

**Metropolitanization and the Re-scaling of
Metropolitan Public Policies.
The Canadian Experience**

**Jean-Pierre Collin, Sandra Breux and Mathieu Rivard
Groupe de recherche sur l'innovation municipale
INRS-Urbanisation, Culture et Société**

**Paper presented to the International Workshop
“Governance and spatial discontinuities:
Reterritorialization or a new polarization of metropolitan spaces?”
Montréal, April 23-25, 2006**

Draft version

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to assess the planning activities in Canadian metropolitan areas and to find out whether there is a trend toward metropolitanization. Assuming the existence of such a trend, does it assert the existence of a re-scaling process of municipal functions toward a metropolitan scale? In that scenario, is it possible to determine what role the “municipal world”, and more precisely the central city, have been playing in the reterritorialization process of public policies? We propose a comparative assessment of institutional arrangements and innovations, as well as public policies in ten middle-size Canadian metropolitan areas (between 200 000 and 1 000 000 inhabitants). The analysis, based on a series of monographs, looks at a wide range of issues at the city-region level, in particular: municipal territorial structures, functional organization at the local and regional levels, strategic planning policies and by-laws, economic development strategies and economic development promotion, cultural policies and infrastructures; as well as sustainable development orientations. We will then try to figure out whether or not there is a Canadian model – in that case, it would support the thesis of a political re-scaling towards the metropolitan level– or instead, if each Canadian city-regions bears too many specificities for us to suppose the existence of any kind of pattern. We will enlighten the importance of the central city as the most significant actor, an assessment that suggests a trend that seems to slow down the metropolitanization of urban issues and remains a factor of territorial differentiation. That being said, it seems that last decade’s institutional reforms contributed to and triggered some fascinating innovations that contribute to a still rising trend of “metropolitanization”.

Résumé

L’objectif de cette communication est de mettre au jour, si elles existent, les activités de planification réalisées dans les régions métropolitaines canadiennes et de voir si elles amorcent un processus de ré-échelonnement des fonctions municipales vers l’échelon métropolitain. Dans ces circonstances, est-il possible de mieux cerner la place du « monde municipal » et plus précisément, de la ville centre dans cette possible reterritorialisation des politiques publiques? Pour cela, nous proposons un examen de l’expérience canadienne, à partir d’une synthèse des arrangements institutionnels et des innovations en matière de gouvernance dans les dix régions métropolitaines de taille moyenne (de 200 000 personnes à 1 000 000). Profitant de la réalisation en cours d’une série de monographie, l’analyse prend en compte les enjeux et les politiques publiques qui interpellent la ville-région aux chapitres de l’organisation territoriale municipale, supra-municipale et régionale; de la planification stratégique, de la planification du développement et de la promotion économique de la métropole, des politiques culturelles, ainsi que des questions relatives à l’environnement et, plus largement, au développement durable. Au terme de cet exercice de synthèse, nous tentons de voir s’il existe un modèle canadien –ce qui supporterait la thèse du ré-échelonnement du politique– ou si, au contraire les spécificités et les circonstances particulières de chaque ville-région l’emportent. Nous mettrons principalement en évidence le fait que la présence d’un acteur municipal majeur -la ville centre- ne semble pas favoriser l’émergence d’une métropolisation des enjeux urbains et qu’au contraire, le poids de cette dernière agit davantage comme un facteur de différenciation territoriale. Cela dit, il semble que les réformes institutionnelles de la dernière décennie ont malgré tout un effet stimulant, déclencheur, propice à l’introduction d’innovations qui vont dans le sens de la « métropolisation ».

Introduction

The 1990s saw considerable municipal restructuring, both in North America and in Western Europe, giving rise to numerous debates on metropolitan governance and regional cooperation. In fact, changes and adjustments to government and governance of metropolises are proliferating and borrowing various forms from other locales (Négrier, 2005; Lefebvre, 1998; and Wannop, 1995). The establishment of such reorganization invites a rethinking of resulting territorial political structures and public policies.

For some, this process bears witness to the reopening of the metropolitan reform debate on new grounds (Drier et al., 2001; Heinelt and Kübler, 2005; and Morris and Frisken, 2001), even the emergence of a new form of regionalism (Macleod, 2001), while for others, rather than a reform of territorial organization or the birth of a new metropolitan regionalism, it is more fitting to speak of a rescaling of power, particularly in the United States (Brenner, 2002). This would translate into greater importance for the metropolitan level, starting with a lasting transformation of multilevel government processes (Brenner, 2002; Jouve and Lefebvre, 2004; and Jouve and Booth, 2004). Others see in this process of metropolitanization opportunities to develop new public policies in both European metropolises (Le Galès, 2003) and certain Canadian metropolises (Andrew, 2003).

Nonetheless, the diversity of political and institutional contexts requires more detailed analysis, particularly in Canada, where the process of metropolitanization has been relatively poorly documented. More precisely, a question arises as to the degree to which the dynamic of metropolitanization is leading to a convergence of institutional arrangements and public policies in all the city-regions of Canada. In other words, is there a Canadian model of metropolitan government likely to lead to a rescaling of power and a new form of government at several levels in Canada, consistent with the observations of Brenner (2002) in the United States? Are there at least signs of the emergence of “projects” (we borrow this notion from Gilles Pinson, 2002 and 2003) of metropolitanization of urban public policies?

Our goal is to offer an account of these projects, where they exist, and above all to learn whether, despite initially being formulated in a spirit of urban marketing, they are starting to set in motion the birth of the “metropolis.” Our paper is comprised of a number of distinct sections. First, we

will review the major works on this question (1) and consider some methodological issues (2). Next, we present Canadian metropolitan regions that have been studied, from both an institutional and territorial angle, and we evaluate strategic planning experiences (3). Finally, three major fields of local responsibility are analysed: culture (4), economic development planning (5) and the environment (6). Each of these areas is examined with regard to political rescaling and the territorial specificity that is revealed.

1. Theoretical perspectives: metropolitan governance in question

Following the rush to municipal reorganization seen in most western democracies in the 1990s, many studies dealing with metropolitan governance and regional cooperation were published. Each utilized one of two distinctly different approaches.

The first focuses on comprehension of the political and institutional process being established. Two trends form this first approach. For some, a new regionalism is being crafted, according a growing role to the central city (Mitchell-Weaver *et al.*, 2000). Macleod (2001) records a similar observation and demonstrates the uniformity and convergence of metropolitan regionalism and its consequences. For others, it is better to speak of a political rescaling. “[...] the current explosion of debates on metropolitan cooperation has represented not a movement towards a putative ‘new regionalism’ but rather a ‘new politics of scale’ in which local, state-level and federal institutions and actors, as well as local social movements, are struggling to adjust to diverse restructuring processes that are systematically unsettling inherited patterns of territorial and scalar organization within major US city-regions” (Brenner, 2002: 4). The process of metropolitanization would thus translate into an adjustment of powers between various actors at different levels rather than an emergence of a new metropolitan regionalism.

The second approach develops the idea that municipal restructuring and the regionalization of metropolises lead to the emergence of new public policies designed to provide urban security for women, for example, in the new metropolitan regions of Montréal, Toronto, and Ottawa (Andrew, 2003). In a similar study, Le Galès, through identifying different European actors, was able to understand European cities as “forms of compromise, aggregation and representation of diverse interests and of culture” (2003: 320). Along the same lines, but using a very different

approach, Négrier (2005) underscores the importance of the content of public policies in the reconfiguration of power created by territorial and political restructuring (2005: 518).

This brief review of the literature reveals the movements and processes evident when one examines metropolitanization. Despite the diversity of research, one is forced to recognize that these studies are primarily interested in the United States and Europe. Indeed, few analyses have been done across Canada, more precisely, of all Canadian metropolitan regions. While Andrew (2003) deals specifically with Canada, her analysis consists only of case studies, not the totality of metropolitan regions. An examination of the process at work in the re-composition of Canadian politics in favour of metropolitan regions is needed, in particular in-depth case studies to better understand the transformation, indeed the upheaval, in urban regimes— a phenomenon visible at least in Toronto (Donald, 2002; and Walks, 2003) and, in all likelihood, in other metropolises (Collin *et al.*, 2004).

More explicitly, the two major theoretical approaches identified here follow from two principal questions. Firstly, is there a convergence of institutional arrangements in all the city-regions of Canada? Secondly, is there a convergence of public policies in all the city-regions of Canada? In other words, are we witnessing the emergence of a Canadian model of public policies on metropolitan issues—which would support the thesis of political rescaling—or, on the contrary, are the peculiarities and specific circumstances of each city-region more significant? These questions are essential in uncovering and fully grasping the process of governance at work, which translates into a restructuring of the relations between the state and civil society, a redefinition of the roles of public and private, and a transformation of intergovernmental relations, notably in the context of a federal regime, indeed, a dilution of the place of state authorities in favour of regulatory mechanisms within a network (Le Galès, 1995; and Badie, 1995).

These reflections are even more timely since, despite everything, confronted with these movements— as Le Galès observed with regard to Western Europe—existing local governments (municipalities, large cities, city halls, etc.) maintain an important place that is sometimes strengthened in the face of each intervener's position (Le Galès, 2003; Chapter 7). Such observations also hold true in Canada where municipal institutions maintain a pivotal place in the emerging plan for new metropolitan governance. This is particularly related to the fact that large urban regions were the object of periodic institutional reforms engineered by provincial

governments, who ensured a comfortable position for the central cities and their city halls. Thus, with rare exceptions, after recent institutional reforms, and even earlier in certain cases, “the basic pattern of metropolitan governance in Canada is now a single municipal government that covers a substantial portion of the urbanized area” (Andrew, 2003: 311; and Collin and Tomàs, 2004).

2. Research methodology

The goal of this research is to better pinpoint and document the place of the “municipal world” in the redeployment of political dynamics and public policies at the metropolitan level. By “municipal world,” we refer to municipal governments but more broadly all territorial institutional actors forming the local sector. We can all agree that this comprises only a small part of the process of metropolitan history that we believe we have too readily neglected. By analogy, our approach to investigating the role of municipalities and, more broadly, institutional territorial actors in the new metropolitan arrangement, is similar to that of Caroline Andrew, who, in her examination of the restructuring at play, not only in municipal territories but also amongst urban services, contends that “there is presently potential to create transformative political spaces through municipal politics in large Canadian cities” (Andrew, 2003: 311).

In an analysis of several case studies, she was interested in the potential for transformation hinted at by some examples, rather than their current limited and, above all, unfulfilled scope. In the same way, it is this possible existence of an opening or creative, innovative space with regard to issues of metropolitan management that we are attempting to chronicle.

Therefore, our methodological procedure consists of identifying a certain number of indicators likely to foster elements of a response to the two central questions previously discussed and, more precisely, creating indicators to understand the mechanisms in place. These flow from a series of questions:

- Is it true that there is usually a major municipal actor—the central city— making “metropolitanization” of urban issues and urban political practices possible or more likely?

- Is there a significant planning activity, on one hand, related to the recognition (institutional, political and territorial) of metropolitan reality, and on the other hand, to the desire to embody this reality (a new arrangement) through the implementation of institutional innovations and, above all, of new public policies?
- Are there signs of a shift from a municipal practice of planning activities to a “more resolutely” metropolitan practice?
- May one perceive signs of *collective learning* (we are returning to this concept of Belley, 2004, following the example of Crozier and Friedberg) linked to metropolitanization in territorial planning practices established in Canadian metropolitan regions?

Consequently, it is a question of discerning and evaluating the manner in which the “municipal world” is appropriating major issues for itself at the level of Canadian metropolises. In other words, we are attempting to understand how and with what intensity the local public sector participates (or not) in the emergence of a metropolitan scene. To do so, one indicator employed must first identify the presence or absence of planning documents produced by local public authorities, as well as the presence or absence of a public structure to apply these planning orientations. Another indicator’s goal is to measure the determination and definition of the status of planning policies as well as of established structures—when they exist. The last indicator chosen aims to record the content of the planning documents examined, primarily according to the guiding principles they favour. All of these indicators allow us to determine the presence of either a change in attitudes or perspectives in public action or of a simple adherence to the idea of the metropolis on the part of local public authorities.

To do this, we have undertaken a comparison of subjects and approaches to planning on major urban issues in the seventeen Canadian metropolitan regions of 200,000 people and more. In the first stage considered in this paper, we have gathered an initial body of documents following systematic consultation of municipalities’ and municipal agencies’ Internet sites, as well as those of the principal provincial ministries responsible for municipalities and various sectors (e.g. the environment, economic development and culture). Monographs are underway for each of the

seventeen metropolises.¹ The six themes examined are those of strategic planning, territorial development, transportation, economic development and promotion, and the environment and culture (to which we eventually hope to add taxation issues). Starting with these monographs, our approach consists of producing tables that provide a synopsis permitting a first level of comparative analysis of the 17 metropolitan regions.

Especially to partially compensate for the bias necessarily associated with the content of public institutions' Internet sites, in the second stage the drawing-up of such a balance sheet of the metropolitan dynamic and governance must incorporate research based on interviews with key experts and/or interlocutors in each metropolis. This phase of the investigation will be undertaken in the fall of 2006. At the same time, we will begin several in-depth case studies of public policies that seem promising for a comparative analysis of the 17 metropolitan regions. This last phase will be carried out in the winter of 2007. Moreover, for the purposes of this first analysis of partial results, considering the state of progress of our research, we will leave aside the three large Canadian metropolises of Vancouver, Montréal and the Toronto conurbation (the *Golden Horseshoe*)—that present specific and exceptional characteristics, particularly from the viewpoint of the urban dynamic, of territorial organization and intergovernmental relations, and we will limit our attention to the ten middle-range metropolises whose population in the 2003 census ranged from 225,927 (Saskatoon) to 1,063,664 (Ottawa-Gatineau).

3. Territorial composition and re-composition of metropolitan regions in Canada

Except for Victoria in British Columbia, Canadian metropolises have been remarkably unfragmented. This is particularly evident when one turns to mid-sized Canadian metropolises (see Table 1). This is due to the small number of local municipalities but also to the fact that where the number of local entities is higher (Saskatoon, Québec City and Edmonton), the central city has a dominant role. Indeed, with the sole exception of Victoria, the central cities comprise more than two-thirds of the population of their respective census metropolitan area. Furthermore, the comparative data on central city/suburban demographic density indicates that what we

¹ These monographs were based on territories resulting from the specific territorial organization for each location rather than the census metropolitan areas (CMAs) as defined by Statistics Canada, while keeping the definition as close as possible to the CMAs.

designate a “suburb” is a territory that could as easily be labelled rural or urban—which is also the case for the municipal region of Halifax and the cities of Ottawa and Gatineau. Only Victoria and, to a lesser degree, Windsor and Québec City have a consistent suburban ring. Also, as we have already emphasized (Collins et al., 2005: 18):

The definition of ‘suburb’ is a tricky one in the Canadian context as central cities often include suburban areas, and more and more frequently, because of the current policy in Canada’s major urban areas of merging municipalities.

In this context, aren’t the central cities called upon to act as engines for metropolitanization in Canada? This hypothesis seems to be verified in an event such as that of the National Forum on Economic Growth of the Big Cities in Canada in June 2004, when the mayors of the 22 largest Canadian cities (the BC22), at the initiative of the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (FCM) raised the question of the place of cities in the Canadian political system. Nevertheless, it is not so much as representatives of “metropolises” but as leaders of the most populous cities in Canada that these twenty mayors came together. Moreover, their demands converge around the traditional goals—principally fiscal—of the municipal sphere.

Indeed, this exceptional caucus would have as its principal goal the channelling of the big cities’ “new” demands to the federal government, despite the fact that municipal and urban affairs are exclusive jurisdictions of the provinces. Thus, the big cities are, on one hand, seeking to force the latter to commit themselves to the path of diversifying sources of municipal revenue and, on the other hand, to convince the federal government to subsidize them further, conscious of the fact that the financial situation of most provinces lends itself with difficulty to a significant transfer of financial or fiscal resources. Nonetheless, they refrain from calling for a change in the division of powers within the Canadian federation.

Furthermore, while the model of the unicity has proven popular in the last decade, institutional innovations of clearly metropolitan scope have been remarkably rare. Comparative analysis of “institutional arrangements” currently underway in metropolitan regions demonstrates that provincial governments maintain a strong ascendancy over municipal organization (Collin, Robertson and Charron, 2005: 36). This contributes to the lack of a genuinely Canadian model in terms of territorial organization, and results instead in “several variations on a theme.” On one hand, we observe a form of cohabitation of institutional authorities with varied functions in metropolitan regions such as London or Edmonton where central cities must deal with the

presence of counties, regional municipalities and other regional service commissions (Table 2). On the other hand, the “unicity” model, where the central city is the sole significant institutional player, is present in Calgary, Winnipeg and Halifax. In the latter case, territorial organization is the result of a reform whereby all local municipalities of the metropolitan region were merged.

“The Canadian assumption has been that a municipality should be on a relatively large scale” (Higgins, 19977; Magnusson, 1981; Higgins, 1986; Lightbody, 1995; Tindal and Tindal, 2000; and Sancton, 2000 in Magnusson, 2005a: 903). Pursuing this secular tendency, a number of provincial governments in the 1990s wished to lessen institutional fragmentation of urban regions through proceeding to implement municipal mergers on a large scale, thus creating new “big cities.” Nonetheless, we note that these movements towards a unicity routinely occur alongside implementation of infra-municipal structures (districts, community councils, etc.) with responsibilities for local services, planning and/or public consultation. Recently, this was the case for Québec and its “twin” city of Lévis, as well as Halifax. Moreover, consultative community councils on questions of development exist in Saskatoon and Winnipeg.

Essentially, the metropolitan level remains characterized by the presence of specialized agencies in the fields of the environment (Windsor), economic development (Halifax, Calgary and Saskatoon) or transportation (Ottawa-Gatineau). Nonetheless, these are exceptional and rather scarce. The existence of multisectors metropolitan structures or “umbrella” organizations remains the exception. We find this in only two regions, Québec City, where the *Communauté métropolitaine* is concerned with planning and coordination in so-called strategic functions, and in Victoria where the Capital Regional District is also concerned with planning, as well as the direct provision of certain public services.

Metropolitan regions also face specific issues requiring action on a metropolitan scale. Windsor, situated near the metropolitan area of Detroit in Michigan, must pay particular attention to the question of transportation, especially due to the bridge separating them. Ottawa-Gatineau, the only metropolitan region extending across two Canadian provinces (Québec and Ontario) is experiencing basically the same problem and a joint planning committee oversees issues related to commuting in the federal capital region.

In this context, wouldn’t the birth of Canadian “metropolises” first be a question of reconfiguring public policies rather than one of territorial organization? So, it is necessary to broaden the field

of observation to more intangible elements of governance. In the case of the United States, this is what the school of new metropolitan regionalism proposes (Champagne, 2002). Following the series of articles by Wallis (1994), this suggests there would be the birth of a new regional civic infrastructure. Along the same lines, Kathryn Foster (1997) seeks to uncover all the metropolitan impulses helpful in understanding the degree of success (or failure) of metropolitan regional experiments.

It is with the help of the concept of metropolitan governance capacity, in other words, the capacity to find cooperative tools at the metropolitan level, that in the course of a collective project bringing together contributions on European and North American cities, Hubert Heinelt and Daniel Kübler (2005) also attempt a comprehensive explanation for the degree of success, as well as the great variability, of metropolitan governance experiences of the last decade. In so doing, they propose an interpretative framework based on three factors: (1) the attitude of actors towards regional cooperation; (2) government incentives; and (3) the importance of individual (particularly in the person of the mayor) or institutional territorial political leadership.

The latter factor is at the core of the research of Gilles Pinson (2002 and 2003) who, in his analysis of metropolitan governance in action, was interested in the European implementation of urban projects—planning activity that no longer aims at regulating territorial development but rather at establishing the foundation for another vision of development, integrating fresh concerns (e.g. the quality of life, sustainable development, and creativity), seen as new factors in competitiveness. This planning activity seems in some ways to constitute a valuable indicator of the metropolitanization of cities.

On this topic, in her study on prospective planning exercises in 18 European cities (in eleven countries), Parrad (2005) observes that recourse to strategic planning is one type of political measure that fosters the drive for metropolitanization (p. 109). In so doing, she adds, consistent with Le Galès (2003), that cities “tend to promote a unique model of the metropolis” (p. 110). To what extent do these conclusions apply to the Canadian situation?

Generally, as observed in Europe, the strategic plans listed (Table 3) have no legal or regulatory weight as such. While they often have very strong ties to territorial development (and urbanism)—the existence, form and content of which are largely determined by provincial general laws, their objective is very different: to facilitate the emergence of a collective capacity to act,

sometimes at the metropolitan regional level (Victoria and Québec City) but in most cases at the level of the central city.

These plans are primarily municipal (central cities) and concern the central city itself—its authorities, services and agencies—above all. In almost half the cases there is, indeed, an opening towards other local actors, both at the time it is established and on the occasion of public consultations (Table 3). But these are more related to budgetary decisions of municipalities and their choice of investments in various types of municipal infrastructure that are governed by strategic orientations, and the principles, objectives and public actions specified in the planning document. This is most apparent when the strategic vision is accompanied by a municipal business plan. For the metropolises in Ontario and the two Albertan metropolises, in practice, prospective planning is limited to the adoption of a business plan.

In short, prospective planning exercises in medium-sized metropolitan regions, with the exception of the cities of Québec City, Gatineau and Saskatoon, do not aim so much at mobilization of social forces of the milieu to achieve a new consensus; instead they are working towards coordinating the actions of territorial public actors (with municipal leaders in the forefront). To return to the classification of Parrad (2004), there are few plans for strategic competitiveness, territories, sustainable development or, most importantly, strategic urban planning efforts, among these planning documents.

Our research does not allow us yet to take account of the entire process of development and implementation of prospective (or strategic) planning exercises but it appears that they cannot be considered as a major component of building metropolitan governance capacity or urban “projects” linked to metropolitanization.

First, despite recourse to a common vocabulary—notably related to economic and environmental issues and the quality of life in the city, we observe great variability in number (from three to eight) and subjects related to priority values, principles, and orientations embedded in the heart of strategic planning (Table 4). The evidence suggests that the local context plays as important a role as participation in the general process of metropolitanization in the formulation of these strategic goals. Furthermore, in certain cases, the orientations have a distinctive local colour.

Next, “municipal” concerns dominate the planning process and the most common themes are: smart growth management, improvement in local services essential to the quality of life and the vitality of local democracy. In practice, the undertakings and strategic planning documents are designed to be instrumental rather than to mobilize actors. Thus, they sometimes become valued tools contributing to the success of municipal mergers (e.g. Ottawa, Gatineau and, to a lesser degree, Halifax). More often, they are conducive to the success of development (e.g. Winnipeg and Québec City) or the business plan (e.g. London and Calgary). Everywhere they present the opportunity to go beyond the short or mid term planning exercises, realized for each or some municipal functions, at least in terms of intentions.

We note few innovations in developing and/or implementing the process of mobilizing social forces of the milieu, although half the cities have conducted public consultations in the first phase. In this regard, the cities of Saskatoon and Gatineau seem to display the greatest community concern, with the implementation of planning mechanisms, Local Area Plans and “urban villages,” respectively, at the neighbourhood level.

Finally, regional or metropolitan considerations are relatively absent, except in Victoria and Québec City, the only places where a metropolitan agency is responsible for the exercise. Recently reformed cities (Halifax, Québec City, Ottawa and Gatineau) seem to offer the most complete and innovative prospective planning processes. In reality, however, with the exception of Gatineau, the process is slow and it takes a long time before results appear. This is especially the case in Halifax where, after six years of discussion, the *HRM 20/20 Plan* has still not been adopted and remains at the working draft stage.

Yet, perhaps these new approaches are more apparent in specific domains. Here, considering the greater potential for expression of identity, we should first turn our attention to cultural policies.

4. Cultural policies: standard-bearers for metropolitanization?

Rich in meaning and sense of identity, the cultural domain is today the focus of specific attention at all levels of government. Indeed, culture seems to have become the object of unavoidable intervention, particularly at the regional and local level (Négrier, 2005). The relative loss of power of the state and national symbols, as well as the growth in number of productions and spread of culture, comprise the major explanations for this tendency (Le Galès, 2003: 313). The

multiplication of cultural policies results from such a process, especially visible in Europe, and has as its main objective the renewed creation of a feeling of belonging, of strengthening identity (Le Galès, 2003: 313).

We are witnessing a progressive *de facto* instrumentalization of culture, which translates into both the emergence of a cultural policy at the supra-municipal level and the implementation of a supra-municipal structure dedicated to management of the cultural domain (Négrier, 2005). The emergence of a supra-municipal interest in culture serves the process of legitimization of and identification with the new supra-municipal structure. Thus, a “symbolic construct” of culture, a tool to qualify and disqualify actors, appears (Négrier, 2003). Culture emerges as a priority, even dominant, sector in the metropolitanization of urban public policies.

Although these findings apply to most of Western Europe (Le Galès, 2003), the panorama of Canadian metropolitan regions paints a strikingly different picture and turns out to be rather disappointing from this viewpoint. Identification and analysis of cultural policies and structures in this domain—at the metropolitan level and at the municipal level—underscore the profound divergences that really exist but also the general absence of culture from public action strategies of middle-sized metropolises. In fact, only the metropolitan regions of Victoria and Halifax have a cultural strategic plan (Table 5). However, the content of these two plans is quite distinctive.

In practice, the metropolitan region of Halifax seems the only one to be participating in a process of metropolitanization of culture. On the one hand, its cultural plan is based on a series of principles aiming at coordination, partnership with other levels of government, financial and educational support, and, in general, promotion, guidance and assistance for this domain (Table 6). In sum, any activity is focused on identity factors as well as economic factors. On the other hand, beyond the fact that the municipality of Halifax alone constitutes a metropolitan region, the presence of a metropolitan structure dedicated to cultural affairs (Table 5), as well as appreciation for coordination and partnership with other levels of government, bears witness to a real concern for political interdependence.

In Victoria, on the contrary, the strategic plan in cultural affairs is clearly less developed. Based on three core principles, it focuses on promotion, improvement of cultural services, and fund management. The approach seems more economic, particularly apparent in the desire to attract tourists, proclaimed in the first principle: “to promote artistic and cultural dimension of tourist

attractions of the area” (Table 6). The policy aspect of culture is absent here, as is cooperation with other levels of government. Thus, there seems to have been metropolitanization only of the economic dimension of culture in Victoria.

In other respects, it is worth mentioning the rather original situation of the metropolitan region of Québec where the cities of Québec and Lévis have created their own cultural policy in interaction with the provincial arts council and the regional cultural councils (of Québec and Chaudière-Appalaches). Nonetheless, this political interdependence in the management of culture did not give rise to a search for harmony in a metropolitan cultural policy, despite the existence of the *Communauté métropolitaine de Québec* (Quebec Metropolitan Community).

Aside from these examples, culture remains strictly within municipal jurisdiction, more precisely, that of the central city, and does not encourage harmonization. Yet, it is possible to distinguish two major trends. The first brings together central cities that lack a cultural policy but still have a municipal structure dedicated to culture. Amongst these cities, Edmonton deals with culture through its arts council while the municipality of Winnipeg has a cultural dimension in its strategic plan and an arts council without, however, a cultural policy.

The second trend is reflected in a group of four cities (Calgary, Ottawa, Gatineau and Saskatoon) with cultural policies, without, nonetheless, a municipal structure such as an arts council. In this case, their cultural policies are mostly oriented towards strengthening their municipal identities, and supporting and promoting local arts (Table 6). Culture is, therefore, instrumentalized without, however, being associated with other levels of government. Consequently, it is the political dimension of culture that is in the forefront.

Finally, two special cases are noted. The municipality of Windsor shows scant evidence of any cultural concerns since it has neither a cultural policy nor a cultural structure. In the metropolitan region of London, the most significant initiative is that of the suburban municipality of Strathroy-Caradoc where one finds both a cultural policy and an arts council, though both are absent from the central city.

Contrary to what was observed in Europe, with the exception of Halifax and to a lesser degree, Victoria, the cultural domain is not seen as an area capable of mobilizing the citizenry and imbued with a “metropolitan sense.” Therefore, it responds to no strategy of metropolitanization

and public policies remain confined to the municipal sphere (that of central cities, in practice).
What about economic development?

5. Policies of economic development in a competitive age

Although these rescalings have been articulated extremely unevenly and in diverse institutional-political forms in each zone of the world system, it is today widely recognized that the upscaling of capitalist control capacities and commodity chains towards the global and supranational levels has been closely intertwined with a downscaling of productive capacities and competitive assets towards the regional and urban levels of metropolitan agglomerations (Dicken, 1998; Knox and Taylor, 1995; Sassen, 1991; Scott, 1998; and Storper, 1996 quoted in Brenner, 2002, p. 14).

Despite a common concern about increased competitiveness of metropolises and the race for first place in the rankings, once again, there are few metropolises with an economic development strategy covering the entire region (Table 7). Furthermore, in certain cases, one may observe the total absence of either an economic development strategy or plan, regardless of the political level considered, although economic development issues may be approached indirectly in more general strategic or development plans. Nonetheless, certain regions stand out through their more advanced—though very uneven—strategies whereby they attempt to maximize what are deemed competitive advantages of their central city or metropolitan region.

These economic development planning exercises employ diverse formulae. For example, in Calgary, already one of the most dynamic metropolitan regions in Canada, the program *C-Prosperty*, headed by Calgary Economic Development, an organization for planning and economic development, proposes an aggressive strategy around several “clusters,” giving responsibility to the leaders of these industrial clusters and arranging it so that the actors involved (companies, the University of Calgary, political decision-makers, etc.) interact and participate in the development of each cluster. The overriding preoccupation of the Albertan metropolis is improving economic competitiveness.

In Winnipeg, *A Homegrown Economic Development Strategy* also identifies a certain number of strategic industrial clusters, but, above all, the emphasis is on the goals of recruitment and retention of human resources. Consequently, the City of Winnipeg has chosen to concentrate some of its efforts on the attraction and development of companies, starting principally from the postulate that they will set up business where human resources are available. Thus, it attempts to

highlight the value of its advantages in terms of quality of life and tries to encourage the emergence of a local entrepreneurship based in the community and, as a result, less likely to relocate.

As for the City of Ottawa, it has established a number of planning instruments. Economic development planning strategy rests on three complementary bases. On one hand, *Innovation Ottawa* is an exercise addressed to the dynamic clusters of the city's economy, aimed at supporting the marketing of innovative technologies. Secondly, *Serving Ottawa* is interested in development of the local economy and firms whose goods and services are destined for the local market. Finally, Ottawa complements its action program with a strategy of rural development: *Securing A Vibrant Economy* (City of Ottawa, 2003).

It must be noted that even when there is a regional planning exercise, local municipalities everywhere retain their power to plan economic development. In a context where Canadian municipalities, large and small, are extremely dependent on property taxes, they hesitate to leave the question of economic development planning to another authority, especially since mechanisms to redistribute fiscal revenues from economic growth are practically nonexistent amongst the municipalities of Canadian metropolitan regions.²

Therefore, it is partly due to the importance of the development issue for local municipalities that regional and metropolitan planning exercises have not replaced different local municipalities' plans. In general, despite everything, we are observing the beginnings of the expression of a metropolitan or regional economic development strategy ensuring a better coordination of activities. While modest, this element should still enhance competitiveness. As Brenner (2002: 14) observes "territorial competitiveness in the global economy is thus said to hinge upon a balanced and coordinated system of relations between all major locational components of a large-scale metropolitan agglomeration."

Moreover, we observe (Table 8) that this sector of public activity is very sensitive to local particularities and variations, as seen in the sample of principal strategic orientations raised in

² The only exception being the Montréal Metropolitan Community that implemented a program (increasingly modest for all that) of sharing the growth of the property tax pie which contributes to financing "blue spaces" development projects (Montréal Metropolitan Community 2006, *Rapport d'activité 2005. Des municipalités, une vision* [Activity report 2005. Municipalities, one vision] p. 18).

different planning documents (strategic plans, economic development plans and other planning documents). The range of concerns is extensive and varied, displaying, overall, little common ground.

Regional or metropolitan organizations with a mission to promote economic development are more common than planning exercises at the regional level, and, for the most part, follow the same model in eight of the ten medium-sized metropolitan regions (Halifax, London,³ Ottawa-Gatineau, Calgary, Saskatoon, Windsor-Essex, Winnipeg and Victoria). Consequently, for example, the Saskatoon Regional Economic Development Authority and the Greater Victoria Economic Development Commission result from partnerships amongst municipalities of the region, and provincial and federal governments, as well as private enterprises, along the lines of the type of organizations previously established in large metropolitan regions such as Montréal and Toronto. The case of Edmonton is unusual since the Edmonton Economic Development Corporation (EEDC) is an organization entirely dependent on the City of Edmonton but it collaborates with member municipalities and views its promotion of economic development and tourism activities as a function of the region of Greater Edmonton.

Following the example of what we have observed in the case of culture, the creation of economic development planning exercises at the regional level is still rather uncommon in Canada. However, the desire to ensure the coordination of municipal intervention and the establishment of an organization to promote economic development in eight metropolitan regions show that there is still a certain form of metropolitan responsibility that is starting to take root. That said, for both planning and promotion, activities undertaken at the regional level do not indicate a retreat of local municipalities from these areas of jurisdiction. Rather these should be seen as complementary actions to better coordinate activities, not necessarily a significant restructuring of activities at a higher territorial level.

³ There are two such organizations in London, the Community Futures Development Corporation of Middlesex that covers the territory of the county of Middlesex with the exception of the City of London and the London Economic Development Corporation that covers only the territory of the City of London.

6. The environment: a promising field of local public policy for metropolitanization

We are interested in finishing with a traditionally very decentralized sector, that of the environment. Indeed, in Canada, if only due to the significance of the related budgetary commitments, this domain is relegated to the municipal level more than other levels of government. Furthermore, as a contemporary issue, the environment is an area with particular resonance for the urban level, as witnessed by the recent proliferation of studies on the subject (e.g. Wheeler and Beatley, 2004; Boisvert, 2004 and Guay et al., 2004). Also, is it possible to support Négrier's conclusions? He contends that the issues related to recent municipal restructuring "are related to questions of content of public policies. Everywhere, urban policy, social integration, physical infrastructure and sustainable development issues are at the heart of new institutions' agendas, and are amongst the most popular arguments advanced to convince numerous recalcitrant actors." (Négrier, 2005: 519)

Once again, the metropolitanization of policies falls short. More precisely, three scenarios are present. The first covers metropolitan regions with a comprehensive environmental policy, as well as a metropolitan structure. The second is comprised of metropolitan regions with neither environmental policies nor structures but whose strategic plan includes a series of orientations in this field. Finally, a third encompasses those that possess a metropolitan structure dedicated to the environment, without their own policy on the subject.

There are no metropolitan environmental policies as such anywhere (see Table 9) with the exception of the metropolitan region of Halifax that has developed a policy based on the concept of *Naturally Green*. This was fashioned around the ideas of recycling, saving water, non-utilization of pesticides, prevention of pollution and education (see Table 10), and is supported by a metropolitan structure, the Environment Management Service.

More often, environmental concerns are found in general strategic plans. Winnipeg and London are examples of such a process. In London, the *Middlesex County 2001-2004 Strategic Plan* contains objectives and recommendations for environmental protection. In Winnipeg, the

metropolitan plan *Next Steps*⁴ lists a series of commitments with the goal, amongst others, of cooperation with different levels of government and the industrial sector (see Table 10).

Finally, in Windsor, there is a metropolitan structure dedicated to the environment (the Windsor Essex County Committee), the objective of which is to coordinate actions between the City of Windsor and the County of Essex. In Victoria, there is no comprehensive policy. Nonetheless, the Capital Regional District is responsible for monitoring air quality, the collection of waste materials, and the distribution and treatment of water, as well as the administration of parks in the region (see Table 10).

All the other metropolitan regions have opted for municipal treatment (that is, by the central city) of the environment. At the municipal level, there are two possibilities: either the municipalities have environmental policies, or the municipal strategic plans have an environmental dimension. However, the activities remain sectoral and no municipality has its own municipal structure to ensure a comprehensive consideration of the environmental issue.

More precisely, three central cities have wide-ranging environmental policies. The City of Windsor has an environmental plan that emphasizes air, water, spring and soil quality, and energy savings. In Winnipeg, two environmental strategies have been put in place aiming principally at making Winnipeg a sustainable city. In addition, the strategic plan of the latter has an environmental dimension. The City of Québec also has an environmental plan, as well as an environmental policy to make the municipality a model capital. Finally, the City of Edmonton has created an environmental mission favouring regional cooperation (Table 9).

The other cities in the sample have environmental orientations in their strategic plan, particularly in Ottawa and Gatineau. Finally, let us emphasize the absence of a comprehensive environmental policy in Calgary. As for intergovernmental cooperation, it is visible in Québec City where powers are divided between the metropolitan community and the municipalities. This cooperation is also hoped for in Edmonton but seems for the moment not to have given rise to specific actions.

⁴ Please note that this document is an action plan developed by the provincial government in 2001 that basically deals with regional planning and seeks to lay the foundation for a regional strategic vision.

While the environment is not usually the object of metropolitan policy, some areas of public activity have been subject to metropolitan deployment. At the federal level in Canada, this is mainly related to air and water quality, waste management and management of green space and more rarely of blue spaces. Identification of the presence of metropolitan policies in these different sectors allows us to conclude that, from this angle, the environmental field is more developed, contrary to what the single observation of a comprehensive environmental policy at the metropolitan level would lead us to believe.

On this topic, six metropolitan regions in our sample have a metropolitan sectoral environmental policy. The development of specific policies varies according to the context. There is talk of a green belt around the metropolitan region of Ottawa-Gatineau while in Halifax there is a policy to decrease water wastage. Four of the six metropolitan regions (Windsor, Halifax, London and Québec) pay specific attention to the treatment of waste. Thus, we note a fairly strong “metropolitan” concern in this area; to these four metropolitan regions, we may add Victoria with an orientation in this domain across its Capital Regional District. In addition, the provincial level seems to intervene more in this field, notably in Québec and Manitoba where the province oversees the practices. Evidence of varied treatments of solid waste in the ten metropolitan regions leads us to conclude that a process of metropolitanization in this specific sector is perhaps emerging.

Conclusion

A number of findings come to the fore from these various analyses. Generally, examination of territorial and institutional characteristics, as well as the major areas of local responsibility, clearly reveals the absence of an explicit process of metropolitanization of public activity at the local level in Canada. Instead, we observe that local municipalities, especially central cities, remain the most significant institutional actors.

More precisely, and to review each of the domains studied, five points may be underlined:

- From an institutional perspective, Canada is notable for its varied institutional arrangements that may be explained by the fact that the provinces retain control of municipal and urban affairs. The specific attributes of Canadian metropolises reside in

their low incidence of fragmentation, a phenomenon enhanced by the reforms undertaken during the 1990s by the provincial governments on one hand, and by the weight of the central city at their core, on the other. Metropolitan structures—when they do exist— are most often sectoral.

- Strategic planning exercises, despite their purpose of contributing to collective action, have no real metropolitan scope. Instead, strategic plans are more instrumental than designed to stir people into action, and concern the municipal level above all, particularly the central city. Furthermore, these planning policies vary greatly, to the point where it is impossible to speak of any harmonization in this field.
- As for the cultural domain, it has not been subject to metropolitan activity and is not triggering the emergence of a metropolitan identity, as in a number of European metropolises. Instead, a lack of consistency in the cultural situations of different metropolitan regions allows one to see culture as established on a case-by-case basis. In addition, at the municipal level, the principles raised by cultural policies, where they exist, demonstrate a clear preoccupation with maintaining, preserving and fostering a given territorial identity, rather than promoting the region.
- In the area of economic development, traces of metropolitan development are visible, particularly in coordinating the intervention of the various actors. However, the establishment of economic development planning exercises at the regional level still remains limited, making this metropolitan development fragile. To find interesting cases of cooperation at the metropolitan level, one must look, mainly, at organizations promoting economic development.
- Finally, the environment is not generally a metropolitan concern. Specifically, environmental policies seem to be more present at the municipal level. Furthermore, the strong presence of environmental concepts at the municipal level allows us to conclude that this field is an identity vector for the entire territory under consideration. Similarly, there are a certain number of environmental sectoral policies at the metropolitan level, raising questions about our first finding. The strong presence of sectoral environmental policies at the metropolitan level still leads one to wonder whether we are proceeding

towards territorial differentiation, rather than towards the creation of a uniform metropolitan system.

In the course of these observations, it became apparent, firstly, that the presence of a major municipal actor—the central city— does not seem to favour the emergence of metropolitanization of urban issues. On the contrary, the weight of the latter acts rather as a factor for territorial differentiation. Secondly, it is not possible to detect the existence of institutional, political or territorial recognition of a metropolitan reality. The absence of harmonization in this domain tends to underscore the significance of the central city first and foremost. While, in a few rare cases, there are signs of a shift from a municipal planning practice to one “more resolutely metropolitan,” these examples are too scarce to be able to speak of the emergence of a metropolitan reality. Similarly, the indicators of any collective learning of metropolitanization are also too few (and/or not sufficiently convincing) to be able to speak of a real process of metropolitanization in Canada.

Nonetheless, it seems the institutional reforms of the last decade have a stimulating trigger effect and favour the introduction of innovations moving in the direction of “metropolitanization.” This is consistent with the observations of Andrew (2003: 330): “If amalgamations have done nothing else, they have clarified the issues and therefore made more acute the need for action.” Also, this finding appears similar to our remarks on the evolution of cultural municipal policies in Québec in the context of the creation of large cities through municipal mergers (Breux *et al.*, 2005).

More precisely, with regard to issues of metropolitan management and/or the emergence of a metropolitan scene, as well as changes linked to the globalization context, it appears that a real space for innovation is developing (Andrew, 2003), unique to each of the municipal entities examined. As Patrick Le Galès emphasizes in the case of Europe, it would seem that we are witnessing in Canada, in a still incremental but nevertheless promising fashion, the creation of collective actors and a mode of governance that “distances itself from the most functionalist and clientalist models” (2003: 373), and focuses on these collective actors’ capacity for innovation.

Références

ANDREW, Caroline (2003). "Municipal restructuring, urban services, and the potential for the creation of transformative political spaces", in W. Clement and L. Vosko (dir), *Changing Canada: Political economy as transformation*. Montréal and Kingston : McGill-Queen's University Press, p. 311-334.

BADIE, Bertrand (1995). *La fin des territoires*. Paris : Fayard.

BELLEY, Serge (2004). *L'apprentissage collectif dans l'action : le défi de la planification et de la coordination métropolitaines dans les agglomérations urbaines de Montréal et de Québec*, Communication présentée dans le cadre du colloque "La gouvernance métropolitaine. Recherche de cohérence dans la complexité", Montréal, 7-8 octobre, 23 p. (http://www.vrm.ca/documents/EJC2004_Belley.pdf)

BHERER, Laurence, Jean-Pierre COLLIN, Eric KERROUCHE and Jacques PALARD (ed) (2005). "Introduction. La recherche des territoires", in *Jeux d'échelle et transformation de l'État : Le gouvernement des territoires au Québec et en France*. Québec : Les Presses de l'Université Laval, p. 1-16.

BOISVERT, M. A. with the collaboration of P. NEGRÓN-POBLETE (2004). *L'urbain, un enjeu environnemental*. Sainte-Foy, Presses de l'Université du Québec, compte-rendu de lecture.

BRENNER, Neil (2002). "Decoding the Newest "Metropolitan Regionalism" in the USA : A Critical Overview", *Cities*. vol. 19, no. 1, p 3-21.

BREUX, Sandra and Jean-Pierre COLLIN (2005). *Réorganisation municipale et politiques publiques locales en matière culturelle au Québec : des liens de rétroaction ?*, Montréal, Groupe de recherche sur l'innovation municipale (GRIM), INRS-Urbanisation, Culture et société, décembre 2004, 49 p. (<http://www.vrm.ca/documents/CultureGrandesvilles1.pdf>)

CHAMPAGNE, Éric (2002). "Le nouveau régionalisme métropolitain aux États-Unis", *Organisations et territoires*, vol. 11, no. 3, p. 111-118.

COLLIN, Jean-Pierre, Mélanie ROBERTSON and Mathieu CHARRON (2005). "Patterns of Growth and Urban Politics in Metropolitan Canada", in V. Hoffmann-Martinot and J. M. Sellers (ed), *Metropolitanization and Political Change*, Germany: Verlag Für Sozialwissenschaften, p.17-52.

COLLIN, Jean-Pierre and Mariona TOMÀS (2004). "Metropolitan Governance in Canada or the Persistence of Institutional Reforms", *Revista de Economía Pública Urbana/Urban Public Economic Review*, no. 2, p. 13-39

DONALD, Betsy (2002). "The Permeable City: Toronto's Spatial Shift at the Turn of the Millenium", *The Professional Geographer*, vol. 54, no. 2, p. 190-203.

DREIER, P., J. MOLLENKOPF and T. SWANSTROM (2001). *Place Matters. Metropolitics for the Twenty-First Century*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.

- FOSTER, Kathryn (1997). "Regional Impulses", *Journal of Urban Affairs*, vol. 19, no. 4, p. 375-403.
- FRISKEN, F. and D. F. NORRIS (2001). "Regionalism reconsidered", *Journal of Urban Affairs*, vol. 23, no. 5, p. 467-478.
- GUAY, L., L. DOUCET, L. BOUTHILLIER and G. DEBAILLEUL (2004). *Les enjeux et les défis du développement durable, Connaître, décider, agir*. Sainte-Foy : Presses de l'Université Laval.
- HEINELT, H. and D. KÜBLER (ed.) (2005). *Metropolitan Governance. Capacity, Democracy and the Dynamics of Place*. London: Routledge.
- JOUVE, Bernard (2004). "Démocraties métropolitaines : de la grande transformation à la grande illusion?", in Bernard Jouve and Philip Booth (ed.), *Démocraties métropolitaines*. Sainte-Foy : Presses de l'Université du Québec, p. 293-328.
- JOUVE, Bernard and Christian LEFEVRE (ed.) (1999) *Villes, métropoles : Les nouveaux territoires du politique*. Paris : Economica, "Collection Villes".
- JOUVE, Bernard and Christian LEFEVRE (ed.) (2002). *Métropoles ingouvernables*. Paris: Elsevier.
- JOUVE, Bernard and Christian LEFEVRE (ed.) (2004). *Horizons métropolitains*. Lausanne : Presses polytechniques et universitaires romandes, coll. "Recherches urbaines".
- LEFEVRE, Christian (1998). "Metropolitan Government and Governance in Western Democracy. A Critical Review", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 22, no. 1, p.9-25.
- LE GALÈS, Patrick (2003). *Le retour des villes européennes : Sociétés urbaines, mondialisation, gouvernement et gouvernance*. Paris : Presses de Sciences Po.
- LE GALÈS, Patrick (1995). "Du gouvernement des villes à la gouvernance urbaine", *Revue française de science politique*, vol. 45, no. 1, p 57-95.
- MACLEOD, G. (2001). "New Regionalism Reconsidered: Globalization and the Remaking of Political Economic Space", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 25, no. 4, p 804-829.
- NÉGRIER, Emmanuel (2003). "Politiques culturelles territoriales : dernier inventaire avant décentralisation ?", *L'annuaire 2003 des collectivités locales*. Paris : CNRS Éditions, p. 47-71
- NÉGRIER, Emmanuel (2005). "Vers des régimes politiques métropolitains ?", in L. Bherer, J.-P. Collin, E. Kerrouche and J. Palard (ed.), *Jeux d'échelle et transformation de l'État : Le gouvernement des territoires au Québec et en France*. Québec : Les Presses de l'Université Laval, p. 517-522.
- MAGNUSSON, Warren (2005). "Urbanism, Cities, and Local Self-Government", *Canadian Public Administration*, vol. 48, no. 1, p. 897-922.

- MITCHELL-WEAVER, C., D. MILLER and R. DEAL Jr. (2000). "Multilevel governance and metropolitan regionalism in the USA", *Urban Studies*, vol. 37, no. 5-6, p. 851-876.
- PARRAD, Frédérique (2005). "Usages et pratiques de la prospective territoriale dans les grandes villes européennes", *Territoires 2030. Revue d'études et de prospective*, no. 1, p. 103-117.
- PARRAD, Frédérique (2004). "Quand les villes pensent leur futur", *2001 Plus*, no. 64, p. 3-58.
- PINSON, Gilles (2003). *Projets et pouvoirs dans les villes européennes. Une comparaison Marseille, Venise, Nantes et Turin*. PhD Thesis (political science), Université de Rennes I.
- PINSON, Gilles (2002). "Political Government and Governance: Strategic Planning and the Reshaping of Political Capacity in Turin", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, vol. 26, no. 3, p. 477- 493.
- WANNOP, U. (1995). *The Regional Imperative: Regional Planning and Governance in Britain, Europe and the United States*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- WALKS, R-Alan (2003). *Polling Apart: Suburbanization and the Political Polarization of Large Canadian Urban Regions, 1945-2000*, PhD Thesis (geography), University of Toronto.
- WALKS, R-Alan (2004). "Place of Residence, Party Preferences and Political Attitudes in Canadian Cities and Suburbs", *Journal of Urban Affairs*, vol. 26, no. 3, p. 269-295.
- WALLIS, A. D. (1994). Series of four articles in *National Civic Review*. "Evolving Structures and Challenges of Metropolitan Regions", p. 40-53 ; "Inventing Regionalism: The first Two Waves", p. 159-175 ; "The Third Wave: Current Trends in Regional Governnace", p. 290-310 ; "Inventing Regionalism: a Two-phase Approach", p. 447-468.
- WHEELER, S.M. and T. BEATLEY (2004). *The Sustainable Urban Development Reader*. London, New York: Routledge,

Table 1. Some measures assessing the fragmentation of the Canadian Metropolitan Areas.

| CMA | Population, 2001 Census | Number of municipalities 2004 | Number of municipalities per 100 000 Inhabitants | Number of municipalities per 100 km ² | % of the CMA population living in the Central city 200? | Municipal fragmentation/ Index Zeigler and Brunn | Demographic Density / Central-City 2001 (inhab./km ²) | Demographic Density/ Suburbs 2001 (Inhab./km ²) |
|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| Saskatoon | 225 927 | 23 | 10.2 | 0.44 | 87.1 | 1.17 | 1 326 | 5 |
| Windsor | 307 877 | 5 | 1.6 | 0,49 | 67.7 | 0.24 | 1 727 | 110 |
| Victoria | 311 902 | 14 | 4.5 | 2.01 | 23.8 | 1.89 | 3 766 | 351 |
| Halifax | 356 183 | 1 | 0.3 | 0.02 | 99.9 | 0.03 | 65 | NA |
| London | 432 451 | 7 | 1.6 | 0.30 | 77.8 | 0.21 | 797 | 50 |
| Winnipeg | 671 274 | 10 | 1.5 | 0.24 | 92.3 | 0.16 | 1 331 | 14 |
| Québec City | 682 757 | 22 | 3.8 | 0.70 | 74.4* | 0.43 | 1 819 | 167 |
| Edmonton | 937 845 | 32 | 3.4 | 0.34 | 71.0 | 0.48 | 974 | 31 |
| Calgary | 951 395 | 8 | 0.8 | 0.16 | 92.4 | 0.09 | 1 252 | 16 |
| Ottawa-Gatineau | 1 063 664 | 13 | 1.2 | 0.24 | 79.0* | 0.15 | 298 | 89 |

Source : Statistics Canada, and calculations by Collin, Robertson et Charron (2005).

* Those figures would be superior to 90% if, instead of only taking account of the central cities of Quebec City and Ottawa, we would also add the population of the twin cities of Québec-Lévis in one case and then Ottawa-Gatineau.

Table 2. The Metropolitan Areas' Institutions (2006)

| Metropolitan Areas | Recent Institutional Reform | Existing Metropolitan Authorities | Specific Metropolitan Bodies | Particular Issues | Sectoral Metropolitan Agencies | Provincial Governments' Initiatives | Infra-municipal Bodies |
|--------------------|---|---|--|--|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Saskatoon | | One of Canada's most fragmented CMA, even though the Central City counts for 87% of the CMA's total population. | The City of Saskatoon is completely embedded into the Municipality of Corman Park. | | Metropolitan Authority responsible for promoting Economic Development | | LAP Committees on land use planning. |
| Windsor | Reorganization of Essex County, that included municipal mergers (1992) | Model consisting in the Cohabitation of diverse territorial structures. The main being the City of Windsor and Essex County. | | Problematic of Trans-border governance: Windsor VS Detroit which entail a particular concern on 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). | | |
| Victoria | | <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. | | | | | |
| Halifax | Municipal mergers (1996) | Unicity Model. Halifax Regional Municipality. Every task of municipal or local scope is taken in charge by the HRM. | | | <i>Greater Halifax Partnership</i> is responsible for promoting economic development but does not have any planning duty. | | Boroughs. Six Community Councils. |
| London | 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 whole London region. | | |

Table 2. The Metropolitan Areas' Institutions (2006). Cont.

| Metropolitan Areas | Recent Institutional Reform | Existing Metropolitan Authorities | Specific Metropolitan Bodies | Particular Issues | Sectoral Metropolitan Agencies | Provincial Governments' Initiatives | Infra-municipal Bodies |
|------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| Winnipeg | New Charter of the City of Winnipeg (2002) | Unicity Model since 1972. | Tripartite Agreement (Federal-Provincial-Municipal). <i>Winnipeg Capital Region</i> that includes the Cities of Winnipeg and Selkirk as well as 14 rural Municipalities. | | <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. Capital Region Partnership Act</i> (2005): The Act is destined to give the Capital region's 16 municipalities partnership a legal recognition. | Community Councils (5). |
| Quebec City | Municipal mergers and metropolitan body (2002). | Communauté métropolitaine de Québec (2002) : « light » Planning and coordinating agency. combined with the Unicity model : Twin cities. | Région of the Capitale nationale du Québec. A territory larger than the CMA. | | | | Boroughs in Quebec City (8) and in the City of Lévis (3). |
| Edmonton | | Model consisting in the Cohabitation of diverse territorial structures. <i>Alberta Capital Region Alliance Ltd.</i> : Voluntary Association of municipalities in the like of Council of Governments (COG). | Few <i>Regional Service Commissions</i> respecting approximately the <i>Capital Region's</i> . territory | | Local public services management based on the private firm model (vg EPCOR-Utilities Inc. And public transportation services by the City of Edmonton | | |
| Calgary | | Unicity model, since the 1950's. The City of Calgary is the only significant institution. | | | <i>Calgary Economic Development</i> : Metropolitan Agency responsible for promoting economic development | | |
| Ottawa-Gatineau | Municipal mergers in the Ontarian 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 of metropolitan addressing issues regarding land-use planning, tourism as well as 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). | | |

Table 3. Strategic Planning Documents in 2006

| Metropolitan Areas | Strategic Vision Documents | Time Frame | Municipal Management Plan | Public Involvement | Other Strategic Planning Initiatives | Infra-municipal Bodies |
|--------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Saskatoon | <i>Saskatoon Strategic Plan</i> : General scope which present the City of Saskatoon's vision, and mission as well as its main values (1993; updated in 2003). "The development of a vision for the community, a mission statement, and a set of corporate values." | Timeless | Framework for the more precise <i>Corporate Business Plan</i> | | | Instigate the involvement of community actors through, among other things, <i>Local Area Plans (LAP)</i> . |
| Windsor | <i>Our Vision: Our Future, the City of Windsor Community Strategic Plan</i> : City of Windsor's Strategic plan (1996). Provides guidance over a 20 year period. Updated in 2003. Assure the coherence between what used to be considered as three separated topics: Quality of life, Quality of the Environment and Economic development. | Timeless | Address city-wide policy matters: <i>Windsor Official Plan</i> . Completed 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). | | |
| Victoria | <i>Regional Growth Strategy</i> : Spatial plan (2003). Agreement between the CRD and local municipalities. Not binding for local municipalities although, the RGS establishes certain quantitative targets for initiatives in economic, social and sustainable development. | Timeless. The first five years review will be initiated in 2008. | | | | |
| Halifax | <i>HRM 20/20: Visions and Values</i> (2000). A report that sets the base for the future regional plan (<i>HRM's Regional Plan</i>), under the responsibility of the Mayor's Office, the plan remains a <i>Working Draft</i> to this day. The document states community centered values. | 25 years | <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 linkage with the <i>HRM 20/20</i> report. | Follows a major public consultation process: more than 700 citizens were involved and it preceded a <i>Community Forum</i> attended by 150 citizens. The process has since been delayed. | | |
| London | <i>Strategic Planning Session, September 9th, 2004</i> , few strategic visions were worked out during a City council planning. (centered on municipal organization) | Timeless | <i>London's Blueprint for Success</i> . The Official Plan. <i>County of Middlesex Official Plan</i> . | | | |
| Winnipeg | | 20 years | <i>Plan Winnipeg Vision 2020</i> : The City of Winnipeg's strategic vision (2001). The document focus on municipal activities and "quality of life" related topics. | | <i>Next Steps</i> : Manitoba's action plan that advances the base for a then forthcoming regional plan (2001). The provincial Government establishes itself as the main planning authority. | |

Table 3. Strategic Planning Documents in 2006 cont.

| Metropolitan Areas | Strategic Vision Documents | Time Frame | Municipal Management Plan | Public Involvement | Other Strategic Planning Initiatives | Infra-municipal Bodies |
|------------------------|---|------------|--|---|---|--|
| Quebec City | <i>Bâtir ensemble une communauté plus forte</i> (June 2005). Strategic Vision document addressing the economic, cultural, environmental and social development of the metropolitan area. The document is fleshed out by more specific sector plans in matters related to economic and environmental development. | 20 years | <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 et 8 position papers from individuals were presented. | <i>Consolider la capitale du Québec</i> : Land use and development objectives of the <i>Commission de la capitale nationale</i> . | |
| Edmonton | | | <i>Plan Edmonton</i> : document leading the 140 sector plans and other planning documents (1998). 3 years time frame. Completed by the <i>Edmonton Corporate Business Plan</i> . | | | |
| Calgary | | | <i>Plan Calgary</i> : planning initiative steering other sector plans (1998). | | | |
| Ottawa-Gatineau | <i>Ottawa 20/20 Growth Management Strategy</i> . The strategy is the framework for managing growth over the next 20 years... Thought in the context of the new merged city and in order to gain support from every merged community as well as from the representatives of different sector of activities. A flexible plan that, along the way, would be adapted to the ever changing planning context. | 20 years. | The Ottawa Official Plan sets out the city's physical development framework. | Result of public consultation process lead by Ottawa's officials ... Inspired by the Smart Growth concept and by its application in the specific context of the City of Ottawa. (<i>Smart Growth Summit</i> held from June 14-18, 2001) | National Capital Commission Plan (1999). | |
| Ottawa-Gatineau | <i>Plan stratégique 2003-2007</i> . Follows the work of the <i>Commission des choix stratégiques</i> . The plan addresses both future growth perspectives of Gatineau and the municipal management. The plan will be revised periodically to assess the evolution of Gatineau's community. A program was also put in place to monitor the elements likely to influence both inside and outside environment. | 4 years. | The execution of strategic directions would be made 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 the synthesis of the workshop discussions. The Commission also put forward different initiatives to stimulate public involvement and the participation of different organisms throughout the process. | National Capital Commission Plan (1999). | "Villages urbains" (16) whose size range from 10 000 to 40 000 inhabitants. The acknowledgement of those urban villages contributes to generate a feeling of belonging to the new merged city. |

Table 4. Strategic (or Prospective) Planning Documents, in 2006: founding values, principles and/or orientations

| Région | Saskatoon | Windsor | Victoria | Halifax | London | Winnipeg | Quebec City | Edmonton | Calgary | Ottawa-Gatineau | Ottawa-Gatineau |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|----------------------------|---|---|
| Time frame | timeless | timeless | timeless | timeless | timeless | 20 years | 20 years | 3 years | timeless | 20 years | 4 years |
| Structure | Central City | Central City | Regional | Unicity | Central City | Central City | Regional | Central City | Unicity | Unicity | Unicity |
| Number and type of main directions | Seven hopes and dreams | Four interrelated themes | Eight strategic initiatives | Eight people's values | Five priority areas | Six principles | Cinq valeurs communes du développement. | Our vision | Three major policy thrusts | Seven principles | Quatre objectifs principaux |
| | (1) an enhanced quality of life | (1) Vibrant economy | (1) keep urban settlement compact | (1) Communities working together | (1) Community development: a caring, safe and healthy community | (1) Sustainability | (1) le développement durable | (1) A culturally diverse city where people choose to live, learn, work, and play | (1) Growth management | (1) A caring and inclusive city | (1) L'amélioration du milieu de vie bâti et la préservation des ressources naturelles |
| | (2) a vibrant economy | (2) Safe, caring, and diverse community | (2) protect the integrity of rural communities | (2) Economic prosperity as the backbone of a successful community | (2) Core infrastructure: a safe, efficient, and effective civic infrastructure | (2) Social consciousness | (2) le développement de communautés viables, inclusives et accessibles | (2) An international smart city with a vibrant economy | (2) Healthy environments | (2) A creative city, rich in heritage, Unique in identity | (2) Travailler ensemble pour résoudre les grandes problématique et ainsi devenir une communauté dynamique |
| | (3) responsible, progressive environmental management | (3) Sustainable healthy environment | (3) protect regional green and blue space | (3) Responsible active citizenship | (3) Culture: a distinct and positive identity and image of the city | (3) Thoughtful development | (3) la culture de l'innovation | (3) A capital city where business want to locate and expand | (3) Healthy communities | (3) Green and environmentally-sensitive city | (3) Tenir compte des différents milieux de vie pour préserver l'identité de chacun tout en partageant un sentiment d'appartenance à toute la municipalité |
| | (4) continued river valley stewardship (Saskatchewan River Valley) | (4) Responsible, Effective local government | (4) manage natural resources and the environment sustainably | (4) Social justice for all | (4) Commerce: a strong and diversified local economy | (4) Partnership and collaboration | (4) l'aménagement du territoire exemplaire à la hauteur du statut de capitale | (4) A welcoming city where citizens take pride in their community and in their contribution to its quality of life | | (4) A city of distinct, liveable communities | (4) La gouvernance devra démontrer une volonté de démocratie par le développement de partenariats et l'encouragement d'une plus grande participation du citoyen à la vie municipale |
| | (5) recognizing the diversity of neighbourhoods while promoting a united community | | (5) build complete communities | (5) Protecting our natural environment | (5) Civic governance: a responsive and accountable local government | (5) Healthy leaving | (5) le respect des patrimoines naturel et historique | | | (5) An innovative city where prosperity is shared among all | |
| | (6) planned growth | | (6) improve housing affordability | (6) Preserving our heritage | | (6) Local empowerment | | | | (6) A responsible and responsive city | |
| | (7) regional and global opportunities | | (7) increase transportation choice | (7) Strength through diversity | | | | | | (7) A healthy and active city | |
| | | | (8) strengthen the regional economy | (8) Dedication to a learning culture | | | | | | | |

Table 5. Metropolitan and municipal structures and their cultural public policies *

| Metropolitan Areas | Metropolitan policies | Metropolitan Structure | Central city policies | Central City Structures |
|--------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Saskatoon | | | Civic Arts Policy | |
| Victoria | Regional Arts Strategic Plan | | | |
| Halifax | HRM Cultural Plan | Cultural Advisory Committee | | |
| London | | | Cultural Master Plan de Strathroy-Caradoc | Strathroy District Art Council |
| | | | Creative City Task Force | Creating City Working Group |
| Winnipeg | | | Plan Winnipeg 2020 Vision | Arts Council |
| Quebec City | | Conseil de la culture des régions de Québec et de Chaudières-Appalaches | Politique culturelle de Québec. Plan en matière de développement culturel 2005-2007 | |
| | | | Politique culturelle de Lévis. | |
| Edmonton | | | | Arts Council |
| Calgary | | | Civic Arts Policy | |
| Ottawa-Gatineau | | | Ottawa : Arts plan | |
| | | | Gatineau, la culture une passion qui nous anime | |

* Windsor is absent from the table as there is no structure or cultural policy in place.

Table 6. Cultural policies' directions at the municipal and metropolitan scales *

| Metropolitan Areas | Metropolitan policy | Strategic Directions | Central City Policy | Strategic Directions |
|--------------------|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Saskatoon | | | Civic Arts Policy | Inclusive process involving a representative sample of the larger arts community Open and transparent process; City Administration will work together with the relevant stakeholders; Involve a cross section from the arts community for input and feedback Consider the implications of the policy to the arts community in general. |
| Victoria | Regional Arts Strategic Plan | To promote artistic and cultural dimension tourist attractions of the area. To improve the formation like developing and maintaining the assets arts culture. To manage the funds. | | |
| Halifax | HRM Cultural Plan | Ensure coordination and Partnership formation amongst business, agencies and governments. Ensure a unified and sustainable plan for cultural programs, facilities management and financial investments Guide future decision-making and investments in order to raise the profile of arts and culture in the HRM. Raise awareness and participation and promote equal access to all cultural activities Promote and celebrate HRM's reputation as a creative community Support cultural education and lifelong learning in children youth, adults and seniors. | | |
| London | | | Cultural Master Plan de Strathroy-Caradoc | Bridge generations Revitalize abandoned spaces Reduce crime and graffiti Increase resident's pride in our area Create a "sense of place" that brings visitors back for repeat visits Preserve and celebrate traditions Revitalize areas Improve academic performance Engage youth Unite cultures |
| | | | Creative City Task Force | Example London broadens public access to the excellence and diversity of our local arts sector and aggressively promotes policies to attract and retain the creative class |
| Winnipeg | | | Plan Winnipeg 2020 Vision | i) promoting awareness of the richness of its arts, entertainment, and culture both within and outside Winnipeg; ii) providing and supporting a wide range of arts, entertainment, and cultural facilities to meet the needs of its citizens; iii) providing effective municipal planning, policy development, and procedures for the cultural sector, while focusing civic expertise on cultural development, and dealing with cultural concerns in a coordinated fashion; iv) establishing an independent arts council with the responsibility for allocating cultural grants, providing timely advice to City Council on cultural matters, and taking a leadership role on behalf of The City of Winnipeg; and v) taking a lead role at the political and staff levels in facilitating, coordinating, and augmenting intergovernmental funding support for the arts, entertainment, and cultural communities. |
| Québec city | | | Politique culturelle de Québec. | Une culture accessible, une vitalité culturelle soutenue, une identité patrimoniale affirmée, des horizons élargis. |
| | | | Politique culturelle de Lévis. | La ville de Lévis veut affirmer le rôle de premier plan que la culture doit jouer en regard de l'identité lévisienne et la responsabilité de la ville pour sa promotion et son développement : a) les arts et les lettres, b) les bibliothèques, c) le patrimoine et l'histoire, d) le tourisme culturel. |
| Calgary | | | Civic Arts Policy | The arts play a leadership role in the future of Calgary; Artists are welcome in Calgary The arts are accessible and engage as many Calgarians as possible Calgary's artists are recognized for their excellence; Unique and authentic characteristics of Calgary's arts scene are identified and strengthened; Stakeholders cooperate and create connections to realize the full potential of the arts; Arts and culture are recognized as an important part of a vibrant city; Accountability is maintained when making arts-related investments; Municipal investments in the arts leverage investment from other orders of government and other sectors; Investments made in the arts are focused on long term growth and sustainability of the sector as a dual responsibility of funders and arts organizations. |
| Ottawa-Gatineau | | | Ottawa : Arts plan | Broaden Public Access to the locale Arts Keep Ottawa's Artist's here Build Creative Capacity Revitalize Public Places and Natural Spaces through the arts Realize Economic Potential of Local Cultural Sector. |
| | | | Gatineau, la culture une passion qui nous anime | Mise à profit du contexte géopolitique Accessibilité et participation à la culture Affirmation de nos facteurs identitaires Le soutien aux arts et à la création Le partenariat La reconnaissance du bénévolat Le soutien à l'émergence de projets prometteurs et novateurs Le financement des arts et de la culture |

* Windsor and Edmonton are absent from table since they do not have any cultural policy.

**The City of London's web site does not contain anymore information regarding the city's cultural policy and other initiatives.

Table 7. Economic Development Strategies in Canadian Metropolitan Areas

| Metropolitan Region | Planning Authorities | Description | Economic Development Strategy Documents |
|----------------------------|--|---|--|
| Saskatoon | City of Saskatoon | | Both the Strategic Plan and the Corporate Business Plan include orientations relating to economic development. |
| Windsor-Essex | | | No economic development strategy |
| Victoria | Capital Regional District | Regional planning Authority | Economic Development Strategy to come |
| | Government of British-Columbia | | Economic Development Strategy for the Heartlands Region |
| Halifax | Greater Halifax Partnership (GHP) | Public-Private Partnership (3 levels of Government and the public sector) in place since 1996 | Halifax Regional Municipality' Economic Development Strategy. Strategies for Success |
| London | City of London in partnership with TechAlliance of Southwestern Ontario and the Stiller Centre for Biotechnology Commercialization | | London's next Economy |
| Winnipeg | City of Winnipeg | | City of Winnipeg's Strategic Plan (<i>Plan Winnipeg 2020</i>) and <i>A Homegrown Economic Development Strategy</i> |
| Quebec City | Communauté métropolitaine de Québec | Planning and Coordinating metropolitan Authority | <i>Plan des grands enjeux du développement économique</i> |
| Edmonton | Edmonton Economic Development Corporation (EEDC) | Corporation administered by the City of Edmonton | <i>Greater Edmonton Competitiveness Strategy</i> |
| Calgary | Calgary Economic Development | Created by a tripartite Partnership | Steer the C-Prosperity Program (Cluster based Strategy) |
| Ottawa-Gatineau | City of Gatineau | | Plan stratégique |
| | City of Ottawa | | Economic Strategy based on three sectoral reports : <i>Innovation Ottawa</i> , <i>Serving Ottawa</i> (Local economy development) and <i>Rural Ottawa</i> . |

Table 8. Economic development strategies and planning initiatives' main directions.

| Metropolitan Areas | Directions |
|--------------------|--|
| Saskatoon | -Ensure balanced growth; -Facilitate the redevelopment of North Downtown; -Build strong industrial sectors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Life sciences (including Biotech, Neutraceuticals and, Pharmaceuticals); • Value-added agriculture and food processing; • Mining and natural resources processing (Ville de Saskatoon and SREDA). |
| Windsor-Essex | -Diversifying the economy and maintain/enhance existing strengths (automotive, tourism); -Support development of Windsor's workforce; -Manage social and economic aspects of downtown (City of Windsor Community Strategic Plan) |
| Victoria | -Building on regional opportunities,; -Revitalizing the resource industry; -Encouraging growth in new and promising sectors; -Restoring transportation infrastructure; -Creating the conditions that promote investment (B.C. Heartlands Strategy). |
| Halifax | -Working to develop Halifax Gateway as the East Coast logistics hub; -Supercharging our labor force; -Enhancing the City's persona as one of the most vibrant by investing in social and cultural infrastructure; -Improving the business climate; -Building on Halifax's quality of life to draw top-drawer companies and people (<i>Halifax Regional Municipality' Economic Development Strategy. Strategies for Success</i>) |
| London | -Accelerating London's growth and global competitiveness; -Expanding London's knowledge base; -Increasing London's innovation capacity (City of London and al., <i>London's next Economy</i>). |
| Winnipeg | -Supporting strategic clusters and high industry interdependence; -Diversifying the economy through the proliferation of many smaller businesses; -Closing the skills gap and enhancing immigration (City of Winnipeg, 2002, <i>A Homegrown Economic Development Strategy</i>). -Promoting downtown development (City of Winnipeg, <i>Plan Winnipeg 2020</i> , 2001) |
| Quebec City | -Hausser le niveau de vie; -Miser davantage sur l'économie sociale; -Favoriser le développement durable; -Adapter la région et le marché du travail aux changements démographiques -Favoriser l'innovation; -Renforcer le positionnement de la région sur le plan des transports et des communications; -Développer des activités à caractère international pour améliorer le rayonnement de la région; -Préserver et affirmer le statut de la capitale; -Diversifier l'économie (Communauté métropolitaine de Québec, 2005, <i>Plan des grands enjeux économiques 2005-2010</i>). |
| Edmonton | -Improving the formation, expansion and attraction of businesses in 8 industrial clusters (Edmonton Economic Development Corporation, 2000, <i>The Greater Edmonton Competitiveness Strategy</i>). |
| Calgary | -Strengthening Calgary's global competitiveness while protecting and enhancing the quality of life -Maintaining sustained economic growth and prosperity in the Calgary Economic Region through workforce development and human capital attraction efforts (Calgary Economic Development). |
| Ottawa-Gatineau | -Building knowledge and ideas; -Linking innovation to market; -Supporting and strengthening key economic activities; -Investing in people and places; -Promoting Ottawa to the world; -Using land use policies to reinforce economic goals. (Ville d'Ottawa, <i>Ottawa 2020</i>). -Approche par clusters; appuyer le développement de la main d'œuvre, actions pour les PME, favoriser le développement et la mise en marché de l'innovation; diversifier l'économie; miser sur les secteurs des hautes-technologies, tourisme en s'appuyant sur les Universités; développer des Créneaux d'excellence (Ville de Gatineau) |

Table 9. Environmental and sustainable development policies at the municipal and metropolitan scales *

| Metropolitan Areas | At the Metropolitan Scale | Metropolitan Structure/Institution | At the Municipal (central city) Scale | Municipal (central city) Structure/Institution |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| Saskatoon | | | Strategic Plan Corporate business plan | |
| Windsor | | Windsor Essex County Environment Committee | Environmental Master Plan | Environmental Planning Advisory Committee |
| Victoria | | Capital Regional District | | |
| Halifax | Naturally Green | Environment Mangement Service | | |
| London | Middlesex County 2001-2004 Strategic Plan | | | London Clean and Green |
| Winnipeg | Next Steps | | Plan Winnipeg 2020 Vision Sustainable Winnipeg: A comprehensive Environmental Strategy. Embracing Sustainability: An environment Priority and Implementation for the City of Winnipeg 2004-2006 | |
| Quebec Ciry | Partage CMQ- Municipalités | | Plan environnemental 2004-2005 Pour une capitale exemplaire en environnement | |
| Edmonton | | | Environmental stratetgy | |
| Ottawa- Gatineau | | | Ottawa 20/20 Plan stratégique 2003-2007 Gatineau | |

* Calgary is absent from the table as there is no structure or environmental policy in place.

Table 10. Main directions and founding principals of environmental policies, in 2006 *

| Metropolitan Areas | At the Metropolitan Scale | Founding principals | At the Municipal (central city) Scale | Directions |
|--------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|
| Saskatoon | | | Strategic Plan Corporate business plan | Maximize the life of the existing landfill beyond 25 years Address issues regarding sewage collection and treatment Continue to pursue innovative environmental management programs Monitor issues resulting from the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol Participate in discussions in the development of Provincial regulations for treatment of storm water |
| Windsor | | | Environmental Master Plan | Form Partnerships: We will pursue partnerships between the City and the community, other levels of government, private and voluntary sectors to work towards solutions to environmental challenges and opportunities Engage Residents: We will build awareness and inform residents of the Plan's progress and seek feedback Focus on Innovation and Balance: We will review and consider best practices while balancing economic, social and ecological considerations Work Together: Internally, the Corporation and its agencies will collaborate and communicate about the Plan's implementation Lead By Example: We will act as leaders by providing responsible and proactive service to our residents Track Our Progress: We will monitor, evaluate, and report on the Plan's progress to Council and the community-at-large and implement follow-up actions Achieve Realism: We will strive for a balance between ambitious and achievable planning |
| Victoria | | monitoring of the quality of the air, the collection of the solid waste, the distribution and the water treatment administration of the parks of the area | | |
| Halifax | Naturally Green | Fusions of several organizations which already worked in the field of the Services environment of recycling, of composting, economy of water, non-utilization of pesticide, pollution TEAM prevention | | |
| London | Middlesex Plan | Contains objectives and recommendations for the environmental protection | | |
| Winnipeg | Next Steps | Series of engagements of which co-operation with the other scales of government and the industrial sector: | Plan Winnipeg 2020 Vision Sustainable Winnipeg : A comprehensive Environmental Strategy. Embracing Sustainability : An environment Priority and Implementation for the City of Winnipeg 2004-2006 | Examining perverse subsidies resulting from existing municipal budgets and reporting on the environmental implications of existing fiscal policies. Educating City employees on green procurement. Developing a protocol for full-cost accounting and working towards fiscal tools that promote sustainability spur innovation and create employment. Ensuring that budgets protect the environment, enhance our economy, spur innovation, promote energy, efficiency and encourage conservation. Ensuring social and intergenerational equity that the move toward green budgeting is equitable and improve the effectiveness of municipal fiscal systems and cooperating with other levels of government to ensure that provincial and federal policies do not compromise municipal green budget policies. |
| Québec | Partage CMQ-Municipalités | | Plan environnemental 2004-2005 Pour une capitale exemplaire en environnement | Les stratégies de développement durable, l'amélioration de la qualité de l'air, la protection de la ressource eau, la gestion des matières résiduelles, la protection et la mise en valeur des milieux naturels et de la forêt urbaine, la réhabilitation des sols contaminés, le développement d'une image corporative et les relations avec les citoyens, l'élaboration d'une vision à long terme des actions à poser en environnement. |
| Edmonton | | | Environmental strategy | The responsibility we share with the public, industry and other levels of government for environmental well-being; The responsibility we have to demonstrate leadership as a municipal corporation in fostering responsible behaviour for the well-being of the environment; The responsibility we have to include environmental matters as important criteria in our decision making process; The responsibility we have towards development that does not impair the well-being of present and future generations; The responsibility we have to ensure compliance with all applicable environmental legislation and regulatory requirements; The responsibility we have to ensure that environmental solutions are delivered in a practical and fiscally responsible manner. |
| Ottawa-Gatineau | | | Ottawa 20/20 Plan stratégique 2003-2007 Gatineau | |

* Calgary is absent from the table as there is no structure or environmental policy in place.