

## **Special Information Request**

### **Regional Planning and Regionalization of services**



**By ICURR**

**November 2007**

## Table of Content

Table of Content .....	2
Introduction.....	3
Regional Planning .....	3
The Hanover city region .....	3
The Metro Vancouver.....	3
Portland .....	4
Other potential positive outcomes.....	5
Qualitative benefits.....	5
Competitiveness Issues.....	5
Regional service delivery.....	7
Economies of scale .....	7
Externalities (spillovers) .....	7
"Stronger together!" .....	7
The Montréal Agence métropolitaine de Transport (AMT) .....	8
Regional Districts in British Columbia.....	8
Other Empirical findings.....	9
Conclusion .....	10
References .....	11
Apendix 1: Canadian Metropolitan Areas: institutitional framework .....	12
Appendix 2: Planning arrangements in Canadian Metropolitan Areas.....	14

## Introduction

We often hear about the theoretical or expected benefits of regionalization: improved coordination; economies of scale; fewer spillovers; reduction of transaction costs, and so on. However, there are few studies that empirically confirm or infirm these propositions. This paper presents some of the findings of studies made on benefits and negative outcomes of public service regionalization and regional planning.

This short report is divided into two sections. The first treats the issues related to regional planning, while the second part is on the regionalization of services in terms of the actual delivery. Both sections present the expected outcomes of the regionalization and are supported by case studies and assessment of the regionalization process, mainly in Canada. Finally, as discussed, the appendix contains two charts that summarize planning arrangements in Canada's largest urban regions.

## Regional Planning

One of the main rationales in regard to regional planning is the fact that some issues can only be tackled on a regional scale. For example, "the environment can only be understood as a regional system" (Barnett, Jonathan, 2001, p. 14).

In the US, regional planning through metropolitan planning organizations is required in order to access federal funding. A 1960 act required, "as a condition attached to federal transportation financial assistance, that transportation projects in urbanized areas of 50,000 or more in population be based on a continuing, comprehensive, urban transportation planning process undertaken cooperatively by the states and local governments" (<http://www.ampo.org/content/index.php?pid=15>).

Regional planning is common in most European countries. If the motivations to do so are varied, objectives have typically been to articulate a more coherent spatial logic for land use regulation, resource protection and investments in regeneration and infrastructure. Regional plans are often complemented by strategic frameworks and visions for territorial development, with an emphasis on place qualities and the spatial impacts and integration of investments, complement and provide a context for specific development projects (Albrechts, Healey and Kunzmann, 2003).

## The Hanover city region

Based on a long tradition of regional frameworks and regional planning programs, the city region of Hanover is now equipped with a binding regional spatial plan. Among other things, the spatial framework and its "regional retail concept" determine the relative positions of centres within the city region and the locations of retail outlets, shopping centres and other big-box retailers. Along with other planning initiatives, such as the Region Hannover 2001 forum and the consensual regional development strategy, the spatial framework has induced better coordination among Hanover and the surrounding 20 local governments. It has also allowed for an intensification in cooperation within the wider region to improve regional transportation mobility and to agree on new greenfield developments while better controlling "out-of-town shopping developments" (Albrechts et al. p. 117).

Consequently, the "support of strong politicians and civil servants for a regional approach has meant that strategic concepts have been translated into regional land use plans, thereby guiding public and private investments to appropriate locations while conserving landscape and natural resources (Albrechts et al. p. 120).

## Metro Vancouver

Known until recently as the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD), [Metro Vancouver](#) was created in 1967 and is comprised of 21 municipalities and one electoral area. Metro Vancouver is responsible for the regional planning of the area and its planning document is called the Livable Region Strategic Plan.

An assessment of smart growth initiatives in Canada looked at the efficiency of the Livable Region Strategic Plan. The study looked at how the growth plan managed to contain the growth in the identified *Growth Concentration Area* (CGA). They found

that unlike what was initially thought: “the percentage of growth going into the CGA is essentially the same as the trend that obtained up through 1996, namely 65%” (Tomalty et al., p. 27). Findings concerning density targets were also disappointing and did not show major progress.

However, the study shows significant positive outcomes: significant residential intensification in the metropolitan core and in regional town centres; fairly significant investments in infrastructure improvements and interest in new approaches to stormwater management and green buildings and fairly robust protection of farmland and a continuing viable agricultural sector, among other things (Tomalty et al. p. 40).

## Portland

Portland has been characterized as the “capital of good planning” (Meyer and Provo, 2004, p. 9). Created in 1970 by vote, [Metro Portland](#) has a regionally elected government that covers 24 cities and portions of three counties, which is a territory smaller than the metropolitan statistical area. The Portland city region is known to be at the forefront of the smart growth movement and renowned for its pedestrian and transit friendly planning approach. Over the years, and especially in the 90’s, Metro Portland has designed and implemented a series of planning initiatives. The latest is Portland’s [2040 regional growth concept](#). In addition to its regional growth concept, Metro Portland is also responsible for the [regional transportation plan](#) has implemented several land use planning initiatives (Urban development plan, a transit oriented development (TOD) program, etc.).

The regional planning initiatives have yielded several tangible benefits. “Prior to the creation of the urban growth boundaries (UGB) [the state mandated part of the planning process], the total number of households that could be accommodated by the urban land supply was about 160,000. After adoption of the UGB, that same supply yielded about 310,000 potential new units. Further, the development of a more compact, efficient settlement pattern in combination with careful transportation planning has yielded rates of transit ridership that increased substantially faster than either “the overall population growth or the increase of vehicle miles traveled per capita” (Seltzer, 2004, p.54-55)<sup>1</sup>.

If urban sprawl has its costs, growth management is not free either. Numerous studies tried to demonstrate that UGBs are the reason for the rising housing prices in the region (Seltzer, 2004). However, none of them was able to determine that UGBs are the only factor, nor even one of the significant reasons why housing costs have risen. That being said, Seltzer (2004) thinks that UGBs imply that “traditional methods for supplying affordable housing—devaluing central cities and older suburbs while minimizing land costs everywhere—won’t be available here” (p. 57).

In addition to growth management and land use planning, Metro Portland also does transportation planning. Although not binding for local communities, the previous Portland transportation plan contributed to improve the coherence of transportation policies in the region as “all jurisdictions in the region have adopted or are about to adopt transportation system plans with goals and policies that support the [regional] plan...” (Adler and Dill, 2004, p. 242). “Despite the varying degrees of policy and program commitment to reducing reliance on the automobile, most plans do include detailed lists of pedestrian and bicycle improvement projects. These projects respond to the regional plan’s requirement for bikeways along arterials and major collectors” (Adler and Dill, 2004, p. 242).

In terms of congestion, using the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita as the main performance indicator, it shows that the implementation of the transportation plan contributed to reducing the use of cars since 1993. At the time, daily VMT in the metropolitan area was 20.3 and 21.6 miles per person in 1996. In 2000, the Highway Performance Monitoring System showed that the VMT was 20 miles per person, a 1.5% drop from 1993 and a 7.4% drop from 1996 (Adler and Dill, 2004, p. 250). However, another study from the Texas Transportation Institute showed that although people travel a shorter distance, they spend more time delayed in congestion. In 2000, Portland ranked 23<sup>rd</sup> nation wide in terms of congestion delay during peak periods (Adler and Dill, 2004, p. 251). That being said, part of the shortfall in terms of congestion can be attributed to the lack of funding for some

---

<sup>1</sup> In fact, studies by the Federal Highway Administration has shown that vehicle miles traveled per capita registered a slight decline which is the opposite trend observed in comparable metropolitan areas (Metro, 2003 in Seltzer, 2004).

planned projects as the state of Oregon is not willing to increase the gas tax and does not have a sales tax to fund regional transportation projects like many other US metropolitan areas.

In part due to its planning experience, the city region of Portland ranks high in a series of quality of life indicators. For example, the American Podiatric Medical Association ranks Portland among “the nation’s best cities for those who love to walk” (Mayer and Provo, 2004, p. 10). The Portland plan also helped maintain the cost of living at an acceptable level as in 2003, Portland was still one of the West Coast’s least expensive cities (Portland Development Commission, 2003 in Mayer and Provo, 2004).

In terms of more qualitative benefits, Portland was ranked in 8<sup>th</sup> position in a Harris poll, as a place where most people want to live in the US in 2003. Money magazine ranked Portland in second place – only to New York City – as the best place to live in the US (Meyer and Provo, 2004, p. 10).

### **Other potential positive outcomes**

In addition to the benefits mentioned above, other studies have mentioned additional positive outcomes, mainly in terms of qualitative benefits and raised the whole competitiveness issue in relation to regional planning.

### **Qualitative benefits**

Albrechts et al. mention in the context of government-led strategic interventions at the urban and regional level: “Such efforts build on Europe’s “strong state” traditions, particularly in the welfare states of the North West as well as enduring political-cultural associations with city and region. This capacity is now being used in new ways to reposition cities and regions in the expanding economic and political landscape of the European Union (EU) and of globalizing economic relations” (Albrechts et al. 2003, p. 114).

### **Competitiveness Issues**

More and more, governance efficiency is cited as a factor of competitiveness for urban regions. Several international organizations and indexes spend a great deal of time looking at governance issues and their impact on competitiveness. The OECD for once, when assessing territorial competitiveness at every scale, considered governance as an important factor (OECD, 2004 and 2006).

*A widely cited case for measuring competitiveness is the measurement by the International Institute for Management Development (IMD), which measures competitiveness in four major categories: economic performance, government efficiency, business efficiency and infrastructure. These four major categories can be further sub-divided into more specific measures covering a comprehensive set of perspectives in national growth. Although employed at the national level, these measures apply to regional economies as well (OECD, 2006, p.55).*

The regional planning process is also important in the quest for attractiveness and competitiveness. “The experience of the most successful metro-regions suggests that a number of key themes need to be addressed by strategic visions” (OECD, 2006, p. 104). For example the elaboration of a regional strategic vision includes the diagnostic of the strength and weaknesses of the region. After that, regional leaders can develop values and targets that will reflect the competitive advantages of the regions. Once this is done, all other regional and local policies and plans should reflect the strategic orientations chosen in the strategic vision document. This type of approach is often used in European and North American city regions. It is also mandatory for *communautés métropolitaines* in Québec and in both cases, it was their first strategic document produced (*Act respecting the Communauté métropolitaine de Montréal*).

*It is important that public authorities take note of what activities flourish already in their region, and what seem, on the basis of evidence elsewhere, to be new activities that should be able to prosper. In this process widespread participation by a range of stakeholders will help ensure both an extensive contribution of ideas and perspectives, and subsequent commitment to the vision achieved. Strategic visions must also be capable*

*of changing and responding to new challenges. This is more easily achieved if it is well understood from the outset that the vision is a permanently developing process and not something established at one point in time (OECD, 2006, p. 103).*

Then, sectoral policies and strategies can be tied to regional strategic planning. For example, several regions are now equipped with cluster-based economic development strategies<sup>2</sup> that are tied to regional strategic visions and land use plans. With the emphasized role of transit as a factor of competitiveness, transportation plans also become increasingly tied to other regional strategic planning exercises.

---

<sup>2</sup> For more information on cluster-based strategies, see Porter (1998) and Communautés métropolitaines de Montréal, 2007.

## Regional service delivery

Regionalization of service also comes with expected positive outcomes. Whether they actually become reality depends on several factors, including how reforms were drafted and other contextual considerations. First we'll look into some of the more often used arguments in favor of regionalization, mainly in terms of efficiency and then look at actual assessment of regionalization experiments.

### Economies of scale

One of the rationales often mentioned in regard to regional service delivery or merger of certain public services is the quest for economies of scale, translated by lower per capita expenditures. Feiock (2007) describes economies of scale as savings that occur when "average cost declines as output increases" (p. 49). Fragmented governments are constrained by their size if there are not enough citizen consumers in a jurisdiction to produce a service at a minimum cost. For this reason, economies of scale are often cited as the impetus for interlocal agreements (Bish, 2000; Sandler, 1992; ICMA, 1997 cited in Feiock, 2007, p. 49).

Interlocal cooperation can be the product of efficiency-enhancing efforts of local officials seeking economies of scale in production, especially in the case of capital-intensive goods (Post, 2002 in Feiock, 2007, p. 49).

However, there are some conflicting results found in research on the topic of economies of scale. Econometric evidence finds that for most public services, economies of scale are exhausted at relatively low population levels (Bish, 2001 in OECD, 2004, p. 100). Above 150 000 inhabitants, per unit cost for most services appears to remain constant. Some studies even suggest that large cities show diseconomies of scale, but this seems to be the result of structural factors (density or age of a city) rather than of institutional organization. On the same topic, after the 1998 merger, the City of Toronto claimed annual savings of \$135 million (Kitchen, 2003) but this is contested by another study (Askin et al, 2003 in OECD, 2004).

### Externalities (spillovers)

Another argument that is often mentioned is the need to take into consideration externalities. Spillovers or externalities can be both positive (water management, pollution reduction, etc.) or negative (incompatible land uses, storm water flooding, etc.). Hence, since they are sensitive to the scale at which a service is provided (local, regional, supra-regional, etc.) both types of externalities are incentives to interlocal collaboration. "In theory, consolidation, overlapping districts or higher level government intervention solves scale and externality problems, yet their larger scale reduces local control, creates allocation inefficiencies, and increases coordination costs (Brierly, 2004 in Feiock 2007, p. 49-50).

Regionalization of services can also reduce fiscal spillovers (OECD, 2004). Services undertaken by a central city can benefit to other residents of the region, without them having to support the costs. Examples of such services are transit (metro) and other assets, such as museums, parks, etc. By implementing a regional authority to undertake these functions, hence expending the number of local units contributing to certain services, it permits to internalize territorial spillovers.

### "Stronger together!"

The regionalization of services can certainly reduce overlaps and competitions among local jurisdictions. Also, the creation of a regional structure offers the opportunity to tackle certain issues, for which local municipalities, do not have the capacity to deal with on their own. Cost-extensive infrastructures in one of them. By getting together, municipalities are better able to plan and share the cost of infrastructures. It's especially important considering that quality infrastructures is another key factor of competitiveness.

*There is considerable evidence that a good and attractive environment, including well-performing urban infrastructure, is not an alternative to metropolitan economic success but in fact fundamental to its continuation (OECD, 2006, p. 137).*

Comment [RC1]: We need a rewrite as this is unclear

Finally, the metropolitan model also holds out the promise of increasing the political power of the metropolitan region, vis-à-vis the central government and internationally. “For instance, since its creation, the Stuttgart Regional Association has been able to activate subsidies for regional development projects totaling EUR 155 million (Walter-Rogg, 2006 in OECD, 2006)”.

Now, thorough reviews and assessments of actual Canadian regionalization experiments have been made in the last few years. They address the issues mentioned above and go further and evaluate if the region benefited from the expected positive outcomes of the regionalization of services. The next sections summarize the assessment of the implementation of the Agence métropolitaine de Montréal made by the Québec government and the regional districts in BC made by Professor Robert Bish.

### **The Montréal Agence métropolitaine de Transport (AMT)**

The Agence métropolitaine de Transport (AMT) is the transit agency for the Montréal metropolitan area. It was created in 1996 by the provincial government is directed by a board comprised of both local elected officials and government appointees. Its mandate is to operate the region's commuter trains, plan and fund regional transit. The AMT receives the provincial special 1 cent gas tax collected within its territory by the provincial government as well as the additional vehicle registration fees. The AMT redistributes a large part of it to local transit operators through a complex formula explained in the previous document.

Interestingly, a provision in the AMT's act is that the provincial government had to proceed to an evaluation or assessment of the agency after three years (Act respecting the AMT, s. 172)<sup>3</sup>. The evaluation was made in 1999 and lists what the government thinks are the positive outcomes of the regional transit agency's creation.

First of all, the government mentioned that by taking over reserved lanes and terminals used by more than one transit operator, the AMT put a stop to the existing conflicts among local operators. The AMT also took over the responsibility of commuter parking lots, which local municipalities weren't interested in due to the fact that they mainly serve out-of-town users. Also, the creation of the AMT and its funding mechanism allowed for better equity within the region as the Société de transport de Montréal is now compensated by other jurisdictions for the out-of-town residents using the subway. In addition, the AMT implemented enhanced specialized transportation services that allow user to travel within the metropolitan region. Before the AMT, there was a lack of coordination among transit operators and the regional service was not offered (Ministère des Affaires municipales et de la Métropole, 1999).

The government noted a series of other benefits. The government acknowledged the fact that the creation of the AMT permitted the implementation of metropolitan-wide cost and revenue sharing mechanisms. Before the AMT, there were certain separate initiatives such as municipal contributions to a metropolitan capital fund, but the framework was lacking for enhanced cost and revenue sharing. In terms of services, the creation of a metropolitan agency improved the quality of services provided to residents, especially for commuter trains as there was no other transit operator with the capacity to cover such a wide territory.

### **Regional Districts in British Columbia**

In 1999, Robert Bish wrote a review of the regional districts in British Columbia based on questionnaires sent to regional district administrators as part of a consultation process between the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and the Union of British Columbia Municipalities.

Bish notes that regional districts compare “very favourably with local government systems elsewhere in North America. Regional districts do provide for inexpensive basic rural government, a political and administrative framework for inter-municipal cooperation and regional governance. The opportunity to enter into inter-municipal cooperation easily and participate in regional governance also permits small

---

<sup>3</sup> The multi-purpose metropolitan agencies (communautés métropolitaines in Québec and Montréal) have similar provisions in their respective acts. However, their evaluations or appraisals are not publicly available information.

municipalities with their very high levels of voter turnout and citizen participation to function efficiently" (1999, p. 3).

Bish also notes that B.C.'s regional district system overcomes the shortfalls associated with single-tier municipal systems as well as those resulting from larger amalgamated local governments.

*A major problem in any single-tier system is adjusting to the diverse nature of local services. In single-tier systems comprised of smaller local governments, the issue is to what degree they can develop intergovernmental agreements to undertake activities, which benefit from being performed at a larger scale. The issue in larger amalgamated governments is whether costs can be contained and smaller community interests accommodated within the larger government (Bish, 1999).*

"One of the most difficult problems for metropolitan governance is to determine institutional arrangements and boundaries for different public goods and services that are preferred by different publics or possess different production characteristics" (Bish, 2002, p.1). That is one of the main advantages of the BC model compared to others existing models in Canada is the flexibility in terms of whether a municipality can choose to deliver some services itself or choose the inter-municipal cooperation option. Considering the fact that, for example, wastewater could be a more efficiently delivered at a certain scale, while the most efficient scale for police services may be different. Consequently, in BC, the most efficient option for any given local service is always at the discretion of local administrators.

Also, as it is the case with all formalized regional structures, regional districts provide a more efficient approach, at least in terms of transaction and administrative costs. Regional structures usually provide a "political forum that reduces the cost of negotiating" because there are defined decision making processes and voting rules in place. Also, as is the case in metropolitan agencies in Québec, financing rules and formulas for services are established (Bish, 1999). Of course, participants have to agree that those financing rules are fair to begin with.

However, the system is not perfect. Questionnaires sent to local administrators showed that there is a major problem associated with the model. Local municipalities may find that there is a miss-match between "who voted, who benefited and who paid" for the service. Consequently, exit disputes may occur because a municipality or an electoral area may think that costs exceed benefits or others may exit or refuse to enter because they feel that they would not get sufficient votes for the cost that they are paying (Bish, 1999).

### **Other Empirical findings**

This section summarizes other cases studies made on the regionalization of certain services. They were mainly interested in verifying the manifestation of economies of scale stemming from the consolidation of services. As you will see, the results are not very convincing.

For sewer and fire protection in California, Krohm (1973) found that district provision of fire services cost more than municipal provision. However, he noticed no significant cost difference for sewer services between district and municipal provision. So, according to him, providing the service through regional districts was inefficient since municipalities were able to deliver the service at a lower cost. Krohm speculated in the sewer case that functional expertise might account for lower costs associated with special-purpose district service.

Chicoine and Walzer (1985) noted a significant positive relationship between the number of districts and local governments' level of expenditures for library, parks and recreation. However, they came to the conclusion that there was an insignificant relationship between the number of districts per capita and the level of expenditures. Their study was realized in the 101 Illinois counties with data from 1977. What that means is that the more regional districts there are, the more local governments tend to spend on library, parks and recreation. On the other hand, they couldn't confirm that the number of districts per capita tended to increase the level of expenditures in Illinois. Although their study tends to show that regional districts were less efficient than counties or municipalities when it comes to library, parks and recreation, it did not take into account the level of services provided (quality).

Finally, in 1988, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) studied the fire services in the St. Louis metropolitan areas and found no evidence of potential economies of scale. The St. Louis area is characterized by a number of small fire protection units and the study came to the conclusion that a regionalization of fire services would not be cost-efficient (Foster, 1997, p. 76).

## **Conclusion**

The benefits of regionalization have been studied quite a bit over the last few years in the context of the increased importance given to city regions in terms of competitiveness and their role as economic engines. International organizations, academics and governments have been looking for keys to improve the competitiveness and attractiveness of metropolitan regions and regionalization as part of the whole governance issue is certainly considered as an important factor of competitiveness.

If some expected benefits stemming from regionalization such as economies of scale are hard to assess and even more difficult to prove, other like the improved coordination of policies – especially with the creation of a multi-purpose structure—are evident. Then again, a lot of the successes or failures of these consolidation experiments depend on how reforms are designed. For example, the Québec Act imposing the amalgamation of the province's main agglomerations contained certain provisions that made the realization economies of scale practically impossible. The main obstacle was that the act stipulated that no municipal employee of any merged municipality could see his salary diminished. Cities had to put the salaries of employees with similar positions on par with the highest salary paid for a given position in the former municipalities. Consequently, amalgamations induced a growth in municipal wages. So, because of that fact, the assessment of the reform's efficiency would not tell the complete story.

As for regional planning, it has been identified as an important factor of region's cohesiveness and competitiveness. Regional strategic vision - which can be separate from the growth planning process, like in the case of the Communauté métropolitaine de Montréal - or included in it, provide an opportunity to make a diagnostic of the region's strength and weaknesses. It also serves as a reference for all other plans and policies in the region. Studies realized by the OECD tend to prove that such process has a positive impact on city regions' competitiveness.

## References

- ADLER, Sy and Jennifer DILL, "The Evolution of Transportation Planning in the Portland Metropolitan Area", *The Portland Edge. Challenges and Successes in Growing Communities*. Portland, Portland State University Press, p. 230-256.
- ALBRECHTS, Louise, Patsy HEALEY and Klaus R. KUNZMANN, 2003, "Strategic Spatial Planning and Regional Governance in Europe", *American Planning Journal*, Spring 2003, vol. 69 (2), p. 113-129.
- BISH, Robert L., 1999, *Regional District Review – 1999: Issues and Interjurisdictional Comparisons*, Victoria, University of Victoria, School of Public Administration, 44 p. [http://web.uvic.ca/padm/cpss/lgi/pdfs/bbish/reg\\_dstrc\\_rev.pdf](http://web.uvic.ca/padm/cpss/lgi/pdfs/bbish/reg_dstrc_rev.pdf)
- BISH, Robert L., 2002, Accomodating Multiple Boundaries for Local Services: British Columbia's Local Governance System, University of Victoria, Presented at a colloquium at the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana University, Bloomington, on October 21, 2002, 20 p. [http://web.uvic.ca/padm/cpss/lgi/pdfs/bbish/bish\\_indiana\\_u\\_2002.pdf](http://web.uvic.ca/padm/cpss/lgi/pdfs/bbish/bish_indiana_u_2002.pdf)
- COLLIN, Jean-Pierre, Sandra BREUX and Mathieu RIVARD, 2007, «Metropolitanization and the Re-scaling of Metropolitan Public Policies in Canada : Strategic Planning in Medium-Size City-Regions», In Jean-Pierre COLLIN and Mélanie ROBERTSON (dir.), *Governing Metropolises : Profiles of Issues and Experiments on Four Continents*, Québec, Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Communauté métropolitaine de Montréal, 2003, *Charting our international future : Building a competitive, attractive, interdependent and responsible community. Strategic Vision Statement*, [http://www.cmm.qc.ca/fileadmin/user\\_upload/documents/vision2025\\_enonce\\_en.pdf](http://www.cmm.qc.ca/fileadmin/user_upload/documents/vision2025_enonce_en.pdf)
- Communauté métropolitaine de Montréal, 2007, *Regional Development Through the lens of clusters. The case of Greater Montréal*, presented by Yves Charette at the Clunet working group, Montréal. [http://www.cmm.qc.ca/UserFiles/File/Regional\\_development\\_through\\_lens\\_clusters.pdf](http://www.cmm.qc.ca/UserFiles/File/Regional_development_through_lens_clusters.pdf)
- FEIOCK, Richard, 2007, "Rational Choice and Regional Governance", *Journal of Urban Affairs*, vol. 29 (1), p. 47-63.
- FOSTER, Kathryn A., 1997, *The political Economy of Single-Purpose Government*, Washington, DC, Georgetown University Press, 269 p.
- Governing Toronto Advisory Panel, 2005, *The City We Want – The Government We Need. Report of the Toronto Advisory Panel*, Toronto, 52 p.
- MEYER, Heike and John PROVO, 2004, "The Portland Edge in Context", in Connie P. OZAWA (ed.), *The Portland Edge. Challenges and Successes in Growing Communities*. Portland, Portland State University Press, p. 9-34.
- Ministère des Affaires municipales et de la Métropole, 1999, *Évaluation de la Loi sur l'Agence métropolitaine de Transport*, Québec, 55 p.
- Ministry of Community Services, 2006, *Primer on Regional Districts in British Columbia*, 13 p. [http://www.cserv.gov.bc.ca/lgd/gov\\_structure/library/Primer\\_on\\_Regional\\_Districts\\_in\\_BC.pdf](http://www.cserv.gov.bc.ca/lgd/gov_structure/library/Primer_on_Regional_Districts_in_BC.pdf)
- OECD, 2004, *OECD Territorial Reviews. Montréal, Canada*, Paris, 176 p.
- OECD, 2006, *OECD Territorial Reviews, Competitive Cities in the Global Economy*, Paris, 450 p.
- PORTER, Michael, 1998, "Clusters and the New Economics of Competition", *Harvard Business Review*, Nov.-Dec. 17 p.
- SELTZER, Ethan, "It's Not an Experiment: Regional Planning at Metro, 1990 to the present", *The Portland Edge. Challenges and Successes in Growing Communities*. Portland, Portland State University Press, p. 35-60.
- Intergovernmental Committee on Urban and Regional Research (ICURR)* 11  
*Comité intergouvernemental de recherches urbaines et régionales (CIRUR)*

## Appendix 1: Canadian Metropolitan Areas: *institutional* framework

Metropolitan Areas	Recent Institutional Reform	Existing Metropolitan Authorities	Specific Metropolitan Bodies	Particular Issues	Sectoral Metropolitan Agencies	Provincial Governments' Initiatives
<b>Winnipeg</b>	New Charter of the City of Winnipeg (2002)	Unicity model since 1972.	<i>Winnipeg Capital Region</i> that includes the Cities of Winnipeg and Selkirk as well as 14 rural municipalities.	Tripartite agreement (Federal-Provincial-Municipal).	<i>Capital Region Partnership</i> : Partnership of local municipalities that share concerns in spatial planning, economic development and environmental protection issues	<i>Regional Planning Advisory Committee</i> (2001): <i>growth management planning</i> . <i>Capital Region Partnership Act</i> (2005): The Act will give the Capital region's 16 municipality partnership a legal recognition.
<b>Québec City</b>	Municipal mergers and metropolitan body (2002).	Communauté métropolitaine de Québec (2002): "light" planning and coordinating agency. Combined with the Unicity model: Twin cities.	Commission of the Capitale nationale du Québec. A territory larger than the CMA.			
<b>Ottawa-Gatineau</b>	Municipal mergers in the Ontario part of the CMA (Ottawa, 2000) and on Quebec side (Gatineau, 2002).	Unicity model: Twin cities.	<i>National Capital Commission</i> is the only agency with a mission and a master plan to address land-use planning, tourism and the region's natural environment.	The only CMA covering parts of two provinces. Challenge of trans-border governance Gatineau VS Ottawa.	<i>TRANS Committee</i> . Joint Committee established to co-ordinate transportation planning activities in the National Capital Region (federal).	
<b>Saskatoon</b>			The City of Saskatoon is completely embedded in the Municipality of Corman Park.		Metropolitan Authority responsible for promoting economic development	
<b>Windsor</b>	Reorganization of Essex County, that included municipal mergers (1992)	Model consisting in the cohabitation of diverse territorial structures. The main ones being the City of Windsor and Essex County.		Trans-border governance: Windsor VS Detroit which entails special concern for transportation issues.	Environmental concerns are addressed through a joint partnership between the City and the County: The <i>Windsor Essex County Environment Committee</i> (WECEC).	
<b>Victoria</b>		<i>Capital Regional District</i> (1967): Multisectoral planning agency that also manages some public services. Its scope of intervention is slightly larger than the CMA's.				

**Canadian Metropolitan Areas institutional framework (continued)**

Metropolitan Areas	Recent Institutional Reform	Existing Metropolitan Authorities	Specific Metropolitan Bodies	Particular Issues	Sectoral Metropolitan Agencies	Provincial Governments' Initiatives
<b>Halifax</b>	Municipal mergers (1996)	Unicity Model. Halifax Regional Municipality. Every task of municipal or local scope is handled by the HRM.			<i>Greater Halifax Partnership</i> is responsible for promoting economic development but does not have any planning duty.	
<b>London</b>	Municipal mergers in the Central City (1992) and in the surrounding counties (1998 and 2001).	Model consisting in the cohabitation of diverse territorial structures. One Central city and two counties.			Economic Development Strategy for the London region.	
<b>Montréal</b>	Municipal amalgamations in 2000 and de-merger of 15 municipalities in 2005. Creation of a Conseil d'agglomération	Communauté métropolitaine de Montréal (multi-purpose agency) and	Agence métropolitaine de Transport (transit planning authority)		Montréal International, tripartite partnership responsible for international economic development promotion.	
<b>Toronto</b>	Municipal amalgamation in 1998 of 7 municipalities, New Toronto City Act, 2007			The Toronto summit Alliance, involved in competitiveness related issues	Greater Toronto Marketing Alliance, a p3 initiative, Greater Toronto Transportation Authority (regional transportation authority), Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (manage regional natural resources)	<i>Places to Grow</i> , a growth management plan for the Greater golden horseshoe region
<b>Vancouver</b>		The Metro Vancouver (formerly Greater Vancouver Regional District)	Translink (transportation authority)			

## Appendix 2: Planning arrangements in Canadian Metropolitan Areas

Metropolitan areas	Strategic Vision Documents	Municipal Management Plans and Regional Plans	Public Involvement	Other Strategic Planning Initiatives	Infra-municipal Bodies
Winnipeg		<i>Plan Winnipeg Vision 2020:</i> It is also the City of Winnipeg's strategic vision (2001). The document focuses on municipal activities and "quality of life" topics		<i>Next Steps:</i> Manitoba's action plan put forward the basis for a then forthcoming regional plan (2001). The provincial government establishes itself as the main planning authority	
Québec City	<i>Bâtir ensemble une communauté plus forte</i> (Communauté métropolitaine de Québec)	<i>Une vision pour Québec: L'avenir maintenant! Québec City's strategic plan</i> (2004-2008).	Metropolitan forum of elected officials and Public consultation process in which 194 citizens participated. 71 position papers from organizations and 8 position papers from individuals were presented.	<i>Consolider la capitale du Québec : Land use and development objectives of the Commission de la capitale nationale.</i>	Québec City's boroughs also have land use planning and zoning functions
Ottawa-Gatineau	<i>Ottawa 20/20</i>	The Ottawa Official Plan sets out the city's physical development framework	Result of public consultation process led by Ottawa officials... Inspired by the Smart Growth concept and by its application to the specific context of the City of Ottawa. ( <i>Smart Growth Summit</i> held June 14-18, 2001)	National Capital Commission Plan (1999).	
	<i>Plan stratégique 2003-2007</i>	The strategic directions would be implemented by the different City Departments through the <i>Plan municipal d'activités</i> (Municipal action plan)	<i>Commission des choix stratégiques</i> formed by three elected officials, six citizen representatives, and two city employees. The Commission played a major role in the co-ordination of various public participation events throughout the process. The Commission was also responsible for summarizing the workshop discussions. The Commission also put forward different initiatives to stimulate public involvement and the participation of different organizations throughout the process.		"Villages urbains" (16) whose sizes range from 10,000 to 40,000 inhabitants. Acknowledgement of the urban villages will help generate a feeling of belonging to the new merged city
Saskatoon	<i>Saskatoon Strategic Plan</i>	Framework for the more precise <i>Corporate Business Plan</i>			Instigate the involvement of community actors through, among other things, <i>Local Area Plans</i> (LAP).

**Planning arrangements in Canadian Metropolitan Areas (continued)**

Metropolitan areas	Strategic Vision Documents	Municipal Management Plans and Regional Plans	Public Involvement	Other Strategic Planning Initiatives	Infra-municipal Bodies
<b>Windsor</b>	<i>Our Vision: Our Future, the City of Windsor Community Strategic Plan</i>	Address city-wide policy matters: Windsor Official Plan. Supplemented by a series of objectives related to local service delivery efficiency.	The Community Vision is the result of a public consultation process (more than 2 500 individuals and groups were involved).		
<b>Victoria</b>	<i>Regional Growth Strategy: Spatial plan</i>				
<b>Halifax</b>	<i>HRM 20/20: Visions and Values</i>	<i>HRM's Regional Plan</i> which, throughout the next 25 years, will guide its physical development in a way that promotes healthy, vibrant, sustainable communities. Does not have explicit linkages with the HRM 20/20 report.	Follows a major public consultation process: more than 700 citizens were involved and it preceded a Community Forum attended by 150 citizens.		
<b>London</b>	<i>Strategic Planning Session,</i>	<i>London's Blueprint for Success.</i> The Official Plan. <i>County of Middlesex Official Plan.</i>			
<b>Montréal</b>	<i>Charting our international future: Building a competitive, attractive, interdependent and responsible community</i> (Communauté métropolitaine de Montréal)	Metropolitan plan (forthcoming), City of Montréal Master plan.	Public consultation at every steps including within borough councils	<i>Sustainable solutions for Montréal</i> (City of Montréal), <i>Plan quinquennal de développement de Montréal</i> (Conférence régionale des élus), Metropolitan Transportation Plan (AMT), City of Montréal's transportation plan, and sectoral plans made by the CMM	Montréal and Longueuil's boroughs have land use and zoning functions
<b>Toronto</b>		City of Toronto's Official Plan	<i>Places to Grow's</i> public engagement strategy, public consultation initiatives in the City of Toronto	<i>Places to Grow,</i> provincial growth management plan, City of Toronto's various sectoral plans including an economic development strategy and sustainable development plan	
<b>Vancouver</b>	A new regional growth strategy is on the way	<i>Livable Region Strategic Plan</i> (MetroVancouver), the City of Vancouver's <i>CityPlan</i>	Public consultations at every steps	Metro Vancouver's <i>Biodiversity Conservation Strategy, Regional Affordable Housing Strategy and Transport 2021</i> , the City of Vancouver also has various sectoral plans including a transportation plan.	

Sources: Collin, Breux and Rivard, 2007