

Received

5.3. Summary of the 2018 Office of the Fire Marshal and Emergency Management (OFMEM) Compliance Submission

Received

In response to a question from Councillor Sinclair regarding Hydro One’s role during a power outage, Andrew Cooper noted that Hydro One and Alectra Utilities have emergency plans and that both organizations provide alerts to the Region regarding outages. He noted that a 24/7 duty officer is available to address critical issues.

5.4. 2018 Regional Fire Coordinators Report

Received

5.5. 9-1-1 Annual Report

Received

In response to a request from Councillor Ras, Sean Baird, Commissioner of Digital and Information Services noted that staff can provide 9-1-1 protocol information for Councillor Newsletters.

Councillor Santos requested that information regarding Amber Alerts also be provided.

6. COMMUNICATIONS - Nil

7. IN CAMERA MATTERS - Nil

8. OTHER BUSINESS

In response to a request from Councillor Sinclair to provide a letter of support from the Regional Chair to the Department of Transportation regarding the matter of railway safety, Stephen VanOfwegen, Acting Chief Administrative Officer, stated that the request will be taken as direction to staff to be referred to the next Government Relations Committee meeting.
8.1. Emergency Preparedness Week Update (Oral)

Received

Andrew Cooper, Acting Manager, Regional Emergency Management provided an update on the Region’s Emergency Preparedness Week activities including attendance at the Peel Regional Police Open House and twitter messaging regarding flood protocols and important website links.

Councillor Saito requested that the Region’s website provide links to the local municipal emergency preparedness websites to ensure residents have access to all municipal emergency information.

9. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Emergency Management Program Committee is scheduled for November 21, 2019 at 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 5th floor, Regional Administrative Headquarters, Suite A, 10 Peel Centre Drive, Brampton, Ontario.

Please forward regrets to Jill Jones, Committee Clerk, and (905) 791-7800 ext. 4330 or at jill.jones@peelregion.ca.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 1:46 p.m.
The Region of Peel Audit and Risk Committee met on May 2, 2019 at 11:03 a.m., in the Regional Council Chambers, 5th Floor, Regional Administrative Headquarters, 10 Peel Centre Drive, Suite A, Brampton, ON.

Members Present: S. Dasko; N. Fairhead; C. Fonseca; K. Ras; R. Santos*; I. Sinclair; R. Starr; H. Zuberi

Members Absent: N. Iannicca, due to vacation

Also Present: S. VanOfwegen, Acting Chief Administrative Officer, Commissioner of Finance and Chief Financial Officer; S. Baird, Commissioner of Digital and Information Services; C. Matheson, Commissioner of Corporate Services; M. Wong, Acting Regional Solicitor; A. Farr, Acting Commissioner of Public Works; N. Polsinelli, Commissioner of Health Services; S. Danos-Papaconstantinou, Acting Commissioner of Human Services; S. Nagel, Treasurer and Director of Corporate Finance; M. Morris, Director, Enterprise Risk and Audit Services; K. Lockyer, Regional Clerk and Director of Legal Services; S. Jurrius, Committee Clerk; T. Kobikrishna, Legislative Assistant

1. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST - Nil

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

RECOMMENDATION ARC-9-2019:

That the agenda for the May 2, 2019 Audit and Risk Committee meeting, be approved.
3. DELEGATIONS

3.1. Trevor Ferguson, Audit Partner, Deloitte LLP, Presenting the 2018 Deloitte Audit Results Report

Related to 3.1, 4.2 and 4.3

Trevor Ferguson, Audit Partner, Deloitte LLP, provided a high-level overview of the 2018 Deloitte Audit Results Report for the external audit of the financial statements of The Regional Municipality of Peel and the Peel Housing Corporation. He summarized that no significant deficiencies were identified.

_Councillor Santos arrived at 11:07 a.m._

In response to a question from Councillor Sinclair regarding the change in landfill closure and post-closure liability from $19.4M in 2017 to $5.9M in 2018, Stephanie Nagel, Director of Corporate Finance and Treasurer, stated that in addition to Note 8 to the Consolidated Financial Statements for the year ended December 31, 2019, listed as Item 4.1 on the May 2, 2019 Audit and Risk Committee agenda, the liability was due to an additional $3.8M in capital projects for the planned closure of the Caledon landfill site and related capital and operating costs for closed landfill sites.

Councillor Sinclair requested that staff provide him with information as to how the landfill closure and post-closure liability related to the Town of Caledon were calculated.

In response to a question from Member Zuberi regarding the acquisition of investments from the consolidated statement of cash flows, Stephanie Nagel stated that the Region of Peel worked with the banks on high interest savings accounts options which allow Regional staff to move money out of the operating bank account into liquid accounts that provide higher interest rates. Trevor Ferguson confirmed that the investments portfolio are in compliance with the Region’s investment policies.

Stephen VanOfwegen, Acting Chief Administrative Officer, stated that Regional Council approved an active cash management strategy which includes a Treasury Oversight Committee to ensure compliance with the investment policy to take advantage of market opportunities and improve investment returns within the scope of the subject policy.

4. REPORTS

4.1. 2018 Region of Peel Consolidated Financial Statements

Related to 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3
4.2. 2018 Peel Housing Corporation Financial Statements

Received

Related to 3.1

4.3. 2018 Deloitte Audit Results Report

Received

Related to 3.1

4.4. 2018 Region of Peel Debt Retirement and Sinking Funds Financial Statements

Received

4.5. 2018 Region of Peel Trust Funds Financial Statements

Received


Received

Member Zuberi expressed concern regarding the risk exposure of unimplemented action plans, nine of which are considered high risk, and sought clarification on the reasons for the delay in implementing the action plans. Michelle Morris, Director, Enterprise Risk and Audit Services, responded that action plan dates are determined in consultation with management. The current process is to hold the original implementation dates recognizing that certain related activities, such as a shift in departmental process or technology, may have caused the delay of implementation. The risks reported are specific to the program, service or process reviewed during the audit and does not represent a Region-wide risk.

The Director of Enterprise Risk and Audit Services was requested to report on management action plans, to the Committee, biannually.

4.7. Roads Resurfacing Audit

Received

4.8. Peel Living Property Management Audit

Presentation by Dan Labrecque, General Manager, Peel Housing; and Jennifer Weinman, Manager, Enterprise Risk and Audit Services

Received

Jennifer Weinman, Manager, Enterprise Risk and Audit Services, provided an overview of the Peel Living Property Management audit and noted that the objective of the audit was to determine if management has effective controls for providing safe and well-maintained living environments for the tenants. She advised that effective controls are in place to help ensure
properties are in compliance with relevant building law and regulations. Jennifer Weinman stated that Enterprise Risk and Audit Services are satisfied with Peel Housing’s management action plans to help mitigate the risks noted for the subject audit.

Dan Labrecque, General Manager, Peel Housing, provided information on the management action plans for improvements related to preventative maintenance, asset management, regulatory requirements and vendor management. He stated that Peel Living is moving to an online platform called Megamations, an application used by the Region of Peel, for its asset maintenance and management of repairs and service requests for Peel Housing Corporation. Further as part of the management action plans, an electronic management system will be implemented to store and access notifications and ensure best practices of the Region’s procurement practices into the Peel Housing portfolio.

In response to questions from Councillor Ras regarding the contractors’ performance measurement and project delivery, Dan Labrecque stated that with the transition to a digital platform and depending on the type of contract being reviewed, staff will have the ability to document and validate a contractor’s performance before payment is issued.

In response to questions from Councillor Fonseca regarding audit of transitional housing and emergency shelters, Jennifer Weinman stated that staff are planning for the audit of the operating contracts for the shelters. Dan Labrecque advised that Peel Living oversees the property management of all the shelters and that the same process will be applied to the shelters as with other buildings owned and operated by the Region of Peel.

In response to questions from Member Fairhead, Dan Labrecque stated that staff are supportive of the transition to a digital platform and change management plans will be in place to roll out the new system.

5. COMMUNICATIONS - Nil

6. IN CAMERA MATTERS - Nil

7. OTHER BUSINESS - Nil

8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Audit and Risk Committee is scheduled for September 19, 2019 at 11:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. in the Council Chamber, 5th floor, Regional Administrative Headquarters, Suite A, 10 Peel Centre Drive, Brampton, Ontario.

Please forward regrets to Jill Jones, Committee Clerk, and (905) 791-7800 ext. 4330 or at jill.jones@peelregion.ca.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.
The Region of Peel ROPA 30 Appeals Oversight Committee met on May 9, 2019 at 8:35 a.m., in the 5th Floor Boardroom, Regional Administrative Headquarters, 10 Peel Centre Drive, Suite A, Brampton, Ontario.

Members Present: A. Groves; N. Iannicca; M. Palleschi*; C. Parrish

Members Absent: Nil

Other Regional Councillors Present: A. Thompson*

Also Present: P. O’Connor, Regional Solicitor; A. Macintyre, Deputy Clerk and Manager, Legislative Services; S. D’Agostino, Counsel, Thomson Rogers on behalf of the Region of Peel; S. Jurrius, Committee Clerk

S. Jurrius, Committee Clerk, presided.

1. **ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR**

**RECOMMENDATION R30AOC-1-2019:**

That Councillor Parrish be elected the Chair of the Regional Official Plan Amendment 30 Appeals Oversight Committee, for a term ending upon the dissolution of the Committee or the end of the current term of Regional Council, whichever comes first.

**RECOMMENDATION R30AOC-2-2019:**

That Councillor Groves be elected the Vice Chair of the Regional Official Plan Amendment 30 Appeals Oversight Committee, for a term ending upon the dissolution of the Committee or the end of the current term of Regional Council, whichever comes first.

*Councillor Parrish assumed the Chair.*

* See text for arrivals
◆ See text for departures
2. DECLARATIONS OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST – Nil

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

RECOMMENDATION R30AOC-3-2019:

That the agenda for the May 9, 2019 Regional Official Plan Amendment 30 Appeals Oversight Committee, be approved.

4. DELEGATIONS – Nil

5. REPORTS – Nil

6. COMMUNICATIONS

6.1. Yazzie Cosentino, Decisions Unit Administrative Staff, Tribunals Ontario – Environment and Land Division, Local Planning Appeals Tribunal (LPAT), Email dated April 2, 2019, Regarding PL170058 – LPAT Decision Issued on the Proposed Official Plan Amendment No. ROPA 30 - Regional Municipality of Peel

Received

6.2. Nazma Ramjaun, Case Coordinator/Planner, Tribunals Ontario – Environment and Land Division, Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT), Email dated April 17, 2019 LPAT, Responding to Stephen D'Agostino, Thomson Rogers, on behalf of the Region of Peel, Regarding PL170058 - Request to Cancel April 23, 2019 Prehearing Conference on the Proposed Official Plan Amendment ROPA 30 - Regional Municipality of Peel

Received

In response to a question from Councillor Thompson regarding the next scheduled prehearing conference, Stephen D'Agostino, Counsel, Thomson Rogers on behalf of the Region of Peel, stated that the Phase 1 hearing with the Local Planning Appeals Tribunal (formerly the Ontario Municipal Board) will be held in June 2020.

Councillor Thompson departed at 8:37 a.m.

7. IN CAMERA MATTERS

At 8:38 a.m., in accordance with section 239(2) of the Municipal Act, 2001, as amended, a motion was placed, and was carried, to move into closed session to consider the following subject matter:
RECOMMENDATION R30AOC-4-2019:

That the ROPA 30 Appeals Oversight Committee proceed “In Camera” to consider a Committee report relating to the following:

- Advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose

Councillor Palleschi arrived at 8:46 a.m.

Committee moved out of In Camera at 9:15 a.m.

7.1. Ontario Municipal Board Hearing - Regional Official Plan Amendment 30 (Oral) (Advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose)

Received

Councillor Palleschi moved the following motion.

RECOMMENDATION R30AOC-5-2019:

That direction given “In Camera” to the Regional Solicitor and Thomson Rogers Lawyers be approved, and voted upon in accordance with Section 5.10.8.b of the Region of Peel Procedure By-law 9-2018, as amended.

8. OTHER BUSINESS – Nil

9. NEXT MEETING

To be determined.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:17 a.m.
DATE: May 21, 2019

REPORT TITLE: DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND ANTI-RACISM COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE

FROM: Catherine Matheson, Commissioner of Corporate Services

RECOMMENDATION

That the Terms of Reference for the Diversity, Equity and Anti-Racism Committee, as proposed in Appendix I to the report of the Commissioner of Corporate Services, titled “Diversity, Equity and Anti-Racism Committee Terms of Reference” be approved.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- On December 13, 2018, Regional Council approved the establishment of the Diversity, Equity and Anti-Racism Committee.
- The revised Terms of Reference, outlining the mandate, is attached as Appendix I.
- Based on the revised Terms of Reference, the Non-Elected Committee Representative recruitment’s posting attached as Appendix II.

DISCUSSION

1. Background

On December 13, 2018, Regional Council approved the establishment of the Diversity, Equity and Anti-Racism Committee (the “Committee”) to advise Regional Council about systemic barriers and diversity issues in the community and internal to the organization which may impact Regional programs and services.

The Committee Terms of Reference was presented to committee members on April 4, 2019 and approved by Regional Council on April 25, 2019 as part of the Consent agenda items. The Terms of Reference, as amended, are included as Appendix I.

2. Proposed DEAR Committee Membership

Based on discussions from the April 4, 2019 Committee meeting, it was recommended that the composition of the Committee include community members, preferably one from each local municipality. Recruitment of non-elected committee members will commence once
Regional Council has approved the Terms of Reference. The recruitment posting, including desired competencies and skills is included as Appendix II.

A report with recommendations regarding the suitability of the prospective non-elected member candidates for the Committee will be presented to Regional Council prior to appointment of non-elected members. Non-elected members to the Committee will be required to sign and adhere to the Peel Regional Council Code of Conduct. The term of membership for new members appointed through this process will coincide with the term of Regional Council.

CONCLUSION

To ensure full representation of Peel’s diverse community, it is recommended that non-elected members of the community be included in the makeup of the DEAR Committee. Recruitment of the non-elected committee members will commence once the revised Terms of Reference has been approved by Regional Council.

Kathryn Lockyer for
Catherine Matheson, Commissioner of Corporate Services

Approved for Submission:

D. Szwarc, Chief Administrative Officer

APPENDICES

Appendix I – Committee Terms of Reference as Amended
Appendix II – Draft DEAR Committee Non-Elected Member Posting

For further information regarding this report, please contact Juliet Jackson, Director, Culture and Inclusion, Ext. 6741, juliet.jackson@peelregion.ca.

Authored By: Sharon Navarro
Committee Name:
The Diversity, Equity and Anti-Racism Committee shall be referred to herein as the “Committee.”

Mandate:
The purpose of the Committee is to advise Regional Council about systemic barriers and diversity issues in the community, external and internal, that may impact Regional policies, programs and services. Areas of focus will be:
- Anti-racism,
- Anti-Black racism,
- Equity,
- Inclusion and
- Approaches to training and accountability.

Membership:
The Committee will be comprised of:

Elected Members:
The Regional Chair (ex-officio) and six additional Regional Councillors (three from Mississauga, two from Brampton and one from Caledon).

Non-Elected Members:
Three members of the community, preferably one from each local municipality.

Non-Elected Member Selection:
An application form will be posted, as a minimum, on the Region of Peel website. The Director, Office of Culture and Inclusion or designate may also contact and solicit individuals who meet the criteria as set out in the “Eligibility Requirements” of the Terms of Reference. In addition, advertisements will be placed in local papers.

Prospective candidates must express their interest in participating on the Committee by submitting an application, resume and/or cover letter outlining their qualifications and experience to the Director of the Office of Culture and Inclusion.

Staff will review applications from prospective candidates to determine if the prospective candidate meets the minimum eligibility requirements. If the minimum eligibility requirements are met, the Director, Office of Culture and Inclusion or designate can request that an interview be set up with the Culture and Inclusion Interview Panel.

The Office of Culture and Inclusion Interview Panel shall be comprised of the Regional Clerk, the Director, Office of Culture and Inclusion, and the Committee Chair; or their designates.
After the interview is complete, the Interview Panel shall forward a report to the Regional Council with a recommendation regarding the suitability of the prospective candidates. Regional Council shall appoint non-elected members to the Committee.

All appointed members to the Committee must be willing to sign and adhere to the Peel Regional Council Code of Conduct.

The term of membership for new members appointed through this process will coincide with the term of Regional Council.

Eligibility Requirements:
Preferred qualifications include:
- Live in Peel or are the owner or tenant of land in the Peel Region.
- Represent and/or have expertise and/or lived experience of diverse and disadvantaged populations (i.e.: newcomers to Canada, racialized populations, LGBTQ and non-binary gender).
- Knowledgeable about issues relevant to the needs of our clients and the community. Demonstrate a passion for matters related to inclusion and diversity.
- Will advocate on behalf of community members facing barriers accessing Regional programs and services.

Applicants from the community cannot be:
- An elected official of Regional Council or of the Council of a municipality in the Region of Peel.
- An employee of the Region of Peel or of a municipality in the Region of Peel.

Non-Elected Member Remuneration and Expenses:
Non-elected members of the Committee will serve without remuneration. Non-elected members shall be eligible for reimbursement of expenses incurred which are deemed necessary for full participation in the Committee.

Term of Appointment:
Members of the Committee shall be appointed for a term ending upon the dissolution of the Committee or at the end of the term of Council, whichever comes first, or until their successors are appointed.

Election of the Chair and Vice-Chair:
The Committee will elect from among its members a chair and Vice-Chair, and this election shall be held at the first meeting of the Committee. The Vice-Chair may act in the capacity of Chair and exercise all the rights, powers and authorities of the Chair when the Chair is absent through illness or otherwise, or is absent from the office in the course of his or her duties, or on vacation or on an approved leave.

Quorum:
Quorum will consist of the majority of the total number of members of the Committee.
Reporting Function:
The Committee will report to the Regional Council. The minutes of each Committee meeting will be placed on the next appropriate Council Agenda for approval.

Meeting Frequency:
The meeting frequency for the Committee will be a minimum of three meetings per year.

Meeting Structure:
The Committee meeting structure will follow the same rules as laid out in the Region of Peel Procedure By-law.

In Camera:
The Committee reserves the right to go In Camera for matters that meet the requirements of an in camera discussion as outlined in Section 5.10 of the Regionals Procedure By-law.

Staff Resources:
The Office of Culture and Inclusion will support the Diversity, Equity and Anti-Racism Committee.

The Committee will be supported by the Regional Clerk, pursuant to the Procedure By-law.
NOTICE TO MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WISHING TO SERVE ON THE REGION OF PEEL DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND ANTI-RACISM COMMITTEE FOR THE 2019-2022 TERM

The Regional Municipality of Peel is seeking applications from individuals interested in serving as a volunteer on the Diversity, Equity and Anti-Racism Committee. Three members of the public, preferably one from each local municipality (Cities of Brampton and Mississauga and the Town of Caledon) will be selected. The term of appointment is until November 14, 2022.

The **mandate** of the Diversity, Equity and Anti-Racism (DEAR) Committee is to advise Regional Council about systemic barriers and diversity issues in the community, external and internal, that may impact Regional policies, programs and services. Areas of focus will be:

- Anti-racism,
- Anti-Black racism,
- Equity,
- Inclusion and
- Approaches to training and accountability.

**Preferred qualifications include:**

- Live in Peel or are the owner or tenant of land in the Peel Region.
- Represent and/or have expertise and/or lived experience of diverse and disadvantaged populations (i.e.: newcomers to Canada, racialized populations, LGBTQ and nonbinary gender).
- Knowledgeable about issues relevant to the needs of our clients and the community. Demonstrate a passion for matters related to inclusion and diversity.

**Applicants from the community cannot be:**

- An elected official of Regional Council or of the Council of a municipality in the Region of Peel.
- An employee of the Region of Peel or of a municipality in the Region of Peel.

**How to apply:**

Please submit your resume along with a letter of interest by email, mail, or in person to:

NOTE – DEAR Non-Elected Committee Member Application will be available on Peelregion.ca

**Juliet Jackson, Director, Culture and Inclusion**  
**Region of Peel**  
**10 Peel Centre Drive, Suite B, 5th Fl.**  
**Brampton, ON L6T 4B9**  
**zzgcultureandinclusion@peelregion.ca**

*We thank all applicants for their interest; however, only those selected for an interview will be contacted.*
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DATE: May 14, 2019

REPORT TITLE: DRINKING WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS UPDATE

FROM: Andrew Farr, Acting Commissioner of Public Works

OBJECTIVE

To provide an update on the continued enhancements to the Quality Management System, including the results of the 2018 Management Review per Element 20 of the Ontario Drinking Water Quality Management Standard (the Standard).

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- Management Review of the Quality Management System was completed for 2018, demonstrating high quality operational performance and confirming that the Region’s drinking water is safe.
- An External Audit reaffirmed the Region of Peel’s accreditation status and conformity to the Standard, and provided guidance for opportunities to further advance the water program.

DISCUSSION

1. Background

Through the mandates of the Safe Drinking Water Act, 2002, drinking water systems in Ontario are required to adopt a quality management system through implementation of the Standard.

The Region’s Drinking Water Quality Management System has been developed on the foundation of the Ontario Drinking Water Quality Management Standard (the Standard) for the water systems operated by the Region and it is maintained and continually improved, as required. Similarly, the Ontario Clean Water Agency, the Operating Authority of the South Peel water treatment, transmission and pumping system, has also employed quality management practices for the operations and management of the respective portion of the South Peel drinking water system. The Region’s Standard is aligned with that of the Ontario Clean Water Agency, to promote a culture of collaboration and continuous improvement.

Element 20 of the Standard requires that every year, management review takes place to evaluate the continuing suitability, adequacy and effectiveness of the quality management system; with consideration to operational performance and regulatory compliance, and that the results are reported to the Owner. This review also provides the management with
appropriate data and information to make decisions about the Drinking Water Quality Management System for action to prompt changes and improvements to the program.

2. Status of the Drinking Water Quality Management System

The performance of the quality management system for 2018 was reviewed in early March, which considered all required indicators that demonstrate the effectiveness of the program. The Region’s emphasis on a proactive and preventative approach to management strategies assures quality drinking water and identifies and manages risks to public health. Also, the availability of documentation control procedures with clear roles, responsibilities and authorities supports the delivery of safe drinking water by meeting all applicable legislative and regulatory requirements.

The overall progress of the Region’s Drinking Water Quality Management System is demonstrated through:

- A successful external third-party audit, which resulted in re-accreditation of the Region’s drinking water systems until March 2021;
- A constructive internal audit that resulted in one finding of non-conformance with the Standard that was administrative in nature, with no impact to the safety of the Region’s drinking water;
- Effective in-house compliance checks that increased inspection readiness thus resulting in the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks Drinking Water System inspection score average at 98.5% with five of seven systems rated at 100%.
- Enhanced continual improvement processes that fostered an attitude of prevention for incident re-occurrence
- Desktop simulation of emergency scenarios that resulted in focused planning of capital work, leading to preparedness for emergencies and isolated events.

The key outcomes of the management review, including operational performance and major milestones achieved in 2018 are detailed in Appendix I.

CONCLUSION

The successes of the Region’s Drinking Water Quality Management System depend on the commitment from all parties involved. The program continues to comply with the mandates set out within the Safe Drinking Water Act, as related to the Standard. The Region is committed to supplying safe and clean drinking water to consumers, meeting all applicable legislative and regulatory requirements as well as maintaining and continually improving the Drinking Water Quality Management System.

Andrew Farr, Acting Commissioner of Public Works
DRINKING WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS UPDATE

Approved for Submission:

D. Szwarc, Chief Administrative Officer

APPENDICES


For further information regarding this report, please contact Justyna Burkiewicz, Manager, Water and Wastewater Regulatory Compliance, Water and Wastewater Divisions at ext. 4494 or via email at justyna.burkiewicz@peelregion.ca.

Authored By: Sarah Vella, Supervisor, Water and Wastewater Programs and Justyna Burkiewicz, Manager, Water and Wastewater, Regulatory Compliance.

This summary provides updates relating to the Region of Peel's drinking water systems performance as mandated through Element 20 of the *Drinking Water Quality Management Standard (the Standard)*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement of Element 20 - Management Review</th>
<th>Achieved?</th>
<th>Conforms to Standard?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ensure that a Management Review is conducted at least once every calendar year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of 2018 operational performance was completed on Feb 26 and Mar 7, 2019 with the top management and the Owner representative.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consider the results of the Management Review and identify deficiencies and action items to address the deficiencies.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed. See the Management Review Summary below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Provide a record of any decisions and action items related to the Management Review including the personnel responsible for delivering the action items related and the proposed timelines for their implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes of discussions and direction have been captured through record of meeting minutes. Follow up on actions is tracked during DWQMS regular monthly meetings and through the processes of internal and external auditing.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Report the results of the Management Review, the identified deficiencies, decisions and action items to the Owner (the Council)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed through this report, submitted for information May 23, 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management Review Summary

a) incidents of regulatory non-compliance
The statement of compliance within the Water Treatment and Quality 2018 Annual Summary, presented to Council at the March 28, 2019 meeting, included events of non-compliance with regulatory requirements that were administrative and operational in nature and did not have a direct impact on the safety of the Region’s drinking water.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 Events of Non-Compliance</th>
<th>Region of Peel Operated Systems</th>
<th>OCWA Operated Systems**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Compliance with the Municipal Drinking Water Licence (MDWL)</td>
<td>see note*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Compliance with O.Reg. 170/03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Compliance with Drinking Water Works Permit (DWWP)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Compliance with Permit To Take Water (PTTW)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Compliance with Watermain Disinfection Procedure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * on several occasions throughout 2018, water emerging from watermain breaks picked up soil (silt) and washed it into a nearby storm sewer or water body, until the water supply was isolated for repair efforts to be initiated (water systems must not discharge a contaminant into the natural environment that causes, or is likely to cause, an adverse effect)
** owned by the Region of Peel, operated by OCWA

b) incidents of adverse drinking water tests
Indicators of adverse water quality are immediately reported to the Region’s Public Health local office and the Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (the Ministry) and appropriate corrective action taken. An adverse water quality event does not suggest that the water supply is at risk but rather that a potential problem has been identified and actions must be taken to investigate and resolve the problem. In 2018, there were a total of 21 water quality reportable events, all of which were immediately addressed as required by the regulation. None of these events resulted in the integrity and safety of the drinking water supply being compromised.

In 2018, a total of 10,243 microbiological samples were submitted for laboratory analysis under O.Reg.170/03. Only 14 of these samples were reported adverse, resulting in 99.87% of the collected samples meeting the Ontario Drinking Water Quality Standard. This percentage aligns with the average number of adverse results reported across Ontario as reported in the 2017-2018

The Regional Municipality of Peel is committed to supplying safe and clean drinking water that meets all applicable legislative and regulatory requirements to the consumer, and is committed to the maintenance and continual improvement of the Quality Management System.
Chief Drinking Water Inspectors report at 99.85%. No drinking water advisories were issued as result of adverse tests. The 2018 Water Quality Report prepared for each of the drinking water system provides detailed information on adverse drinking water occurrences and corrective actions.

c) deviations from Critical Control Point limits and response actions
Critical control limits have been established based on known critical control points identified through outcomes of regular assessment of risks. As such, deviations from the set limits do not generally occur as all critical control points have set SCADA alarms with associated operational limits in place to trigger the shutdown of a process before a negative impact could occur. Operational challenges are periodically reviewed by Water Operations and Water and Wastewater Regulatory Compliance including other stakeholder groups with aim to mitigate risk and to implement effective solutions.

d) the effectiveness of the risk assessment process
Assessment of risks to public health and our water systems is conducted at regular intervals and succeeding predetermined triggers. A full-scale risk assessment was completed in September and October 2018, considering all potential hazardous events for municipal residential drinking water systems, as required by the Ministry. No changes in critical control points or critical control limits were deemed necessary and the updated risk assessments were approved by Top Management.

e) internal and third-party Audit results
In 2018, the Region’s drinking water systems were operated in accordance with the approvals framework under the Act and has successfully maintained the accreditation to the Standard as demonstrated via third party verification audits conducted annually by SAI Global.

Through this accreditation, it is recognized that the Region’s Drinking Water Quality Management System conforms to the provincial standard and that the culture of continual improvement is effectively fostered. All the audit findings were administrative in nature with no direct impact on the safety of Region’s drinking water.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator / Measure</th>
<th>Internal Audit</th>
<th>Third-party External Audit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-conformity identified</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-conformity corrective action open</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for improvement</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWQMS elements audited</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) results of emergency response testing

Testing of our preparedness and response to emergencies is an important aspect of continual improvement. In 2018, a series of water supply modelling workshops took place to review water demand during emergencies and to identify critical infrastructure within the Region’s drinking water systems. During these meetings, staff evaluated water distribution under a variety of
watermain closure or failure scenarios to establish redundancy and control measures to better assess risks as well as potential impact and infrastructure vulnerability.

g) operational performance

The Ministry score card ratings based on annual inspections help us verify that our performance meets the requirements set out in applicable legislation and regulations. Operational performance can be impacted by varying circumstances that influence the inspection outcome. In 2018, our water systems scored 100% with an exception of Palgrave-Caledon east and South Peel (Lakeview) where administrative oversights with no impact on the quality of drinking water have slightly marked down inspection final ratings.

Although rating of less than 100% does not indicate that the water supply is unsafe, it presents areas of the system where opportunity for further improvement exists. In response to findings of non-compliance, the Region takes immediate action to review and assess the events to find suitable solutions and implement documentation and procedural changes to avoid reoccurrence of events in the future.

h) raw water supply and drinking water quality trends
Raw water supply and drinking water quality trends from the 2018 monitoring program align with test results in previous years. Water quality for bacteriological and chemical parameters was consistently within the Ontario drinking water quality standards.

i) follow-up on actions items from previous management reviews
Management review from 2018 resulted in 28 action items, which upon a thorough review were not considered deficiencies of the QMS and subsequently closed.

j) the status of management action items from previous management reviews
A total of 23 items were identified in late 2018 and documented through monthly QMS meetings for action. 15 of these action items were assessed against existing priorities and carried over to 2019 for completion.

k) changes that could affect the Quality Management System
Consideration of upcoming changes to the drinking water system for the next operational year was evaluated and their impact to the QMS reviewed. Potential changes considered were registered through three distinctive streams and included:
Customer feedback is our primary measure of water systems operating effectively. Feedback helps us assess and address any potential issues of concern. To ensure consumer confidence in our drinking water supply, we strive to deliver service excellence with timely and appropriate response to requests, enquiries, thorough complaint investigation and problem resolution with help of established protocols and attentive practices. In 2018, a total of 1,660 water quality enquiries were logged, many of which were associated with low water pressure at the tap (see graph below).
m) the resources needed to maintain the Quality Management System
To effectively maintain the QMS, a number of resources must be considered for the upcoming year. Discussion around the needs for 2019 included the need for a permanent program support, consideration of procurement of program tracking tools, advancing electronic documentation control to eliminate manual processes, and the development and integration of workflows and dashboards, which are all effective ways to help us continually improve, progress our practices and ultimately adequately maintain the program.

n) the results of the infrastructure review process
Physical condition of water infrastructure is regularly evaluated to maintain state of good repair and optimal performance of the drinking water systems, and to ensure regulatory requirements and financial sustainability to meet both the current and future demands. Highlights of the 2018 operational year include:

- over $55 million allocated to the watermain renewal program
- 59.2 km of watermain replaced in South Peel water distribution
- new water supply well drilled in Alton
- Inglewood Well No. 4 connected to Inglewood Well No. 3 treatment facility with process upgrades to accommodate additional supply
- Cheltenham Wells No. 1 and 2 Greensand filter media replacement

Note: Pressure calls are usually related to watermain breaks, infrastructure works, and internal plumbing issues.
**o) Operational Plan currency, content and updates**

During 2018, the operational plan was reviewed and updated to meet version 2.0 of the DWQMS. The key changes included administrative flexibility to water program management and mandatory consideration of risks of climate change in water infrastructure planning, applied to elements associated with risk assessment, provision, rehabilitation and maintenance of infrastructure, and the overall documentation of continual improvement.

**p) staff suggestions**

The Quality Management System staff suggestion process provides merits of continued improvement to the documented practices of how we operate and manage our drinking water systems. In 2018, staff submitted six suggestions, which were all considered for implementation. As a result of these suggestions, a total of 10 Quality Management System documents, including standard operating procedures and protocols were improved.

**Conclusion**

The Management Review reinforces the Quality Management System as a best practice for continual improvement in the administration and operations of drinking water systems. Strong commitment to program success through collaborative leadership, staff engagement and ongoing evaluation ensure consistent and effective performance to technical, regulatory and quality system standards.

The on-going maintenance of the Quality Management System and focus on continual improvement provides assurance to Council, as the Owner of the municipal drinking water systems, that their duties and responsibilities of Standard of Care under the Act are being met and that the drinking water in the Region of Peel is safe.
DATE: May 10, 2019

REPORT TITLE: WASTE MANAGEMENT SCHOOL EDUCATION PROGRAMS UPDATE

FROM: Andrew Farr, Acting Commissioner of Public Works

RECOMMENDATION

That the Region of Peel extend its service agreement with ecoCaledon for a 12-month term: from September 2019 to August 2020 in the estimated amount of $32,499, in accordance with Procurement By-law 30-2018;

And further, that the Region of Peel extend its service agreement with Ecosource for a 12-month term: from September 2019 to August 2020 in the estimated amount of $395,161, in accordance with Procurement By-law 30-2018;

And further, that the Region of Peel issue a Request for Proposal for required Waste Education services beyond the 2019/2020 school year as described in the report of the Acting Commissioner of Public Works, titled “Waste Management School Education Programs Update”.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- School Waste Education programs, including Waste Reduction Workshops and Waste Reduction Challenges are currently delivered by ecoCaledon (for schools located in Caledon), Ecosource (for schools located in Mississauga) and the Region of Peel (for schools located in Brampton).
- This purchase of service model is in its final contract term, ending in August 2019.
- A Request for Expression of Interest was issued on November 15, 2018 to gauge the interest of other potential community organizations to deliver Waste Reduction Workshops in Peel. Three organizations responded to the Request for Expression of Interest including ecoCaledon and Ecosource.
- Based on the results of the Request for Expression of Interest, staff recommends issuing a Request for Proposal to allow other community agencies the opportunity, to participate in the bidding process to offer these services for the 2020-2021 year and beyond.
- Staff recommends extending ecoCaledon and Ecosource’s contract for the 2019-2020 school year, by an additional 12 months, ending in August 2020 to allow sufficient time to complete the Request for Proposal process and avoid program disruptions.
- The scope of the Request for Proposal will address internal audit results identifying opportunities to strengthen governance, transparency and mitigate risks associated with continually funding the same three agencies.
DISCUSSION

1. Background

Waste Education programs are offered to Peel elementary, middle and secondary schools in the form of curriculum-connected classroom Waste Reduction Workshops (Workshops) and Whole School Waste Reduction Challenges (Challenges). These programs focus on themes and calls to action that support the Region of Peel’s Roadmap to a Circular Economy and emerging priorities to help achieve the 75 percent 3Rs diversion rate by 2034 as set by Council in October 2015.

- **Waste Reduction Workshops** are one-time classroom-based offerings that focus on specific priority waste themes as they connect to the Ontario Curriculum. Unique grade-specific workshops are available for kindergarten to grade 12.

- **Whole School Waste Reduction Challenges** offer elementary and middle schools an opportunity to address waste reduction through hands-on learning and action. The Challenge program is designed to inspire behavior change in waste practices and foster critical thinking about waste issues. A revised secondary school version of the Challenge program is currently being piloted within Brampton.

Waste Education programs are currently provided through a direct negotiation purchase of service model, with ecoCaledon, providing delivery within the Town of Caledon, and Ecosource, providing delivery within the City of Mississauga. The Region of Peel provides delivery within the City of Brampton.

Prior to 2016, Waste Education programs within the Region of Peel were funded by the Public Works Community Program Funding grant and were provided to the Brampton Clean City Committee, ecoCaledon, and Ecosource. On February 2, 2012, the results of an Internal Audit on the former Public Works Community Program Funding grant program were presented to Audit Committee and received. The findings of the Internal Audit Committee indicated that while administrative controls were effective, there was opportunity to strengthen governance, transparency and mitigate risks associated with continually funding the same three agencies.

To address the findings, a change in program processes from a grant model to a purchase of service model was required. This process change was presented and approved by Regional Council on May 14, 2015 (Resolution 2015-321). The Public Works Community Program Funding grant program transitioned to a full purchase of service process model in January 2016.

The Brampton Clean City Committee discontinued its involvement in the Region’s Waste Education program delivery at the end of 2015 with the conclusion of the former Public Works Community Program Funding grant program. At that time the City of Brampton decided it was best to retire from the business of delivering waste education and redirect resources to develop strategies to support more effective sport and recreation program delivery for youth (City Resolution CPS 130-2015). To ensure that there was no service interruption for the Brampton area, the Region assumed program delivery for Brampton schools.
In January 2016, the Region entered into contract agreements with ecoCaledon (Caledon service area) and Ecosource (Mississauga service area) to deliver the Region’s Waste Education programs. These contract agreements expire in August 2019.

2. Delivery Results

Since the new purchase of service model began in January 2016, performance metrics were developed to monitor and report on program delivery and quality of service.

Since the program commenced in January 2016, 72 percent of all schools in Peel, encompassing over 130,000 students, have participated in either a Workshop or Challenge. This value includes 77 percent of schools in Brampton, 91 percent of schools in Caledon, and 68 percent of schools in Mississauga. The total number of Workshops and Challenges by each municipality from January 2016 to January 2019 are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Total number of Workshops and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Total Number of Workshops</th>
<th>Total Number of Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>2,971</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,699</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Waste Education Metrics

Key metrics for Waste Education programs includes customer (teacher) satisfaction, knowledge transfer (Workshops) and observed change in waste sorting practices as measured through classroom waste audits (Challenges).

Overall teacher feedback has been positive with an average of 85 percent of respondents for Workshops and 100 percent of respondents for Challenges providing a satisfaction rating of 8/10 or higher.

Data from the September 2017-June 2018 school year indicated an average of 72 percent of students increased their learning after participating in the Workshop; Brampton 65 percent, Caledon 65 percent, and Mississauga 83 percent. This is gauged by asking students questions before and after the Workshop to gauge learning (knowledge transfer).

Composition data from pre and post waste audits as well as Challenge checks provide insight into the effectiveness of the Waste Reduction programming. Data from the September 2017-June 2018 school year indicated overall reductions in key waste streams across all Challenge themes. For the wasteless lunch theme, an increase of 44 percent of students brought in a wasteless lunch, compared to before
the Challenge. For the recycle right theme, the percent of contamination in recycling decreased by 75 percent; the percent of garbage composed of recyclables decreased by 87 percent; and the percent capture of recyclables increased by 15 percent.

3. Program Delivery Model Review

The results of long-term monitoring and evaluation suggest the program delivery design include continuation of Workshops by a community agency across Peel and the delivery of Challenges by the Region of Peel. It is most effective for the Region to contract community agencies to complete the Workshop delivery because of cost efficiencies for program delivery and administration as well as customer satisfaction. It is also more effective for the Region to assume delivery of Challenges to allow for flexibility in continuing program development and monitoring to meet emerging waste priorities, manage program costs, experience efficiencies in program delivery, and meet the goals of the Roadmap to a Circular Economy.

4. Request for Expression of Interest

The contract term with ecoCaledon and Ecosource ends in August 2019. To provide an opportunity for other potential community service providers to demonstrate their interest in delivering Workshops in Peel beyond August 2019, a Request for Expression of Interest was made publicly available on the Region’s external website on November 15, 2018.

Three organizations responded to the Request for Expression of Interest, including ecoCaledon and Ecosource. ecoCaledon proposed to deliver Workshops within Caledon schools, and Ecosource proposed to deliver these services to both Brampton and Mississauga schools. A third agency also responded to the Request for Expression of Interest. Due to the multiple responses, it is recommended that a public Request for Proposal process be initiated to ensure that other suitable prospective service providers have an opportunity to respond.

The Request for Proposal will specify program expectations and key performance indicators, set targets and milestones for Waste Education programs, and outline reporting requirements to which the awarded vendor(s) must adhere.

5. Proposed Direction

To allow sufficient time for the Request for Proposal process and ensure no service disruption to the current program, it is recommended that the Region extend its current contract with ecoCaledon and Ecosource for an additional twelve-month period, ending in August 2020, for delivery of the program for the 2019-2020 school year.

For the 2019-2020 school year, Waste Education programs will be delivered by the Region of Peel in Brampton, Ecosource in Mississauga and ecoCaledon in Caledon.

This procurement process will address the internal audit recommendations which identified opportunities to strengthen government, transparency and mitigate risks associated with continually finding the same agencies.
RISK CONSIDERATIONS

If the extension to the current delivery contract for the 2019-2020 school year is not approved, there would be potential risks and implications to the Waste Education program resulting in: loss of education to students and their families on current waste priorities; reputational risk to the Region by disrupting established relationships within Peel schools; customer service impacts of not being able to meet the needs of teachers and residents; and would negatively impact the promotion of waste reduction activities and benefits as outlined in Waste Management's Roadmap to a Circular Economy.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Waste Education Program Costs

To ensure value for money and fiscal responsibility, the Region monitors the cost of Workshops and Challenges delivered by ecoCaledon and Ecosource as well as the Region of Peel led programs.

Table 3: Annual program costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Agency</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019 (projected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>$229,964</td>
<td>$286,460</td>
<td>$286,460</td>
<td>$341,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery Agencies</td>
<td>$482,619</td>
<td>$403,068</td>
<td>$408,980</td>
<td>$427,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$712,583</td>
<td>$689,528</td>
<td>$695,440</td>
<td>$769,620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding increases to account for inflation are provided on a school year basis and have been maintained since the new procurement model was implemented.

Funding for additional contract years will be included in future operating budget submissions, for Council’s review and approval through each annual budget cycle.

A total of $769,620 for the cost of the Waste Education programs delivered by the Region of Peel, ecoCaledon and Ecosource has been included in the 2019 operating budget.
CONCLUSION

Waste Education programs delivered by ecoCaledon, Ecosource and Region of Peel support the goals of the Region’s Roadmap to a Circular Economy and emerging priorities to help achieve the 75 percent 3Rs diversion rate by 2034 as set by Council in October 2015.

Andrew Farr, Acting Commissioner of Public Works

Approved for Submission:

D. Szwarc, Chief Administrative Officer

For further information regarding this report, please contact Johann Manente, Manager, Education Programs and Services, extension 3297, Johann.Manente@peelregion.ca.
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GC-0192-2019

1. That the bicycle signals at the seven signalized intersections and one midblock location owned and operated by the City of Mississauga on Burnhamthorpe Road East, Rathburn Road West and Terry Fox Way be re-energized;

2. That staff be directed to monitor the operations of the current and future intersections, taking into consideration the unique characteristics of each intersection that include bicycle signals and to take corrective action as required to address safety issues if they arise;

3. That staff be directed to review and enhance cross-ride pavement markings through use of green colour applications where appropriate;

4. That staff be directed to review and enhance the signage directed to cyclists and motorists in support of bicycle signal installations; and

5. That the report titled Review of Bicycle Traffic Signal Installations dated April 02, 2019 from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works be forwarded to the Region of Peel for their consideration with respect to the bicycle signals at the intersection of Winston Churchill Boulevard and Britannia Road West; and

6. That staff create an intersection awareness campaign with participation from the Road Safety Committee, Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee and Traffic Safety staff.
Subject
Review of Bicycle Traffic Signal Installations

Recommendation
1. That the bicycle signals at the seven signalized intersections and one midblock location owned and operated by the City of Mississauga on Burnhamthorpe Road East, Rathburn Road West and Terry Fox Way be re-energized;

2. That staff be directed to monitor the operations of the current intersections that include bicycle signals and to take corrective action as required to address safety issues if they arise;

3. That staff be directed to review and enhance cross-ride pavement markings through use of green colour applications where appropriate;

4. That staff be directed to review and enhance the signage directed to cyclists and motorists in support of bicycle signal installations; and

5. That the report titled Review of Bicycle Traffic Signal Installations dated April 02, 2019 from the Commissioner of Transportation and Works be forwarded to the Region of Peel for their consideration with respect to the bicycle signals at the intersection of Winston Churchill Boulevard and Britannia Road West.

Report Highlights
- The newly installed bicycle signals at intersections along Burnhamthorpe Road East, Rathburn Road West and Terry Fox Way were deactivated due to concerns raised by the Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee.

- The bicycle signal installations in Mississauga have exceeded the minimum recommendations of Ontario Traffic Manual Book 12A – Bicycle Signals to a standard that
Background
The Mississauga Cycling Advisory Committee (MCAC) passed a motion at its January 8, 2019 meeting, subsequently amended by General Committee on January 16, 2019 and adopted by Council on January 23, 2019 as follows:

GC-0027-2019
1. That all newly installed cross rides be deactivated immediately due to safety concerns raised by the MCAC.
2. That City staff report back on how the cross-rides were implemented and the studies and standards that were established for cross-rides, including the Region of Peel.
3. That the matter be referred to the Road Safety Committee and the MCAC.
4. That the recommendation be forwarded to the Region of Peel for their consideration to deactivate the cross ride at Winston Churchill Boulevard and Britannia Road.

(Original - MCAC-0004-2019)

On January 17, 2019, City staff deactivated the bicycle signals along Burnhamthorpe Road East, Rathburn Road West, and Terry Fox Way. For consistency, the Region of Peel deactivated their bicycle signals recently installed at the intersection of Winston Churchill Boulevard and Britannia Road West. Staff then proceeded with a review of the bicycle signals, including options available to improve the operations of the bicycle signals from a safety perspective. The purpose of this report is to inform Council of staff’s findings and recommendations.

Comments
The 2018 Cycling Master Plan (CMP) identified intersections as critical locations for improvements in the cycling network. Retrofitting intersections to remove ‘Dismount and Walk’ conditions is considered extremely important. In order to remove ‘Dismount and Walk’ conditions, bicycle signals and cross-rides are required as per the Highway Traffic Act. The CMP also includes recommendations about removing obstacles from the path of travel of bicycle riders, including intersection elements such as traffic light standards and bollards. Ontario Traffic Manual (OTM) Book 12A – Bicycle Signals was published in 2018 by the Ontario Traffic Council in partnership with the Province and participating municipalities. OTM Book 12A represents the collective experience and knowledge of practitioners across Ontario, private
firms with international experience, and best practices from design guidelines and standards of other jurisdictions.

The community of practice around traffic signal operations is highly sophisticated and mature, generally. For bicycle infrastructure design and bike signals specifically, the community of practice is growing rapidly and maturing over time. Drawing on a community of practice means that developing “made in Mississauga” standards is not required; municipalities can seek guidance from manuals that are developed collaboratively by practitioners and represent best practices and lessons learned from other jurisdictions with more experience. OTM Book 12A provides municipalities with consistent guidelines for the installation and operation of bicycle signals.

Features of consistent installation and operation throughout the Region include:

- Dual bicycle signal heads for each direction of travel;
- The bicycle signal green indication comes up concurrently with the pedestrian walk signal cycle;
- The bicycle signal indications will display a clearance interval (i.e. amber and all red), which is calculated based on bicycle traffic characteristics (typical behaviour, speed, movements, etc.) and as per OTM Book 12A; and
- The bicycle signals are monitored to the same rigour as every other signal indication.

As a result, installations in the City have exceeded the minimum recommendations of OTM Book 12A. Furthermore, the standards employed by the City are consistent with those of the Region of Peel and the City of Brampton. It is also important to note that in conjunction with the installation of bicycle signal equipment, City traffic signal staff, in coordination with the Region, have specifically designed and procured new traffic signal controller cabinets to ensure the proper operation of the new equipment with existing City infrastructure.

**Bicycle Specific Phasing Options**

OTM Book 12A provides information on bicycle specific phasing options. Some specific phasing options that have been discussed or mentioned by members of MCAC include:

- ‘Bicycle-advanced Through Only’ phase;
- ‘Protected Left Turn’ phase (for left turning vehicles from the parallel street crossing the cross-ride);
- ‘Bicycle-only’ separate phase; and
- ‘No Right Turn on Red’ restrictions.

Section 5.1 of OTM Book 12A notes that bicycle specific phasing can be advantageous in boulevard multi-use trail situations where the bicycle traffic flows are mixed with pedestrian flows. The Burnhamthorpe Trail is a multi-use facility where pedestrians and cyclists share the trail; however, at the intersections pedestrians and bicycles are provided with separate crossing
spaces – crosswalks provided with “zebra stripe” markings and cross-rides provided with “elephant’s feet” square markings.

Section 6 of OTM Book 12A outlines decision criteria for implementing bicycle specific phasing:

- Volume/Delay (e.g. high volume of bicycle movements where delay is of concern, high volume of turning vehicles where safety of cyclists is of concern);
- Collision/Conflict (e.g. significant number of bicycle / motor vehicle conflicts occur or may be expected to occur);
- Planning (e.g. continuity of bicycle network or where movement would otherwise be challenging);
- Geometric (e.g. a multi-use trail that comes into the intersection in such a way that motorists may not see or yield to cyclists approaching the intersection);
- Timing/Phasing;
- Demographic/Geographic (e.g. proximity to schools, parks and popular bike routes).

Other impacts to consider include the context of the benefits and impacts to all road users, such as the additional delay to road users resulting from adding bicycle specific phasing, as well as the cost of retrofitting signals.

Intersection Operation Analysis Incorporating Bicycle Phasing

Staff modelled and evaluated three signal phasing scenarios, in isolation and in combination, as part of its review of the bicycle signals; specifically, ‘No Right on Red’ Restriction, Protected Left Turns, and Exclusive Bicycle Phase. The intersection of Burnhamthorpe Road East at Bough Beeches Boulevard, during the afternoon (PM) peak travel period, was modelled as a representative intersection for the review. A summary of the analysis and findings for each scenario is provided below.

**Scenario A:** Implement a ‘No Right Turn on Red’ restriction on the cross street to mitigate the conflict between bicycles and right-turning vehicles.

The findings were:

- Motorist compliance of a ‘No Right Turn on Red’ restriction is anticipated to be low given the relatively low frequency of bicycles during peak and off-peak periods and based on experience elsewhere in the City with similar restrictions.

**Scenario B:** Implement a fully protected eastbound left-turn (EBLT) phase for the parallel street (e.g. Burnhamthorpe Road East) to mitigate the conflict between bicycles and left-turning vehicles.

The findings were:
A fully protected eastbound left-turn phase would reduce intersection capacity and introduce additional delay to motorists since time must be taken away from the major through phases; and

A fully protected eastbound left-turn phase would result in driver frustration as left-turning vehicles would be required to wait despite there being many adequate gaps in through traffic, and lead to the abuse of the clearance intervals (amber and all-red).

**Scenario C:** Implement a fully protected EBLT phase with a No Right Turn on Red restriction and an exclusive bicycle and pedestrian phase.

The findings were:
- These measures would result in a delay of approximately two and a half minutes for cyclists using the cross-ride as they wait for their exclusive phase, likely resulting in low compliance and cyclists proceeding on a red indication;
- An actuated bicycle phase would increase the number of phases (i.e. from 2 phases to 3 phases) and reduce the overall capacity of the intersection; and
- The eastbound left-turn lane’s storage length may have to be increased to account for an increase in vehicle queues for the eastbound left-turn movement.

The safety of road users, particularly cyclists, would not be improved by implementing the new signal phases reviewed in the above three scenarios. Additional delay, potential for driver abuse of clearance intervals, and a high probability of non-compliance with traffic controls create conditions for decreased safety for all road users.

Region of Peel staff modelled various bicycle phasing scenarios for the intersection of Winston Churchill Boulevard and Britannia Road West. They advised that, under all scenarios, intersection operations would degrade significantly and increase delays for all movements in comparison to the current timing phasing.

**Intersection Layout**

At its meeting on January 8, 2019, MCAC raised specific concerns regarding the layout of intersection elements with the implementation of bicycle signals and cross-rides along Burnhamthorpe Road East. Specific concerns included:
- Placement of decorative bollards in the path of travel for cyclists;
- Traffic signal poles in the path of travel for cyclists; and
- Alignment of the cross-ride markings.

Staff committed to the following actions at the meeting:
- Removal of the decorative bollards from the intersections along Burnhamthorpe Road East;
- Realign the cross-ride markings to minimize conflicts with traffic signal poles; and
• Improve the process for intersection construction layout where bicycle signals and cross-rides are incorporated, to avoid conflicts in the future.

MCAC Comments

A draft of the corporate report “Review of Bicycle Signal Installations” was shared with members of MCAC at its March 5, 2019 meeting. The Committee received the draft report and engaged in a discussion about bicycle signals, which resulted in the following recommendation:

MCAC-0018-2019
That Transportation and Works staff implement the following safety measures at cross-ride intersections:
   a) To implement ‘No Right Turn on Red’ restrictions
   b) To paint cross-ride intersections green
   c) That increased enforcement is needed from the Peel Regional Police at cross-ride locations (MCAC-0018-2019)

The recommendation was referred back to staff by General Committee at its March 20, 2019 meeting.

Road Safety Committee Comments

A draft of the corporate report “Review of Bicycle Signal Installations” was shared with members of the Road Safety Committee at its March 26, 2019 meeting. The Committee received the draft report and engaged in discussion about bicycle signals, which resulted in the following comments:

RSC-0014-2019
That the Road Safety Committee provides the following comments to staff regarding the memorandum date March 4, 2019, entitled “Review of Bicycle Traffic Signal Installations” from the Active Transportation Manager:
   • The Road Safety Committee supports the green painted bicycle lanes.
   • More education be provided on cross-rides.
   • Staff review the City of Ottawa’s website regarding cross-rides.
   • Staff review the feasibility of shifting the stop bar line at intersections.
   • That there is limited support by the Road Safety Committee on no right turns on red lights.

Green Colour Applications

Using a green surface treatment for cycling facilities in conflict areas is a common practice in North America. Typically the green application is used where protected bike lanes, cycle tracks, or multi-use paths cross driveways or intersections. At these points, there is more concern of
vehicles turning across the bikeway, especially right-turning vehicles who fail to yield to cycling and pedestrian traffic going straight through the intersection with the right of way.

OTM Book 18 supports the use of green surface treatments as one of several options for carrying a cycling facility through a conflict area. As well, the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO), which does ongoing research with major North American cities, supports the use of green pavement markings through conflict zones, and notes that it does tend to increase the visibility of cyclists, increases motorist yielding behaviour, and increases cyclist comfort through the crossing.

**Financial Impact**

There are no significant financial impacts resulting from the recommendations of this report. Sufficient funding is available from the operating and capital budgets for the costs associated with:

- Re-energizing the bicycle signals;
- Monitoring and adjusting the bicycle signals to adjust to operational issues as they arise;
- Reviewing and enhancing the signage directed to cyclists and motorists regarding the bicycle signal installations; and
- Reviewing and enhancing cross-ride pavement markings through use of green colour applications where appropriate.

**Conclusion**

The signal phasing options reviewed in this report would not result in a significant improvement to safety for cyclists, and therefore re-instatement of the original signal timings is recommended. Continued monitoring of the operation of recently implemented bicycle signals and cross-rides would be beneficial to identify and take corrective action for any safety issues that may arise. Review and enhancement of the signage directed to cyclists and motorists in support of bicycle signal installations, as well as review and enhancement of pavement markings through use of green colour applications, is also recommended.

Bicycle signals and cross-rides are new traffic control devices for Mississauga and are an evolving practice across Ontario. Staff will continue to stay apprised of best practices and coordinate with their professional colleagues, and will continue to work closely with members of MCAC and RSC to promote safety and advance cycling infrastructure in the City.
Geoff Wright, P. Eng., MBA, Commissioner of Transportation and Works

Prepared by: Matthew Sweet, Manager, Active Transportation
ITEMS RELATED TO HEALTH
DATE: May 15, 2019

REPORT TITLE: THE CHANGING LANDSCAPE OF HEALTH IN PEEL: A COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH STATUS REPORT 2019

FROM: Nancy Polsinelli, Commissioner of Health Services
Jessica Hopkins, MD MHSc CCFP FRCPC, Medical Officer of Health

OBJECTIVE

To provide an overview of the changing landscape of Health in Peel.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS

- Peel has experienced rapid population growth and changes in the structure of the population. Additionally, Peel residents are living longer.
- Demonstrated successes in the health of Peel’s population include high immunization rates for many vaccines and a decline in smoking prevalence and exposure to second-hand smoke, with notable reductions of tobacco-related diseases such as lung cancer. Incidence and prevalence rates of several chronic diseases such as ischemic heart disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and lung cancer are declining.
- Areas demonstrating little improvement include nutrition and physical activity. There has been no change in physical activity or vegetable and fruit consumption, an indicator of nutritional status. Additionally, recreational screen time more than the recommended two hours per day, and lack of sleep are issues for Peel students.
- Alcohol use in Peel is low, but there are emerging issues related to opioid use. Harms related to cannabis use will also need to be monitored.
- Other emerging issues include mental health and wellness and monitoring the health impacts of climate change. There have been increased rates of emergency department visits for certain mental health conditions, particularly among Peel youth and young adults.
- Public Health will be communicating the findings of this report to stakeholders and will be using the findings from this report to inform the 2020-2030 Peel Public Health Strategic Plan.
DISCUSSION

1. Background

The collection, analysis and reporting of epidemiological data to key stakeholders is a requirement of the Ontario Public Health Standards 2018 and this requirement is directed by Section 7 of the Health Protection and Promotion Act.

In 2009, the report “A Picture of Health – A Comprehensive Report on Health in Peel 2008” was used to inform the development of the Peel Public Health 2009-2019 Strategic Plan. The report, “The Changing Landscape of Health in Peel. A Comprehensive Health Status Report 2019,” was prepared to evaluate progress on the 2009-2019 Strategic Plan, inform stakeholders and the community of Peel residents’ health status, and identify health priorities for 2020 to 2030. This Council report provides an overview of Peel-specific health status and surveillance data that will be used as a foundation for public health programming and strategy development with a goal of improving the health of Peel’s population.

2. Findings

Highlights of “The Changing Landscape of Health in Peel. A Comprehensive Health Status Report 2019” include:

Regional Structure and Demographics

- Peel has a growing and changing population; additionally, Peel residents are living longer.
  - Peel’s population has increased by 20 per cent between 2006 and 2016 and is projected to increase by a further 19 per cent by 2031. As of 2016, the population was 1,381,739 people. In addition, Peel’s age structure is changing. Compared to 1996, there are now more individuals aged 50 years and older and fewer in the middle and younger age groups.
  - Peel is an ethnically diverse region. The proportion of immigrants in Peel in 2016 was 52 per cent; recent immigrants comprised 6 per cent of this group.
  - In 2012, life expectancy for females in Peel is 86.1 years (compared to 80.7 years in 1986) and 82.6 years for males (compared to 75.7 years in 1986).

- Peel has a strong regional infrastructure (e.g., drinking water and waste disposal) and is seeing some positive change in the built environment, which contributes to active living (e.g., increased population density); however, there is room for continued improvement in housing density, street connectivity and public transit commute times.
  - Peel’s population density increased by 7 per cent between 2006 and 2016
  - Approximately 78 per cent of Peel residents live within a five-minute (400 m) walk to a park, open green space or natural train or path running through it.
  - The proportion of medium- and high-density housing has remained unchanged between 2006 (37 per cent) and 2016 (38 per cent).
Peel’s street connectivity is seven intersections per square kilometre. A measure of good intersection connectivity is 75 intersections per square kilometre.\(^1\)

There has been a slight increase in the proportion of Peel residents who use public transportation to commute to work from 13 per cent in 2006 to 15.5 per cent in 2016 (Census); however, Peel residents have longer public transit commute times when using public transit (55 minutes) compared to Toronto (46 minutes) and Ontario (48 minutes).\(^1\)

**Successes**

- **Peel’s smoking rate and exposure to second-hand smoke has declined, with notable reductions of tobacco-related diseases such as lung cancer**
  - Peel’s smoking rate has declined from 20 per cent in 2000/2001 to 11 per cent in 2013/2014.\(^{F1,F2}\)
  - Exposure to second hand smoke in the home and in private vehicles and in public places has declined between 2003 and 2013/2014.\(^{F1,F4}\)
  - The incidence and prevalence rates of many chronic diseases associated with tobacco smoking such as ischemic heart disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and lung cancer are declining.\(^{G1,G2,H}\)

- **Rates for most vaccine-preventable diseases have declined or remained stable since 2007. Immunization coverage rates in Peel are high for many vaccines.**
  - Up-to-date immunization coverage rates for school children age seven years were 85 per cent for diphtheria, tetanus, polio and pertussis, 93 per cent for measles and mumps, and 98 per cent for rubella.\(^1\)

**Opportunities for Improvement**

- **Measures of physical activity, nutrition, and sedentary behaviour, which are modifiable risk factors for chronic diseases, have not improved.**
  - In Peel in 2013/2014 only 26 per cent of residents were physically active during leisure time; 38 per cent eat five or more vegetables and fruit per day. Neither of these statistics have improved over the past 15 years.\(^{F4}\)
  - Additionally, 67 per cent of Peel students in grades 7 to 12 spend more than the recommended two hours of recreational screen time per day.\(^J\)
  - Sleep duration for Peel adults is not available; however among Peel students in grades 7 to 12, only 36 per cent reported getting eight or more hours of sleep on an average school night.\(^J\)

- **The incidence of diabetes is starting to stabilize; however, diabetes prevalence rates continue to rise.**
  - The incidence rate of diabetes in Peel and Ontario has started to stabilize since 2006; however diabetes prevalence continues to increase.\(^K\) This is driven by population growth, change in diabetes risk and population aging.
  - While older adults (aged 60 to 79 years) have the highest incidence of diabetes, younger individuals are increasingly being diagnosed with diabetes,
Over the past two decades, the incidence rate for those aged 20 to 49 years has doubled. A trend not seen in other age groups.

- There have been overall improvements to air quality, however, indicators of climate change can be observed in Peel.
  - There have been observed declines in the mean annual levels of air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide and fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$) in Peel. However, greenhouse gas emissions have continued to rise and there has been an increase in annual mean temperature from 8.1°C in 1938 to 9.3°C in 2017.
  - Other observed environmental changes in Peel are increased total rain and changing vector patterns, including the identification of blacklegged ticks (a carrier of the bacterium that causes Lyme disease) in Mississauga.

New and Emerging Issues

- Alcohol use in Peel is low, but there are emerging issues related to opioid use. Harms related to the use of cannabis will need to be monitored.
  - In 2011/2012 in Peel, 8 per cent of residents used marijuana, cannabis or hashish in the past year. With legalization of recreational cannabis use in October 2018, health effects of cannabis will need to be monitored.
  - Opioid-related deaths in Peel region have increased since 2013 from 21 deaths to 81 deaths in 2017. Peel will continue to monitor opioid-related health outcomes.

- While many Peel residents are happy and satisfied with life, some are experiencing high levels of psychological distress. Increased rates of emergency department visits for certain mental health conditions are being observed in Peel, particularly among youth and young adults.
  - There have been increases in the rates of emergency department (ED) visits related to mental health disorders in Peel between 2003 and 2016; specifically, increases in substance-related mental health disorders, anxiety, mood, and schizophrenia/psychotic disorders. Increases in ED visits for anxiety and mood disorders are notable among those aged 0 to 24 years.

Future Work

- Certain populations have been identified as having poor health behaviours and/or outcomes across a range of issues. For example, men are more physically active, but are more likely to smoke, drink alcohol above the recommended guidelines, binge drink alcohol, and use cannabis. They are less likely to consume vegetables and fruits. In addition, the incidence rates of several chronic conditions are higher among males compared to females. Strategies to address this disparity are needed and will be developed.
- Data gaps limit our understanding for some populations. These include Indigenous peoples, children aged 0-11 years, those with disabilities and the LGBTQ2S+
community. Public Health will continue to explore opportunities to better understand the health status of these populations.

- Public Health has developed a knowledge translation plan to share information with relevant stakeholders and the community.

CONCLUSION

The Peel Public Health report “The Changing Landscape of Health in Peel. A Comprehensive Health Status Report 2019” provides information on important health trends for use by staff, external stakeholders, and the community in program planning and service delivery. The data presented in this report will also inform the priorities for inclusion in the 2020-2030 Peel Public Health Strategic Plan that will be released in the fall of 2019.

Nancy Polsinelli, Commissioner of Health Services

Jessica Hopkins, MD MHSc CCFP FRCPC, Medical Officer of Health

Approved for Submission:

D. Szwarc, Chief Administrative Officer
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DATE: May 21, 2019
REPORT TITLE: UPDATE ON 2019/2020 PEEL PUBLIC HEALTH FUNDING AND GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES
FROM: Nancy Polsinelli, Commissioner of Health Services
Jessica Hopkins, MD MHScc CCFP FRCPC, Medical Officer of Health

OBJECTIVE
To provide the Board of Health (Regional Council) with an update on recent information shared by Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care staff related to Ontario’s Public Health Modernization introduced in the 2019 Provincial budget.

REPORT HIGHLIGHTS
- On May 9, 2019, Council received and endorsed a report which provided known details about proposed provincial changes to Ontario’s public health sector, including increasing the municipal portion of public health cost-shared funding and restructuring public health units across Ontario.
- On May 10, 2019, Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (the Ministry) staff verbally communicated that:
  - For the 2019/2020 fiscal year, the Ministry is adjusting its provincial public health cost-shared allocation to 70 per cent. Peel Public Health is expecting to receive $53.9 million from the Ministry. The 2019 budgeted funding from the Ministry amounted to $55.1 million, leaving a shortfall of $1.2 million.
  - By April 1, 2020, the Ministry proposes that four current public health units be merged to create a new regional health entity – 1) Peel 2) Halton 3) Waterloo and 4) Wellington-Dufferin-Guelph. Legislative changes are expected to be introduced in the Fall of 2019.
- Details regarding the transition process to the new autonomous regional public health structure are unknown at this time. The Ministry plans to establish technical working groups and has committed to formal consultations on the geographic boundaries and local structure of public health in Ontario.
- As directed by Council on May 9, 2019, Region of Peel will participate in the Ministry consultations to ensure Provincial changes protect a strong public health sector with a prevention and health promotion mandate, sufficient resources and funding, and local partnerships and connections to address local needs.
- Council will continue to be updated in a timely manner, as further details become available.
1. Background

The May 9, 2019, Council report on the Modernization of Ontario Public Health Units in the 2019 Ontario Budget described the Provincial Government’s proposed changes to public health. On May 10, 2019, Peel’s Medical Officer of Health received a verbal update from Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (“the Ministry”) staff regarding the 2019/2020 funding and the proposed regional public health structure. This report updates the Board of Health (Regional Council) on the details verbally shared by the Ministry on May 10, 2019.

2. Findings

On May 10, 2019, Ministry staff verbally shared the following information:

a) For 2019/2020, Peel Public Health should use the planning assumption of $53.9 million in Provincial funding.
   o The Ministry is assuming existing public health funding for Peel is a 70/30 cost-share, acknowledging the existing situation for several municipalities, including the Region of Peel, which contribute more than the obligatory 25 per cent cost-share for public health. The intent is to move to a 60/40 cost-share by April 1, 2021.
   o Funding for the Healthy Babies Healthy Children program, which comes from the Ministry of Children, Community and Social Services, will be maintained at 100 per cent.
   o Peel Public Health will receive $3.9 million in additional 100 per cent Provincial base funding to support implementation of a new dental program for low-income seniors. Currently, Region of Peel funds $1.7 million for the seniors’ dental program. A separate report will be brought to Council once specific details regarding the new dental program are received in the next few weeks.
   o Waivers on public health requirements and one-time Provincial funding, to help mitigate financial impacts, will only be considered if the approved municipal public health cost-share is not already at least 30 per cent.
   o There are no expectations of approval for additional funding requests.
   o Provincial 2019/2020 funding is subject to Ministerial approval. A formal funding letter is expected in the next month or so.

b) Halton, Peel, Waterloo and Wellington-Dufferin-Guelph public health units will be combined under one proposed regional public health entity.
   o This proposed regional public health entity would be one of the largest in the Province, serving a growing population of over 2.7 million residents and covering a geographic area of about 7,700km². The boundaries are not finalized. Any changes will require legislative change and formal consultation will occur as part of that process.
   o Details on the composition of the new regional Board of Health have not been shared. The new Board will be in place by April 1, 2020.
   o Core public health functions will remain as defined by the Ontario Public Health Standards and local public health needs.
   o Ministry staff identified the intent to balance the new regional public health structure with the local nature of public health.
The Provincial government plans to provide funds to cover costs of transition to the new regional public health entities. Amounts and details are unknown.

3. Next Steps

The Ministry has not provided any written confirmation of the information shared verbally. The Ministry has committed to formal consultations with public health units, Boards of Health, and municipalities, including the Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO). The focus of the consultations is on the geographic boundaries of proposed regional public health entities and the local structure of public health. Technical working groups are planned to support operational issues during transition. Legislative changes are anticipated in Fall 2019.

RISK ASSESSMENT

A more detailed risk assessment will be conducted and reported to Regional Council as further information is known.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Based on the information shared by Ministry staff on May 10, 2019, Peel Public Health expects to receive Provincial public health cost-shared funding for 2019/2020 of $53.9 million. This funding leaves a $1.2 million shortfall in provincial funding from budgeted amount of $55.1 million. The provincial funding is subject to ministerial approval. Peel Public Health will report back to Council on program implications once more details are shared by the Ministry.

CONCLUSION

Region of Peel participation in Provincial consultations is important to help ensure modernization results in a strong and well-resourced public health sector with a prevention and health promotion mandate and the ability to collaborate with local partners to address local needs. As further details are made available by the Province, staff will continue to update Council on the implications and key considerations for the health and well-being of Peel residents.

Nancy Polsinelli, Commissioner of Health Services

Jessica Hopkins, MD MHSc CCFP FRCPC, Medical Officer of Health
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THE REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL

BY-LAW NUMBER 36-2019

A by-law to establish percentages by which tax decreases are limited for 2019 for properties in the commercial, industrial and multi-residential property classes.

WHEREAS, subsection 330(1) of the Municipal Act, S.O. 2001 c. 25 (the "Act") provides that a municipality, other than a lower-tier municipality, may pass a by-law to establish a percentage by which tax decreases are limited for a taxation year in respect of properties in any property class subject to Part IX of the Act in order to recover all or part of the revenues foregone as a result of the application of section 329 to other properties in the property class;

AND WHEREAS, subsection 330(2) of the Act provides that such a by-law must apply to all properties in the property class whose taxes for municipal and school purposes for the previous year, as determined under subsection 329(2) exceed their taxes for municipal and school purposes for the taxation year as adjusted in accordance with the regulations in respect of changes in taxes for municipal purposes and changes in taxes for school purposes;

AND WHEREAS, subsection 330(3) of the Act provides that such a by-law must establish the same percentage for all properties in a property class, but may establish different percentages for different property classes;

AND WHEREAS, subsection 330(4) of the Act requires that a tax decrease limitation percentage for a property for a year shall be determined in accordance with paragraphs 1 through 4 of the subsection;

AND WHEREAS, subsection 327(4) of the Act provides that Part IX of the Act applies to the commercial, industrial and multi-residential property classes;

AND WHEREAS, subsection 329.1(1) of the Act provides that a municipality, other than a lower-tier municipality, may pass a by-law to have one or more of the optional tools in subsection 329.1(1) and Ontario Regulation 73/03 as amended apply in the calculation of the amount of taxes for municipal and school purposes payable in respect of property in the commercial classes, industrial classes or multi-residential property class for 2019;

AND WHEREAS, section 8.0.2 of Ontario Regulation 73/03 as amended (the "Regulation") provides that if a by-law has been enacted by a municipality providing that that section applies within the municipality for the taxation year then a property meeting any conditions set out in the by-law pursuant to subsection 8.0.2 (2) of the Regulation is exempt from the application of Part IX of the Act for the taxation year;
AND WHEREAS, section 8.3 of Ontario Regulation 73/03 as amended provides that if a by-law has been enacted by a municipality providing that that section applies within the municipality for the taxation year then a property meeting any conditions set out in the by-law pursuant to section 8.3 of the Regulation is phased out from the application of Part IX of the Act for the taxation year;

AND WHEREAS, section 15.0.1 of Ontario Regulation 73/03 as amended provides for an exclusion from the determination of taxes under section 329 of the Act of reassessment related increases, if a by-law has been enacted by a municipality, other than lower-tier municipality, that provides that section 15.0.1 of the regulation applies within the municipality for the year, which by-law may provide for certain conditions to be met in order to exclude reassessment related increases;

AND WHEREAS, Regional Council enacted By-law 33-2019 which adopted the optional tools that may be applied in determining the amount of taxes for municipal and school purposes payable in respect of property in the commercial classes, industrial classes or multi-residential property class for the 2019 taxation year, and which further provided that section 8.0.2, section 8.3 and section 15.0.1 of the Regulation apply within the Region of Peel for the 2019 taxation year and set out the conditions provided for in section 8.0.2, section 8.3 and section 15.0.1 of the Regulation;

AND WHEREAS, subsection 330(6) of the Act requires that a by-law made under subsection 330(1) to establish a tax decrease limitation percentage shall also require that adjustments shall be made between the upper-tier municipality and lower-tier municipalities so that no lower-tier municipality has a surplus or shortfall as a result of the application of the by-law;

AND WHEREAS, subsection 330(7) of the Act provides that if the upper-tier municipality experiences a shortfall as a result of the application of subsection 330(6), the by-law made under subsection 330(1) shall provide that any shortfall shall be shared by the upper-tier municipality and the lower-tier municipalities in the same proportion as those municipalities share in the taxes levied on the property class for municipal purposes.

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the Regional Corporation enacts as follows:

1. That tax decreases for the 2019 taxation year on properties in the Regional Municipality of Peel referred to in subsection 330(2) of the Act which are in the property class set out in Column I shall, in 2019, be limited by the percentage of the tax decrease set out in Column II in order to recover the revenues foregone as a result of the application of section 329 of the Act to other properties in the property class, so that the percentage of the tax decrease set out in Column III is the maximum tax decrease permitted to be received in 2019 by such properties;
### Column I (Property Class) | Column II (Clawback %) | Column III (Allowable Decrease %)
---|---|---
Commercial | 10.38102% | 89.61898%
Industrial | 0.00000% | 100.00000%
Multi-Residential | 0.00000% | 100.00000%

2. That adjustments shall be made between the Regional Municipality of Peel and its lower-tier municipalities so that no lower-tier municipality has a surplus or shortfall as a result of the application of the by-law;

3. That if the Regional Municipality of Peel experiences a shortfall as a result of the adjustments made in order to eliminate any surplus or shortfall at each of its lower-tier municipalities, the shortfall shall be shared by the Regional Municipality of Peel and its lower-tier municipalities in the same proportion as those municipalities share in the taxes levied on the property class for municipal purposes.

READ THREE TIMES AND PASSED IN OPEN COUNCIL this 23rd day of May, 2019.

________________________
Regional Clerk

________________________
Regional Chair
ADDITIONAL MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED AT MEETING
NOTICE

Ernst & Young LLP (“EY”) prepared the attached report only for the Region of Peel (“Client”) governed by a Steering Committee comprising senior officials from the Region of Peel, City of Brampton, City of Mississauga and Town of Caledon (collectively, the “Steering Committee”) pursuant to an agreement solely between EY and Client. EY did not perform its services (the “Analysis”) on behalf of or to serve the needs of any other person or entity. Accordingly, EY expressly disclaims any duties or obligations to any other person or entity based on its use of the attached report. Any other person or entity must perform its own due diligence inquiries and procedures for all purposes, including, but not limited to, satisfying itself as to the financial condition and control environment of the Steering Committee, and any of its funded operations, as well as, the appropriateness of the accounting for any particular situation addressed by the report. EY did not perform an audit or review (as those terms are identified by the CPA Canada Handbook - Assurance) or otherwise verify the accuracy or completeness of any information provided by the Steering Committee or any of its funded operations financial statements. Accordingly, EY did not express any form of assurance on accounting matters, financial statements, assumptions used, any financial or other information or internal controls. EY did not conclude on the appropriate accounting treatment based on specific facts or recommend which accounting policy/treatment the Steering Committee, or any funded operations should select or adopt. The observations relating to all matters that EY provided to the Steering Committee were designed to assist the Steering Committee in reaching its own conclusions and do not constitute EY’s concurrence with or support of Client's accounting, assumptions, or reporting or any other matters.
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Executive Summary

The Region of Peel in collaboration with the municipalities of Brampton, Caledon and Mississauga commissioned the firm EY to conduct analysis of the potential impact of changes to governance as part of its input to the Regional Government Review being conducted by the Province of Ontario. Results of this work are presented in this Report: Financial Impact Analysis of Service Delivery Models, May 21, 2019.

The Analysis was conducted between April 26, 2019 and May 21, 2019, and is a report provided by EY to the Region. So that the Analysis reflects a reasonable interpretation of the potential impact of alternative service delivery models, work was governed by a Steering Committee comprising each Chief Administrative Officer of the four municipalities participating in the Analysis (Brampton, Caledon, Mississauga, Peel Region) and their CFOs as Advisory Board members. The Steering Committee approved the approach, scope and assumptions framing the Analysis, enabled access to the referenced data from municipal budgets and plans, and provided review of and feedback on the Analysis throughout. Approximately 10 Steering Committee meetings were held; interviews with approximately 100 municipal officials were conducted; over 1,500 calculations of financial impact have been completed.

The Analysis is strictly of the financial impact of potential changes to service delivery models under three scenarios: Status Quo, Amalgamation, Dissolution. Analysis is structured at the municipal service level (e.g., Roads, Transportation, Public Works, Police, Water and Wastewater, etc.), and at the consolidated level for each municipality. Detailed assumptions about the potential impact of a move to Amalgamation or Dissolution are presented in comparison to the Status Quo, focusing on the impact to net cost of service (NCOS), capital allocation, and debt allocation over a forecast period to 2028. Lower and Upper Bounds are presented to reflect alternative assumptions.

Analysis indicates that on a consolidated basis over the forecast period, the total cost of Amalgamation ranges from a decrease of $13m to $576m ($2018), or 0.0% to 2.2% of total Status Quo NCOS. On an annualized basis, Amalgamation cost ranges from a decrease of $11m to an increase of $49m ($2018), or -0.4% to 1.8% of annualized Status Quo NCOS, calculated in year 2022 at the end of the assumed amalgamation period.

The total cost of Dissolution on a consolidated basis over the forecast period is modeled in the range $16m to $655m ($2018), or 0.1% to 2.5% of total Status Quo NCOS. On an annualized basis, Dissolution cost is in the range of a decrease of $6m to an increase of $61m ($2018), or -0.2% to 2.2% of annualized Status Quo NCOS, calculated in year 2022 at the end of the assumed dissolution period. A key driver of dissolution costs is the way Peel Regional Police would be dissolved, and is assessed using multiple options that on its own has a range of a decrease of $1m to an increase of $52m (annualized 2022 in $2018).

The Dissolution scenario has differential local tax impacts that result in a potential shift in tax burden as Regional services are transferred. A key driver in this is the Peel Regional Police dissolution model (two scenarios tested as outlined below). On an annualized basis at 2022, the calculated shift for Brampton ranges up to $45m ($2018); calculated shift for Caledon is as low as $53m savings($2018); calculated shift for Mississauga ranges as high as $84m ($2018).

Change in overall governance structure would necessitate specific strategies and approaches to manage any transition; current and future municipal officials would need to make important policy and administrative choices in response. The Analysis indicates the key areas of potential impact, identifies further work that would need to be conducted, and presents a financial model to help municipal managers analyze the impact of specific recommendations made by the Regional Government Review and any subsequent decisions taken by the Government of Ontario.
Project Scope

Section A
A1. Project Scope

The scope of Analysis was governed by terms established by the Region of Peel in collaboration with Brampton, Caledon and Mississauga and contained within the agreed Project Charter and associated contract. The project was governed by a Steering Committee comprising the chief administrative officers of each municipality and an Advisory Board comprising the chief financial officers of each municipality and was conducted between April 26, 2019 and May 21, 2019.

The project scope comprised three main components:

1. A model to enable financial analysis of the expenditures, non-tax and non-rate revenues, and assets by major service line and of consolidated positions of the four municipalities in scope (Brampton, Caledon, Mississauga, and Peel) under three service delivery models: Status Quo, Amalgamation, and Dissolution.
   - Within each service delivery scenario, feasible options were developed and assessed equally.

2. Assumptions were developed about how expenditures, non-tax and non-rate revenues, and assets might change in the Amalgamation and Dissolution scenarios compared to the Status Quo. Assumptions rely on analysis of current operations, interviews with officials from each municipality, and available relevant research.
   - The assumptions and sources were approved by the Steering Committee.

3. Presentation of potential financial impact of the three service delivery models such that the impact can be reported in total across all service lines and municipalities, and disaggregated by service line and municipality, from 2019 to 2028.
   - A view of the consolidated impacts of each scenario, with analysis, is provided.
Approach

Section B
B1. Main Dimensions of the Approach

The approach was approved by the Steering Committee and designed for analysis of potential service delivery model impacts. The model and analysis were created for use as a management tool for municipal officials and should enable on-going analysis. The analysis rests on defined assumptions that would need to be refined as specific dimensions of any dissolution or amalgamation event would be known. The analysis is restricted to a point-in-time assessment of what might happen under the conditions defined in the analysis; it is not a prediction of what will happen.

I. Governance

► The project was governed by the Steering Committee, which was responsible for reviewing and approving the approach, all assumptions, facilitating access to all data utilized in building the Status Quo financial model, validating that the data were utilized appropriately, and validating the analysis for the Amalgamation and Dissolution scenarios accurately reflects the underlying data and agreed assumptions.

► The Steering Committee met a total of ten (10) times during the course of the project for a total time of approximately 35 hours.

► Interviews were conducted with approximately 100 various municipal officials to clarify and validate utilization of data, to explain current service-line parameters, and to inform reasonable assumptions about potential impact of alternative service models.

II. Materiality of Analysis

► The following thresholds were established to help ensure the analysis focused on material issues:

1. Materiality was defined as a percentage of each total municipal budget and accepted at the lowest level (i.e., smallest budget level, Caledon), and set at a level of 5%

2. All non-material items were still included in the overall analysis, based on a higher level of assumption and modeling

3. Material options/assumptions required and achieved agreement and signoff from the Steering Committee for inclusion in the analysis
B2. Main Dimensions of the Approach

III. Focus only on Financial Impact Analysis
► The analysis focuses solely on the potential financial impact of overall service delivery models (Status Quo, Amalgamation, Dissolution).
► It does not analyze the efficiency, effectiveness, productivity, equity, or any other dimension of current operations. All current service levels and forecast plans are taken as given and, unless specifically noted, are assumed to be held constant for purposes of financial impact analysis.
► This approach respects the sovereignty of current and future municipal Councils and managers to determine all choices about service levels, funding models, taxation levels, organizational and business models, management and business operations and processes, and all other dimensions of how the Region and municipalities operate.
► Risk analysis has been conducted to highlight key dimensions of financial impact.

IV. Approach to Enable Future Analysis
► The financial model was designed to enable future analysis by municipal officials. This reflects the fact that specific dimensions of how any given service delivery model (e.g., amalgamation, dissolution) might operate cannot be known at this stage, and will need to be assessed and refined in the future.
► The model is built such that inputs can be varied, assumptions can be modified, and analysis can be conducted on essentially all parameters that affect service-line and consolidated financial impacts. The analysis has been designed to provide significant flexibility for future users.

V. Reliance on Municipal Data
► The analysis is based on information and data provided by the Region of Peel, City of Brampton, Town of Caledon, and City of Mississauga. The analysis and report presents factual information as provided to EY. EY has not validated the completeness and accuracy of this information.
► The information and data provided prepared by municipal officials was based on their own information, and might include certain estimates. Actual results might differ from municipal estimates.
► All other data and information from research is referenced by source.
Service Delivery Models

Section C
C1. Service Delivery Models

The service delivery models frame the central part of the analysis. For each model the objective is to provide a consolidated view by municipality, a disaggregated view by service line, and combined views by service line and municipality. The objective is to provide analysis for each municipality of the potential financial impact of the three general models (Status Quo, Amalgamation, and Dissolution).

I. Service Line Analysis

Service lines were identified for each municipality and materiality thresholds were assessed for each service line as a proportion of total cost of service for each municipality. Service lines that represent 5% or greater of total municipal expenditures were included for the identification of detailed assumptions and analysis; remaining service lines are included based on a more general set of assumptions. Table 1 presents the list of Service Lines.

Table 1. Material Service Lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service lines (SL)</th>
<th>% of Total Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL1. Internal and Other Services</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2. Fire</td>
<td>4.7%¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3. Police</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4. Housing</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5. Human and Social Services</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL6. Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL7. Land Use Planning</td>
<td>1.4%²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL8. Transit</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL9. Waste Management</td>
<td>3.5%¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL10. Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL11. Roads and transportation and Other Public Works (incl. storm water)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL12. All Other</td>
<td>10.8%³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ While under 5% of total expenditures, Fire and Waste Management are sufficiently complex to warrant a full analysis and are included in scope.
² While under 5% of total expenditures, Land Use Planning is greater than 5% of Caledon’s total expenditures and as such is been included in scope.
³ All Other includes Libraries, Paramedics, Conservation, Culture, Public Health, Seniors Services

* In-scope for in-depth analysis
* Except Region of Peel, where 2018 actual expenditures are not available and budget is used.
II. Status Quo Model

The Status Quo model acts as the baseline for the analysis. It reflects the current, planned and forecast dimensions for each service line and municipality. Figure 1 presents the key parameters used in the analysis.
The Amalgamation model essentially creates a single municipality for the provision of all current services at the overall governance level and at the individual service line level. Figure 2 presents the key parameters used in the analysis.

**Figure 2. Parameters of the Amalgamation Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Service Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amalgamation</td>
<td>Amalgamation of fire services with composite department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of four back-office support functions into one support function at the enterprise level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amalgamated fire services with composite department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint police board for Brampton and Mississauga (Caledon uses OPP)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One police board managed by the single enterprise for all three locals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralize all transit services into one model, owner, and manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All assets and services move to new enterprise model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All assets and services move to new enterprise model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All assets and services move to new enterprise model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C4. Service Delivery Models

III. Dissolution Model

The Dissolution model essentially splits the provision of all current Regional services to the three individual municipalities (Brampton, Caledon, Mississauga). In defined cases, a modified Status Quo model would be retained at the service line level due to the view that it represents the optimal model (e.g., a new Joint Utility Board for water and wastewater services). Figure 3 presents the key parameters used in the analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Service Line</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissolution</td>
<td>Regional support services dissolved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Separate police boards for Brampton and Mississauga, OPP contract for Caledon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint police board for Brampton and Mississauga, OPP contract for Caledon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three service managers and separate housing corporations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional services delivered by the local municipalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional planning function dissolved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services run separately by each municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contracts re-negotiated, Brampton retains waste processing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joint Utility Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional services delivered by the local municipalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services delivered by the local municipalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Parameters of the Dissolution Model
Assumptions

Section D
D1. Assumptions

Assumptions have been determined and detailed at the general and service line levels. The basis of assumption and dollar value range is analyzed in each case and each assumption has been signed off by the Steering Committee. The assumptions drive the differences between the three service delivery models and have been built into the financial model such that specific assumptions can be modified in the future to maximize analytical flexibility.

I. General Assumptions

The general assumptions applied across multiple service lines / delivery models are:

1. Wage harmonization applied to situations where employees on different current rates are harmonized to the highest comparable level for equivalent roles, responsibilities and conditions (in both the Dissolution and Amalgamation scenarios). The assumption reflects analysis of collective agreements and associated precedent by the law firm, Hicks-Morley, under contract to EY.
2. Transition costs representing the one-time activities and costs required to manage transition at the overall entity and individual service line levels, including legal advice tied to contract transition, transformation advisory activities, and change management. Allocation of transition costs to specific activities and municipalities would be determined once specific service model changes are known.

II. Service Line Assumptions

► Service line assumptions drive a significant portion of the financial impact modelled by service delivery model. Detailed analysis leading to each assumption, by service line, was conducted, and ranges for each determined.

► For those service lines that do not have a material impact on the overall financial analysis (i.e., those that are less than 5% of total expenditure by municipality), a set of general assumptions was utilized.

► Impact of service line assumptions is reported in the analysis as a Lower and Upper Bound.
Financial Impact Analysis

Section E
E1. Financial Model

The financial model uses historical financial information, forecasted budgeted capital plans, wages and salaries, and full-time equivalent headcount for each municipality, with approved assumptions from the steering committee, to develop a flexible and dynamic financial model to assess the financial impact for various options under each scenario for the ten-year period 2019-2028.

Based on the approved assumptions, the financial model will be dynamic and provide a range of outputs based on the inputs, scenario, and options selected.

Source data (Level 1):
- Financial information return data
- Independent property tax levy and property assessment data

Primary research and analysis (Level 2)
- Capital budget data
- Stakeholder interviews and consultations conducted with the Region and lower tier municipalities
- Internal client working papers and forecasts
- Independent analysis performed by EY subject matter experts
- Independent information including academic, benchmarks, industry and public sector information

Secondary research and analysis (Level 3)
- Other forecasts derived from 5-year average growth by finance object

Inputs
- Based on the approved assumptions, the financial model will be dynamic and provide a range of outputs based on the inputs, scenario, and options selected.

Outputs
- Based on the dynamic nature of the financial model, outputs will be a direct derivation of selected assumptions, scenarios, outputs and timelines.

Financial impact:
- Changes in the cost of service offerings
- Changes in the capital asset cost base
- Changes to financial ratios

Non-financial impact:
- Changes in the ability to maintain the existing quality of service delivery
- Operational changes to the existing structure of government

Key considerations
- Objective and fact based assumptions will be used for forecasting costs and benefits over time
- Identification of objective vs. subjective outcomes of each proposed option
- Selection of the most appropriate, accurate and complete input data and information available at each level of government to inform model baseline

Assumptions
- Step 1: Define Status Quo
- Step 2: Select Scenarios
- Step 3: Select Options

Service area 1
Service area 2
Service area 3
Service area 4
Service area 5

Amalgamation
Dissolution
Amalgamation
Dissolution
Option 1
Option 2
Option 3
Option 4
Option 1
Option 2

Service area 1
Service area 2
Service area 3
Service area 4
Service area 5

Time
Financial impact analysis is driven off the baseline Status Quo model that forecasts the net cost of service for each municipality for the ten-year period 2019-2028. The Status Quo forecasts reflect known budget plans for each municipality and estimated growth thereafter based on agreed assumptions.

**Figure 4. Net Cost of Service – Status Quo Consolidated by Municipality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>1,308</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>1,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>2,524</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>3,178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highlights of Analysis**

- Compound annual growth rates, by municipality in Status Quo are:
  - Brampton: 3.9%
  - Caledon: 5.5%
  - Mississauga: 3.0%
  - Region: 2.2%
- At a consolidated level, the compound annual growth rate is 2.8%
- In 2018, municipalities made up the following proportion of the aggregate service line expenditure:
  - Brampton: 19.1%
  - Caledon: 2.5%
  - Mississauga: 21.2%
  - Region: 57.2%
E3. Amalgamation: Consolidated Service Lines by Municipality

Net Cost of Service Status Quo vs. New Entity

Amalgamation consolidates all underlying service lines by municipality into a single “New Entity”. The net cost of service is represented as a range between Upper and Lower Amalgamation Bounds, reflecting defined assumptions of changes to underlying service line costs. The amalgamation period is modelled to be complete by 2022.

Figure 5. Net Cost of Service – Comparison of Status Quo to Upper and Lower Amalgamation Bounds

Table 3. Net Cost of Service – Comparison of Status Quo to Amalgamation model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net of Cost of Service, $ Million, Real 2018 dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status Quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 – 2028 Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amalgamation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net of Cost of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipal data; model calculations
E4. Amalgamation: Consolidated Service Lines by Municipality
Impact on FTE Costs, Assets and Liabilities, and Transition Costs

Amalgamation assumes FTEs are consolidated and wages are harmonized with corresponding impact on FTE costs. Post-amalgamation assets and liabilities are consolidated to the New Entity.

Table 4. FTE Analysis - Amalgamation reported by municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ Million, Real 2018 dollars</th>
<th>Pre-Amalgamation</th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
<th>Harmonization</th>
<th>Post-Amalgamation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ Million, Real 2018 dollars</td>
<td>Total FTEs</td>
<td>FTE Costs</td>
<td>FTE Adjustments</td>
<td>FTE Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>355.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>4,595</td>
<td>495.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>934.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,099</td>
<td>1,826.3</td>
<td>(298 - 74)</td>
<td>(33.6 - 3.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Capital and Debt Analysis - Amalgamation reported by municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ Million, Real 2018 dollars</th>
<th>Pre-Amalgamation</th>
<th>At Amalgamation</th>
<th>Amalgamation Complete</th>
<th>Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ Million, Real 2018 dollars</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>8,111</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>14,804</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Entity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28,629</td>
<td>2,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipal data; model calculations

Highlights of Analysis

FTE Adjustments
- Total annualized FTE costs are modeled to increase by $26m - $57m ($2018)
- This represents a range of 1.4% to 3.1% increase over Status Quo

Capital and Debt Analysis
- All capital and debt is allocated to the new entity
### E5. Amalgamation: Consolidated Service Lines by Municipality

**Net Cost of Service Change by Service Line**

Amalgamation assumes FTEs are consolidated and wages are harmonized with corresponding impact on FTE costs. Post-amalgamation assets and liabilities are consolidated to the New Entity.

#### Highlights of Analysis

- **Annualized change in 2022 at completed amalgamation**
  - On a gross basis, the most significant reduction in annualized NCOS would come from Internal and Other Services
  - On a gross basis, the most significant increases in annualized NCOS would come from:
    - Roads and transportation and Other Public Works (incl. Stormwater)
    - Fire
    - All Other
  - The largest ranges are for Parks and Recreation and Land Use Planning

#### Table 6. Net Cost of Service - Change in NCOS for Amalgamation v. Status Quo at the Service Line Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Line</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Amalgamated Entity</th>
<th>$ Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL1. Internal and Other</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2. Fire</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3. Police</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4. Housing</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5. Human and Social Services</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL6. Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL7. Land Use Planning</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL8. Transit</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL9. Waste Management</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL10. Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL11. Roads and transportation and Other Public Works (incl. Stormwater)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL12. All Other</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>2,759</td>
<td>2,819</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Cost of Service, 2022, $ Million, Real 2018 dollars**

Source: Municipal data; model calculations
Dissolution allocates current Region of Peel services to the single-tier municipalities on the agreed basis with corresponding impact on Upper and Lower Dissolution Bound net costs of service. The dissolution period is modelled to be complete by 2022.

**Figure 6. Net Cost of Service – Comparison of Status Quo to Upper and Lower Dissolution Bounds**

- **Cumulative change from 2020 to 2028 Forecast**
  - The total net cost of service change ranges from a decrease of $56M to an increase of $578M.
  - This represents a 0.2% to 2.2% change in total net cost of service.

- **Annualized change in 2022 at completed dissolution**
  - The one year net cost of service change is a decrease of $6M to an increase of $61M.
  - This is a (0.2%) to 2.2% change in total net cost of service.

**Table 7. Net Cost of Service – Comparison of Status Quo to Dissolution**

Net Cost of Service, $ Million, Real 2018 dollars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2020–2028 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status Quo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>5,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>5,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>1,443</td>
<td>1,487</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>14,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,536</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>2,705</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>3,106</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>26,122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Dissolution**   |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |       |      |               |
| Brampton          | -     | 1.071 | 1.095 | 1.131 | 1.136 | 1.158 | 1.180 | 1.192 | 1.219 | 1.221 | 10,728 - 10,969 |
| Caledon           | -     | 1.423 | 1.472 | 1.478 | 1.527 | 1.563 | 1.607 | 1.637 | 1.684 | 1.717 | 13,880 - 14,262 |
| Mississauga       | -     | 1.409 | 1.446 | 1.467 | 1.516 | 1.557 | 1.582 | 1.616 | 1.671 | 1.694 | 14,457 - 14,860 |
| Total             | -     | 2.622 | 2.669 | 2.765 | 2.831 | 2.882 | 2.897 | 2.964 | 3.032 | 3.076 | 26,067 - 26,700 |

**Source:** Municipal data; model calculations
The Dissolution assumes Regional FTEs are allocated with corresponding impact on FTE costs. Post-dissolution assets and liabilities are consolidated to the single-tier municipalities.

Table 8. FTE Analysis – Dissolution reported by municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Pre-Amalgamation</th>
<th>Adjustments</th>
<th>Harmonization</th>
<th>Post-Amalgamation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total FTEs</td>
<td>FTE Costs</td>
<td>FTE Adjustments</td>
<td>Wage Harmonization Costs</td>
<td>Total FTEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>4,595</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>7,640</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,099</td>
<td>(39) - 359</td>
<td>(6) - 53</td>
<td>16,060 - 16,458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Capital and Debt Analysis – Dissolution reported by municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Pre-Amalgamation</th>
<th>At Amalgamation</th>
<th>Amalgamation Complete</th>
<th>Allocations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>3,797</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6,204</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>8,111</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>10,942</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel</td>
<td>14,804</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>10,273</td>
<td>1,272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Municipal data; model calculations
E8. Amalgamation and Dissolution: Transition Costs

Impact on Transition Costs

Table 10. One-time transition costs - Amalgamation and Dissolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmarking approach</th>
<th>Amalgamation</th>
<th>Dissolution^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition board budget^1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change management, restructuring &amp; transition support</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use planning</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and transportation and other public works</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workforce adjustment costs</th>
<th>Severance pay</th>
<th>12.5 - 19.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERP</td>
<td>Consolidated ERP system</td>
<td>Immaterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td>104.6 - 111.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. Transition Board Budget includes costs associated with the setup and operation of a transition board for the new municipal structure, as well as expenses to set up the joint boards for utilities and police.
2. Dissolution costs represent expenditures across all municipalities, quantified as a cumulative amount.
3. One-time costs of transition in dissolution are allocated to municipalities on the basis of the proportion of the dissolved Region's net costs of service assumed. This would be Brampton 38%, Caledon 5% and Mississauga 57%.

Case study: Hamilton amalgamation (all values in 2018 real dollars)


Notes:

1. Over 1,000 contracts were reviewed with no material termination costs or contract transfer costs identified.
2. Allocation of costs by service line or municipality would need to be determined in the future based on the specific requirements of transition.

Highlights of Analysis

One-time Transition Costs

- One-time transition costs support completion of amalgamation and dissolution by 2022.
- Change management, restructuring and transition support, transition board budget, and workforce adjustment costs represent the most significant one-time transition costs.

7.1-26

$ Million, Real 2018 dollars

Notes:

- Over 1,000 contracts were reviewed with no material termination costs or contract transfer costs identified.
- Allocation of costs by service line or municipality would need to be determined in the future based on the specific requirements of transition.
E9. Dissolution: Consolidated Service Lines by Municipality

Net Cost of Service Change by Service Line

Change in net cost of service for the Dissolution model compared to the Status Quo can be reported at the service line level by municipality. Upper and Lower Dissolution Bounds are determined at the service line level based on the agreed assumptions.

Table 11. Net Cost of Service – Change in NCOS for Dissolution v. Status Quo at the Service Line Level by Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Line</th>
<th>Status Quo</th>
<th>Brampton</th>
<th>Caledon</th>
<th>Mississauga</th>
<th>Consolidated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL1. Internal and Other Services</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL2. Fire</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL3. Police</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL4. Housing</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL5. Human and Social Services</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL6. Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL7. Land Use Planning</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL8. Transit</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL9. Waste Management</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL10. Water and Wastewater</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL11. Roads and transportation and Other Public Works (incl. Stormwater)</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL12. All Other</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,770</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1,476</td>
<td>2,764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Cost of Service, 2022, $ Million, Real 2018 dollars
Source: Municipal data; model calculations

Highlights of Analysis

Annualized change in 2022 at completed dissolution
- On a gross basis, the most significant reduction in annualized NCOS would come from Internal and Other Services, followed by Land Use Planning.
- On a gross basis, the most significant increases in annualized NCOS would come from:
  - Human and Social Services
  - All Other
- The range of potential impact for Peel Regional Police reflects two allocation models – one by MPAC assessment, the other by a weighted average based 50% on property count and 50% on time-weighted calls for service.
E10. Dissolution: Consolidated Service Lines by Municipality

Impact on Transition Costs

The financial metrics analysis is driven off of the baseline Status Quo model that forecasts assets, liabilities, non-tax revenue, operational expenditure and known budgeted capital expenditure for each municipality for the ten-year period 2019-2028. The Status Quo forecasts reflect known budget plans for each municipality and estimated growth thereafter based on agreed assumptions. The below analysis provides commentary on the financial health for the new amalgamated entity and each municipality as at 2022, the year assumed the proposed change in governance would be complete.

Amalgamation

• The increase in operational spending is greater than the increase in operating balance, reducing the operating balance to operational spending ratio relative to the status quo
• Increased non-tax revenues are offset by increases in operating expenditure, resulting in a decrease to non-tax revenues as a percent of operating expenditures
• Growth in non-tax revenue is much greater under amalgamation than the growth of non-tax revenue under dissolution, strengthening the operating balance overall
• The modelled newly amalgamated entity’s long-term debt to operational spending is similar to the combined financials of each municipality under the status quo scenario, with slightly higher operating expenditure, resulting in a lower ratio of long-term debt to operating expenditure

Dissolution

• An increase in operating spending offsets the increase in operating balance, reducing the operating balance to operational spending ratio relative to the status quo
• The higher cost scenario reduces operating balance relative to the operational spending, largely driven by changes in wage harmonization costs
• Given the Region’s relatively large balance of tangible capital assets and long-term debt, each respective municipalities’ long-term debt to operating expenditures increase upon receipt of its allocated share of the Region’s long-term debt
• The aggregate tangible capital assets and long-term debt do not vary materially from the Status Quo
Recommended for Further Analysis

Section F
F1. Recommended for Further Analysis

It is unknown currently whether any service delivery model changes will affect the Region of Peel. The analysis presented herein offers an indication of the potential impact under the modelled assumptions. Further analysis would be required to analyze the impact of specific changes once they become known. Key areas of further analysis are outlined below and reflect both the unknown dimensions of a future change, and the known areas for further analysis identified as part of the current assignment.

### A. Response to a change in overall service delivery models and governance

Once any Provincial decision is taken that would affect service delivery model and governance changes, key issues to be addressed would include:

- **Detailed examination of the Provincially mandated changes to identify the specific parameters in play.** Emphasis should be on:
  1. Changes to overall legislation and regulations that establish mandate and authority for the new jurisdictions.
  2. Detailed mapping of any such changes to the Status Quo to identify specific implications for the existing municipalities and service lines.
  3. Analysis of the financial and service-level impact of mandated changes to inform transition strategies.

- **Detailed transition planning** will be required and should include at a minimum focus on the following:
  1. Regardless of the specifics of mandated changes, each jurisdiction should engage in detailed transition planning and risk management to ensure all obligations are appropriately discharged.
  2. Focus should be on strategies and tactics to maintain and/or enhance service levels for recipients, ensure appropriate treatment of directly and indirectly affected stakeholders, employees, commercial partners, ratepayers, taxpayers, and constituents in response to the Provincially mandated changes.
  3. Development of a transition management approach with necessary financial, staffing, workplans, schedules, engagement, communication, risk management, change management, benefits tracking, and reporting functions.
  4. Transition costs may or may not be partially or wholly funded by the province. Municipalities should seek to understand how they may be supported in such a scenario and seek to optimize any available transition support.
F2. Recommended for Further Analysis

It is unknown currently whether any service delivery model changes will affect the Region of Peel. The analysis presented herein offers an indication of the potential impact under the modelled assumptions. Further analysis would be required to analyze the impact of specific changes once they become known. Key areas of further analysis are outlined below and reflect both the unknown dimensions of a future change, and the known areas for further analysis identified as part of the current assignment.

B. Items identified as part of the current analysis

► As more information becomes available about recently announced Provincial measures affecting the four current municipalities, each municipality should assess the financial impacts of new policies and develop appropriate plans in response. For example, changes to provincial funding levels and delivery models related to areas such as public health, paramedic services, social assistance and employment, child care, housing and homelessness, and the Ontario Municipal Board should be analyzed to determine impacts. Once these impacts are known, an update to the financial impact analysis of potential service delivery model changes should be provided for the Status Quo, Amalgamation, and Dissolution scenarios.

► The identification of the means for funding any additional expenditures that have been identified in the scenarios will be the decision of elected officials. Funds can be made available a number of ways including development charges, service level and delivery changes, tax rates and ratios. Specific analysis of such decisions would need to be assessed (e.g., analysis of broader economic impact and/or the costs and benefits of potential policy changes).

► Should overall governance changes require an alternative to the Status Quo, analysis of direct impact on service levels and beneficiaries should be considered as part of analysis provided to elected officials for required specific policy choices.

► Once any specific governance changes are known, updated analysis of the key drivers of impact modelled in the current assignment should be provided, with a focus on the areas of most significant potential impact. For example these areas could include:

1. FTE impacts and wage harmonization.
2. Potential policy decisions to amalgamate service levels (e.g., Parks and Recreation).
3. Various police governance and funding model choices.
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Region of Peel
Financial Impact Analysis of Service Delivery Models
Presentation to Peel Regional Council

23 May 2019
Introduction

- The scope of the project was to conduct analysis of the potential financial impact of changes to governance and service delivery models as part of the Region's input to the Regional Government Review being conducted by the Province of Ontario

- Analysis conducted between April 26 and May 21, 2019
- Collaborative approach
- A range of assumptions
- Financial impact
- Further analysis
Overall Approach: Steering Committee and Stakeholder Engagement

- The Region of Peel struck a Steering Committee that was comprised of the CAOs for the four impacted municipalities, and an Advisory Board of the municipal CFOs. The Committee met regularly to discuss scenarios and options, and to validate and reach consensus on the assumptions and values presented.

- For the purposes of developing and validating assumptions and generating values for assumptions, stakeholders were engaged across the municipalities and their respective divisions and departments.

**Divisions and Departments Consulted**

- **Region of Peel**
  - Accessible Transportation (TransHelp)
  - Corporate Services
  - Human Services
  - Housing Services
  - Public Works
  - Peel Regional Police

- **City of Brampton**
  - Brampton Transit
  - Corporate Services
  - Fire and Emergency Services
  - Community Services
  - Public Works and Engineering
  - Planning and Development Services

- **City of Mississauga**
  - Community Services - Parks, Recreation, Fire
  - Corporate Services
  - Transportation and Works - MIWay, StormWater
  - Planning and Building

- **Town of Caledon**
  - Community Services - Parks, Recreation, Fire
  - Corporate Services
  - Strategic Services
  - Finance and Infrastructure Services - Roads, Transportation

**Number of Interviews**

- 40+

**Number of Stakeholders Consulted**

- 100+
Overall Approach

Determined the in-scope service lines and materiality, and understood the key data

Conducted detailed analysis, and initiated the development of scenarios (3) and service line options and parameters

Engaged key stakeholders across the service lines in the development and testing of a range of assumptions, including two subcontractors for legal and case law (Hicks Morley), and DC advice (Hemson Consulting Ltd.)

Engaged the Steering Committee in a series of working sessions in the testing and refining of the scenarios, options, and general and specific assumptions, and generated consensus

Identified values and ranges for the assumptions for input into the financial model
Financial Model

Inputs
- Source data
- Primary research and analysis
- Secondary research and analysis

Define Status Quo
- Service area 1
- Service area 2

Select Scenarios
- Amalgamation
- Dissolution

Select Options
- Option 1
- Option 2
- Option 3
- Option 4

Outputs
- Financial impact
- Non-financial impact

Assumptions
- Time
Summary of Findings

Total Cost of Amalgamation

- **Cumulative:** $13M to $576M, or 0.0% to 2.2% of total Status Quo Net Cost of Service to 2028
- **Annualized:** Decrease of $11M to an increase of $49M, or (0.4%) to 1.8% of annualized Net Cost of Service
- **Debt and Capital:**
  - All capital and debt would be transferred to a new municipal entity

Total Cost of Dissolution

- **Cumulative:** $16M to $655M, or 0.1% to 2.5% of total Status Quo Net Cost of Service
- **Annualized:** Decrease of $6M to an increase of $61M, or (0.2%) to 2.2% of annualized Net Cost of Service
- **Debt and Capital:**
  - **Brampton** - Gain of $7.4B in capital assets and $749M in debt
  - **Caledon** - Gain $2B in capital assets and $71M in debt
  - **Mississauga** - Gains $8.8B in capital assets and $1.1B in debt

All dollars are presented in $2018
### Police Dissolution Model

#### Service Options and Cost Allocation Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Board</td>
<td>$461M</td>
<td>MPAC¹</td>
<td>Brampton: $170M</td>
<td>$13M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mississauga: $278M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caledon*: NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WAC²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ $39M - $53M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate Board</td>
<td>$501M - $514M</td>
<td>MPAC¹</td>
<td>Brampton: $185M - $190M</td>
<td>$13M - $14M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mississauga: $303 - $311M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caledon*: NC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WAC²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Property Assessment Values from Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC)

² Weighted Average Cost of Policing per property and per time for service

* In all dissolution scenarios, Caledon retains the contract with OPP.
Tax Analysis: Impact

Dissolution Structure

Upon dissolution, the services and related expenditures of the Region are dissolved and allocated to the remaining municipalities. This results in an increase in the net cost of service of the dissolved municipalities, which in turn has an impact on the municipality’s taxes.

Impact of Dissolution

- Brampton: Savings from $45M to a cost of $33M* annually
- Caledon: Costs from $20M to $23M* annually
- Mississauga: Savings from $84M to a cost of $28M* annually
Development Charges: Risk Analysis

EY retained Hemson Consulting Ltd. ("Hemson") to provide Development Charge ("DC") advice on the potential financial implications of moving from the current two-tier governance model (Status Quo) to the Amalgamation or Dissolution governance models.

Two options are presented below to demonstrate the potential risk of alternative models of future development charges under a dissolution scenario.

Options:

1. Hemson's findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Annual revenue impact of DCs</th>
<th>Impact of DCs to 2028</th>
<th>Total cost of Dissolution to 2028</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hemson's findings</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>$655M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2017 Council Report</td>
<td>$11.2M</td>
<td>$110.8M</td>
<td>$755.8M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?

DISCLAIMER

Ernst & Young LLP (“EY”) prepared the attached report only for the Region of Peel (“Client”) governed by a Steering Committee comprising senior officials from the Region of Peel, City of Brampton, City of Mississauga and Town of Caledon (collectively, the “Steering Committee”) pursuant to an agreement solely between EY and Client. EY did not perform its services (the “Review”) on behalf of or to serve the needs of any other person or entity. Accordingly, EY expressly disclaims any duties or obligations to any other person or entity based on its use of the attached report. Any other person or entity must perform its own due diligence inquiries and procedures for all purposes, including, but not limited to, satisfying itself as to the financial condition and control environment of the Steering Committee, and any of its funded operations, as well as, the appropriateness of the accounting for any particular situation addressed by the report. EY did not perform an audit or review (as those terms are identified by the CPA Canada Handbook - Assurance) or otherwise verify the accuracy or completeness of any information provided by the Steering Committee or any of its funded operations financial statements. Accordingly, EY did not express any form of assurance on accounting matters, financial statements, any financial or other information or internal controls. EY did not conclude on the appropriate accounting treatment based on specific facts or recommend which accounting policy/treatment the Steering Committee, or any funded operations should select or adopt. The observations relating to all matters that EY provided to the Steering Committee were designed to assist the Steering Committee in reaching its own conclusions and do not constitute EY’s concurrence with or support of Client’s accounting or reporting or any other matters.
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Financial Impact Compared to Status Quo

### Amalgamation ($ millions)
- Deloitte*
- EY High**
- EY Low**

### Dissolution ($ millions)
- Deloitte*
- EY High**
- EY Low**

*Based on 10 years  **Based on 9 years
#CutsHurtPeople

AWARENESS. CONSEQUENCES. OPPOSITION. ACTION.

A Communication Strategy in Response to Provincial Budget Cuts

Bethany Lee
Marketing and Communications
May 23, 2019
A Strong Campaign for Peel

Peel Regional Council passed a resolution on May 9, 2019, for Communications to report back with a strong, wide-reaching campaign to raise awareness to all residents on the potential impacts of Provincial funding cuts.
Campaign Focus

AWARENESS. CONSEQUENCES. OPPOSITION. ACTION.

• To raise **awareness** about the issue of Provincial cuts specific to Peel.

• To convey to Region of Peel residents the **consequences** of the Provincial Budget cuts.

• To convey the Region’s **opposition** to the current cuts, and potential further cuts, by the Provincial government.

• To enable and generate **action** in opposition to the cuts, from residents.
Audience/Stakeholder Engagement

Primary

- Peel residents
- Premier of Ontario
- Peel MPPs
- Media

Secondary

- MARCO (Mayors and Regional Chairs of Ontario)
- AMO (Association of Municipalities of Ontario)
- Peel leaders with a voice in the community (businesses, union leadership, etc.)
- Staff
Telling the Story

“Cuts Hurt People. When you take funding away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up.”

“Provincial Cuts don’t save money. One way or another, residents will pay.”

Call to action

#CutsHurtPeople = Call for the Province to stop the cuts.
Sample Creative

#CutsHurtPeople
Cuts Hurt People

When funding is taken away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up.

It’s that simple.

One way or another, residents will pay for Provincial funding cuts.

Go online now and ask the Province to work with us and stop the cuts.

peelregion.ca/CutsHurtPeople
Cuts Hurt People

When you take funding away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up.

It’s that simple.

One way or another, residents will pay for Provincial funding cuts.

Go online now and ask the Province to work with us and stop the cuts.

peelregion.ca/CutsHurtPeople
When funding is taken away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up.

It’s that simple.

One way or another, citizens will pay for provincial funding cuts.

Go online now and ask the Province to work with us and stop the cuts.

peelregion.ca/CutsHurtPeople
Peel residents deserve a balanced approach

When funding is taken away from essential programs, services will be lost or taxes will go up. It’s that simple.

One way or another, citizens will pay for Provincial funding cuts.

Go online now and ask the Province to work with us and stop the cuts. peelregion.ca/CutsHurtPeople
Proposed Tactics/Channels

#CutsHurtPeople
Website & Email Form

Stop the Water Bill Hike Before It's Too Late

The provincial government is considering changes that would increase your water bill to pay for water and wastewater to new houses.

What are Development Charges?
The purchase price of a new home is made up of many components – a significant portion of which is a tax referred to as Development Charges (DCs). These are one-time fees imposed by municipalities on land developers, homebuilders and institutions when they build within their boundaries.

Municipalities in Ontario use DCs to recover certain costs associated with home and business growth - things like new water and wastewater systems, roads and transportation infrastructure, community centres, parks, trails, fire and police facilities.

These funds may only be used for the purpose for which they are collected.

Why you should understand Development Charges
Development charges can cost a lot of money, but they're also necessary. A simple way to think of this system is that growth pays for growth. It is important to understand that the people who come to live in this region will pay for the services they require to live here. Home builders will front the costs with municipalities but then these fees are passed on to the buyer as part of the cost of a new home.

If development charges are lowered, your water bill could go up by 70 per cent. We don't want that to happen.

Email your Member of Provincial Parliament (MPP)

Follow the steps to email your MPP to voice your concerns about this potential increase.

Step 1. Find Your MPP:
find electoral district by entering a postal code

Step 2. Select you MPP:
Amarjot Sandhu, amarjot.sandhu@pc.ola.org

Your name (optional):
Nobody

Your email:
john.doe@test.ca

Email Amarjot Sandhu, amarjot.sandhu@pc.ola.org
Social Media & Connect 2 Peel

#CutsHurtPeople

- Shareable webpage, Connect2Peel
- Share through Regional Mayor and Councillor accounts
- Tag relevant champions
- Monitor and respond
Telephone Town Halls

• Telephone Town Hall Meeting is a unique way to reach residents
• A two way communication method
• Reaches residents ‘where they are’
• Two date options, to connect with as many residents as possible
• Promote in advance
Councillor Toolkit

• Campaign approach
• Key Messages
• FAQs
• Sample tweets for use
• Snapshot of website and email form
• Campaign visuals
• List of ways to connect (tactic)
Campaign Tracking & Measurements

• Media coverage
• Sentiment
• Social campaign statistics
• Email (Connect 2 Peel) - #s opened, engagement
• Telephone town hall data

(Details of all Tactics are in Appendix)
Thank You
via e-mail

May 21, 2019

The Honourable Doug Ford
Premier of Ontario
doug.ford@pc.ola.org

Honourable Steve Clark
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing
steve.clark@pc.ola.org

Michael Fenn and Ken Seiling
Special Advisors
Regional Government Review
regionalgovreview@ontario.ca

Re: Province of Ontario’s 2019 Regional Government Review

The Council of The Corporation of the City of Brampton unanimously passed the following resolution at its Special Meeting on May 21, 2019:

WHEREAS, earlier this year, the Province of Ontario began reviewing regional governments to ensure municipal and regional governments are working as effectively and efficiently as possible, and can continue to provide the vital services that communities depend on;

WHEREAS, the City engaged the Peel Region community in a number of ways, including by Telephone Town Hall, a Town Hall meeting, online survey, and a detailed scientific study conducted by a third-party;

WHEREAS, the majority of the comments received from the public were in favour of keeping the current structure of the Region of Peel due to the cost of breaking away from the Region cited as the major public concern;

WHEREAS, the City of Brampton and Peel Region have received financial and legal advice from highly respected organizations including Deloitte on the impact to Peel taxpayers that would result from upper tier governance changes;

WHEREAS, the City will be receiving a report commissioned by the Region of Peel from Ernst & Young with financial analysis related to regional governance options, and to support development of this report, Brampton has been collaborating with the Chief Administrative Officers and Chief Financial Officers/Treasurers of the Region of Peel, City of Mississauga and Town of Caledon;

REFERRAL TO __________________________________________
RECOMMENDED
DIRECTION REQUIRED ____________________________
RECEIPT RECOMMENDED ✓ __________________________
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

THAT, with the support of Brampton residents, and in the best interest of protecting Peel Region taxpayers, Brampton City Council endorses maintaining the upper tier governance structure of Peel Region and the lower tier structure of City Council; and,

THAT, the City of Brampton advise the Government of Ontario accordingly, along with local Brampton MPPs.

The referenced Ernst & Young report will be submitted electronically to the Special Advisors directly by the Region of Peel and made available on their website, www.peelregion.ca, on May 21, 2019.

Yours truly,

Peter Fay
City Clerk, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer
Tel: 905.874.2172 / Fax: 905.874.2119 / TTY: 905.874.2130
e-mail: peter.fay@brampton.ca
(SP CL)

cc: Brampton MPPs:
   Amarjot Sandhu, MPP, Brampton West: amarjot.sandhu@pc.ola.org
   Gurratan Singh, MPP, Brampton East: GSingh-QP@ndp.on.ca
   Sara Singh, MPP, Brampton Centre: SSingh-QP@ndp.on.ca
   Prabmeet Singh Sarkaria, MPP, Brampton South: prabmeet.sarkaria@pc.ola.org
   Kevin Yarde, MPP, Brampton North: KYarde-QP@ndp.on.ca

Region of Peel
   Nando Iannicca, Regional Chair and Chief Executive Officer
   Kathryn Lockyer, Regional Clerk

Mayor Brown and Members of Council
   Acting Chief Administrative Officer and Senior Management Team
   L. Rubin-Vaughan, Manager, Government Relations and Public Policy, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer

Attachments:

- Presentation by Mainstreet Research, re: Survey of Citizens’ Attitudes regarding the Province of Ontario’s upcoming Regional Municipality Review.
- Staff Presentation by J. Pittari, Acting Chief Administrative Officer, and L. Rubin-Vaughan, Manager, Government Relations and Public Policy, re: Update on the Regional Government Review.
- Report from J. Pittari, Acting Chief Administrative Officer, and L. Rubin-Vaughan, Manager, Government Relations and Public Policy, re: Update: Regional Government Review
Survey of citizens’ attitudes regarding the Province of Ontario’s upcoming regional municipality review, potential amalgamation, city services.

Report Prepared For:
BRAMPTON
Methodology

The analysis in this report is based on results of two surveys conducted by Mainstreet Research commissioned by the City of Brampton. The first survey was conducted between April 26th, 2019 and May 1st, 2019 using automated telephone interviews (Smart IVR). Respondents were interviewed on landlines and cellular phones among a sample of 2018 adults, 18 years of age or older, living in Peel Region.

The second survey was conducted between April 26th, 2019 and May 4th, 2019 using live call agents. Respondents were interviewed on landlines and cellular phones among a sample of 1500 adults, 18 years of age or older, living in Brampton.

In both surveys, respondents were given the option to take the survey in English, Mandarin, Cantonese, and Punjabi.

The first survey is intended to represent the voting population in Peel Region, while the second survey is intended to represent the voting population in Brampton. The margin of error for the first poll is +/- 2.18% at the 95% confidence level. The margin of error for the second poll is +/- 2.53% at the 95% confidence level. Margins of error are higher in each subsample.

Totals may not add up 100% due to rounding.
The provincial government will conduct a review of the nine regional municipalities in Ontario, and the 82 individual towns they comprise. Were you aware of this review?

Source: IVR Poll, Peel Region, April 26th-May 1st, 2019, n=2018, MOE: +/- 2.18%
A near majority of respondents want to leave the current governance structure as it is. The second most popular option is to de-amalgamate the region (29.7%), followed by centralizing all governance at the regional level (20.9%). The desire to leave the governance structure of Peel Region intact is strongest in Brampton (66.4%) and Caledon (63.5%). Most respondents in Mississauga (48.3%) wish to de-amalgamate the region.

Source: IVR Poll, Peel Region, April 26th-May 1st, 2019, n=2018, MOE: +/- 2.18%
Is your local city council too small to do its job effectively, too large to do its job effectively or the right size to do its job effectively?

Source: IVR Poll, Peel Region, April 26th-May 1st, 2019, n=2018, MOE: +/- 2.18%
Is your Peel Regional Municipality council too small to do its job effectively, too large to do its job effectively or the right size to do its job effectively?

Brampton

- The Right Size: 51.3%
- Too Large: 29%
- Too Small: 19.7%

Source: IVR Poll, Peel Region, April 26th-May 1st, 2019, n=2018, MOE: +/- 2.18%
In Brampton, the Regional Municipality of Peel provides some services and the City of Brampton provides others. Which level of government should be providing the following services?

- A majority of respondents believe that most services should be provided by the Regional Municipality of Peel, except policing (41%).
- Most respondents want to see recycling provided by Peel Region (64.1%), followed by transit (61.5%), and then sewers and water treatment (54.4%).
- In every instance, the desire to see Peel Region provide these services is higher among those earning more than $50,000 than those who earn less.

Source: Live Agent Poll, Brampton, April 26th-May 4th, 2019, n=1500, MOE: +/- 2.53%
Generally speaking, Brampton residents are finding that the services provided by the city are meeting expectations.

The largest gap is found in terms of public transit, where Brampton residents on average think that they have to wait 13 minutes for a bus, and think they should wait 8.4 minutes.

Interestingly enough, Brampton residents think that both solid waste and recycling are picked up more than twice a month, which is incorrect.

This confusion is likely because some sort of waste is picked up every week. That said, service delivery is meeting expectations on both fronts.

One very positive insight here is that Brampton residents on average think that it takes 9.8 minutes for an ambulance to arrive, mirroring almost exactly how long Bramptonians think it should take for an ambulance to arrive (9.92 minutes).

Source: Live Agent Poll, Brampton, April 26th-May 4th, 2019, n=1500, MOE: +/- 2.53%
Despite Brampton residents feeling that crime is an increasing problem, they do not think that Brampton having its own police force would be an ideal solution.

Just under 50% think that Brampton having its police force would not improve safety for the city.

The only demographic where a majority think that having a unique Brampton police force would make the city safer are respondents aged between 50 and 64.

Similarly, a majority of residents do not think Brampton having its own police force or its own health presence would be effective in reducing the perceived drug problem.

Source: Live Agent Poll, Brampton, April 26th-May 4th, 2019, n=1500, MOE: +/- 2.53%
46.7% of respondents do not want to see Brampton merged into a larger City of Peel.
However, there is significant support for a merger as well, with 39% saying that they would like to see a merger.
The only demographic group that prefer a merger are those that earn less than $50,000 and respondents in the 50-64 age cohort.

Source: Live Agent Poll, Brampton, April 26th-May 4th, 2019, n=1500, MOE: +/- 2.53%
Where we are

January 15, 2019:
Ontario Government announces appointment of Special Advisors and launches review of 8 regional municipalities, the County of Simcoe and all lower-tier municipalities.

Objective of the Review:
• Improve governance
• Decision making
• Service delivery

Provincial consultation concludes May 21, 2019
Our Options

Examining potential financial implications through 3 likely governance structural models

SPLIT, MERGE OR STAY?
Our Approach

Principles to understand the most effective and efficient model.

• No reduction in core services currently provided by the Region of Peel
• Ensuring no additional financial costs and/or finding cost savings opportunities
• Fairness to all affected municipalities
Update on Ernst & Young (EY) Financial Analysis

EY was retained by the Region of Peel to conduct an independent financial analysis of the 3 options (status quo, dissolution and amalgamation).

• Steering Committee comprised of the 4 Chief Administrative Officers (Peel, Brampton, Mississauga, Caledon) and the Chief Financial Officers/Treasurers
• Evaluating each option equally
• Report to be provided to the Province and made public prior to the deadline
• Presentation to Regional Council on May 24, 2019
REGIONAL GOVERNMENT REVIEW

Have Your Say
Dedicated Website and a Social Media Presence

brampton.ca/regionalgovernmentreview
Have Your Say – City of Brampton Consultation

Completed Opportunities

- Telephone Town Hall, April 27, 2019*
- In-Person Town Hall, May 4
- Online survey (until May 15) at www.brampton.ca/regionalgovernmentreview
- Provide comments using online form at www.brampton.ca/regionalgovernmentreview

All comments, questions and feedback have been provided

*Summary, including polling from the Telephone Town Hall, was previously presented to Council on May 1, 2019. Included as Appendix VI
Online Poll (April 29, 2019 – May 15, 2019)

These are some options for the City of Brampton. Which of these do you support?

- Dissolve Region of Peel and enable Brampton to become a standalone city (13%)
- Merge the three municipalities to become a single-tier City (28%)
- No change to Region of Peel (59%)

629 Total Responses

Survey results should not be considered as a true random sample of the population.
Online Poll (April 29, 2019 – May 15, 2019)

Any change will have implications. Which of these criteria is the most important to you?

- Cost: 45%
- Independence and stronger self identity: 29%
- Streamlining government services: 19%
- Fair and full representation: 7%

629 Total Responses

Survey results should not be considered as a true random sample of the population.
Online Poll (April 29, 2019 – May 15, 2019)

Would you support the City of Brampton becoming a single-tier municipality (separate from the Region of Peel), if this resulted in higher costs?

- Yes: 11%
- No: 77%
- Unsure: 12%

629 Total Responses

Survey results should not be considered as a true random sample of the population.
Online Poll (April 29, 2019 – May 15, 2019)

Currently Peel Regional Police provides services to Cities of Brampton and Mississauga. Police services for Caledon is provided by the Ontario Provincial Police. Should there be a change to the Region of Peel structure, which of these options to you support?

- **70%**: One police board for all three municipalities
- **16%**: Two police boards, one for each of the bigger municipalities in Peel
- **14%**: Three police boards, one for each of the three municipalities

629 Total Responses

Survey results should not be considered as a true random sample of the population.
Currently water and wastewater services is provided by Region of Peel to Brampton, Mississauga and Caledon. Should there be a change to the Region of Peel structure, which of these options do you support?

- 80%: One water utility board to support all three municipalities
- 14%: Two water utility boards to support all three municipalities
- 6%: Three water utility boards, one for each of the three municipalities

629 Total Responses
Survey results should not be considered as a true random sample of the population.
What’s Next?

Provincial decision is expected by Summer 2019.

• Developed a Communications Strategy
• Will continue to update website with current information
• Circulate EYs Financial Analysis (when becomes publically available)
• Leverage the Association of Municipalities of Ontario’s Annual Conference to reinforce Council’s position
Date: 2019-05-14

Subject: Province of Ontario’s 2019 Regional Government Review

Contact: Joseph Pittari, Acting Chief Administrative Officer, joseph.pittari@brampton.ca
Lowell Rubin-Vaughan, Manager, Government Relations & Public Policy, lowell.rubinvaughan@brampton.ca

Recommendations:

1. That the report from Joseph Pittari, Acting Chief Administrative Officer and Lowell Rubin-Vaughan, Manager, Government Relations and Public Policy, dated May 14, 2019, to the Special City Council Meeting of May 21, 2019, Re Province of Ontario’s 2019 Regional Government Review, be received;

2. That a verbal update to the Ernst & Young’s Financial Impact Analysis of Service Delivery Models currently being undertaken, a collaboration between the Region of Peel, Cities of Brampton, Mississauga and Town of Caledon, be provided by the Acting Chief Administrative Officer, if it is made public prior to the May 21, 2019 Special Council Meeting;

3. That the Ernst & Young’s findings (if made public) along with findings from the City’s public engagement work be reviewed to form the City’s formal recommendation to the province in regards to the provincial government review;

4. That a copy of this report and any associated Council resolution be sent to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, the provincially appointed Special Advisors, Michael Fenn and Ken Seiling, and the Region of Peel.

Overview:

- The Provincial Government’s consultation on regional governments in Ontario will conclude at 11:59 pm on May 21, 2019.

- The City of Brampton undertook a public engagement campaign between April 17, 2019 to May 15, 2019, that included a variety of tactics.
The 2019 Deloitte report, commissioned by the Region of Peel, found that while taxes will increase over the next 10 years due to inflation, by the 10th year, it is expect that dissolution and amalgamation will require more taxes to be raised than the status quo.

As per Peel Regional Council, the Chief Administrative Officers of the Region of Peel, Cities of Brampton, Mississauga and Caledon and the consultant, Ernst & Young, are completing a new financial analysis of the various governance scenarios (status quo, dissolution and amalgamation).

Background:

The Provincial Government’s consultation on regional governments in Ontario will conclude at 11:59 pm on May 21, 2019.

City of Brampton

On April 17, 2019, Committee of Council received the report titled Update: Regional Government Review. The report provided information on the City’s previous regional governance advocacy, in particular fair and full representation at the Region the of Peel, as well as the current provincial consultation process including the key areas of focus of the Special Advisors, Michael Fenn and Ken Seiling.

The report also outlined a series of proposed public engagement tactics the City would implement to inform and gather residents’ feedback on the review. Results of the public engagement effort are outlined in the next section.

Region of Peel’s Deloitte Report

In preparation for the provincial regional government review, the Region of Peel commissioned their auditors, Deloitte, to provide a Financial Impact Analysis of Service Delivery Models (Deloitte report). The analysis was included as part of the Regional Chair and Chief Administrative Officer’s (CAO) discussion with the provincial special advisors. The Executive Summary is provided as Appendix I with the full report available online: http://peelregion.ca/finance/_media/financial-impact-analysis.pdf

The Deloitte report examined the financial implications of moving from the current state model to three specific governance scenarios:

- Efficiencies to be explored without a governance change
- Dissolution of the Region
- Amalgamation of the Local Municipalities
Deloitte also calculated the estimated impact on the resident over a 10 year time horizon.

Based on their set of assumptions and data reviewed, as highlighted in Chart 1, found that while taxes will increase over the next 10 years due to inflation, by the 10\textsuperscript{th} year, it is expected that dissolution and amalgamation will require more taxes to be raised than the status quo.

**Table 1: Deloitte Report, page 2**

![Cumulative changes in tax levies as compared to status quo - overall (\$ millions)](image)

Since the Deloitte report was made public, subsequent discussions at Regional Council on the validity of the report, the data sources and set of assumptions used to analyze the 3 identified scenarios. Deloitte made themselves available and delegated at the April 25, 2019 Regional Council meeting.

A challenge with the Deloitte report is the set of assumptions on Development Charges, and not discussing nor interviewing representatives of each of the local municipalities, which could have an impact on their findings. As a result, and noted in the next section, Regional Council passed a motion calling on all four municipalities to work together to complete a more fulsome financial analysis.

**Current Situation:**

*Update on Ernst & Young Financial Analysis*

On April 11, 2019, on a motion moved by Mayor Patrick Brown, Peel Regional Council unanimously directed the four Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs - Region of Peel, Cities of Brampton, Mississauga and Town of Caledon) to conduct an independent financial analysis of the three options related to the future of the Region of Peel (status quo, dissolution and amalgamation); ensuring all options are evaluated equally.
The CAOs and Chief Financial Officers/Treasurers have been working diligently with Ernst & Young (EY) to complete this financial analysis. To ensure this analysis meets the provincial consultation deadline, Regional Council moved a motion on May 9, 2019 instructing that EYs report be sent directly to the province and be made public, prior to any formal presentation to Regional Council.

Given EYs findings and analysis could help inform City Council's decision on its position to the province, all efforts will be made to ensure the report is shared as soon as it becomes available prior to the start of the Special Council Meeting.

Results from the City's Public Engagement Initiatives

1. Public Consultation and Outreach

   A. Brampton.ca/regionalgovernmentreview: On April 5, 2019 the City launched this specific website to provide current regional government review-related information. The page was made available in any language through the Google Translate feature. As public engagement opportunities became available (both from the province and city), they were publicized on the website. The site has continually been updated as new information has become available.

      From April 5, 2019 to May 14, 2019:
      o Excluding internal traffic, there were a total of 790 page views, which 712 were unique page views to Brampton.ca/regionalgovernmentreview homepage

   B. Social Media: The City leveraged various social media platforms, including Twitter and Facebook, to promote and encourage the participation in various engagement activities. A total of 26 posts generated the following:
      o Impressions per post ranged from 1198 – 3112 per Tweet on Twitter.
      o Reach per post ranged from 599 – 2,347 on Facebook and Instagram.

      The final reminder for online survey was placed as an ad on Facebook and Instagram, and reached 22,981 people, had 39,275 impressions and generated 613 link clicks.

   C. Dedicated Online Contact Form: Through the dedicated regional government review website, residents have been providing their feedback, opinions and questions to the City via the online contact form. As of May 15, 2019, staff received a total of 8 emails. Appendix II provides the email content the City received.
D. City Matters e-Newsletters: The regional government review was the feature story in the May edition of City Matters e-newsletter. On May 10, 2019, an e-blast was issued to the subscribers of the e-newsletter outlining details of the upcoming engagement opportunities. The May edition led to an almost 43% open rate.

2. Engagement Activities and Results

A. Online Poll

Between April 29, 2019 and May 15, 2019, staff leveraged an online poll to gauge Brampton resident’s thoughts on what position the City of Brampton should take in response to the province’s regional government review. The online poll received a total of 629 responses to the following questions. All comments provided are included as Appendix III.

Chart 1 - Question 1:
These are some options for the City of Brampton. Which of these do you support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissolve Region of Peel and enable Brampton to</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become a standalone city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merge the three municipalities to become a single-tier City</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change to Region of Peel</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The survey results should not be considered as a true random sample of the population.
Question 2: Any change will have implications. Which of these criteria is the most important to you?

- Cost: 45%
- Independence and stronger self identity: 29%
- Streamlining government services: 19%
- Fair and full representation: 7%

Question 3: Would you support the City of Brampton becoming a single-tier municipality (separate from the Region of Peel), if this resulted in higher costs?

- Yes: 77%
- No: 11%
- Unsure: 12%
Question 4:
Currently Peel Regional Police provides services to Cities of Brampton and Mississauga. Police services for Caledon is provided by the Ontario Provincial Police. Should there be a change to the Region of Peel structure, which of these options to you support?

- One police board for all three municipalities: 70%
- Two police boards, one for each of the bigger municipalities in Peel: 14%
- Three police boards, one for each of the three municipalities: 16%

Question 5:
Currently water and wastewater services is provided by Region of Peel to Brampton, Mississauga and Caledon. Should there be a change to the Region of Peel structure, which of these options do you support?

- One water utility board to support all three municipalities: 80%
- Two water utility boards to support all three municipalities: 14%
- Three water utility boards, one for each of the three municipalities: 6%
B. Town Hall:

On May 3, 2019 from 3 pm to 5 pm, the City hosted a Town Hall that was also streamed live through Facebook. Mayor Brown was joined by Councillors Palleschi, Vincente, Santos, Dhillon, Williams, Singh and the Acting Chief Administrative Officer, Joseph Pittari.

The event included a short overview presentation by Lowell Rubin-Vaughan, Manager, Government Relations and Public Policy, with majority of the time focusing on listening and responding to residents’ comments and questions.

Appendix IV provides a summary of the questions and/or comments raised at the Town Hall and Facebook LIVE. For all comments from Facebook LIVE viewers, visit https://www.facebook.com/CityBrampton/videos/461047564667925/.

C. Telephone Town Hall:

On April 24, 2019, Mayor Brown hosted a Telephone Town Hall to engage the community in a discussion on the regional government review. Nearly 5,000 individuals joined the conversation at some point during the hour long session, peaking at about 1,230.

A full summary of the session, including poll results were presented to Council as part of the Government Relations Matters update on May 1, 2019. It is also attached as Appendix V.

D. Mainstreet Research

As directed by Council, the City of Brampton commissioned Mainstreet Research (Mainstreet) to conduct a defensible, statistically and representative survey regarding the Province of Ontario’s regional government review.

Mainstreet conducted a telephone survey between April 26, 2019 and May 1, 2019 among a random sample of 2018 adults, 18 years of age or older, living in Peel Region. The margin of error for the poll is +/- 2.18% at the 95% confidence level.

Chart 1 below, are the results to just one question asked to respondents regarding what governance model is the best for the Regional of Peel (status quo, amalgamation, dissolution).

Mainstreet will present their full findings during the May 21, 2019 Special Council Meeting.
Corporate Implications:

Financial Implications:

This report does not have any financial impacts to the City of Brampton at this time.

Strategic Plan:

This report achieves the Strategic Plan priorities of Good Government by participating in the provincial regional government review, including engaging with the public and working collaboratively with the Region of Peel, City of Mississauga and Town of Caledon.
Conclusion:

The deadline to the province’s consultation on regional governments closes May 21, 2019 at 11:59 pm. Information contained in this report is intended to support Council finalizing its position to the special advisors.

Approved by:

Joseph Pittari
Acting Chief Administrative Officer

Attachments:

Appendix I - Regional Government Review - Deloitte - Financial Impact Analysis of Service Delivery Models
Appendix II - Regional Government Review - Deloitte - Financial Impact Analysis of Service Delivery Models
Appendix III - Regional Government Review - City Matters - Split, Merge or Stay
Appendix IV - Regional Government Review - Comments from Online Poll
Appendix V - Regional Government Review - Town Hall
Appendix VI - Memo May 1, 2019 - Regional Government Review – Telephone Town Hall

Report authored by: Lowell Rubin-Vaughan, Manager, Government Relations and Public Policy.
Executive summary

Introduction
One of the most significant financial challenges for Ontario’s municipalities over the next 10 years will be the infrastructure financing deficit, which is currently estimated to be $60 billion for Ontario municipalities (Association of Municipalities Ontario, 2018). Municipal infrastructure is used to provide key services to residents of Ontario, including drinking water, sewage and waste disposal, social housings, roads and bridges, transit and parks and recreational facilities. The Association of Municipalities of Ontario has noted that the infrastructure used to provide these services is under pressure, as many of these assets were first built in the 1950’s and 1960’s (Reid, 2018). In Ontario, some of the significant infrastructure challenges have historically been addressed through regional governments, which are designed to provide certain area-wide municipal functions in a more economical manner by establishing a larger tax base to support services where significant infrastructure investments are required.

We have been asked by the Regional Municipality of Peel (“the Region” or “Peel”) to examine the financial implications of moving from the current state model of a two tiered municipal government model (i.e. Regional and Local Municipal governments), to three specific governance scenarios:

- Efficiencies to be explored without a governance change
- Dissolution of the Region (the extinguishment of regional government in Peel)
- Amalgamation of the Local Municipalities (“the Locals”), which include the City of Mississauga (“Mississauga”), the City of Brampton (“Brampton”), and the Town of Caledon (“Caledon”), with the Region (one government providing local and regional services)

The Region’s request was made to prepare for the upcoming Province of Ontario (“the Province”)’s review of Ontario municipalities that are currently governed under a two-tiered governance model. The Province has announced that its review will be conducted to assess whether governments are currently operating as efficiently and effectively as possible. As such, the financial implications determined under this report will serve to assist the Region in preparing for its discussions with the Province.

The financial analysis completed in this report also considers past case law and arbitration results as the best evidence to allocate assets and liabilities in the absence of an agreement between willing parties. It is believed that using this type of legal precedence is the best evidence to determine the financial outcomes of the scenarios that have been defined. We recognize that it is essential for our methodology to consider governance structure changes in alignment with key arbitration principles, such as the Cummings principles, which asserts that municipalities should be compensated in the event residents lose access to a particular benefit as a result of the transaction – these principles are important to consider, especially as they may impact how asset allocation decisions are made, as well as affect the ease of transition.

In addition to the above, when comparing these options, we have been asked to calculate the estimated impact on the following measures over a 10 year time horizon:

**Resident impact**
- Property tax per average home value of $484,000
- Utility rates per average household water consumption of 290m³

**Total impact**
- Total property tax paid by each jurisdiction
- Total utility rates charged by each jurisdiction
Municipal financial metrics
- Debt to operating revenue
- Interest expense to operating revenue
- Operating balance to operating revenue
- Operating and capital balance to total revenue
- Annual repayment limit
- Net debt

Findings
Based on the analysis contained in this report, we have calculated the following impacts of the scenarios described above. Deloitte does not provide a recommendation on which option should be selected, as this report is limited to strictly financial analysis. The impacts of our analysis are summarized as follows:

- Amalgamation will require additional tax levies of $676 million that will need to be raised when compared to the status quo over the next 10 years. However, out of the three governance restructuring options, amalgamation requires the most tax levies in year 10 as operating costs are the most significant due to the estimated impact of harmonizing wages amongst the Region and Locals.
- Dissolution will ultimately require additional annual tax levies of $1,081 million that will need to be raised when compared to the status quo over the next 10 years. Dissolution is more costly than amalgamation initially due to initial investments required to duplicate regional services locally. Once these investments are made, the harmonization impact of wages is less pronounced as harmonization would only occur between the Region and individual local governments (as opposed to the Region and all local governments under amalgamation).
- Efficiencies will generate tax savings of $261 million, if realized, that will reduce tax requirements when compared to the status quo over the next 10 years.

Impact on property tax levies
It is expected that taxes will increase over the next 10 years due to inflation and the need to address the existing infrastructure financing deficit across all governments. By the 10th year, it is expected that dissolution and amalgamation will require more taxes to be raised than the status quo.

While dissolution does require a more significant up front investment (one time costs), the cumulative change in tax levies over time under amalgamation demonstrates that amalgamation has the potential to be more costly over time as the impacts of harmonization are more significant and are not expected to be reversed. Overall view of changes in tax levies for the overall region is included below and expanded for each of the Locals in Appendix B.
Utility rates per average household water consumption of 290m³

Under amalgamation there are no impacts to utility rates as water and wastewater services are already provided at the regional level.

Upon dissolution, an assumption has been made that the delivery model would remain the same and that a joint utility board (i.e. the base case) could be formed by the Locals. This model was used as our base case given that it was considered to have the least financial impact on the taxpayers. In this delivery model, the joint utility board would be responsible for all asset ownership, asset management, and operational activities, as well as customer-facing activities, such as the billing process. As such, there is no expected impact on utility rates, which result from changes in the municipalities’ DC revenues, under dissolution. The Locals’ debt capacity, however, will be affected, especially as the board’s assets and liabilities would be apportioned to each of the municipalities for accounting purposes.

There is, however, an alternate service delivery model that has been used in Ontario. The Locals could elect to use a wholesale-retail model whereby a board would be responsible for significant water and wastewater assets, such as water and wastewater treatment facilities and large diameter linear mains, and the Locals would be responsible for smaller diameter linear assets for water distribution and wastewater collection. In this model, the Locals would need to fund anticipated maintenance and replacement costs through their respective utility rates. Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. prepared a sensitivity analysis, which examined how each of the Locals’ utility rates may change in the event this separate model is used. The following table summarizes Watson & Associates Economists Ltd.’s analysis, which examines utility rates for 2019 based on forecasted water and wastewater volumes (m³) and budgets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Water – rate/m³</th>
<th>Wastewater – rate/m³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current rates</td>
<td>Forecasted rates ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>$1.4725</td>
<td>$1.1367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>$1.5504</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>$1.4306</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon</td>
<td>$2.5064</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above analysis indicates that Mississauga and Caledon’s residents would be most negatively affected if a wholesale-retail model is implemented subsequent to dissolution to account for additional infrastructure maintenance and replacement costs that will not be funded if utility rates remained the same. For further details concerning Watson & Associates Economists Ltd.’s analysis, please refer to Appendix F.

One additional consideration to note is that as the report assumes that a joint utility board would be in place for dissolution, the Locals will need to consider how the board’s financial results will be reflected in their year-end financial statements. In particular, Canadian public sector accounting standards, which are a series of accounting regulations and standards followed by public sector entities for financial reporting purposes, indicates that the Locals would need to assess whether they control the board’s day-to-day operations. In the event the Locals are seen to have full control over how the board operates its business, then the board’s financial results may need to be proportionately consolidated or included in each of the Locals’ financial statements. If this approach is taken, then the boards’ liabilities, such as long-term debt, would be reflected in the Locals’ year-end financial results which may ultimately impact their financial metrics. For the purposes of this report, we will assume that a proportional consolidation approach would be used. However, additional investigation would be required to ensure that that this accounting approach is valid.

Financial Metrics

The Region, Mississauga, and Brampton have all obtained “AAA” credit ratings from Standard and Poors, and are three of eight municipalities in Canada that have obtained this rating. Based on our review, we have estimated that each municipality is able to withstand a dissolution or amalgamation without upsetting borrowing limits. However, if dissolution were to occur, we estimate that Mississauga would see a significant
improvement in financial metrics, to the detriment of Brampton and Caledon, given that Mississauga has a larger commercial and industrial tax base which would be available for their exclusive use. On amalgamation, the Region would see a deterioration of financial metrics, but would theoretically improve its borrowing capacity. On dissolution, Caledon would face significant financial challenges and is not viable on their own in the event that a governance model changes. Details of how the Region and the Locals’ financial metrics change in each of the reviewed governance models are available in Appendix C.

Dissolution – Key Impact on Municipalities

- Mississauga benefits the most from dissolution, especially as it sees positive trends in financial metrics. Significant changes in financial metrics for dissolution in comparison to the status quo, include: increase of operating balance to operating revenue by 6.7%, increase of total balance to total revenue by 10.1%, and increase of $2.4 million for net assets.
- Caledon does not maintain healthy financial ratios in the case of dissolution. In particular, the municipality does not have a sufficient tax base which can be used to supplement the additional expenditures that it will need to fund on a standalone basis. Significant changes in financial metrics for dissolution in comparison to the status quo, include: decrease of operating balance to operating revenue by 28.8%, decrease of total balance to total revenue by 25.3%, and increase in debt to operating revenue by 23.8%.
- Brampton’s debt related metrics are most impacted upon dissolution. Upon dissolution, as noted in the earlier section, the city would be required to recognize a proportion of the board’s long-term debt as part of the municipality’s financial statements to comply with accounting regulations. As a result, the municipality is predicted to proportionately consolidate long-term debt related to water and wastewater assets. In particular, under dissolution, Brampton’s debt to operating revenue, when compared to the status quo, will increase by 27.9%.

Amalgamation – Key Impact on the new city

- Amalgamation has a minor negative impact on the new city’s financial metrics, such as operating balance to operating revenue and total balance to total revenue ratio (please refer to Appendix C for further details). No significant changes are observable, which can be attributed to the relatively strong financial positions that are currently reported by Mississauga and Brampton.
- Debt ratios under amalgamation become more favourable for the new city as the debt consolidated from the local municipalities is much less in comparison to the additional assets and revenues it collects.

Approach for the Financial Analysis

In reviewing the financial implications of the defined options, all regional and local services were analyzed based on publicly available information, using a common, standardized approach as it related to FTE, asset, debt and reserve allocations, other operating expenses, and capital expenditures. Some services, however, were reviewed in greater detail given that they were perceived to significantly influence the municipalities’ total tax requirements.

Dissolution

Dissolution of a regional government is not a common occurrence in Canada or globally. The research we have conducted indicates that dissolution is not usually done with the objective of financial savings for one municipality over another, as it is intentionally moving away from the desired economies of scale that a regional government should provide. In the examples we have found where dissolution did occur, we found that the reason for dissolution was due to either a previous amalgamation that became ineffective, or due to smaller communities not needing the same service levels as other communities in the Region (e.g. urban versus rural constituents often have different service level needs).

Our research also indicates that if dissolution does occur, significant effort will be required amongst the local municipalities to negotiate how assets and services should be divided, and could result in the local municipalities going to arbitration to determine how to allocate Regional assets. As such, precedence established by both case law and arbitration results were used to guide our approach to dissolution. We recognized that, on average, the arbitrator considered general principles such as the original source of
funding to determine how to best allocate resources amongst the affected parties, as well as considered how compensation should be awarded in the event residents were seen to lose access to benefits they previously enjoyed.

A review of how dissolution impacts some key service lines is summarized in the below table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service area</th>
<th>Summary of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water/wastewater</td>
<td>Under the base case scenario, services would be maintained and provided by a joint utility board, which includes all of the Locals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Upon dissolution, this report assumes that Brampton and Mississauga would establish their own standalone police boards. Use of discrete police boards is a common approach in Ontario, especially in similar sized single-tier municipalities, such as the City of London and the City of Hamilton. Although not considered in this report, Brampton and Mississauga could elect to use a different delivery model whereby services are provided under a joint police board. For instance, the City of Ottawa, the City of Nepean and the Town of Gloucester had a joint police board before the three municipalities were formally amalgamated in 2001. Caledon, on the other hand, is expected to assume the Region’s current contract with the Ontario Provincial Police. The Locals are predicted to be responsible for more than $108.0 million of forecasted capital expenditures over the next 10 years to ensure that they have the right infrastructure and assets in place to serve their residents, such as two police headquarters buildings. One-time costs of $47.5 million and $50.9 million for Mississauga and Brampton, respectively, will need to be incurred to account for temporary management staff who will assist the two cities transition to local police boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Deloitte previously performed a regional roads assessment in 2017, which was formally approved by the Regional Council. Under this study, the dissolution study showed that the Locals would need to increase the number of their front-line employees to maintain current service levels, which has the potential to increase salary and wage costs by $1.4 million on annual basis. Development charges of $10.8 million, previously collected by the Region, may also be lost which would translate to higher tax requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste management</td>
<td>The Region of Peel currently outsources collections and disposal services, and it is assumed that this would continue if dissolution of the Region were to occur. Since waste processing is dependent on the Peel Integrated Waste Management Facility in Brampton, it was assumed that Brampton would be allocated the asset and enter into service agreements with Mississauga and Caledon to provide waste processing services to their residents. Exact quantification of the savings or costs resulting from this transfer was not determinable at the time of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>For the purposes of maintaining current service levels, a greater number of management staff will be needed to provide system oversight and manage operations for the local facilities which will result in ongoing operating costs for each of the Locals (Mississauga: $4.2 million; Brampton - $2.4 million; and Caledon - $0.4 million).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development charges</td>
<td>In a dissolution, development charge (DC) revenues are anticipated to decrease given that revenues will only be generated from growth-related development that take place within each of the Locals’ areas versus the overall region. The narrowed DC scope is predicted to increase tax-supported costs by $186.2 million over a 10-year period. Rate-supported costs, on the other hand, are not estimated to be affected by the governance change based on the assumption that all water and wastewater services are administered by a local board, which is comprised of the Locals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transitioning to single-tier municipalities will require more consideration, especially as the Locals will need to reach an agreement as to how the Region’s assets and liabilities should be allocated. In addition, the Locals would need to consider how they would finance one-time transitional and transactional costs which result from the need to change the governance structure, create and implement a transition plan, engage members of the public, perform due diligence procedures, and determine whether existing agreements with vendors need to be terminated. These additional costs may be substantial in nature, especially if arbitration is required to finalize the transition process. However, given the lack of data around these costs available to the Region, we did not quantify the potential expenditures in our analysis.

Amalgamation

Unlike dissolution, amalgamation of local governments occurs on a more frequent basis and there are recent examples in Ontario, Canada and globally of where amalgamation has occurred. Recent studies, such as the Fraser Institute’s 2015 report on Municipal Amalgamation in Ontario have concluded that amalgamations do not result in a reduction of taxes for residents.

Our analysis in this report indicates that amalgamation will likely cause increases to property taxes to all taxpayers across the region. Savings as a result of FTE reductions are more than offset by additional costs related to wage harmonization. Upon amalgamation, given the decrease in net assets caused by these additional costs, this could negatively impact the Region’s existing credit rating. These studies have concluded that while amalgamations do have the potential to create efficiencies and economies of scale, these efficiencies are usually offset by an increase in service levels that are typically required to ensure that all residents within the new amalgamated local government receive the same level of service. We believe that service level harmonization is a possible outcome, which would likely increase the costs of providing services, especially as service levels would be increased for all taxpayers in the new municipality. However, at the time of this report, input from the Locals regarding service level harmonization could not be obtained. As a result, this report assumes that service levels do not change upon amalgamation. Amalgamations also can theoretically be used to create more economies of scale to deal with significant infrastructure challenges (sharing the burden of future infrastructure costs); these economies of scale would allow the Region to better handle infrastructure financing deficits due to increased borrowing capacity of the new municipality.

A review of how amalgamation impacts key service lines is summarized in the below table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Summary of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate support</td>
<td>Under amalgamation, it is expected that there would be a significant reduction of management level positions due to the centralization of administration. However, similar levels of front-line employees would be maintained to ensure that they can continue to offer similar service levels. The combined impact of terminations and wage harmonization would result in a net cost of $151 million over a 10-year period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit and TransHelp</td>
<td>Under amalgamation, centralization of administration will likely reduce the need for management positions, but similar levels of front-line employees would be needed to sustain service levels. The combined impact of terminations and wage harmonization would result in a net cost of $29.4 million over a 10-year period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Similar to corporate support services, there is an expectation that there could be a reduction in the management positions for Fire departments. Existing front-line staff, including firefighters, would undergo a wage harmonization process. The combined impact of these personnel changes would result in net savings of $15 million over a 10-year period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation</td>
<td>After amalgamation, it is expected that the new “City of Peel” would generate less revenues from its recreational programs, as it would reduce the amount of revenue that could be charged to non-local residents. The change in user classification, therefore, is expected to reduce the higher user fees that they would have previously collected in the status quo scenario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Summary of Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation</td>
<td>The service is expected to incur net costs of $199.9 million over a 10-year period. The majority of this increase is attributed to the wage harmonization of front-line employees, but also includes the compensation costs associated with terminated management personnel that were made redundant through amalgamation. The service's net costs arising from amalgamation are predicted to be larger than the other services given that, on average, it employs a larger proportion of front-line employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Upon amalgamation, the new City is anticipated to incur net costs of $95.3 million over a 10-year period, which results from savings associated with the elimination of redundant personnel that is offset by wage harmonization costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCs</td>
<td>An amalgamation is estimated to have a neutral impact on the new municipality’s DC for both tax-supported and rate-supported costs. No significant variances are anticipated given that the new municipality would be able to leverage pre-existing processes, such as those that are used to provide water and wastewater services to residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on past examples of amalgamations, transitioning to a new governance model will require careful planning and analysis, which may be complex in nature. The new city, for example, would need to consider how the new governance structure would maintain its flexibility and responsiveness to citizens, especially as the taxpayers in each of the current areas would want their needs to be fairly represented. Other qualitative factors, such as harmonization of service levels, updates to current policies and processes, as well as change management activities needed to support existing employees would need to be examined. These transitional activities are anticipated to take time. Rushing amalgamation could create further challenges for the new city to address, such as identifying how the costs of restructuring would be funded or mitigated, as well as whether all services need to be harmonized (Miljan & Spicer, 2015).

Harmonized Ratios and Rates under Amalgamation

Our analysis has assumed that the tax ratios and rates that are used by the Locals under status quo would be carried over under amalgamation. However, there is a strong possibility that the new amalgamated entity could undertake harmonization process of tax ratios, as well as tax rates.

Background of Tax Ratios

Under the current property tax assessment model, properties are classified into different classes, such as residential, farm, multi-residential, commercial, and industrial. Different property classes are used to allow municipalities to set different tax rates based on local priorities, as well as identify properties which are subject to receive tax reductions due to the uniqueness of their nature.

Municipalities, however, are bound to a provincial legislation which limits how the tax burden can be shared between the property classes. The province’s legislation sets out a “range of fairness” which identifies target ranges for tax ratios that are expressed in relation to the tax rate of the residential property class. It is possible for municipalities to change the province’s original tax ratios for farm, commercial, industrial, multi-residential, and pipeline property classes. However, changes are typically made to eliminate the impact of any reassessment related tax shifts that occur during a reassessment cycle.

Peel is the only region where the setting of tax ratios is delegated to the existing lower-tier municipalities.

Harmonization of Tax Ratios

In the event of an amalgamation, without the lower-tier municipalities to which tax ratio setting authority can be delegated, the Region has estimated that harmonized tax ratios would result in the residential taxpayers in Mississauga facing an average increase of approximately 2.07%, whereas both Caledon and Brampton residents would see a small decline in their tax rates. The commercial taxpayers in Brampton
would see an increase of 5.02% in their taxes, whereas commercial taxpayers in Mississauga would see a reduction of 5.25% in their taxes.

The following table shows the change in tax rates and levies for year 2018, resulting from a situation where there is a move from unique tax ratios for each local municipality to harmonized tax ratios under amalgamation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class</th>
<th>Change in Tax Rates (%)</th>
<th>Change in Tax Levy (CAD $000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Caledon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (RT)</td>
<td>(0.67%)</td>
<td>(0.12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm (FT)</td>
<td>(31.75%)</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-residential (MT)</td>
<td>(15.01%)</td>
<td>(15.40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (CT)</td>
<td>5.02%</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (IT)</td>
<td>3.69%</td>
<td>(3.60%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Harmonization of Tax Ratios and Tax Rates

The Region has estimated that if harmonized tax rates were to be utilized, the residential tax-payers in Mississauga would face a dramatic increase in their tax rates of 14.58%, whereas Brampton taxpayers would see a sharp decline of 14.42%. This is due to the fact that residents of Mississauga currently have the lowest tax rate, despite contributing the most tax dollars overall to the Region. This is due to the fact that Mississauga residents generally have the highest Current Value Assessment and highest population amongst the three local municipalities.

The following table shows the change in tax rates and levies for year 2018, resulting from a situation where there is a move from unique tax rates for each local municipality to one harmonized tax rate under amalgamation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class</th>
<th>Change in Tax Rates (%)</th>
<th>Change in Tax Levy (CAD $000s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brampton</td>
<td>Caledon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (RT)</td>
<td>(16.42%)</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm (FT)</td>
<td>(42.57%)</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-residential (MT)</td>
<td>(28.49%)</td>
<td>(14.42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (CT)</td>
<td>(11.64%)</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (IT)</td>
<td>(12.75%)</td>
<td>(2.48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Efficiencies

During our engagement, we were asked to identify whether there were any efficiencies that could be explored without requiring a change in governance structure. For this part of our review, we focused on services where there was potential duplication occurring (similar services being performed by upper and lower tier governments), as well as focusing on where local and regional governments could work together more to achieve more efficiency and effectiveness of services.

On an overall basis, we acknowledged that both the Region and the Locals have achieved efficiencies on a standalone basis, but that further efficiencies could be achieved if all of the municipalities in the region...
collaborated with one another. A review of how efficiencies impacts key service lines is summarized in the below table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Summary of Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate support</td>
<td>Corporate support services could be centralized at the Region to minimize growth of back-office employees for all municipalities within the region by investing in automation tools which reduce personnel time spent on manual and repetitive tasks. This investment decision would require the Region and the Locals to assess their current information technology environment to select a suite of programs that are best suited for the needs of all entities, and would involve a transformation in mindset to a more service oriented delivery approach. In general, greater leverage of automation tools are anticipated to lead to a 10% reduction in wages for front-line employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit and TransHelp</td>
<td>TransHelp services could be downloaded to the local municipalities to eliminate redundant management level positions, which could translate to $2.5 million of cost savings over a 10-year period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Fire services are currently provided by each of the Locals. To maximize greater economies of scale, as well as reduce back-office and management costs, resources could be centralized and maintained at the regional level. Cost savings could not be quantified at this time due to the lack of publicly available information, however this is a potential efficiency that could be explored with all parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation</td>
<td>Similar to fire services, management and back-office functions could be centralized to achieve overall savings at the Local level. In addition, all municipalities could achieve more efficiencies through use of additional technologies to address work order management and scheduling of time and attendance. Cost savings could not be quantified at this time due to the lack of publicly available information, however this is a potential efficiency that could be explored with all parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Due to similarities in the nature of services provided amongst the Region and the Locals, there is a potential to achieve greater efficiencies through the centralization of management and back-office functions. Procurement of goods and services could also be centralized to maximize economies of scale when negotiating for favourable prices with vendors. Cost savings could not be quantified at this time due to the lack of publicly available information, however this is a potential efficiency that could be explored with all parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedic services</td>
<td>Fire and paramedics services were considered for a potential consolidation. However, based on a review completed by the Region, the merger of the two service lines was not considered to be feasible, especially as the two services had a different workplace culture, mandated by a different set of legislative requirements, and possessed different skill sets which would require extensive training to share responsibilities. In addition, fire and paramedics services were considered to operate under a different service deployment model. For example, fire services use fixed fire stations in order to ensure that there are dedicated resources in a given area, but paramedic services rely on mobile ambulance posts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations of our analysis
The analysis in this report is a best estimate of the potential financial impacts that could occur if the scenarios described in this report do occur. In carrying out our work, we worked closely with the Region’s financial staff to estimate and quantify the potential impacts. The data used to support our work has been based on publicly available information, such as the Financial Information Returns of each municipality, the operating and capital budgets, the Region’s and Locals’ financial statements, and the Ontario public sector salary disclosure. It should be noted that this information is not a complete set of data for each municipality and that our analysis may be impacted by data that we were unable to obtain. Additionally, this work was
completed without discussing or interviewing representatives of each of the local municipalities, which could contribute materially to our analysis.

The analysis contained in this report is solely limited to the financial implications of the specific scenarios described and does not consider any other potential impacts. If any of these scenarios were to actually occur, this analysis would be impacted by actual negotiations and agreements by the parties involved, which may lead to different outcomes than what are described in this report.
## Appendix II: Public Feedback from the Online Contact Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Feedback from the Online Contact Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stay or Mississauga pay us big time to leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No Content, just contact information provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Would there be a situation where City council along with the voting public elect to keep things the way they are, but the Province would choose to merge or separate the region anyway? If so, what would that situation look like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Thanks I listened in to the Town Hall. I would prefer to leave Peel intact. A value would have to be put on Mississauga's share of our development but it is primarily our responsibility too. We would also be without they're future headaches. I hated the Provincial Survey; they timed me out at the last question and had to start over. Then it said I didn't say what higher level I was talking about and when put down Peel it erased all my answers! Did they get my suvey who knows?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>If Peel Region is dismantled into Mississauga, Brampton &amp; Caledon separately, how will we continue to receive Police, Water &amp; Service, Public Health, Social Housing, Waste, Regional Road maintenance services? If they are split up, how will these services be funded? Will it cost more to provide these services to each municipality? Will there likely be lawsuits between the municipalities fighting over costs, especially in area where one municipality may have borne more than its proportionate share of the cost, thinking that in the following year or two they would be repaid? Then, with dissolution you could have one city refusing to reimburse the other. Will there be huge severance costs as employees are laid off from the regional services, but then others are hired to replace them. Who will pay for these possible additional services/costs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>What will the cost be to everyone to divide up the water and sanitary facilities, to create new divisions going forward to maintain these services. How will policing be spread out over Mississauga and Brampton. Regional Roads, are they to be fixed, or have aded lanes where proposed before the breaking up of the Region. How will waste management and the facilities be handled. So many other questions. I was around for the creation of the Region. Keep in mind the province will do what it wants and without thinking. It is in their interest to pit Mississauga against Brampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brampton has matured and needs its own independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Status Quo is the most effective way. Everything boils down to Tax payers money. Neither Amalgamation nor dissolution will save tax payers money. So Keep the governance model (2 tier with Region of Peel)as it is.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Split, Merge or Stay? Have Your Say.

The City of Brampton would like your input on making an important decision about it’s position in the Region of Peel.

What?

Tell us if Brampton should:
- Split from the Region of Peel and become a standalone City
- Merge with the other Region of Peel municipalities to become a bigger City
- Stay in the Region of Peel

Why?

The province of Ontario initiated a review of regional governments to ensure they are working as effectively and efficiently as possible, and can continue to provide the vital services that communities depend on.

How?

Take this [survey](#) now to tell us what you think. Your views can help Brampton City Council make the important decision this month.

[Click here for more information](#)
Appendix IV: Public Feedback from the Online Poll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-1: Public Feedback from the Online Poll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. United we stand divided we fall. Do not split. Please concentrate on other issues such as bringing more business to Brampton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. About time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All the support that Brampton put in the past to support Mississauga should be given back to Brampton, especially when Brampton decides to become independent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. All three areas should be merged into one governmental body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Amalgamation worked well for city of Toronto and will do the same for Peel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Also merge both transit systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Amalgamate Brampton And Caledon but dissolve Peel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Amalgamation and merger is recommended instead of separation in order to reduce costs and reduce red-tape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Amalgamation is necessary and ultimately inevitable, therefore the sooner, the better! A streamlined government will result in higher efficiencies therefore lower costs!! Get it done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Amalgamation of Brampton and Mississauga could streamline service provisions and further support cohesive growth. A proposal to move Caledon from Peel Region to Dufferin County could prove to be beneficial to all parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Anything that can make Brampton better recognized by the government as one of the largest cities in Canada, thereby services provided to the city should reflect this. Also, anything to reduce the cost of car insurance for those people who live here, but don’t put insurance claims in, it’s very unfair, perhaps stricter penalties to those bad, careless drivers!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. As a former resident, it’s completely ridiculous that Mississauga, benefitting from many years of Bramptonians paying to build their city up, wants to separate without paying their fair share. The City of Mississauga should be forced to pay for what residents of Brampton and Caledon had to pay for decades to build up these other areas of Peel Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. As a resident of Brampton, I don’t agree with separation. In fact, I believe costs for everything would increase. How would this create savings for each municipality? I mean, the rebranding alone would be an extreme cost. Services? How would they be provided? There are currently no issues so why are we looking to reinvent the wheel? We are three special municipalities that have so much to offer! Let’s stay united!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. As is model has a limited shelf life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. As the GTA grows, it will become more important to have consistency in our regional services. Providing quality waste, water, and policing. These services must not draw borders and should look to finding efficiencies. Having separate municipalities allows for the focus on communities. Merging municipalities will drive less focus on these communities and may have an impact on how everyone’s voice is heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Better communicate the reasons why this is being considered. How will this change result in savings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Blending the 3 cities will be a disaster. Mississauga will get the largest share of the tax money. Brampton and Caledon will lose our Mayors and will get little representation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1-1: Public Feedback from the Online Poll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Brampton and Caledon are being bullied by Mississauga. If all three municipalities were merged this bullying would not exist and a lot of money could be shared and used more effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Brampton and Mississauga mesh, Brampton and Caledon mesh, but Caledon and Mississauga don't, really. We need to either all be individual or create one big city. At least of Brampton and Caledon. Brampton has been expanding northward anyways, and while we have a lot of greenspace in the city, they're all very small individually. I would like larger greenspaces left more wild.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Brampton has supported Mississauga’s growth for many years. Now that it’s Brampton turn to grow, they want out. Mississauga cannot cherry pick what they like. Under Hazel McCallion, the City bullied its way through. Bonnie Crombie is the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Brampton is one of the highly taxed cities in Ontario. We need to reduce taxes not increase them every year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Brampton residents have supported Mississauga in the growth of their infrastructure. I believe it is time for Mississauga to reciprocate and help Brampton and Caledon. I do not wish to become a mega city like Toronto which is too large to be managed, especially when the provincial government is dictating what to. Do without consultation and reason. Large cut backs now in healthcare etc. will cost us greatly in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Brampton Residents were led to believe that Mississauga is on the hook for their share of development costs that Brampton paid into over the past few decades. The City of Brampton was expecting financial support from Mississauga since Brampton is the city that is now growing. More clarity around the particular dollar value of this funding is needed to shed light on decisions about the regional structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Brampton should be its own city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Brampton was incorporated as a village in 1853. We are 166 years old, starting from 50 people to almost 800K. We need to fight for our right to remain a City as hard as we fought against the LRT in the Downtown. WE need to control our future, NOT Mississauga and for sure not the Province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Bundled is stronger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>By breaking up Peel is going to add more cost to 3-tier services. Why on earth do you want to create more cost if Peel could be run effectively n efficiently under the municipalities of Peel than under separate entities. COST is the underlying factor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Caledon is anti-development but constantly relies on the backs of Mississauga and Brampton. It comes as no surprise companies are relocating to London. Caledon allows no zoning amendments, does not allow for any more approval of industrial lands, cancelled Highway 413. They need to separate as they do not wish to cooperate and coexist in a developmental level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Change should not be made unless it provides a better cost effective solution to the status quo... Too many things are being implemented today because egotistical attitudes and poor judgement are at play. Time for fiscal intelligent management with proper consultation with those affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Changes seem unnecessary at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Cities are not isolated standalone creatures, rather part of larger ecosystems. There is a need for Greater Toronto Area municipality to provide integrated service just like the TTC upload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Conservative cuts are damaging and hurtful to Ontarians. Disbanding regional governments will hurt municipalities and increase costs. NO! To PC cuts!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Cost and fair representation would be my concerns. Taxes should be reduced gradually and not increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Costs in Brampton are already high. Car insurance rates just went up astronomically. One main government priority should be keeping costs down for residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Costs will be high if Mississauga leaves Peel...and they will probably be high if we merge. I think we'd be stronger and more independent if merged into a single city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Could OPP assume responsibility for policing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Create more jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Dismantling the Region of Peel and segregating the municipalities to be independent of each other creates cost increases for shared services which will then be put on the municipal tax payers. Also the amount of time and money that will go into the preparation and execution of this type of segregation of municipalities will be long and drawn out and again costs land on the tax payers within the respective municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Dissolution of smaller regional governments makes sense but not for larger regions such as Peel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Divorces seldom end nicely. Let's stay together for the sake of the kids, their parents &amp; their grandparents. Let's find ways to keep what we have and build in it, instead of throwing it all away chasing dreams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Do not want higher taxes or utilities cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Do what is right for the growth of the region and Ontarians not just one city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Don't change anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Don't change what isn't broken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Don't cut the jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Don't fix what isn't broken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Don't want BRAMPTON to be sidelined in regional governance like Etobicoke and Scarborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Doug Ford is (redacted). Please know that any change that is his idea is likely meant to cause mayhem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Doug Ford will most likely do whatever HE wants regardless of what citizens think or wish. How do our voices matter if there is no referendum to hear us? Is the government of Ontario decision final? Referring to how cities in Quebec were forced to amalgamate then many separated after a referendum. Given that the new water treatment plant was built in Mississauga with Peel taxpayers’ money, what will happen to Brampton and Caledon’s water? Will we have to “buy” water from them? If there is a change to the region, either amalgamation or separation, how long will the process take? If the province decides to dissolve the region, will all property taxes paid by Brampton residents in the interim remain in Brampton? Or can Mississauga, Brampton or Caledon take a larger portion to complete regional projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Either stay the same or merge as one city. Separating hurts all cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Either the Region of Peel should be left as is or all three municipalities in the Region become one megacity for better cohesion of services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Fire department to be merged together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Fire services could be amalgamated like Police and Ambulance services to reduce costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>For many years, Brampton has subsidized Mississauga’s growth. Now when the situation is reversed they want out. OK, then reimburse us for the past 40 years of overpayment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix IV: Public Feedback from the Online Poll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Freedom!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Separating from regional government at this time is not a good decision given the current state of the provincial government including who's in power.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Have the student loan system back to the way it was. It's impossible to stick to the new rules and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Having a single amalgamated municipality is not only better from a cost perspective but will also ensure consistent development across all the municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Hazel tried this crap may years ago. Mini Hazel, Bonnie, is a clone and still seeks and takes direction from Hazel. The cost of change will be through the roof and the costs will be borne by the tax payer. Knock it off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>How are social services affected if peel is dissolved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>How can we get a fair price on our car insurance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>How much will taxes go up for the average household in a dissolution? Will there be new ward boundaries? If dissolution, will Mississauga councillors vote themselves a pay hike due to loss of regional salary? Depending on the outcome can Brampton take legal action against the province or city of Mississauga?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>How would amalgamation affect the services provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>I am against Mississauga taking the majority or pooled funding for decades on end, just to bail out when Brampton and Caledon want the favour returned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>I am totally against amalgamation! I do not want to be part of the concrete jungle that Mississauga has become compared to our combination of green space and environmental standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>I am vehemently against the dissolution of the Region of Peel. Doug Ford and Bonnie Crombie are not qualified to make a decision of this magnitude, period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>I believe that plain and simple, Brampton, Mississauga and Caledon should each have their own individual structures for everything. They are three very different cities each capable of sustaining themselves. There is no need to cross-breed these regions in any matter. Being isolated will be best for growth in each region to strive as an independent community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>I believe the idea of regions consisting of cities to be an excuse for another tier of fees and taxes. Municipalities should and can provide the services that the region provides. City departments should be streamlined for efficiency. Cut the fat. The region is the fat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>I believe we should be one big city of peel and we can stream line all the red tape and be more efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>I don’t want to pay anymore you already take enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>I do not believe any Peel Region will survive as a city without Mississauga. It is well run and has been for many years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1-1: Public Feedback from the Online Poll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel Brampton is developed enough to be a standalone city. I would agree that they stay in the Region of Peel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not support splitting the Region of Peel. Having been a resident of Brampton and now, Caledon, I do not believe there is any chance of cost savings in splitting. Various services are shared, thus, making it difficult to split. I am a believer in collaboration and our three municipalities are stronger together. This would be a major step back should we all be divided. Furthermore, both Brampton and Caledon have helped support Mississauga for years, it is time the reverse take place. The fall of Rome occurred when the decision was made to split into an East / West system. I see the same happening here. Let’s look at Toronto and how they coped with amalgamation? Not too well...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t want Mississauga to leave the Region of Peel. If this happens the Brampton residents’ tax rates will increase. It this happens no one else will want to move to Brampton. If my taxes increase significantly, I will be looking to move to a cheaper city to live outside of Brampton. Although the 2 tier system is not perfect, it keeps costs down and taxes are not affected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel it would complicate services such as policing, emergency services and even education. How would the public school board be changed? I feel there’s enough changes happening in education, we don’t need any more additional negative changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that efficiencies could be made, in terms of huge funding given to capital projects that are not vital and that more front line staff are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that the region was poorly designed in the beginning. There should have been two regions originally. The area south of the &quot;401&quot; highway should have been the Region of Mississauga, and the area north of the &quot;401&quot; highway (including Malton, Bramalea, Brampton, and Caledon ) should have been the Region of Peel. By using these boundaries, both The Region of Mississauga and The Region of Peel would have had an equitable industrial base area as well as easy access to the major highway in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I fully support merging all three municipalities into the city of Peel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hope that Peel is not torn apart. Now that Mississauga is fully developed it is her turn to help Brampton and Caledon to develop. Like we helped Mississauga. It's not fiscally responsible for Mississauga to separate from Peel simply because it will cost the residents more financially. Any changes to the Peel region is ill conceived.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just want to say that I have lived in Brampton for over 30 years now (redacted) I am happy to call Brampton my home! I like the way the city is taken care of by all who take care of her! It's always clean, any problems, electrical, flooding, snow storms, whatever comes our way is always taken care of quickly and efficiently! Just want to say to all those involved, thank you for your service! I see Mississauga is breaking from Brampton, maybe it's a good thing, I don’t know! But change is always around the corner, we always have to be ready to accept it or fight against it! Good luck to us all, have a nice day!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live in Caledon, the smallest of the three. I am worried that if the Region dissolves, Caledon will not be able to support itself. Also, a lot of tax dollars from Caledon residents helped Mississauga we expect the same in return.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1-1: Public Feedback from the Online Poll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I lived in Mississauga for 20+ years of my life before moving to Brampton and the city council there has always been horrible and selfish. I have never seen any benefit from anything that they did in the past and this is just a selfish move based on one thing only, money. They do no think things through and they do not realize that they will spending more money than they realize if they split. And more money brings more problems. The fact is I love being a part of the ‘peel’ region, one that works and helps each other and I think needs to remain together because we need each other. We are Canadians and we help each other, not be selfish and think only of ourselves (redacted).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I lived/worked in Mississauga for 20 years. Their push is very motivated by ego and politics, pushed by former Mayor McCallion. There was politics in the original 1867 creation of Peel County and during the 1974 amalgamation and creation of the Region. But common sense prevailed then. I hope it does again in 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really don't understand how having independently run cities can deliver any savings. Why would the provincial government consider a whole bunch of independent cities while they promote amalgamation at all other levels i.e. environment, child advocacy, health care? Secondly, I resent the implication from the Mississauga mayor that Brampton does not contribute enough to support the Region and somehow we are a drain. Brampton has not held back Mississauga....as a matter of fact, because so many people from Brampton work in Mississauga we bring scads of money into the shops and restaurants to support their economy. I also believe that this is another incident where Brampton is being pigeonholed as a second class city....Brampton City Council has to step up to the plate here. Strong leadership is required (redacted).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support almost anything that reduces the size, bureaucracy and cost of any governing bodies. I strongly object to anything that goes contrary to the above comment, or lessens or infringes upon my personal freedoms, or cost of living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support Brampton as its own City. However, I'm not sure how Caledon could afford to survive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think we need to go with the independent review and stick with the region, but find efficiencies to cut costs. I am concerned about all of the ins and outs, and mostly the large costs that will happen if things change. I think Mississauga is being selfish in trying to separate. Do we not pay higher property taxes than they do already? Also will our school board change? How many people in these three cities travel between to use services and work already, why do we need to separate? To line the pockets of Mississaugans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want Brampton to be its own standalone city because it is growing and has different needs than Mississauga or Caledon. However, I worry about the cost because insurance rates, property taxes and other costs are already higher in Brampton than neighbouring cities and I don't think it is fair that Brampton residents repeatedly have to pay more for everything. There are not a variety of job opportunities in Brampton either and I think that Bramptonians deserve a fair plan that can help our city be independent gradually so that Brampton residents don't get stuck paying for all of the costs to transition the city to independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to learn more about the implications of separating Brampton into its own city verses keeping the Region of Peel the same. I said Brampton should maintain its city status because I believe it would allow us to get this done quicker, but I do not understand all the cons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see one big municipality with one Mayor, all three municipalities merge as one and provide fair share to all three localities to stop the mismanagement of public funds and develop all three as Mississauga was developed with the help of all three.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1-1: Public Feedback from the Online Poll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would want to be sure that all three municipalities are receiving a</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent standard of service and that bureaucratic roles are not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being duplicated, but the region should consider the specific and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse needs of each region. The needs of Caledon and Brampton might</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be very different, so they may need different approaches, but for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instance, Caledon should not be neglected because it's smaller in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population and more rural. Money and resources should go towards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effective and needed government programs, including prevention-based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services like public health, and not towards duplicating work and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ineffective bureaucracy. The focus should be on providing services to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the public that are evidence based and compassionate. Services should</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be self-aware and accountable, especially police. The government should</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fund and prioritize community-based programs that focus on quality of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life, equality of opportunity, and prevention of poverty, health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems, and crime. Police should be given ongoing training and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information on de-escalation, mental health, disability, race, LGBTQ+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identities, women's rights, and sexual violence. Police should meet with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the community to discuss the community's grievances and ideas. Police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officers should be held accountable for excessive force and violation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of civil and human rights, and access to lawyers should be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prioritized for those they are questioning. Police should be retrained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on what they can and cannot do under the law while detaining or stopping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it ain't broke don't fix it. The system of operating within the</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region of Peel has served Brampton well and continues to do so. While</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is always room for improvement with any governing body,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissolving the Region of Peel is a mistake and Brampton should remain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within it along with Mississauga and Caledon.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Mississauga is allowed to split do we get compensated for prior</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tax investments on our behalf for Mississauga benefit? That would</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>include police, transit and subsidized housing units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Mississauga likes to part way from Brampton, Caledon then all the</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fixed, liquid and real estate assets including roads, snow and road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works equipment, real estates, city buildings, any tax revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generating public and private structures, parks and transportations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should be inventoried and appraised for their worth and should be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>divided among all parting away municipalities. City of Brampton had</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paid more than their fair share of taxes. All developments took place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during joint property tax base money allotted to peel region by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government was spent discriminately.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Mississauga wants to go on their own then they should pay for</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everything on their own. Their own separate police force and their own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water supply/charges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Mississauga wants to leave, let them. Why keep what's not wanted?</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If property Taxes can be reduced that set up will be the best.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Redacted) If I were a Metropolis, Modern city as Mississauga I would</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>want to separate from Brampton too Brampton is getting filthier &amp; no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flowers or roses are being planted by the city in greenspaces &amp; parks,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instead replaced by litter, the by-laws are not enforced residents were</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>given an xtra large garbage bin this is disgusting extra small only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should have been allowed and extra large blue recycle bins only for all,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so Brampton would become an Eco-Conscious city to compete with York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region, Markham,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the region is eliminated how will Brampton be compensated for the</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years we helped build out infrastructure in Mississauga?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we could govern our own city it would be a much better place to live.</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much more focus on us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1-1: Public Feedback from the Online Poll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101. If we separate make sure Mississauga pays all that is owed to Brampton at today's $$$ value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Implement a head tax property tax system so that homeowners won't have to pay even more property tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is clear that the &quot;review&quot; is based on political personalities and ideology instead of what is best for residents. An upper tier like the current Region of Peel is the best way to manage risk and costs among all residents. There should not be two separate transit systems in Peel; there should be one that serves at least Brampton and Mississauga, maybe offering limited service in Caledon (or somehow connected with GO maybe?). With the announced changes in OW and ODSP, we should definitely keep a regional approach and not download social services further to cities. If the focus is to be on getting people back to work, we need a broader, regional approach to employment, not a narrower one. Breaking up the Region would also be very problematic for the school boards. Generally, governments want to make school boards larger, not smaller, so what would happen to the school boards if the Region broke up? At best, bussing would be a disaster! At worst, it would break up one of the most progressive public school board in the province (if not the country) (redacted) I hope Mayor Brown will step up and fight for the region in spite of his personal issues with Premier Ford. Mayor Crombie should abandon her selfish approach to breaking away from there region, considering that Mississauga is not technically a city but an amalgamation of many small villages (Clarkson, Streetsville etc.) that wouldn't have been able to survive on their own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes no sense to split communities for cost savings alone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems the OMB has downloaded a disproportionate amount of residential development on Brampton, a blended Peel offers a fairer way to pay for all the services that are called for. On the governance side, each separate municipality makes most decisions based on their immediate appeal to voters, not on long term outcomes. Having attended a municipal council meeting in Brampton, I left with the impression that the councillors were more concerned with impressing their constituents than providing responsible governance. Having one administrative &amp; executive unit for Peel could be a very good thing if properly done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be interesting to see the cost projections for both merge VS stay options, not just for the next 10 years but for the next 30-40 years. I'm definitely for more integration of services, particularly public transit in the GTA, but recognize that some public services are better handled in decentralized manner, e.g. parks services, for improved local autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be nice to streamline services where possible and maintain separate ones where it is not. Also, taxes should not be charged unfairly to any city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be nice to be able to volunteer in regions other than the one we reside in, and to hold community memberships and library cards to cities other than the one we live in. Other cities could benefit from our service in the community and vice versa. I have tried volunteering at York region, but was denied because I live in Caledon. I also tried to rent out library material from Toronto, but was denied as I am not a resident of Toronto, so it would be nice to see more of a merge than a disconnect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's nice that we're having these inquiries. However, this is a decision of the provincial government. We know the Deloitte report is skewed and Mississauga/City Hall pushed for independence before speaking to their constituents. Regardless of the answer, please approach this more maturely and in-depth than Mississauga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix IV: Public Feedback from the Online Poll

| 110 | It’s proven that services are more efficient on a broader scale, I don’t want any tax increase and I say keep the region of Peel and look for improvement. |
| 111 | It’s time to move forward with building up Brampton. We are in desperate need to move forward with all the promises that have been made. |
| 112 | Keep Peel together. |
| 113 | Keep the current structure |
| 114 | Keep the Region intact. Why fix something that is not broken. Why not share resources such as water and police! The Mayor of Mississauga is following in the path of her predecessor. Perhaps she was hand-picked and groomed to lead Mississauga away. They need to contribute to the organization that helped them develop. The Brampton Mayor is talking sense. |
| 115 | Keep the region of peel. |
| 116 | Keeping Brampton, Caledon and Mississauga under one umbrella would be the ideal outcome. |
| 117 | Leave it the way it is! |
| 118 | Leave it the way it is. Streamlined is cheaper |
| 119 | Leave it the way it is. We will be stronger as a group |
| 120 | Leave the region as it is. I want all the numbers reported honestly.....Mississauga says it pays more than it should and I want to know why they say that! |
| 121 | Let’s hope someone can talk some sense into Doug Ford and to leave things as they are. A lot of jobs will be lost if there are changes to the Region of Peel. (redacted) |
| 122 | Lower our insurance in Brampton. For the amount we pay the city is not doing much about waste/garbage in the parks people parking on the street overnight crime etc. |
| 123 | Make Peel Metropolitan city. Attract more businesses. Give incentive to business to move from Toronto to here. |
| 124 | Making three cities into one under one region would help reduce cost and benefit from balanced residential and commercial growth...as well as prop tax. |
| 125 | Merge all 3 |
| 126 | Merge Fire |
| 127 | Merge into one mega city. |
| 128 | Merge the three municipalities to become a single-tier City |
| 129 | Merge them to bring efficiencies. One mayor, one transit network and all |
| 130 | Mississauga & Brampton are very diverse in demography... residents are to be heard rather councillors & mayor. Council does not represent current demography of both cities. |
| 131 | Mississauga and Brampton should amalgamate while Caledon joins Dufferin County. Peel Region government is dissolved and all regional services are transferred to amalgamated city to deliver. New councillor wards should be the same as provincial ridings (same as Toronto) which will reduce Mississauga councillors from 11 to 6 and Brampton from 10 to 5...1 mayor and 11 councillors resulting in annual savings of over $1 million. Factor in staff savings of at least over $2 million annually by reducing senior and middle management staff duplication. Plus efficiencies in transit and fire. No brainer. |
## 1-1: Public Feedback from the Online Poll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga has been supported financially by the other members of the municipality. They should not be allowed to remove themselves from the Region of Peel without supporting the growth and social services that are provided at a regional level in the same way they have received. This will also drive up the costs of living for Brampton residents simply to maintain what we already have. I do not support this move by Mississauga mayor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga should need to write a very large if they choose to leave unilaterally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga trying to separate from Peel Region is ludicrous. Brampton has helped them financially and the cities: Caledon, Brampton, and Mississauga are stronger together. Separation would mean higher costs per city and less community and cooperation across cities. In this world, we need to be coming together more as a community to help each other not trying to create more divide. The mayor of Mississauga is contemplating a selfish move that will benefit no one—not even their city!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga used a ton of Peel money to increase their infrastructure. It's not fair to dissolve the partnership until Brampton gets to do the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga's whining is ridiculous. We all look after each other equally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most important issue is that the services remain the same and taxes ideally don't go up or if they need to increase the increase is as low as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My selections stem from my belief that a more local government provides city planning decisions that are more tailored to local resident needs; the bigger the city/region, the more divided the decisions. But basic services (water, wastewater, police) for municipalities so closely situated and whose day-to-day citizen lives are so intertwined, you can't draw an imaginary barrier between them in terms of delivering basic services. That's why I believe one body should govern these basic services and this is reflected in my selections. I ask that whatever decision is made is done so responsibly, with the lives and well-being of the residents of these municipalities in mind, not one's political aspirations or favours to friends. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to consider legally and cost wise how all the assets of the Region of Peel including peel housing corporation and peel police (peel police does not own any of its buildings or vehicles) would be transferred among the three municipalities if they separated. What are the legal implications and triggers for sales tax and land transfer tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change is preferred, but if change is needed merging instead of separating is better for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No changes to the Region of Peel!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer Mississauga a one time buyout option equal to what Brampton put into their city to expand it. If we separate we need the capital to sustain us through the change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Brampton hospitals don't get &amp; have never received a fair % of healthcare budget &amp; that needs to change right away!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel Region appears to be working well, perhaps a reduction in the number of council members would be in order, with NO municipality have any more votes than the other. Structured more along the line of a corporation than another tier of gov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please do what's best for the residents of our growing municipality and don’t let party politics get in the way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix IV: Public Feedback from the Online Poll

| 148 | Please tell the Premier if he does the unthinkable to have a reasonable timeline to integrate services. Property tax is very high and auto insurance is very high. Not fair for average people. Political Corruption like third world country. |
| 150 | Question #4 did not give option of staying the same which is what we would support due to cost, etc. |
| 151 | Region of peel serve the purpose of all 3 cities, must not dissolve to benefit only Mississauga. The benefits and drawbacks are equal responsibility of all three cities. |
| 152 | Region of peel should stay as is. All is working well. Why fix it when it is not broken and at what cost to the taxpayers who are already heavily taxed. |
| 153 | Rural Brampton in the Greenbelt should annex to Halton Hills; we are more like Halton Hills as we are likely to never get urban services. Same for rural Caledon. Mayor Bonnie Crombie seems to distort the reality that Brampton only has a couple of corners yet to built out, hardly an unfair burden on Mississauga. |
| 154 | Separation is ridiculous, expensive and a nightmare. The region is barely surviving as is. |
| 155 | Shared services = shared expenses. There is no need to break up the region. |
| 156 | Should stay as it is |
| 157 | Someone needs to step up and deal with all the truck traffic on our roads. Rush hour traffic is horrendous with trucks tying up all lanes. There needs to be steady Ministry of Transportation on major veins around the city or allow police to act and pull over trucks that are clogging our city streets. |
| 158 | Splitting up from the Region of Peel is worth only if substantial reduction is there in costs and taxes compared to the existing. |
| 159 | Splitting up is ridiculous! We must work together because strength comes in numbers. |
| 160 | Stay as we are! There is no need to separate! This will cost us so much and waste the time of everyone. It is good the way it is. |
| 161 | Stay together |
| 162 | STAY. Please |
| 163 | Stop looking for excuses to raise our taxes to pay for your (redacted) luxury lifestyles |
| 164 | Streamline everything with one supercity. |
| 165 | The 3 cities are fairly small compared to Toronto and don't need to really divide services yet. But the OPP shouldn't need to be responsible for Caledon. |
| 166 | The assets that the Region currently holds were built with money contributed by all three cities. What will happen to these assets if the region is dissolved? |
| 167 | The Brampton Infrastructure would be at so risk that it is going to affect everything |
| 168 | The City of Brampton needs ownership over its own demographical data to guide targeted programming for its citizenry. The population’s health and well-being depends on it. |
| 169 | The current structure works well. No change is needed. Change for the sake of change is less than useless. |
## 1-1: Public Feedback from the Online Poll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The last thing this province and this community needs is a political shell game played with municipal services and change for its own sake. Work from the bottom up with service delivery, do the diligence to build a real business case, see if that's what needs doing. Otherwise, it's just political smoke and mirrors, and it will cost us far more than it saves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of service provided by the Region of Peel and the City of Brampton are sufficient and works well. Status quo is my preference. Why change something that is not broken? Mayor Brown promised no change to taxes to Bramptonians and that's how it should be. Amalgamation or merging to one big city will be a huge tax burden to the taxpayers. The money spent on studies that may or may not prove what the politicians want could have been spent on more pressing issues like healthcare or education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The plan should be to fully utilize our resources and minimize wastes. Costs should be kept down and taxes should be controlled or reduced. Ultimately, the residents pay those bills and we should think about the residents' wallets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Region of Peel functions in a responsible manner and should be left alone to continue its business with efficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Region of Peel is working well the way it is. Separating would greatly increase costs for all three municipalities, as well as introduce frustration and confusion. Please recognize the success that has been long established. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Region of Peel works well. Perhaps some minor tweaking to cut duplication in Public Works/Planning. Some services might be better if they were uploaded to Peel, such as transit and Fire/Emergency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The region of peel's governance should not be changed just because Mississauga council wants to separate. If Mississauga does succeed, it needs to reimburse Brampton for all the investments that peel made to Mississauga. It makes no sense for Mississauga to separate and then end up with two police boards, two utility boards etc when peel is the most efficient government in Canada. Kudos to Mayor Brown and Brampton Council for recognizing the value of maintaining the current structure and for standing up for Brampton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are other major issue to deal with. Stop wasting our hard earned money and utilize this making those region weapons free, and health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is (or should be) an efficiency to services delivered on a regional basis both from an economic standpoint as well as a geographic one. For example, Brampton is dependent on Lake Ontario in Mississauga for water and wastewater servicing. If Mississauga separated from the Region and/or Region was disbanded how would those services / costs work? Who would assume responsibility? Policing would become more complex if there were separate police forces as municipal boundaries are blurred when it comes to crime and law enforcement, particularly in urban areas. We should consider increasing efficiencies by delivering more services on a regional basis in the RoP municipalities where there are distinct inter-municipal functions, such as Transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is just no way savings would take place., (redacted) I assure you this would cost so much more than staying together. I look at our services and how intertwined everything is... To start all over? I simply cannot support separation. Each municipality helps one another and I truly believe that collaborating is key. Let's all work together for the greater good!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1-1: Public Feedback from the Online Poll

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>What we have now works. Why waste money on changing things for no reason.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>While a sense of identity is important for each city and cost will always be a large concern for most people, having equitable access to the same levels and quality of government services is the most important factor. If it is a single tier delivery of government services to the three areas, then equity and levels of services can be mandated, monitored, and delivered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>While I would prefer no change to the region of Peel, I support amalgamation over dissolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Why are we even trying to separate. We should all be together as one entity. It feels like we aren't a part of GTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Why is this even being reviewed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Why spend unnecessarily? No one gains from these mergers? People will stand to lose more than they realize if these regions separate. Pride goes before destruction!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Working class with families are already struggling to make ends meet. Don't make it more difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Worried about taxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>You left out the most obvious choice. Toronto is one sprawling city from Burlington to Ajax to Newmarket. Have the new &quot;Region of Toronto&quot; manage regional items like water, sewer, transit. Have local boroughs for Pickering, Toronto, Brampton, Mississauga, etc. Separate out Caledon because it is a rural, green belt municipality with different interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>You say three levels of govt. The region makes it 4 levels we need 1 city called Peel. We do not need concillors sitting on two councils. r elected chair for region. Or two diff .city r region looking after same road. Too much duplication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>You won't call me on this but I have a idea on project (redacted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix V: Public Feedback from the Town Hall (May 3, 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Feedback from the Town Hall (In Person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What happens to the school boards if region is dismantled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>We need to know the implications, advantages and disadvantages, before we can make the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mississauga has older infrastructure, such as old water pipes. Brampton’s pipes are newer. If we split and water delivery, Mississauga’s rates would go through the roof. Mississauga doesn’t have the money to pay Brampton back for costs associated with the split.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lived in Brampton for over 30 years. Regarding the Deloitte report... if Brampton was consulted, why are we doing another report?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No one talks about the fact that maybe it’s the constitution that is dated, by giving the province undisputed power over the municipal governments I wish someone has opened the door on the constitution, because the Province has too much power over the cities. We should stay as is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>How would taxes increase under the dissolution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>How long will it take for the changes to be implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A megacity would make our region influential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Brampton proud. Keeping Brampton distinct is important. Yes, there is duplication and efficiencies can be found, but identity of the City is important to maintain. Dissolution is respectfully silly, costs are too significant; if some want to split, they should pay the associated costs. It’s staying as is, or hybrid amalgamation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thank you for having this conversation. Think of the social services, affordable housing, taxes that will skyrocket. I wish the Premier took this into account. He said he was for the people, but it doesn’t seem like it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Brampton has high insurance rates. Will this change anything?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Half of Brampton’s population is female. There are lots of issue facing women, how will this turn out if we split?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Brampton is still vulnerable to the risks associated with merger. Similar to some areas of TO, while downtown benefits. I wonder if Miss wants to separate to stay away from ‘those’ people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Brampton is not receiving the needed supports from the province. We don’t want to go the US model. We should remain and improve the services we have. The University, health care... everything is done to us, not done by us. Need more education to connect ppl to resources Continue with ROP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Let’s merge and make a bigger/stronger City of Brampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Why is this decision being made now, not before the next municipal election?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Why is Miss wanting to leave now?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>There was an issue regarding the Deloitte report?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix V: Public Feedback from the Town Hall (May 3, 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can the Mayor explain the Deloitte Report. Why is the cost of amalgamation higher than the status quo?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What's going to happen to council if we split? Will we save money or will this cost us? Will the taxpayers have to pay for another election and if yes will the wards change?? ??</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If Brampton were to split from the region, how long would that take to implement?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Previous years we saw that Brampton's development is way behind then of Mississauga's development. If all 3 cities merge, to a single city, we predict that all 3 cities will get equal funds of development. Let's merge and make a biggest and strong city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mayor and team is doing Fantastic job with engaging the community. All the best</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How much would taxes increase for the average household in dissolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What is the average cost to a single household for 1 billion over 10 years?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Miss you flower city, you are the best!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Thankyou!!!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Very impressive that this is taking place on a Saturday. A hard working team lead by Mayor Patrick Brown working to involve the people of Brampton and Peel Region. As the Mayor said it's important for the people to be actively involved and informed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Why not we can make the whole of Region of Peel into a mega city of future? That will solve the cost of dissolution of Region of Peel. The overall cost of the mismanagement of Region of Peel (if any) will evaporate. There will not be any additional cost of Regional Councillors / Councillors in the region; plus the duplicity if administrative expenses among Region of Peel; &amp; three municipalities will be wiped out. How coolly Mayor can say that the cost of dissolution in billions will be passed over to households for next 10 years?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. If Mayor of Mississauga is so keen to separate the city from Peel Region; &amp; this cycle was the brain child of the then Mayor of Mississauga in 2003..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I have a simple question to ask the current council members of Region of Peel. How many times they have physically travelled to the new development projects in the cities and towns; other than their own city/town? If the whole council of Peel region is so divided; then why not bury the aspirations of Mayor of Mississauga; &amp; merge the whole of pPeel region with City of Toronto. That will end their personal bickering since and for all.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There is one option still available to save the anomaly. Why all the three Mayors of Brampton, Mississauga; &amp; Caledon can not sit together; &amp; Mississauga still remains part of The Region of Peel; if changes are made to address the inefficiencies and systematic issues?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. No one is big enough other than Provincial Government to take a stand Review of Region of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Efficiencies, economy; &amp; cost saving are the biggest striving factor by Ford Government in trusting out review of Regional administration among 9 municipalities in Ontario. There is nothing wrong by Ford Govt in seeking reforms &amp; Regional reviews of Government.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I appreciate this guy. He knows alot and is giving us alot of information! Thank you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. who will be making the ultimate decision when the City splits or stays, the people or the province?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Update to the Provincial Regional Government Review

Telephone Town Hall - April 24, 2019

To: Members of Council
Senior Leadership Team

From: Lowell Rubin-Vaughan
Manager, Government Relations & Public Policy

Re: Summary of the April 24, 2019 Regional Government Review Telephone Town Hall hosted by the City of Brampton.

Background

On April 24, 2019, from 7 to 8 pm, Mayor Patrick Brown hosted a Telephone Town Hall (TTH) to engage the community in a discussion on the current provincial regional government review. The Mayor was joined in-person by Regional Councillors Fortini and Vincente; Regional Councillor Santos participated via telephone.

The TTH focused on the future of Brampton and its position in the Region of Peel. The options discussed included:

- whether the City should split from the Region and become a standalone city;
- should the City merge with the other municipalities to become a bigger city; and
- should the City keep the current structure as is

The TTH is one of many ways the City is engaging the community to collect input on the current review. All information will be presented to Council for review and help shape the City’s formal response to the Province, due by May 21, 2019.

Current Situation

Participation

- 94,505, randomly selected, landlines and cell phone numbers, with a Brampton address plus an additional 14 individuals who registered through the City’s website were contacted (94,519 total)
- Out of the 94,519 calls, 30,125 were answered by individuals
- Out of answered calls, a total of 4,938 (16.39%) individuals joined the conversation at some point of time during the one-hour event
- Attendance peaked at 1,228 participants at one time
- An additional 60 audio users streamed the TTH online
Participants Questions/Comments

- 73 questions/comments were screened during the event and 32 of them were brought forward to the live audience
- 28 questions were left on voicemail after the TTH ended

Appendix I provides a list of questions screened during the one-hour TTH and questions/comments left on the voicemail after the TTH.

Polling during the Telephone Town Hall

- 5 polling questions were asked during the discussion.¹

Which of these Regional Governance outcomes do you support?

- Dissolve Peel Region - Brampton standalone
- Merge the 3 cities into a single-tier city
- No change to Peel Region

¹ The survey results should not be considered as a true random sample of the population.
Which of these parameters are most important to you?

- Cost: 47%
- Independence & Stronger Self Identity: 29%
- Streamlining Government Services: 18%
- Fair & Full Representation: 6%

Would you support the City of Brampton becoming a single-tier municipality, if this resulted in higher costs?

- Yes: 41%
- No: 32%
- Unsure: 28%
What is your preference for police services for the Region?

- 1 police board for all 3 municipalities: 83%
- 2 police boards, 1 for the bigger municipalities: 7%
- 3 police boards, 1 for each municipality: 10%

How many water utility boards do you prefer to service the Region?

- 1 water utility board for 3 municipalities: 93%
- 2 water utility board for 3 municipalities: 3%
- 3 water utility boards, 1 for each municipality: 3%
Upcoming and Ongoing Engagement Opportunities in Brampton

There are a number of ways for the public to engage with the City to provide their comments:

**Town Hall Meeting**
The City will be hosting an in-person Town Hall on Saturday, May 4, 2019 from 3 to 5 pm in Council Chambers. The event will be live streamed via Facebook.

**Informal Pulse Check**
Poll questions will be circulated to better understand resident’s views regarding the future of the Region of Peel. The questions will be similar to the TTH poll questions.

**Social Media**
Various social media channels are being leveraged (i.e. Twitter, Facebook) to reach Brampton’s residents.

**Online Feedback Form**
An online feedback form has been created on the City webpage and will serve as another opportunity for the public to voice their opinions on the regional government review.

**Website**
The City has a dedicated website for the provincial regional government review: http://www.brampton.ca/regionalgovernmentreview. The site is regularly updated and provides the public with up-to-date information, including opportunities to engage with the City. The site will be a common landing page for social media activity.

For more information

Lowell Rubin-Vaughan
Manager, Government Relations and Public Policy
lowell.rubinvaulhan@brampton.ca
905-874-5977
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### Appendix I: Public Feedback from the Telephone Town Hall and Post-Event Voicemail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50. What is the motivation to dissolve the region? I believe it will increase the taxes for all three of the cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. What is your position on making it all one city?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. What participated this meeting in the first place? What would happen if Missisauga succeeded in breaking up the region? What would our response be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. What will the Government be doing about the taxes being so high?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. What will this regional govt model cost me in taxes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. When did we become a region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Whether it’s valuable to Brampton to make this change. I don't think it is to make our own police force etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Which is better for Brampton?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Who is going to pay who will make the final decision on if we stay together as a region?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Whose idea is it to break up? I wonder if it would be good for me and my property taxes. I think we should stay the way we are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Why are house prices going down? Why are house insurance going up? Why don't we do anything about downtown which is terrible. And roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Why are we focusing on this decision? It is costly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Why are we leaving now? Would we have to pay more?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Why are we paying more taxes and insurance and will this increase in view of the regional govt. review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Why can't Peel Memorial be like a regular hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Why can’t we just come together as a whole?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Why do we not form a megacity &amp; amalgamate with Toronto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Why is the insurance in Brampton so high and what is the Mayor going to do about it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Why now are we talking separation and why not before I believe that we shouldn't change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Why should we separate the cities when we are supporting someone who can raise money for the City of Brampton and help Brampton?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Will our insurance rates be going up if we go with the bigger cities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Will taxes go up or down if we break away?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. With the Deloite report if the most favorable option is to maintain the status quo can we leverage the report to other cities to work it out?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Wouldn’t it be more of an advantage for us to be one big city?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1-2: Public Feedback from the Telephone Town Hall Post-Event Voicemails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Needs to see more details on benefits and details of all three options. If Brampton is going to split and there is a cost to it, what will it mean to taxpayers annually?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mississauga downtown is a mess of buildings, an eyesore. Brampton shouldn’t go the same route in building out the city. Best things about Brampton is green space and trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Agree with Mayor that Mississauga has benefitted from our transfer payments during their growth. Now it’s time for them to stand by us for our growth in this wonderful, vibrant, diverse city with educated people. If need be, we can take them to court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Quebec separation was a fiasco. Toronto amalgamation was also led to lot of people losing jobs. Not thought out well. We want to save money, yes we want to make it better but we also want to make it cost efficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>This discussion could have been more productive if we were given report regarding the feasibility study and more details on the options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Leave everything the way it is. Brampton has more parks, greenspace, festive lights and specialty stores. Too much rapid change like Mississauga leads to a high-density concrete jungle, traffic, crime etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>What is the situation now for Brampton? Why don’t we leave everything the same? That’s my opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Was interesting to learn about the different options. I wonder how would this effect our senior citizens?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I would like us to be one city – Brampton, Mississauga and Caledon. This way we can grow more if we get together, the three of us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No one has talked about if province decides Mississauga can separate, rather than compensation for money we’ve put in, that they can rent it from us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Why won’t the key disadvantages be put forth, as to what are the demerits of the choices?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>What do you have planned when Heart Lake separates from Brampton?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Divorce is quite expensive and a lot of people are hurting, so I think people should think about what they’re going to do before they make life changing decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Excellent forum tonight. Why are we soliciting input without the required data to make our comments? Bottom line is what is my tax bill this year? My son lives in Etobicoke and his tax is lower than mine here in Brampton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>When are we going to get newspaper for Brampton? Guardian will not come to our condo. We don’t get Brampton news.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Would like to meet Mayor in person to discuss City and where Brampton is going and business we are attracting. Big companies are in Toronto and Mississauga. What are our chances of boosting our economic growth? Also have concerns about schooling system. Appreciate a call back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Senior citizen, enjoys this town hall meeting. Wants to talk to Mayor in person. Mentioned disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Excellent town hall. Appreciates the opportunity to participated in the town hall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>What is City doing about curbing dandelions in parks as it blows over to neighbouring places?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Would you be doing about insurance rates? What is going on about property taxes and tax freeze?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Appreciates town hall, it is inclusive. Would like to continue to be on the list for such town hall opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1-2: Public Feedback from the Telephone Town Hall Post-Event Voicemails

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Thank you for including us in this meeting. Likes the tele town hall and thanks Mayor for opportunity to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>I didn’t get the call until 7:41 so I missed a lot of the discussion. Will it be repeated online so I can hear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I’m glad I took part in this conversation. Happy we have chosen the right Mayor who cares about citizens voices. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Is there a number where you can join the call next time or listen online?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I really liked the way the call is conducted. If this thing happens for issues like property tax increase or other type of important issue, I really like this type of involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Thank you for including me, it was quite interesting. This is a very good way of reaching constituents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Hello Mr Mayor, it was a wonderful and informative discussion tonight. I hope we have more like this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 2019-04-02

Subject: Update: Regional Government Review

Contact: Joseph Pittari, Acting Chief Administration Officer, joseph.pittari@brampton.ca, 905-874-5922.

Lowell Rubin-Vaughan, Manager, Government Relations and Public Policy, lowell.rubinvauughan@brampton.ca, 905-874-5977.

Recommendations:

1. That the report from Joseph Pittari, Acting Chief Administration Officer and Lowell Rubin-Vaughan, Manager, Government Relations and Public Policy, dated April 3, 2019, to the Committee of Council Meeting of April 17, 19, be received.

Overview:

- The Ontario government has launched its review of eight regional municipalities (Halton, York, Durham, Waterloo, Niagara, Peel, Muskoka District, and Oxford County), the County of Simcoe, and all lower-tier municipalities.

- The government is consulting directly with Ontario residents, and providing opportunities for everyone to have their say through various methods including in-person, written submissions and online survey.

- The City’s Senior Leadership Team (SLT) is executing a multi-staged, research, evaluation, and communication initiative to respond to the provincial government’s comprehensive review of regional government; including a financial analysis of various governance structures.

- The City is moving forward with Brampton specific public consultation opportunities to gather the community’s thoughts on regional government.
**Background:**

On January 15, 2019 the Ontario government began its expected review of eight regional municipalities (Halton, York, Durham, Waterloo, Niagara, Peel, Muskoka District, and Oxford County), the County of Simcoe, and all lower-tier municipalities.

The review is being led by Michael Fenn (former Deputy Minister and Chief Administration Officer) and Ken Seiling (former Chair of Waterloo Region). The advisors are responsible for delivering advice to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, based on their expertise and assessment of the feedback received through public consultation.

The overall objective of the review is to ensure the affected municipalities are:

- Working well and supporting the future economic prosperity of residents and businesses; and
- Working harder, smarter and more efficiently.

Recommendations from the special advisors will be submitted to the Minister by early Summer 2019. It is widely expected that the Government’s proposed direction could be timed around the 2019 Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) Annual Conference, August 18-21.

It is important for the City of Brampton to be prepared to address the direction the province ultimately proposes for the future of the Region of Peel and City of Brampton.

**Previous Regional Governance Advocacy**

The City of Brampton has long advocated for fair representation at the Region of Peel. This is consistent with findings from Justice Adams, commissioned in 2004 by the Premier. Justice Adams recommended full representation at the Region that included all Brampton Councillors. In preparation, Brampton reduced its own Council, from 17-11, 10 Councillors and a Mayor, with all 10 to serve on Regional and City Council, similar to the Mississauga Model.

This position was raised at the 2018 AMO Annual Conference, when the province began its “informal” consultation of regional governments. At that time, the City’s delegation met with the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, to provide the City Council endorsed position, specifically relating to full and fair representation.

As reported to Council, the Minister indicated that no decision has been made; and acknowledged there is not one single model that works for all affected municipalities. The relevant portion of the City’s briefing note to the Minister is included as Appendix I.
**Special Advisors Interviews with Peel Heads of Council**

On February 8, 2019, the special advisors individually interviewed the Regional Chair and Mayors of Brampton, Mississauga and Caledon. Guiding the discussion were three fundamental questions:

1. What reforms would you recommend to promote better representation and decision-making?
2. What reforms would you recommend to improve the quality and/or to reduce the cost and overlap of lower-tier and upper-tier municipal services?
3. Where do you see your upper-tier and lower-tier municipality ten years from now?

Representing the City of Brampton was the Mayor and Acting Chief Administration Officer.

**Current Provincial Consultation**

The government is currently consulting directly with Ontario residents, and providing opportunities for everyone to have their say through various methods. These Provincially-run public consultations will end May 21\(^{st}\).

1. **Meet the special advisors in person**
   Individuals and organizations had until April 9\(^{th}\) to submit a request to speak to the special advisors in person. The advisors will be at the Region of Peel on May 8, 2019 from 9:00 am – 4:00 pm.

   Although the deadline requesting a speaking opportunity occurred prior to the publication of this report, the City used its social media channels to promote the opportunity to Brampton residents and businesses.

2. **Send a written submission**
   The province is also accepting written submissions focusing on the three themes identified above. Any submissions over 500 words must be accompanied by an executive summary and highlight recommendations. Submissions can be sent by email to regionalgovreview@ontario.ca.

3. **Survey**
   The public can also help inform the regional government review by participating in an online survey at the following website: [https://www.ontario.ca/form/survey-regional-government-review](https://www.ontario.ca/form/survey-regional-government-review). The online survey closes May 21, 2019.

**Current Situation:**

Given the potential and far-reaching implications on residents and businesses, the City’s Senior Leadership Team (SLT) is executing a multi-staged, research, evaluation, and
communication initiative to respond to the provincial government’s comprehensive review of regional government. This includes monitoring and understanding the work that has already been publically released and reported on by the Region of Peel, City of Mississauga and Town of Caledon.

City of Brampton’s Approach for the Review

Guiding the City’s work to-date has been examining potential financial implications, through three likely governance structural models:

1. **Status Quo**
   Two-tier regional governance model in place with the Region of Peel, Cities of Brampton, Mississauga and Town of Caledon

2. **Two (2) Single-Tier Municipalities**
   The Region of Peel is dissolved and the Cities of Brampton and Mississauga each become a single-tier municipality, taking on current regional services. SLT is also examining current regional services that could be delivered either through a utility or service board.

3. **Amalgamation**
   Some configuration of bringing together the cities of Brampton, Mississauga and/or Town of Caledon.

The City is reviewing these potential governance structures to identify the most effective and efficient structural modal to ensure cost-effective service delivery through the following lenses:
- No reduction (or minimal reduction) in core services currently provided by the Region to Brampton residents and businesses;
- Ensuring no additional financial costs and/or finding cost saving opportunities; and
- Fairness to all affected municipalities.

SLT is currently reviewing all available financial information to analyze how the City can be best positioned when the province announces their decision for the Region of Peel. This is particularly important should the province choose to decide to dissolve the Region of Peel or enact some form of amalgamation. This full analysis will be part of a future report to Council.

Public Engagement

Concurrently with SLT’s financial analysis, the City is moving forward with Brampton specific public engagement opportunities. The following is a list of opportunities being planned over the course of the next several weeks:
Tele Town Hall
The City is tentatively coordinating a Tele Town Hall, hosted by the Mayor, for the evening of April 24, 2019. Once confirmed, all details will be shared with Council and community.

Town Hall
The City is in the beginning stages of planning an in-person Town Hall. Further details will be provided when available.

Informal Pulse Check
Poll questions will be developed to better understand resident’s views regarding the future of the Region of Peel.

Social Media
Various social media channels will be leveraged (i.e. Twitter, Facebook) to reach Brampton’s residents.

Online Feedback Form
An online feedback form has been created and will serve as another opportunity for the members of their public to voice their opinions on the regional government review.

Website
The City has dedicated website for the provincial regional government review: http://www.brampton.ca/regionalgovernmentreview. The site will be regularly updated and provide the public with the most up-to-date information, including opportunities to engage with the City. The site will be a common landing page for social media activity.

All information will be collected and reported to Council in a future report to Council.

Corporate Implications:

Financial Implications:
This report does not have any financial impacts to the City of Brampton at this time.

Strategic Plan:
This report achieves the Strategic Plan priorities of Good Government by proactively participating in the provincial regional government review, including engaging with the public.

Conclusion:
The current provincial regional government review could have significant impacts on the City of Brampton. The City will continue to monitor and proactively engage with the province over the coming weeks. Staff will report back to Council on the financial analysis and results of the public engagement.

Approved by:

__________________________
Joseph Pittari,
Acting Chief Administration Officer

Attachments:

Appendix I: City of Brampton's 2018 AMO Annual Conference Briefing Note to Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing

Report authored by: Lowell Rubin-Vaughan
Full & Fair Representation at the Region of Peel

Our Ask:
The Ministry of Municipal Affairs enact legislative changes, ahead of the 2022 municipal election, to create fair and equal representation for the City of Brampton at the Region of Peel.

What is the ideal regional governance structure for Brampton and the regional economy?
Brampton residents deserve full and fair representation at the Region of Peel (Region) that includes all 10 elected Councillors and the Mayor.
Currently, each Brampton Regional Councillor represents 98,939 residents at the Region, compared to Mississauga Councillors who each represent 72,159 residents.

Why is full and fair representation important for the regional economy?
- Brampton’s population growth has outpaced that of Mississauga and Caledon, reinforcing the need for increased representation for Brampton
- Brampton’s current population is nearly 600,000 and is anticipated to grow to 900,000 by 2041, making Brampton the second-fastest growing city in Canada.
- From 2011 to 2016, Brampton saw a net population increase of almost 70,000 people, a growth rate of 13.3%. Each day, 47 people relocate to Peel, 38 of those, move to Brampton.
- Equal representation is essential to reflect our current and future strong population and employment growth.
- Consider these facts:
  - Brampton’s location in the middle of the Innovation Super Corridor (between Waterloo to Toronto), will have a significant and positive impact on the Regional and Provincial economies
  - Brampton will soon open doors to a university that is a unique Centre for Innovation, a catalyst for more jobs, increased development and investment
Brampton has more than 800 health sector businesses and agencies. This is further strengthened as a significant health and life sciences cluster is taking shape around the new Peel Memorial Centre for Integrated Health and Wellness. More than $500 million has been invested in the 350,000 sq.ft. urgent care facility that is estimated to see more than 40,000 visitors annually. Businesses in this sector are recognizing the potential and investing in this growth opportunity.

Key highlights

- The Municipal Act’s requirement of a triple majority to change the composition of Council has prevented the residents of Brampton from having an equitable voice at Regional Government.
- Since 2003, many unsuccessful attempts have been made to seek full representation:
  - In 2003, Brampton took a bold step and reduced its own Council from 17 to 11 members, 10 Councillors and a Mayor, with 10 Wards to prepare for all members to serve on Regional and City Council, like the Mississauga model.
  - In 2004 Justice Adams was commissioned by the Premier to look at the issue of representation at the Region of Peel. Justice Adams recommended full representation at the Region that included all 10 Brampton Councillors.
    - Despite his recommendation, it did not receive majority support at Peel Regional Council
  - During the 2010–2014 term of Council, a regional Task Force was formed with the Regional Chair and Mayors, who discussed this issue for months.
    - There was no consensus among all three municipalities
  - In 2013, Brampton underwent a ward boundary review due to population growth, and to prepare for full representation at Regional Council.
  - In 2015 a third-party facilitator was retained to work with the Regional Chair and Mayors to do a full review of the existing governance model.
    - After a lengthy and vigorous review, the Region’s consultant indicated that Brampton’s proportion of the Region’s vote share was 29%, which warranted all 10 elected Brampton Councillors have a seat at Regional Council.
  - In 2017, Bill 68 did not go far enough to address disparity in regional representation and call for legislative changes in advance of the 2018 Municipal Election
To date, only six Councillors plus the Mayor sit on Regional Council. All of Mississauga’s Members of Council have been sitting on Regional Council for more than two decades.

Brampton is asking that the province initiate legislative changes to create a fair and equal representation at the Region of Peel Council. This will be a significant step towards empowering the regional economy to meet the current and future needs of population and employment growth.

INFORMATION CONTACT

Lowell Rubin-Vaughan,
Manager, Government Relations and Public Policy
T: 905.874.5977
lowell.rubinvaughan@brampton.ca
The purpose of this memo is to provide a breakdown of the costs related to the Deloitte Report that was prepared to provide the financial analysis of three service delivery models of governance.

**Breakdown of Costs Before Taxes:**

**Deloitte:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$243,529</td>
<td>Cost of report, which includes $3,409 cost to review the Mississauga report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,370</td>
<td>Costs to prepare for and attend the April 11, 2019 Regional Council meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$259,899</td>
<td><strong>Total Final Costs</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Watson:**

- $50,609 Final cost for the analysis related to Development Charges

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at ext. 4759 or Stephen.VanOfwegen@peelregion.ca

Yours,

Stephen VanOfwegen, CPA, CMA
Commissioner of Finance and Chief Financial Officer
Region of Peel
905-791-7800; ext 4759