

ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND RESOURCES OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT IN MANITOBA

Final Breakout Report



June, 2006



Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Introduction | 3 |
| Section 1 – Who is responsible for what? | 4 |
| Section 2 – Who should be responsible for what? | 7 |
| Section 3 – Municipal Fiscal Resources | 10 |
| Section 4 – Who does what? | 12 |
| Conclusions | 14 |
| Appendix | 15 |

Introduction

The AMM's greatest strength is its members. The AMM recognizes this and strives to meet with members as frequently as possible to tap into this valuable resource and find out what is happening in communities across the province.

At this year's Mayors, Reeves and CAO meetings held in each of the seven AMM districts, the AMM conducted a discussion on the roles, responsibilities and resources of municipal and provincial governments. The goal of these brainstorming sessions was to look at those responsibilities currently held by the two levels of government, which responsibilities currently being dealt with could be better delivered by the other level of government, the funding sources available to municipalities and the role of each level of government, including the federal government, in the current infrastructure deficit.

The results of these discussions are provided in this report. From these discussions it is evident that some responsibilities should be transferred between the two levels of government to improve the delivery of services. The discussions also clearly show that municipalities are in need of a greater array of funding sources to meet their current challenges. Municipal budgets are stretched too thin, and although there have been some positive steps for municipalities (including the 100% GST refund and the New Deal) far more is needed.

Section 1 – Who is responsible for what?

AT each of the seven AMM meetings, participants were asked the question “which responsibilities are municipal and which are provincial”? This included areas of traditional responsibilities, as well as new areas. This question generated a great deal of discussion and some long lists of issues. While almost every meeting had a couple of unique thoughts, there was a great deal of commonality across the province.

In the discussions on municipal responsibilities, basic infrastructure was identified as a municipal responsibility at every meeting. Basic infrastructure includes everything from roads to drainage and municipal lagoons. Economic development was also identified as a municipal responsibility at all meetings, however it was often mentioned that a partnership with the Province is required. Recreation was also viewed as a municipal responsibility, along with garbage collection and recycling. Protective services, which includes police, fire and ambulance, was identified as a municipal responsibility at all seven meetings as well. Water and wastewater management was also identified as a core municipal responsibility. Many of the meetings also identified health care and physician recruitment as a current municipal responsibility. Municipalities also felt they had responsibility for local planning, by-law enforcement, housing and emergency preparedness, among other issues.

Basic infrastructure was also identified as a provincial responsibility at all seven meetings. Education, health care, and protective services were also identified at all meetings. Social assistance was determined to be a provincial responsibility, as was emergency preparedness, justice, the environment, water issues and tourism.

What is perhaps most interesting about the lists is the overlap of issues. While in certain areas overlap should be expected, there was also overlap in other areas that would be thought to be exclusive to one level of government. For example, health care is typically thought to be a provincial responsibility, not a municipal one, and was identified as a provincial responsibility at all seven meetings. However, municipalities did identify that they have been forced to take on a role in health care in response to community needs, with mandatory contributions to health capital projects and physician recruitment being cited.

Economic development was another area identified as both a provincial and municipal responsibility. Municipalities indicated that economic development should be driven from the local level but needs to work within the context of a provincial plan.

Protective services were also an overlapping issue and identified at all seven meetings as both a provincial and municipal responsibility. Municipalities certainly see a responsibility in policing and firefighting, but also indicated that there are provincial responsibilities, especially in setting provincial standards.

Areas where there was obvious overlap included infrastructure. One of the major issues facing Manitoba today is the current infrastructure deficit. Municipally, this ranges from urban streets and rural roads, water treatment facilities, municipal lagoons and municipal drainage systems,

and provincially it ranges from major highways and secondary provincial roads to provincial drainage systems. Nearly all of the infrastructure in Manitoba falls under the purview of these two levels of government and is currently in need of a major injection of funding.

Question 1: Which responsibilities are municipal and which are provincial?

| RESPONSIBILITIES IDENTIFIED AS MUNICIPAL | # OF ANSWERS |
|---|--------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic Infrastructure: Roads, Ditches/Drainage, Sewer/lagoons/waste water • Economic Development • Protective service • Recreation • Garbage and recycling | 7 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water & Wastewater | 6 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health Care and Physician Recruitment | 4 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airports • Education • Planning | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By-law Enforcement • Housing • Land Use Planning • Pandemic and emergency preparedness planning • Weed control • Street lighting • Vet services | 2 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building inspections • Cemeteries • Conservation • Environment • Libraries • Parks services • Social assistance • Tourism | 1 |

| RESPONSES IDENTIFIED AS PROVINCIAL | # OF ANSWERS |
|--|--------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic Infrastructure (Highways, Ditches, Drainage, Roads) • Education • Health Care • Protective Services (Policing 6, Emergency Services 2) | 7 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Assistance | 6 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic Development | 4 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EMO • Environment • Justice • Natural Resources • Recreation & Tourism • Water Issues | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture • Conservation | 2 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment • Contaminated Sites • Crown Land • Day Cares • Disaster Assistance • Immigration • Income Tax • Major Infrastructure • Mines • National Defence • Resource Stewardship • Training • Unfunded Mandates. | 1 |

Section 2 – Who should be responsible for what?

The questions “Can you think of any municipal responsibilities that would be better delivered by the Province?” and “Can you think of any responsibilities that would be better delivered by Municipalities?” were asked of the groups. There were a variety of responses to these questions.

The groups generally agreed that municipalities were better suited to look after secondary provincial roads and the drainage system. Municipalities could also take on responsibility for conservation and planning. Interestingly, there were a number of issues that were raised at only one or two of the meetings, such as health boards and gaming.

On the other hand, the groups felt the Province was best suited to deal with health and education responsibilities, along with social services and policing. Education taxation collection was also mentioned. Again, there were many issues raised only once or twice, including disaster management, regional policing and building inspections.

Overall, the groups found that funding is a major obstacle to municipalities taking on greater responsibilities. At all meetings, the comment was made that with better access to funding municipalities could better deliver most services. There was also a near consensus that the Provincial Government should be focusing on setting out overall goals and working with key stakeholders to develop a province-wide vision to coordinate and focus efforts. In areas as varied as economic development and drainage, there was a feeling that the Province’s role is to set the overall framework within which municipalities operate.

Question 2: Can you better think of any Municipal responsibilities that would be better delivered by the Province? Can you think of any responsibilities that would be better delivered by Municipalities?

| RESPONSIBILITIES BETTER DELIVERED BY MUNICIPALITIES | # OF ANSWERS |
|---|--------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary Provincial Roads • Drainage | 4 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation • Roads | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning • Water Issues | 2 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burning Permits • Economic Development • Education • Gaming • Health Boards • Immigration • Manure Management • Policing, Responsibilities • Taxation • Transportation w/funding • West Nile Virus Protection | 1 |

| RESPONSIBILITIES BETTER DELIVERED BY PROVINCE | # OF ANSWERS |
|--|--------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health | 4 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Social Services | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning • Policing • Education Tax Collection | 2 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Airports • Ambulance • Building Inspectors • Conservation • Disaster Management • Drainage • Employment Services • Enforcement of Environment Act • Main Street Cleaning • Provincial Roads – no cost sharing • Regional Focused Policies • Vet Clinics | 1 |

Section 3 – Municipal Fiscal Resources

A third question asked at all the meetings was “What funding sources should municipalities have access to?” This question generated much discussion, and many of the groups came up with novel ideas.

The revenue sources discussed could broadly be placed in either a tax or user fee category, with gas tax and a share of the income tax topping the list. Municipalities have gained access to some of the gas tax revenue through the ‘New Deal’, however more is needed. Also, while municipalities in Manitoba do get a small percentage of provincial income tax, those in attendance felt a far greater share was warranted, and access to federal income tax was also deserved. Full access to the property tax base was also highlighted, along with a municipal sales tax, and a percentage of the Federal GST or the Provincial sales tax.

Greater fine revenues were also mentioned as an option for additional funding, as was toll fees for roads and user fees for services such as garbage collection.

There was unanimous agreement among the groups that municipalities needed greater revenue. Those sources available to municipalities are insufficient to meet the responsibilities currently faced. Not only is the property tax base inadequate, but when compounded by the reality that education taxation takes up nearly 50% of this base, greater revenue sources are needed.

Many in attendance were concerned with a growing trend of other levels of government taking revenues from communities and then reinvesting them through application based programs or conditional transfers. Many felt more unconditional funding should be given, and communities should be allowed to decide their key priorities. Many were concerned that application based funding priorities do not match the priorities decided by many municipalities and they are therefore left on the outside. There was a great deal of support for a change from the tax and return system to a system that leaves the money in the communities.

There was also a general consensus that not every option would be applicable to all municipalities, so a number of options would be needed. For example, a retail sales tax may generate revenue in an urban area with a great deal of commercial property, however it is of little use in a smaller rural municipality with few commercial properties. It would also be suitable in a municipality with a great deal of commercial businesses, but may serve as an impediment to those communities looking to attract business. At the same time, toll fees for roads may be applicable to municipalities with a lot of land mass and a relatively small tax base, but of little use to small urban municipalities with few roads. The best situation is to provide all municipalities with options to generate revenues that are applicable and acceptable for their needs.

In general, there was a strong feeling that municipal government should share in the current growth revenue streams that other levels of government currently have. It was also felt that in those areas where municipalities do have a share, a greater share is needed to better reflect responsibilities.

Question 3: What funding sources should municipalities have access to?

| FUNDING SOURCES IDENTIFIED | # OF ANSWERS |
|--|--------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income Tax • Greater share of lotteries revenue | 5 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fuel Tax – both gas and diesel | 4 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provincial Sales Tax • Federal GST • Growth Taxes | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fine Revenue • Property Tax • Toll Fees • User Fees • Revenue from Utilities – (Hydro lines, Gas lines) • Revenue Sharing from Natural Resources • Unconditional grants | 2 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business Tax • Revenue from Crown Land Sales • Grants from other levels of government • Hotel Tax and Hospitality Tax • Municipal Sales Tax • Park Fees • Property Tax – 100% Tax Space • Transfer Payments Share from Federal Government | 1 |

Section 4 – Who does what?

The final question asked of each of the groups was “What do you think is the role of all three levels of government in funding the current infrastructure deficit?” There was a recognition that the infrastructure problems that face communities in Manitoba cannot be dealt with by any one level of government exclusively and all three levels need to play a role.

What was discussed at nearly all the meetings was that if there are new requirements for municipalities, there should be funding attached and there should be discussion with municipalities in the development of the mandate. If municipalities are expected to provide a service, it is reasonable to expect consultation in the development of the requirements.

Another issue discussed was the need to find ways to make the current infrastructure programs work better. This includes making them more flexible, ensuring the municipal perspective is included in the creation of the programs and making programs easier to access.

There was also a general agreement that responsibility for the infrastructure deficit should be partially based on the ability to pay, which currently puts much of the onus on the federal government. Both the provincial and federal governments have access to growth revenues, which puts them in a better position to fund this area.

There was also a great deal of discussion on who should be funding new infrastructure. There was agreement that infrastructure that runs across the province or to the United States should be the federal government’s responsibility. There was also consensus that new land developments, such as the infrastructure needed for subdivisions, should be the responsibility of the developers.

Overall, there was near consensus that all three orders of government have a role to play in dealing with infrastructure and a better partnership needs to be developed in order to address the current deficit and into the future.

Question 4: What do you think is the role of all three levels of government in funding the current infrastructure deficit?

| ROLE OF THREE LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT | # OF ANSWERS |
|---|--------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there are new requirements for municipalities set by the Provincial/Federal Governments, there should be a corresponding funding increase. | 6 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve infrastructure programs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Greater flexibility (2) ▪ Consider municipal lens when developing programs and setting criteria (3) ▪ Minimize administration/allocate full funding to projects (1) ▪ Programs are too difficult to access (1) ▪ Consider interest-free loan program for infrastructure (1) | 5 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributions should be based on ability to pay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Federal has growth revenue/most revenue sources (4) ▪ Province has access to growth revenues (1) ▪ Federal surplus should contribute (2) ▪ Municipalities need access to growth revenues, particularly since they only receive 7 to 8 cents per tax dollar (3) • All three governments share responsibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Federal should pay for infrastructure between provinces and into US (1) ▪ Federal gas tax should pay for highways (3) ▪ Province should pay for infrastructure that extends across Manitoba; must make greater investment (3) ▪ Federal/Provincial should cost share regional projects (2) ▪ Municipalities should be responsible for local community needs (2) | 4 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Municipalities should plan for the future maintenance/operation of new infrastructure • Resource revenue should primarily be returned to local communities | 3 |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New vs. existing infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Federal/Provincial should pay for existing infrastructure deficit (2) ▪ Municipalities should make a greater contribution to new infrastructure (2) ▪ Federal/Provincial often pass responsibility to municipalities, but municipalities cannot pass on responsibilities –need more resources at municipal level (2) ▪ Federal Government should increase funding to Provinces; address fiscal imbalance (2) | 2 |

Conclusions

The last few years have seen some meaningful increases in revenues for municipal government. Federally, municipalities received an exemption from the Federal GST and the New Deal for Communities will bring sustainable, long-term funding to municipalities. Provincially, Manitoba municipalities have traditionally benefited from the Provincial-Municipal Tax Sharing Agreement that sees a small percentage of the provincial income tax granted to municipalities. The new Building Manitoba Fund replaces this system and provides some additional revenue to municipalities. Municipalities in Manitoba have a strong working relationship with both the Federal and Provincial Government and both levels of government recognize the efforts of municipal governments to improve Manitoba communities.

While there have been advancements, more is needed. If you take a look at any community in Manitoba it is evident that greater assistance is needed. Local infrastructure is in decay. However it is not only local infrastructure in need of repair, as there are issues with both Provincial and Federal infrastructure as well. It is clear that a coordinated approach is needed.

There is little doubt that there is room for improvements and it is necessary to examine the roles, responsibilities and resources of all levels of government to make these improvements. With limited resources available, it is necessary to ensure that each level of government is doing what is appropriate. While greater funding is needed and appreciated, it is hollow without taking a serious look at the roles and responsibilities that currently exist. If additional revenue does not even match additional responsibilities, communities are no further along. Only by examining all three areas together can we create a better system to address the needs of Manitoba communities.

Appendix

QUESTION 1

Which responsibilities are municipal and which are provincial?

| CENTRAL DISTRICT | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Municipal | Provincial |
| Economic Development | Agricultural Policy |
| Health Care - recruitment, financial | Bridges |
| Highways - in municipality | Economic Development |
| Land Use Planning | Education |
| Municipal Drainage | Environment |
| Municipal Roads | Health |
| Planning | Highways |
| Protective Services | Justice |
| Recreation | Natural Resources |
| Recycling | Policing - Federal |
| Waste Disposal | Provincial Drainage System |
| Water & Wastewater | Provincial Roads |
| | Resource Stewardship |
| | Social Agencies |
| | Tourism |
| | Water Regulation Enforcement |
| EASTERN DISTRICT | |
| Municipal | Provincial |
| Cemeteries | Assessment |
| Drainage | Day Cares |
| Economic Development | Disaster Assistance |
| Environment | Economic Development |
| Housing | Education |
| Libraries | Environment |
| Parks Services | Health |
| Planning | Highways |
| Protective Services | Immigration |
| Recreation | Justice |
| Roads | Mines |
| Taxation | Natural Resources |
| Transportation | Police |
| Vet Services | Provincial Drains |
| Waste Management | Social Assistance |
| Water & Wastewater Management | Tourism |
| Weed Control | Training |
| | Unfunded Mandates |
| | Water Area Regulations |

INTERLAKE DISTRICT

Municipal

Economic Development
Protective Services
Health Care - recruitment/financial
Municipal Infrastructure
Recreation
Roads
Seniors Housing

Provincial

Ambulance Service -
Provincial/Federal
Contaminated Sites
Drainage
Economic Development
Education
Health Care
Highway Drainage
Highways
Policing

MID-WESTERN DISTRICT

Municipal

Building Inspection
Conservation
Economic Development
Emergency Measures
Land Use Planning
Pandemic Planning
Protective Services
Recreation/Culture
Recycling & Solid Waste
Roads
School Tax Collection
Social Assistance
Street Lighting
Water & Wastewater

Provincial

Agriculture
Assessment
Building Inspection
Conservation
Education
Emergency Measures
Health
Highways - maintenance
Income Tax
Law Enforcement
Social Assistance

NORTHERN DISTRICT

Municipal

Airports
Drainage
Economic Development
Education
Protective Services
Garbage
Housing
Recreation
Recycling
Roads
Street Lighting
Tourism
Water & Wastewater

Provincial

Crown Land
Drainage
Education
Emergency Measures
Health
Highways
Justice
National Defence
Natural Resources
Policing
Social Assistance

PARKLANDS DISTRICT

Municipal

Airports
Bylaw Enforcement
Drainage
Economic Development
EMO
Garbage
Handi-Transit
Protective Services
Recreation
Recycling
Roads
School Tax Collection
Water & Wastewater

Provincial

Conservation
Drainage across jurisdictions
Education
Environment
Health Care
Highways
Major Infrastructure
Policing
Social Assistance
Water Quality

WESTERN DISTRICT

Municipal

Bridges
Bylaw Enforcement
Drainage
Economic Development
EMO
Planning
Protective Services
Recreation
Roads
Safety
Vet Clinics
Waste Disposal
Water
Weed Control

Provincial

Economic Development
Education
Emergency Services
EMO
Health Care
Provincial Roads
Recreation
Social Assistance

QUESTION #2

**Can you think of any municipal responsibilities that are better delivered by the Province?
Can you think of any provincial responsibilities that are better delivered by municipalities?**

CENTRAL DISTRICT

| Municipal | Provincial |
|------------------|-------------------|
| Drainage | Development |
| Planning | Drainage |
| Policing | Education |
| Responsibilities | Health |

EASTERN DISTRICT

| Municipal | Provincial |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Conservation District Management | Disaster Management |
| Drainage | Education Funding |
| Economic Development | Enforcement of Environment Act |
| Highways | Policing |
| Immigration | Provincial Plan |
| Transportation w/funding | Regional Focused Policies |
| Watershed Management | |

INTERLAKE DISTRICT

| Municipal | Provincial |
|----------------------------|-------------------|
| Conservation | Health |
| Drainage | Social Services |
| Roads | |
| West Nile Virus Protection | |

MID-WESTERN DISTRICT

| Municipal | Provincial |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|
| Conservation | Conservation |
| Drainage | Healthcare - all |
| Highways | Main Street Cleaning |
| Manure Management | Planning Districts |
| Planning Districts | Provincial Roads - no cost sharing |
| | RCMP - uniform funding |
| | School Tax Collection |
| | Social Assistance |

NORTHERN DISTRICT

| Municipal | Provincial |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| Highway Traffic Act | |
| Education | |
| Taxation | |
| Gaming | |

PARKLANDS DISTRICT

| Municipal | Provincial |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| Drainage | EMO |
| Roads w/funding | Airports |
| | Employment Services |
| | Health Care |
| | School Tax Collection |
| | Vet Clinics |

WESTERN

| Municipal | Provincial |
|------------------|---------------------|
| Road Maintenance | Ambulance |
| Highways | Social Assistance |
| Water | Education Funding |
| Health Boards | Building Inspectors |
| Burning Permits | |

QUESTION 3
What funding sources should municipalities have access to?

CENTRAL DISTRICT

Unconditional Grants
Funding for additional regulations/responsibilities
Growth Tax Sharing
Income Tax Sharing - more
Per-Capita Grants
PST Sharing
Retail Sales Tax
Shift Taxes
User Fees

EASTERN DISTRICT

Dedicated Taxes
Gas Tax - total amount
GST Sharing
Hydro Line Revenue
Income Tax
Provincial Lotteries System
Sales Tax
Transfer Payments Share from Federal Government

INTERLAKE DISTRICT

Growth Taxes
GST
Unconditional Education and Health Funding

MID-WESTERN DISTRICT

Fines Revenue w/greater legislated authority
Gas Tax - unconditional funds
Gas Tax Sharing
Grants
Income Tax
Property Taxes
Sales Tax
Toll Fees
User Fees
VLT Revenue Percentage

NORTHERN DISTRICT

Gaming
Personal Income Tax
Taxation

PARKLANDS DISTRICT

Business Tax
Crown Land Sales
Fine Revenues
Gas Tax
Hospitality Tax
Hotel Tax
Income Tax - Federal & Provincial
Park Fees
Property Tax - 100% Tax space
Revenue Sharing from local resources, unconditional
Transportation Fees for Hauling Products
Utility Revenue
VLT Revenue

WESTERN DISTRICT

Fuel Tax
Gas Tax
Landfill User Fees
Lotteries
Municipal Sales Tax
Oil Revenue Sharing
Sales Tax
Toll Roads/Bridges
Trans Canada Pipelines

QUESTION 4

What do you think is the role of all three levels of government in funding the current infrastructure deficit?

| CENTRAL DISTRICT | | |
|--|--|---|
| Federal | Provincial | Municipal |
| Ensure equity – same projects eligible for each community | | Cannot pass responsibility to anyone but the over-burdened tax-payer; must have resources to fulfill responsibilities |
| Need new spending | Has growing revenues, therefore should have greater responsibilities | Need growth taxes to generate more revenue |
| Need more flexibility of funding | | Should ensure the sustainability of new infrastructure, both residential and commercial |
| Has an obligation to fund the infrastructure deficit; should pay the most | | Should pay the least towards the infrastructure deficit (10% maximum) |
| Make sure programs don't create a burden for municipalities, e.g. PGRP shifts trucks away from provincial highways to municipal roads | | Should have a financial responsibility where projects directly benefit the municipality |
| Must take more responsibility for highways | | |
| Shouldn't keep downloading responsibility without appropriate funding | | |
| Avoid creating bureaucratic red tape so that program funds target projects not administration | | |
| Regional infrastructure should be cost-shared between the federal and provincial governments | | |
| Sewer/water should be the responsibility of all three | | |
| Where the federal/ provincial government sets rules and regulations for municipalities to follow, all three governments should share in financial responsibility (i.e. Water Protection Act) | | |
| Responsibility should be split 50% federal, 30% provincial, 20% municipal | | |

| EASTERN DISTRICT | | |
|---|---|--|
| Federal | Provincial | Municipal |
| Should pay full cost of National Highway System | Has many of the same problems as municipalities | Need funding for future projects |
| Funding for municipalities should follow regulations imposed on municipalities | | Adding responsibilities to municipalities refocuses the municipal budget away from infrastructure |
| | | Resource revenue should be allocated where the resource is located, since those communities often pay costs associated with industry |
| New infrastructure that extends across provinces or to the US | New infrastructure that extends throughout Manitoba | Local people should pay for local services |
| | | Cannot keep up with increasing costs |
| | | Responsibility to plan for operation and maintenance of infrastructure they build |
| Give each level of government responsibility for infrastructure based on their level of return – i.e. municipalities receive 7 cents back on every tax dollar | | |

| INTERLAKE DISTRICT | | |
|--|--|---|
| Federal | Provincial | Municipal |
| Has surplus, should pay for federal infrastructure | Should pay for provincial infrastructure | Should have access to lottery funds for a few years |
| Should provide increased funding to Provinces | | |
| If there are more requirements for municipalities, there should be more funding; Federal and Provincial Government should fund their new standards | | |

| MID-WESTERN DISTRICT | | |
|---|-------------------|--|
| Federal | Provincial | Municipal |
| Must contribute more; federal revenues have increased more than other government revenues | | Should have access to taxes paid by local residents |
| Infrastructure is largely a Federal responsibility; have collected gas tax for years without investing in roads | | Resource sharing – some portion of resource revenues should stay with local government (pipelines) |
| Responsibility to address fiscal imbalance | | |
| Federal/Provincial governments should look after old infrastructure (deficit) | | Should pay a significant portion of new infrastructure |
| Need more support for regional projects | | |
| Use gas tax for highways | | |
| Make processes simple (DFO) | | |
| Decisions made by Provincial/Federal Governments require a municipal lens as well | | |
| Any rules enforced by Federal/Provincial Governments but implemented by municipalities, require associated resources for municipalities | | |

| NORTHERN DISTRICT | | |
|---|---|--|
| Federal | Provincial | Municipal |
| Ability to pay should be a factor; Federal is in best position right now | Need a Provincial plan – lack of transportation infrastructure in the North | Identify priorities |
| Old infrastructure should be Federal/Provincial responsibility | | New infrastructure is a matter of choice, so municipalities should pay and accept responsibility |
| Used to have interest-free loan program for infrastructure; would be beneficial since interest payments on debentures is costly | | Important to have maintenance plan in place; need long-term planning for infrastructure |
| Distribution of revenues should better reflect where money comes from (i.e. mining) | | |

| PARKLANDS DISTRICT | | |
|--|-------------------|------------------|
| Federal | Provincial | Municipal |
| 1/3 share for each is fair because the infrastructure deficit is due to neglect from all three governments | | |
| Collect most tax dollars, so should invest most | | |
| Key role in overall infrastructure deficit | | |
| Should be based on ability to pay – Federal revenues have grown the most | | |
| New regulations from Federal/Provincial Government should have associated funding | | |
| Federal/Provincial Government should take into account the impact on municipalities | | |

| WESTERN DISTRICT | | |
|--|---|--|
| Federal | Provincial | Municipal |
| DFO has negative impact | Must fix own infrastructure; poor provincial infrastructure is driving people to use municipal infrastructure (road restrictions) | Cannot download, so need more resources |
| Wider impact of infrastructure – all governments should be responsible | | |
| If it is required by another order of government, then there should be funding to go with it | | Should pay for strictly municipal infrastructure |
| Too difficult to access existing infrastructure programs; should be more flexible to address different infrastructure needs in different communities | | |



Association of Manitoba Municipalities

1910 Saskatchewan Avenue W.

Portage la Prairie, Manitoba

R1N 1A5

Phone: 204-856-8666

Fax: 204-856-2370

Email: amm@amm.mb.ca

Website: www.amm.mb.ca