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ABSTRACT

In a province that describes itself as a democracy, all areas of New Brunswick are not represented at the local level. While all cities, towns, villages, and rural communities are represented by an elected council, local services districts are not represented by an elected mayor or council. Local service districts are provincial entities and are thus represented by the Provincial Minister of Environment and Local Government.

There has been a great deal of public scrutiny of the provincial government regarding the lack of a defined process for community service agreements, specifically with shared service agreements. The shared service agreement seeks to maximize efficiency and the value of citizens' dollars by sharing a service between two or more communities such as recreation agreements. Local service district citizens have been questioning the government's authority under the Municipalities Act for these legally binding agreements. They are claiming that these agreements are unlegislated and unregulated in the Act and Regulations which guide the procedure for the addition or suspension of services.

This report will argue for a legislative process of shared service agreements. Increasing the use of shared service agreements in local service districts meets the needs of local citizens while also promoting participatory democracy where representative democracy is absent. A legitimate shared service agreement process would address transparency and accountability concerns from citizens, and local government structural problems the provincial government appears eager to modernize.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Democracy’s literal Greek translation of ‘demos’ and ‘kratos’, meaning ‘people’ and ‘power’, refers to how the people participating in the democratic process have the ultimate power as part of a direct democracy (Ober, 2008). Others believe that even though our formal democratic system has its weaknesses and that there is a need to encourage greater direct participation in the political process, the representative system is far more democratic and open to all than direct democracy (Nahan, 2004). However, traditional representative democracy tends to limit citizen participation to voting, leaving actual governance to politicians and a civil service. If a democracy is a system of government in which the people hold the ruling power by electing certain persons to make laws and to do the work of governing at all levels, why is this not the case in local governments within New Brunswick?

Section three of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms affirms that every Canadian citizen has the right to vote in federal and provincial elections (Charter, 1982); however, it neglects elections at the local level as not all systems of local government are representative. Despite democracy’s limitations, providing opportunities for the public to be engaged in decisions affecting their own welfare is extremely important. Where a representative democracy is absent, a participatory democracy (i.e. citizen-made decision-making) is the best option for governance. Participatory democracy has the potential to reverse the tide of civic disengagement and break down the walls of perceived elitism in a representative democracy. Recognizing that participatory democracy is not a panacea, Nylen claims that it could serve as “a blueprint for a necessary democratic revival in the twenty-first century” (p. 12).
Based on underlying principles of an open and transparent government, municipal council meetings are open to the public where citizens can take a proposal to council or its committees simply by requesting a place on the agenda. Municipalities have provisions for direct democracy that allow citizens to vote on important issues through public meetings, to petition their council or, for the province of New Brunswick, through the provincial Minister of Environment and Local Government who can force a question on an issue of community importance on the ballot. The cumulative effect of this is that an open government produces even stronger demands by the public for participation and citizens have also come to expect that they will be heard. This has been the case for the provincial government of New Brunswick.

It is essential to remember that local governments are very different from provincial or federal governments in the traditional ways in which they relate to citizens, as not all areas of New Brunswick are represented at the local level. The term 'local government' in the context of this report, means a municipal government structure. The local government structures in New Brunswick are: municipalities (which are cities, towns, or villages); rural communities; and local service districts. Municipalities and rural communities are incorporated governance structures, while local service districts are unincorporated; this means LSDs do not have the same powers to operate as a corporation nor do they have the authority to make decisions on behalf of the community.

A local service district (LSD) is a unit of local government which consists of the areas outside incorporated cities, towns and villages. There are 266 local service districts in New Brunswick as opposed to approximately 101 municipalities and four rural communities. These local service districts encompass over 254,000 New Brunswickers –
over a third of New Brunswick's population (Table 1). Local Service Districts were developed after the disbanding of the old County system in the mid 1960's in response to the Byrne Commission's report and subsequent equal opportunity legislation. They are mostly organized around the parishes in the old County system, covering most of the land area of the province (Map 1).

LSDs may have elected advisory committees; however, these advisory committees do not have legislative or taxing authority. The *Municipalities Act* provides authority to the Minister of Environment and Local Government to administer services usually provided by incorporated municipalities. The Minister may call a meeting of residents eligible to vote under the *Elections Act* in a local service district or an area within a local service district, for their consideration of the provision of a new service. Services consist of: recreation and sports facilities, street lighting, garbage, land acquisitions, policing services, sewage treatments, and water works. The process begins with either a petition from 25 or more residents who are eligible to vote in the local service district who wish an additional service, or if the Minister is of the opinion that the voters should consider the addition of a new service. There must be at least 50 residents or 30 per cent of the residents who are eligible to vote, whichever is the lesser, in attendance at the meeting. If a majority of those at the meeting decide in favour of the new service, the service may, on the recommendation of the Minister, be provided.

Since services have subsequent financial implications on the tax rate of local service districts, communities have the option to share services with other local service districts in which they can share the cost of providing and maintaining a service(s) through a shared service agreement. Shared service agreements are contractual and
binding agreements that can be between two or more communities, between a
municipality/municipalities and a private company, or the Crown that will provide a
service where the operating costs of the service(s) are paid through tax rate(s). The
shared service agreements seek to maximize efficiency and the value of citizens’ dollars
by sharing a service between two or more communities. Communities may enter into a
shared service agreement for a service provided by a municipality by engaging their
citizenry in a plebiscite, commonly known as a referendum. LSD citizens have the
opportunity to vote on whether or not they would like to have the service provided to
their community and agree to pay for the service through their tax base.

Plebiscites are an active method for citizens to be engaged in their local service
district by volunteering in the administration of the vote or to solely participate in the
vote itself. Plebiscites are not offered to municipal citizens as their councils would have
the authority to vote on the service and the cost associated with that service. This may
cause citizens of municipalities to be less knowledgeable of the services they are
receiving and paying for as they are not involved in the process for voting for services.

Public engagement is no longer viewed as an opportunity that is graciously
bestowed on the public by the government of the day. It is regarded as a basic right and a
fundamental part of local governance as it has become an extension of democracy. As
local governments move toward a culture of ‘citizen-centered’ government where citizens
expect to take an active role in the planning of services that will be designed for them,
and as governments struggle to re-build relationships with their citizens after severe
budget reductions due to the global recession, citizens have even higher expectations for
public participation as a means of governance. In facing these challenges, it is important
for local governments to plan strategically to create opportunities for problem solving. Specifically, it is imperative for elected officials at the local level to bring their communities together to create opportunities for local citizens to be involved in developing, updating, and reviewing the strategic plan for their community, as this will create opportunities for leadership and action for local citizens (Ruether, St. Claire & Coffman, 2002).

As local governments are expected to engage their citizens, there is also an expectation that the citizens must be well informed and must be prepared to make tough decisions as well. Citizens share a responsibility for how local governments perform. It is, nevertheless, the responsibility and duty of all levels of government to provide opportunities for citizens to be engaged in policy decisions that directly affect them. Local governments must be accountable to their citizens on how public input is used in policy-making.

Table 1: Local Governance Structures, Population and Geography (J. Finn, p. 28)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Structure</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent of total Population</th>
<th>Area covered (sq. kms)</th>
<th>Percent of Area Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>456,641</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Communities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,243</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Service Districts</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>254,527</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>67,097</td>
<td>92.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Nations</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>7,586</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>729,997*</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>72,820</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Numbers are based on data from 2008 and have changed since published.*
When the provincial government tabled its budget in March 2009, the negative effects of the recession were starting to be felt in New Brunswick. The consequence of the recession meant that the budget for many programs and operations had to be reduced - including a $300,000 cut to New Brunswick ferry operations. This budget cut meant the closing of essential ferries located in two rural communities. The New Brunswick government reversed its controversial decision to cut the ferry services after it sparked public demonstrations on the front lawn of the Legislative Assembly and criticism in the media for not consulting the communities affected. This budget cut would have affected not just the means of transportation for residents of these communities but it also
threatened their economic growth. As one local resident stressed, "[t]erminating the service would slow the response times of emergency vehicles, create headaches for agriculture producers and hurt the tourism industry" (Poitras, 2009b). Even though the protests eventually led government to conduct community consultations regarding the proposed budget cuts, this confrontation could have been avoided had the government consulted the communities or conducted a plebiscite before a decision was announced. In addition to the public being critical of the policy move, the public have also made some disparaging remarks regarding the New Brunswick government's lack of a defined process for public engagement in developing government policy. One resident who opposed the policy decision was quoted in the Daily Gleaner as saying: "There's a complete lack of communication from government to the people of this province" (Poitras, 2009a). While there is a mechanism for New Brunswickers to be involved in the establishment of services in the local service districts, it is ineffective.

The public are not passive consumers of government policies and programs. They will often object when government policies have gone awry and do not reflect the views of the majority or those of special interest groups. The Crossing Boundaries National Council and their Canada 2020 working group chaired by public engagement expert, Don Lenihan, are a not-for-profit national forum whose mission is to foster the development of Canada as an information society through a more citizen-centered approach to government and governance. They have recognized that "[t]hey (the public) are less willing to accept that their role in democracy occurs at the polling station" (p.115).
Still, a large number of citizens do not vote. From information collected through the Department of Environment and Local Government, data shows that voter turnout for plebiscites held between 2008 and 2011 regarding service additions hovered around nine percent (Table 2). This may speak to communication problems between the Province and LSDs when it concerns local policy development as mentioned in the previous ferry example by one concerned citizen. The engagement and voter turnout problem can become a temporal ‘chicken and egg’ argument, but to start, if the public was more informed and engaged through discussion sessions, perhaps this would lead to more participation at the polls. Information and discussion sessions are an opportunity for citizens to gather and to receive information and discuss the issue with other citizens prior to the plebiscite and tend to build momentum for the actual plebiscite. “[P]eople are more likely to participate in debates about the future of local community centres or the upkeep of local roads between local elections than to vote in them” (Graham & Phillips, 1998a, p. 224).
Table 2: Percentage of Voter Turnout from 2008-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L.S.D</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Voters</th>
<th>% Participation</th>
<th>Population 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maugerville</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Maryland</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish of Saint-Paul</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish of Canning</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltempec</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish of Bathurst</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarendon</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blissville</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Mary</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Marys</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish of Northampton</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of voter turnout: 9.38%

Another example of citizens demanding transparency in policy decisions and process is regarding the creation of shared service agreements between communities. These shared service agreements have financial implications on the tax bases of the partnering communities. Shared service agreements seek to maximize efficiency and the value of citizens’ dollars by sharing a service between two or more communities such as recreation agreements. Citizens of the province of New Brunswick have questioned the government’s authority under the Municipalities Act for these legally binding agreements. They are claiming that these agreements are unlegislated and unregulated in the Act and Regulations which guide the procedure for the addition or suspension of services. The bureaucrats who administer these agreements have been condemned by the public when one bureaucrat openly stated that “the Act was silent on such
agreements...while the policy developed for the shared recreation service agreement was created to be consistent with the Act, the agreement does not fall under the Municipalities Act” (Oldenburg, 2009, p. C6).

Two things are evident. One, what may have worked in the past, is not appropriate for the future. This is becoming increasingly evident as government struggles to make policy decisions while dealing with dwindling budgets. This has caused decisions to be made without seeking public input before cutting services. Two, there is not a clearly defined process on how to engage the public. From the two examples above, it appears that government is manipulating public feedback and opinions to support government decisions by consulting with citizens and reversing policy decisions after they were made by cabinet so they can save face and appear as a government that consults citizens; government is also not making the mechanisms or results of any of the consultations readily available to the public; and they do not have a clear and consistent process to facilitate LSD shared service agreements. These are problems especially when one of the goals of the government of the day included ‘transparency’ under its mandate.

Citizen participation can come in many forms besides casting a ballot at election time. As one author expressed, “[c]itizen engagement happens when ordinary citizens...come together, deliberate, and then take action collectively to address public problems or issues that citizens themselves define as important and in ways that citizens themselves decide are appropriate and/or needed” (Gibson, 2006, p.7). When we think of the public being engaged and involved in voicing their opinions to politicians, besides at the polls, we typically think of town hall meetings. This has been a very effective way of
engaging the public and, presently, town hall meetings are still used. With technological advances, public engagement has taken on other forms and methods, including: letter writing submissions to government, opinion polls or surveys issued by mail or electronically, and on-line consultations. This allows the public to actively address issues it considers to be important.

Using public engagement as a tool in creating government policy has become an increasingly popular instrument in creating and supporting government policies in the last five to ten years. "[F]or much of our history, policy making happened mainly inside government" (Crossing Boundaries, 2006, p.31). Policies have normally been created through in-house, closed door, and private meetings by bureaucrats. There is now an emerging culture shift in government thinking and an emphasis to demonstrate transparency in government decision making.

An example of transparency in government decision making would be the community budgeting process that is becoming more popular in the United States, the United Kingdom, and some African nations. Access to information legislation in Canada is another example of how governments are moving away from coveting information, to promoting openness and transparency by allowing the public to make requests for government documents/position papers/agreements. The province of New Brunswick was one of the first provinces to adopt right to information legislation in 1980 and has recently amended the legislation to broaden the scope of what the public can gain access to, including municipalities. Another popular method to demonstrate transparency is by using public consultation. Even the government of New Brunswick used public consultation in forming their revised right to information legislation. Susan Phillips
(2006) states that public engagement can be used as a means of promoting federal visibility for purposes of national unity and of connecting with individual citizens to restore greater trust in government. “When local governments give citizens the resources necessary to solve problems, they send a positive message about the value they place on the contributions of citizens” (Moulder & O’Neill, 2009, p. 27).

Local governments in New Brunswick have been conducting public engagement as a routine part of land use planning and are increasingly being confronted with the need to undertake citizen engagement in new areas such as shared service delivery. The methods that had been previously tailored to dealing with local development issues must now be modified or replaced by new methods that can properly engage their citizens in other policy areas.

1.2 Main Goal of the Study

If the government wishes to use what some critics may refer to as a ‘trendy’ policy development strategy, government needs to be able to use the technique of public engagement effectively and establish a process for engaging the public at the right time and in the correct manner. Hence, my intention with this report is to outline a process that aids the provincial government in creating and implementing shared service agreements in LSDs. Specifically, I intend to outline a process to allow for contractual service agreements among LSDs. This may mean that an amendment to the Municipalities Act will be required to allow for a new course of action.

The study is significant since there has been a great deal of public scrutiny of the provincial government regarding the lack of a defined process for community shared service agreements. This process will not only provide a transparent process of policy
development but will also provide government with a practical method of accountability for its decisions. Perhaps most importantly, it will also provide a voice for citizens in local service districts.

1.3 Terminology

Some terms need to be defined that are used frequently throughout this report. The term ‘public engagement’, which means “the deliberate and active participation of citizens by the council and/or administration, outside of the electoral process, in making public policy decisions or in setting strategic directions” (Graham & Phillips, 1998b, p.4), will be used to encompass other terms such as consultation/discussions/sessions/forums.

‘Devolution theory’ is the transfer of powers from a central government, in this context a provincial government, to local units or a local government. ‘Local government structures’ means a municipality (city, town or village), a rural community, or a local service district.

‘Transparency’ is implemented by a set of policies, practices and procedures that allow citizens to have accessible, usable, understandable, and auditable information and processes held by centers of authority. When government meetings are open to the press and the public, when budgets and financial statements may be reviewed by anyone, when laws, rules and decisions are open to discussion, they are seen as transparent and there is less opportunity for the authorities to abuse the system in their own interest. Feedback mechanisms (such as public engagement) are necessary to fulfill the goal of transparency (Mattozzi & Merlo). ‘Government policy’ can be generally defined as a system of laws, regulatory measures, courses of action, and funding priorities
concerning a given topic promulgated by a governmental entity or its representatives (Kilpatrick).

This report will argue for a legislative process of shared service agreements. Increasing the use of shared service agreements in local service districts meets the needs of local citizens while also promoting participatory democracy where representative democracy is absent. A legitimate shared service agreement process may address transparency and accountability concerns from citizens, and local government structural problems the provincial government appears eager to modernize.
2.0 NEW BRUNSWICK IN CONTEXT

Providing context into New Brunswick’s local service districts and their similarities and differences from other provinces may provide a better understanding of the LSD shared service agreement process.

2.1 Jurisdictional Differences

Every jurisdiction in Canada establishes a different practice for providing administration and service delivery to unincorporated territories of the province. These arrangements vary considerably in terms of territorial organization, governance, service delivery and financing arrangements (summary in Table 3). Provinces such as British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Québec, and Nova Scotia attempt to construct the entire geographic area of the province into municipal structures, and allow for unincorporated communities, settlements and hamlets within these areas. However, the provinces of Manitoba, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland do not group their entire geography into a municipal structure, but rather allow for vast areas of unincorporated territory.

In terms of governance, some provinces are directly responsible for governance and administration of the unincorporated territory, such as Prince Edward Island, and for certain types of unincorporated territory in Alberta and Saskatchewan. The governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan are directly responsible for administration of certain types of unincorporated territory, but both appoint special boards to administer services to the other types of unincorporated territory in the province. In Manitoba and Ontario, governance is provided by special boards appointed by the provincial government to deliver administration and services to the area. In both jurisdictions, the provincial
government can either choose to appoint the members of this board, or give the residents of the area the ability to vote for their representative. Meanwhile, British Columbia, Quebec, and Nova Scotia provide administration and services to their unincorporated territories through the municipal structure that the unincorporated territory falls within. For British Columbia this means the regional district, for Quebec this is the regional county municipalities and the Kativik regional administration, and in Nova Scotia this is the regional municipality, county, or district municipality.

In terms of service delivery, unincorporated areas do not necessarily benefit from the same services that incorporated municipalities provide, although, in certain provinces such as British Columbia, the range of services available to unincorporated areas is very similar to what is provided in municipalities, although wastewater and water distribution services are not provided in sparsely populated communities. In Newfoundland, legislation identifies only seven types of services that local service districts may provide, while incorporated municipalities may undertake a wider range of responsibilities. In British Columbia — and to a lesser extent, in Québec — unincorporated communities have the flexibility to choose which types of services they would like to receive from the regional district, the upper-tier local government. Communities would then only pay for the services from which they actually benefit.

Provincial governments, in general, play an important role in the delivery of public services in unincorporated areas. That being said, there is no other province that functions exactly like the unincorporated model in New Brunswick. In relation to the provinces that allow for unincorporated areas, the Province of New Brunswick
administers services, not special boards, and will provide several services to sparsely populated communities.

The only province that would be close to the New Brunswick model would be Prince Edward Island as both provincial governments undertake a wider range of local services that are typically under the responsibility of local governments. Only Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick have areas which are not served by either local or county levels of government. "Although New Brunswick has unincorporated areas, those areas are served by Local Service Districts which act in an advisory capacity to the provincial government on local matters. The effect of the foregoing is that ours is the only jurisdiction in which the provincial government provides local government services directly to some of its residents without some other form of local government structure in place" (Province of Prince Edward Island, 2009, p.75). The Province of Prince Edward Island does not acknowledge unincorporated areas as a form of Prince Edward Island's local government structure, such as LSDs in New Brunswick; therefore they do not allow for shared service agreements to be established either.

Table 3: Jurisdictional Scan of Governance and Service Delivery in Unincorporated Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Responsibility of unincorporated areas</th>
<th>Service administrator for unincorporated areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Alberta Municipal Affairs in Improvement Districts.</td>
<td>Alberta Municipal Affairs in Improvement Districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Area Boards in &quot;Special Areas&quot;.</td>
<td>Special Service Agreements between Special Area Boards and urban municipalities establish the services to be delivered to residents of Special Areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>The Regional District that the unincorporated territory falls within.</td>
<td>The Regional District that the unincorporated territory falls within.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>Either a Local Government District; or where the unincorporated</td>
<td>Either a Local Government District; or where the unincorporated territory is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Governmental Body</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newfoundland</strong></td>
<td>The Local Service District Committee.</td>
<td>The Local Service District Committee or corporations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nova Scotia</strong></td>
<td>The regional municipality, county, or district municipality that the unincorporated territory falls within.</td>
<td>The regional municipality, county, or district municipality that the unincorporated territory falls within.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontario</strong></td>
<td>The Local Services Board.</td>
<td>Either a Local Services Board or an Area Services Board. Planning Boards can also be formed to provide planning services and functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prince Edward Island</strong></td>
<td>The Province.</td>
<td>The Province or through regional cooperation initiatives among municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Québec</strong></td>
<td>The Regional County Municipality.</td>
<td>The Regional County Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the northern Nunavik area, the territory is administered by the Kativik regional administration.</td>
<td>The Kativik regional administration will provide a minimum of municipal-like services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Saskatchewan</strong></td>
<td>In Southern Saskatchewan, the Rural Municipality that the unincorporated area or hamlet is located within.</td>
<td>In Southern Saskatchewan, the Rural Municipality that the unincorporated area or hamlet is located within.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Northern Saskatchewan, the Northern Municipal Services Branch.</td>
<td>In Northern Saskatchewan, the Northern Municipal Services Branch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Government’s Response

While government has never responded to the frustrations from LSD citizens regarding the administration of shared service agreements, government has responded to some of the concerns brought to light by the Finn Report. The Finn Report has generated a growing interest in restructuring and the sharing of services; however, the government’s proposal is to implement a new local governance system. The new local governance system would bring locally elected representation to all New Brunswickers, including
LSD citizens. Government claims that they will not force communities (including LSDs) to amalgamate, but this seems unrealistic as government will be forcing LSDs to amalgamate with or be annexed by municipalities, thus eliminating the LSD structure.

Government has identified barriers to communities collaborating together in order to increase their capacity and address common pressures such as artificially low property taxes in LSDs. LSD residents are not interested in amalgamation with a municipality because of an expectation that their property taxes will be increased. This includes the inequity of the 65 cent provincial property tax in LSDs as well as the inability of municipalities to share the cost of services and infrastructure that benefits communities adjacent to their boundaries. Other barriers to regional collaboration identified by government include: no locally elected representation in LSDs, no formal method for collaboration, and no regional planning.

Government’s solution to removing the barriers that limit community restructuring and regional collaboration is by funding police and LSD administration services through local taxation and to establish a regional services delivery model. As far as government is concerned, the proposed regional services delivery model would better reflect New Brunswick’s present and projected demographic and economic conditions. Government believes that the regional services delivery model will allow for greater empowerment and cooperation between communities which would be more accountable to all communities involved.

The regional services model will divide the province into twelve regional services commissions which are comprised of all municipal and rural community mayors within each region. Unincorporated representation will be based on population and tax base
ratios. LSD Advisory Committee Chairs in each region would nominate representatives, from among all Chairs in the region, to be appointed by the Minister of Environment and Local Government. This model would eliminate shared service agreements as requests for shared services will be voted and decided on by the regional service commission, not LSDs, thus eliminating the requirement for plebiscites and abolishing LSD citizens’ involvement in making decisions related to services in their communities.

LSD citizens are frustrated with the current system of administering the shared service agreement process. Government has responded with a proposal to revise New Brunswick’s local government structure instead of addressing citizen’s concerns with the shared service agreements process. While the new system does provide opportunities for citizens to be involved by voicing their opinions prior to government proceeding with implementation of a new system through the regulations process, the new system will not provide LSD citizens with the same opportunities for engagement they had previously.
3.0 METHODOLOGY

In this report, the following questions are addressed to find a solution to the problem of New Brunswick’s lack of a defined process for public engagement in developing public policy for shared service agreements:

1 - What are the current ways that the government of New Brunswick engages citizens in developing localized government policies?

2 – Of the various methods to engage citizens which are effective in obtaining feedback?

3 – Do issues such as demographics and taxation affect citizen’s engagement in local service districts?

4 – There are different local government structures across the country. Are there any best practices or structures that should be implemented by New Brunswick?

5 – Will a redefined service agreement process be more inclusive and will citizens be more engaged in the process? Are there any other issues that need to be addressed in a revised process?

This research project builds upon a project I completed at my place of employment – the Department of Environment and Local Government. Three years ago, I was seconded as a policy analyst and project manager to renew and modernize the administrative provisions in the Municipalities Act that affect the day-to-day operations of local governments and to research new and innovative ways to modernize the current local government structure. To this end, I established a working committee, called the Municipal Representation Committee, made up of individuals from each of the four municipal associations in New Brunswick. This working committee consisted of thirteen individuals that offered a variety of perspectives as elected and administrative officials.
from municipalities of varying population size, geographic location, and language. In their report titled ‘Municipal Representation Committee Report: Review of the provisions of the Municipalities Act of New Brunswick’, they identified two priorities to be included as part of a new or revised Municipalities Act. The first priority was the inclusion in the legislation of a series of statements about the purpose of local government. The second priority was a legislative commitment by the provincial government to consult with municipalities before any changes are made in legislation or public policies that directly affect local government. These two initiatives alone would go a long way to resolving the respect and recognition issues that municipalities seek and would be very positive steps in building a better relationship between provincial and municipal politicians and bureaucrats. Even though this first project only addressed municipalities, it does provide direction on how local entities would like to govern themselves. The Municipal Representative Report was used as a precursor to this report as it is a current document that addresses underlying principles that need to be addressed when working with New Brunswick’s local governments.

To address the local service districts for this report, a committee consisting of local service managers and their staff was created to collect their opinions concerning a new defined process for shared service agreements. The local service managers conduct the administrative duties of the Minister of Environment and Local Government and have daily contact with the local service districts and citizens in their respective areas. There are eight local service managers, one assistant manager, and eight additional staff members in eight separate regions which provide assistance to the 325 local service districts in New Brunswick. In this research project, I will focus on the provision
regarding service agreements under Section 25 of the Municipalities Act and its corresponding regulation (Regulation 2005-98).

Policy analysis will be conducted by using a combination of qualitative and quantitative research to address the previously mentioned questions in conjunction with the recommendations outlined in the Municipal Representation Committee Report. This approach has allowed me to make conclusions based upon observed patterns found within the qualitative and quantitative data, and develop a new process for shared service agreements. For the qualitative research, two methods were employed: a questionnaire and examination of documents on the subject of public engagement in local government policy creation. The method of using a questionnaire was structured in a way that the questions and sequence of the questions were carefully planned in advance, but were also open-ended to allow the participants to respond to questions with answers that were not included in the questionnaire. This also allowed them the opportunity to provide further clarification to their answers that advanced the study. As the sole researcher facilitating this project, I have been able to oversee and ensure consistency in questions asked and in analyzing the participants’ responses.

Current processes, policies, and legislation were reviewed that address the issue of engaging citizens and how to engage them in the formation of service agreements, including legislation from other provinces in Canada. Also being reviewed are consultations conducted by the now defunct New Brunswick Advisory Council on Youth. Specifically, two reports have been studied: Capturing the Process: An Examination of the New Brunswick Rural Youth Dialogue Project and Youth and Democracy: Engaging Young New Brunswickers in the Political Process (Youth and Democracy). These
consultations were very informative as they were conducted province-wide and among a demographic — youth — that is not voting at the same rate as other segments. “Among youth, the numbers are even more bleak, with less than one in five youth eligible to vote in the 2000 federal election exercising that privilege” (Youth and Democracy, 2005, p.1). These reports will provide context to New Brunswick’s local government structure and how to engage rural New Brunswickers in the political process.

A monumental report, commissioned by the Graham government in 2007, was the first audit in over forty years conducted on the local governance system in New Brunswick. Jean-Guy Finn, the Commissioner on the Future of Local Governance, released Building Stronger Local Governments and Regions: An Action Plan for the Future of Local Governance in New Brunswick (also known as the Finn Report). It offered a number of recommendations and potential solutions to the challenges facing communities in New Brunswick. This report was deemed necessary by both Liberal and Progressive Conservative political parties for the present and future economic and social sustainability of the province. Since its release on December 18, 2008, not one of the recommendations has been implemented. Finn’s recommendations include: giving unincorporated areas a voice and decision-making authority regarding local services and issues, as well as regional economic development activities and programs cost-shared among the municipalities, the provincial government and the federal government. A process for shared service agreements would coincide with these suggestions.

As for the quantitative research for my report, perception data was used to measure the participant’s perception of the current process of engaging citizens from local service districts against its effectiveness and whether it is beneficial in developing sound
government policy. In selecting candidates for this exercise, provincial employees were the focus - the local service managers and their staff - who conduct the administrative duties on behalf of the Minister of Environment and Local Government. Data from the quantitative study was collected, compiled and compared to the findings of the previously mentioned documents in searching for consistencies. From here, recommendations were created for a process to administer shared service agreements and how to engage the public in making policy decisions.

There are weaknesses associated with the relationship of quantitative and qualitative data which Mitchell (1967) identifies: "[q]uantification has no magical property to confer accuracy on the data: if the basic observations are inaccurate or incomplete, statistics derived from them will assuredly also reflect those weaknesses" (p.25-26). Essentially, if the conclusions are derived from inaccurate data, then the conclusions based on the data will be flawed as well. To overcome this barrier, the perception questionnaire was administered by me. The qualitative research will also fill the gaps that the quantitative research overlooks and will hopefully prevent some discrepancy between the methods.

3.1 Limitations and Biases

Before beginning the research, it was important to identify any limitations and biases that may impede this report from being complete. Understanding the limitations and biases of the study allows researchers to be more adaptive to irregularities and able to provide clarity and context in maintaining the consistency of the study (Merriam & Simpson, p.98).
There are some limitations that have been present throughout the study, such as financial resources. Limitations in funding have prohibited some methods in obtaining feedback from participants due to geographical problems. To remedy this problem, communication with participants was conducted through electronic means such as the Internet and email. Related to financial limitations, the questionnaire was unfortunately unable to engage a larger sample size to include LSD citizens who may be affected by the recommendations of this report. The irony of the situation is not lost on this researcher given the subject matter.

Another limitation is that the province of New Brunswick is a bilingual province. As the researcher, my first language is English. To overcome this barrier, a francophone colleague was enlisted to review any documentation that went out to participants or to communicate directly with participants, if required. This was a great help as translation services can be very costly.

The Department of Environment and Local Government has already been instructed to review the current local government structure. When this topic was originally chosen for my report three years ago, this subject was not on the government’s radar as a priority. It seems as though it now has taken a prominent role in the current government’s agenda. Great effort was made to ensure that information that is open to the public was used in calculating data and obtaining information for this project to avoid releasing personal or confidential information.

One bias towards this subject matter is that I have only ever lived in a municipality and not in a LSD. I may favor larger local government structures rather than a LSD structure as I have not been previously involved as a voting citizen in a LSD.
In turn, I tried to get a sense of how citizens of LSDs felt by attending talks on the issue of public engagement in New Brunswick and by volunteering at a public meeting for the local service district of Estey’s Bridge in December 2009. The vote at this meeting was very significant as the community was conducting its third attempt in two years to establish a recreational service agreement between the local service district and the City of Fredericton. The vote was controversial because the results of previous meetings were divided and advocacy groups, for both sides, re-petitioned the Minister after each vote when the results were not in their favor. This is a prime example of how a defined assessment process could have determined if a shared service agreement would be of value for the communities. It would have been effective in providing information to the voting citizens and perhaps avoiding the constant re-petitioning after each vote as there are no provisions for when a municipality has already voted on an issue. This volunteer experience gave me a better sense of the issues and emotional responses of citizens in LSDs.
4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The sample used to collect the perception data consisted of eighteen participants. The participants, composed of local service managers and their staff, provided perception data concerning a new defined process for shared service agreements. The data collected from this sample wasn’t as successful as anticipated as the response rate to the questionnaire was approximately 25 percent. This equated to four staff members responding to the survey.

While the response rate was disappointing, those that did respond were a good representation of the regions of the province and the language profiles representative of New Brunswick. The respondents represented parts of the north, east, south and west. Each respondent represented a range of 24-56 local service districts with populations of 300-3,000 in each LSD. Despite LSD differences in language and geographic area, respondents' feedback was often similar.

The questions in the questionnaire centred on identifying the methods by which the government of New Brunswick engages citizens in developing localized government policies; of those various methods to engage citizens, identifying which methods of public engagement are effective in obtaining feedback from citizens and have the most participation; identifying trends in voter participation based on the population size, tax rate, and tax base for local service districts; identifying best practices from other provinces that should be included in New Brunswick; and if a redefined service agreement process would be beneficial for New Brunswick. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix I.
The main goal of the data is to ultimately support a process in the creation of shared service agreements that can be applied to all local service districts in New Brunswick. The data was also linked to research from other New Brunswick documents regarding public consultations. This created a logical, well-researched shared service agreement process that is transparent, provides accountability to those with authority, and most importantly, gives citizens the opportunity to be engaged in their community.

In the interpretation of the questionnaire results, several differences and trends have been noted in the respondents’ answers. They have been categorized according to the questions. They are: population information, local government structures, engaging citizens, shared services, and tax information.

4.1 Population Information

In deciphering whether or not the population size of a local service district impacts the engagement of citizens, respondents were split. While two respondents viewed that the population size of a LSD didn’t affect voter turnout, the other two respondents felt the opposite: “[v]ery small LSDs have a good number present while large LSDs have the minimum number required to hold the elections”. This implies that smaller LSDs have a greater participation rate as opposed to larger LSDs that can only attain the minimum number of eligible voters to hold an election.

Respondents were in agreement that the population size of LSDs should not dictate whether LSDs should become a municipality especially since two of the respondents acknowledged that local service districts have been experiencing a population decline. Forcing LSDs to become a municipality solely based on the number of citizens that lived
within a region was unpopular. This echoes feedback in the media from LSD citizens who feel that they are being forced by government to become a municipality.

4.2 Local Government Structures

In Commissioner Finn's report, the overwhelming message was that the current local governance system is not sustainable in the long-term. The Province has proposed that services be regionalized in New Brunswick as it will lead to better, more cost-effective services. Under a regional services model, the Province would be divided into 12 regions that combine all municipalities, rural communities, and local service districts into regional commissions. These regional commissions would be responsible for delivering, or facilitating the delivery of mandated services to communities; facilitating voluntary service arrangements among interested communities; and acting as a regional forum for collaboration among communities on regional issues.

From the questionnaire, there was a sentiment from some of the respondents that the concept of regionalization may work here, but this was rebuked by other respondents who felt that regionalization is another way in which the provincial government is catering to the municipalities. Only one of the respondents agreed that New Brunswick LSDs should be fully incorporated like Nova Scotia. However, it was mentioned by another respondent that regionalization will not occur unless it is imposed, as "voluntary hasn't worked for the past 10 years in this province and it didn't work in other provinces either. In most cases, it had to be imposed. People will not participate, simply to have government impose a system which will give the people an excuse to criticize". While none of the respondents offered suggestions of other provincial local government
structures that could increase citizen engagement in New Brunswick, all agreed that New Brunswick needs to be more democratic at the LSD level.

In realizing an ideal government structure for New Brunswick compared to other provinces which would support LSD citizen engagement, the respondents acknowledged that New Brunswick has prominent barriers in reaching a consensus among citizens that other provinces do not necessarily have. They all agreed that the province of New Brunswick is fractured by language, geography, and ideology. All of the respondents agreed that there are other issues and concerns that need to be addressed if the current local government structure is redesigned. The respondents offered the following concerns with regard to a new regionalized local government structure, which have been categorized as follows:

- **Costs**: regionalization would create another tier of government where costs will increase because of the additional expenditures to cover expenses for all municipalities, rural communities, and LSDs within a region;

- **Transparency**: in a regionalized structure, the representatives will have to listen to all forms of local government - not just the municipalities;

- **Accountability**: accountability mechanisms will need to be in place for those who have authority, such as determining those with authority, identifying their responsibilities and authority level;

- **Consultation**: regional commissions will need to receive input from LSDs in deciding their future at the beginning of the policy development process.
Two of the respondents agreed that regionalization would make better use of citizens' dollars; however, there was some disparity between communities about local service districts finding it difficult to pay and maintain services that are provided to them. This seemed to depend on the tax base and whether or not services were shared with other communities. Overall, there was agreement that the local government system needs to be revised and there was hope of an effective system in existence that could be applied to New Brunswick.

4.3 Engaging Citizens

Answers to questions regarding the current engagement of LSD citizens, for the most part, formed a consensus among the respondents. In describing the communication between LSDs and the Province of New Brunswick, most respondents said that public meetings and on-line consultations were the most popular methods which the provincial government uses to engage citizens. These methods seem to partly differ from what the respondents viewed as effective LSD citizen engagement.

The respondents felt the best methods for obtaining feedback from citizens were through plebiscites (referendums), town hall meetings, and door-to-door campaigns. These methods received the greatest support by the respondents as effective engagement methods. These effective engagement methods identified by the respondents often require numerous resources – time, money and manpower – to effectively deliver messages to the public as opposed to other 'newer' means of engagement such as social media or online engagement.

Despite the aforementioned effective methods in obtaining feedback from citizens, it was cautioned by one participant that “[i]n many instances, especially the town hall
meetings, that many decisions are made by minority opposition groups, and the silent majority often has to pay for the stupidities of small pressure groups. Governments need convictions for their actions and take into consideration that the silent majority is still there”.

Voter turnout for plebiscites seems to depend on the issue and the interest level of the citizens. However, most respondents reported a 25-50% participation rate for plebiscites in their region. In a previous study I conducted, a linear relationship emerged between voter turn-out for plebiscites and the size of the proposed increase in tax rates (Table 4 shows this relationship). This is similar in Stone’s Voter Alienation Model where the percentage of "no" votes increases as turnout rises. Smaller voter turnout consists mostly of votes cast by the ‘non-alienated’, and voters that are typically more involved in community affairs. A large turnout indicates increased tension in the political system. This corresponds to what one respondent mentioned in their questionnaire, that “(LSD citizens will) participate because they object to the issue”. This signifies that the ‘alienated’, who are often nonparticipants, have been attracted to the political arena to register their protest vote. Therefore, "voter turnout is generally higher for defeated than for passed referendums," or, conversely, "the lower the turnout, the more likely the measure is to be accepted" (Horton & Thompson, 1962, pp.487-488). To overcome the barrier of lack of interest, providing the proper information beforehand may assist in piquing citizens’ interest in the plebiscite. One respondent noted that “if people are not given the proper information beforehand in a well-structured information method, even these (the most effective methods) can be non-effective as in all areas you will find
individuals distorting information that is out there, rendering the final feedback results questionable”.

Table 4: Linear Relationship of Voter Turnout for a Plebiscite versus Tax Rate Increase

All four respondents said social networking websites and letter writing submissions are the least effective in obtaining feedback from citizens. These methods may be less of a burden on government resources but do not produce results in terms of an effective engagement strategy. These strategies involve less face-to-face interaction with the citizenry and one respondent acknowledged that “citizens get bombarded from so many parties for various campaigns, that they...let the answering machine pick-up”.

Another word of caution from one of the respondents in trying to understand why citizens are not engaged, and how to properly obtain feedback from LSD citizens: “they (citizens) are fed up with the system and don’t give a crap anymore”. Two other respondents answered with “trust and transparency isn’t there” and that “(citizens) are not willing to get involved”. These quotes reinforce the discussion of voter turnout for
plebiscites, as well as the concerns respondents had with respect to a new local government structure. From this, we can gather that citizens' engagement level seems to depend on the issue raised at the plebiscite and the interest level of the citizens with respect to that issue, and whether or not they trust that their ideas will be implemented in a transparent way by the authorities. If these two variables are not favourable and constant, in citizens' minds, we can expect to see less involvement from citizens.

The respondents were unsure if a new shared service delivery process would make a difference in engaging citizens and increasing participation. One respondent said a new process would engage citizens as long as the citizens understood the new process, while another respondent said that a new process would increase participation only if it became a regulated process where citizens would have no choice but to accept the new process. On the other hand, if it is left to the municipalities to encourage LSDs to 'jump on board' then it just transfers the responsibility to municipalities (who may be biased and money hungry). Therefore, it should be the responsibility of the Province to make tough decisions if it is going to take the risk and impose a regulated process on LSDs. As one participant stated, for the provincial government to make decisions on behalf of LSDs, it will “create a short lived ruckus and then simply die as their effects are minimal...it simply takes guts”. This may seem heavy handed, but if enacted, it will allow citizens to be legitimately engaged in the shared service agreement process. Also, citizens will be able to provide feedback to the Province regarding the regulation amendments as all potential changes are open to the public for comment.
4.4 Shared Services

When it came to whether or not there is an increase in demand for shared service agreements, there was disparity between communities. For those that saw an increase in shared service agreements, they cited loss of volunteers in the community due to a natural shift in the population or an exodus from the region that required communities to join forces in providing adequate services. Given that New Brunswick’s net interprovincial migration has resulted in a loss of 13,208 youth between the ages of 15-24 from 1999-2011 (Department of Post-Secondary Education, Training and Labour, personal communication, September 10, 2012), speculation that the rural depopulation is also causing the depletion of social capital in New Brunswick appears to be valid. For those communities that saw a decrease, respondents differentiated between services that they considered primary and secondary when it came to the decrease in shared service agreements.

Primary services such as fire services and solid waste collection services have shared service agreements between LSDs and municipalities. However, when it comes to shared service agreements between LSDs regarding a secondary service such as recreational agreements, these agreements tend to be less stable. A quote from one of the respondents: “[m]unicipalities have the right to charge user fees to LSDs as a simple outside user, and (LSDs) should be expected to pay as they are not paying for the municipal services in the first place. What the tri-county project (a shared service agreement between three LSDs) causes, is simple hardship on the regional local government office workload, which is still ongoing because they have had vote-ins, vote-outs, etc. It simply created a precedent for other areas to request the Province to jump in
and control municipal issues for which municipalities were created for self-administration within their municipal boundaries”. This comment points to a flaw with the Municipalities Act, where a LSD can vote to be part of a shared recreation service agreement but then if they decide later on that they do not want to be part of the agreement, they can petition the Minister of Environment and Local Government to get out of the agreement. This creates hardship on the other communities that were part of the agreement as they are now forced to cover and recoup the costs from the LSD that decided to renege on the agreement.

Shared service delivery gives LSDs citizens more power than municipalities over the future of their community by voting on the services provided to them. The idea of sharing services with other communities may conjure up ideas of ‘too many cooks in the kitchen’ but it provides LSDs with the opportunity to rationalize their resources while preserving their community identity and autonomy. An example of where several communities successfully preserved their identity is the City of Fredericton. The City of Fredericton is actually made up of several smaller communities. What we now know as the neighbourhoods of Silverwood, Nashwaaksis, Barker’s Point, and Marysville were all amalgamated as part of the City of Fredericton in 1973, and previously Devon in 1945. While at first there was tension because the communities did not want to lose their identity, they soon realized after they amalgamated with the City of Fredericton that their community identities still existed. Today, several Frederictonians continue to pledge allegiance to their respective neighbourhood. This is quite similar to how New Yorkers identify with communities in the New York City area of New York State. Amalgamation does not equate to loss of identity or autonomy. Being that the department “wants to
preserve our local and community identities, while looking at ways we can deliver services more collaboratively, more efficiently, and be more accountable to New Brunswickers”, it seems the department is cognisant of preserving community identity and autonomy which conflicts with the Finn Report’s suggestion for amalgamation of LSDs with other LSDs, municipalities, and rural communities.

Despite the fact that most communities have not been requesting more services in the last five years, three of the respondents give the impression that they are supporters of increasing shared service agreements given some of the suggestions they made on how to improve the process for sharing services: “[m]ake all services shareable…it’s just that simple as some services could benefit all such as street lighting”. While it was acknowledged that there is already a shared service agreement process in place, there was agreement among the respondents that the process needs to be defined, consistent, and information needs to be provided to citizens on the quality of services along with the costs associated with the service prior to engaging the public in discussions or voting.

Three of the respondents agreed that shared services do not give more authority to the provincial government as citizens in LSDs have the opportunity to vote for or against a service and the majority of shared services are between two or more LSDs, not with municipalities. However, when there is a vote for a shared service agreement between a LSD and a municipality, the process and the result are often questioned when the vote is not in the municipality’s favour. The majority of shared service agreement complaints often come from municipalities and not from the LSDs. This is evident particularly when LSDs do not vote in favour of municipal proposals. Municipalities question the process
because they would like some or the entire LSD property tax share to be applied to the administration costs for the service being provided.

As a result, LSDs feel pressured into shared service agreements by municipalities, especially recreational agreements. LSDs are concerned about their ability to pay and maintain the services over the life of the agreement because of their smaller tax base. One respondent suggested that if municipalities are going to seek financial assistance and cooperation from LSDs, they should consult and work with LSDs before bringing the issue forward to the Minister of Environment and Local Government. This would aid municipalities in being transparent with their intentions. A suggestion from one of the respondents to improve the process for sharing services: “greater engagement with residents by proponents detailing information and giving all pertinent financials”. One remedy to ensure an effective engagement strategy would be to inform the citizenry before a strategy is implemented. This suggestion corresponds to the advice given by Ruether, St. Claire, and Coffman.

4.5 Tax Information

One respondent mentioned that even though LSDs feel pressure to either enter into a shared service agreement or pay user fees to municipalities, that they should feel pressure. One respondent mentioned that citizens are under the impression that the province pays for all services and that they (citizens) don’t have to pay more for the extra services. However, if LSDs want access to services, they will inevitably have to either pay higher property taxes or pay user fees. One respondent compared paying for services to buying a car. “If you want a car, you’ll have to buy or rent one. Just because you want a car doesn’t mean the dealership will give you one”. In other words, if your community
wants a service, the community will have to pay for that service because it won’t be
given to them for free. This same philosophy was applied to shared services.
“Municipalities have developed services for their citizens and in turn the citizens are
paying for the costs associated with those services. If LSD residents want to partake in,
for example, Bantam AAA hockey which takes place in a municipality, the LSD resident
will need to pay a user fee to use the services of an arena if their LSD has not entered into
a shared service agreement with that municipality”. Within the current LSD structure,
LSDs only have themselves to blame when a service that would aid in larger societal
issues is refused by the majority of voters because they do not want their tax rate to
increase. Therefore, those who want to participate in recreation services in a
municipality will have to pay a higher user fee (approximately $600-$800/per person) as
opposed to a minimal tax increase to the tax base ($0.01-$0.03 per $100, or $10-$30 for a
property assessed at $100,000).

The crux of this problem was identified by one participant as being an issue that
was overlooked in the Equal Opportunity era of New Brunswick. This was the timeframe
in which many recreation arenas were built. A user fee system was not in place as they
did not realize the future financial impact of building several recreation facilities.
Economic feasibility studies were not conducted and the demographics at the time were
positive as the 1961 census had the largest percentage point increase at any point in
New Brunswick’s history between 1911 and 1961. Subsequently, several arenas were
built across the province in LSDs with the government of New Brunswick’s money. The
government may have assumed at the time that the population would naturally increase.
If the government had known about future demographics and the lack of a tax base to
support the infrastructure upgrades, provincial politicians may have planned more strategically or had a contingency plan by incorporating user fees for LSDs as opposed to a user fee system which puts pressure on individual families.

Today, the problem is that LSDs are not fully paying for the services that are being provided to them and the provincial government is paying for the discrepancies in the taxes collected for the LSD services and the cost for those services. In data provided by the respondents, the average tax base of an unincorporated area is approximately $50-60 million, while the average LSD tax rate is approximately $0.35 per $100 of property assessment on owner occupied properties. In 2008, the Office of the Comptroller determined that the property tax revenue collected by applying the levy of $0.65 per $100 of property assessment only to owner occupied properties in unincorporated areas, not including non-owner occupied properties, was $43.3 million. The shortfall between the real costs for provincially provided LSD services (i.e.: transportation, policing, administration, and dog control) and property tax revenue of $43.3 million was $55.4 million for the province (Table 5). This is obviously a problem as tax dollars collected by the Province of New Brunswick from other areas of the province are subsequently dispersed to the LSD services payment shortfall instead of services that could provide benefits to the whole province. It appears as though this problem may have increased in the last three years based on data collected from the Office of the Comptroller and the respondents.

This problem is also known as the ‘65 cent issue’ where a tax of 65 cents per $100 of property assessment is levied on owner occupied properties. This amount was actually reduced to 63 cents in 2010. Historically, 64 of the 65 cents were notionally allocated
only to policing and roads although the actual costs for delivering these services exceeded collected revenue. The remaining one cent of the 65 cents was notionally allocated to the administration of LSDs and dog control services. Once again, the real costs for service delivery exceeded available funds. Also, these taxes are only levied to owner occupied properties, not including the non-owner occupied properties such as vacation properties and commercial properties. Three respondents reported that only some LSD citizens were aware that the $0.65 issue existed. In the last two years, changes have been made to transfer the administration of LSDs and the service of dog control to the LSD local service tax rate; however, this only equated to approximately a savings of $1.5 million for the Province.

Two respondents agreed that most LSD citizens are willing to pay an increased tax rate once informed of the disparities in collected and real costs of services. If another model of local government were introduced “they would have to know what it consisted of and what their role is”, and “for them, they don’t want to see any increase, but still they want more services...they don’t understand the budgetary system, taxing system and what it pays for. Many still believe the Province is paying for their services and some LSD members think the Province is giving them the funds to operate”. This statement is indicative of the lack of information being provided to citizens on what services they are receiving and what services cost.

Proposals from the Department of Environment and Local Government to remedy this taxation problem are incomplete as part of the restructuring of local government project. Any proposals put forward will take a couple of years to implement, not including a legislative process which will undoubtedly take another two years to
complete. The Department of Environment and Local Government has done little to reverse the side effects of a poor LSD taxation system as the Department has not informed the public on the 65 cent issue or included the public on the solution.

**Table 5: Shortfall between Costs of Provincially Provided Local Services to LSDs and Property Tax Revenues (Office of the Comptroller, p.6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ Millions (based on 2006/07 data)</th>
<th>% of Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost of Services</td>
<td>$98.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Revenue</td>
<td>$43.3</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortfall</td>
<td>($55.4)</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on my analysis and research, the following strategies and options have been compiled to broaden democracy in New Brunswick’s local service districts through improving the shared service agreement process:

5.1 Determining if Shared Services are of Value

Prior to developing shared service agreements between communities, it would be beneficial for communities to first determine whether a shared service agreement is right for them when a proposal is brought forward. All respondents commented on the frustration of citizens related to the process of shared service agreements. Their frustration stems from how easy it is for the citizens to petition the Minister of Environment and Local Government after a service has been voted upon. One participant specified that citizens are not satisfied with the system because citizens can object to the issue after a plebiscite vote and it is often “too simple” to change the outcome of the plebiscite once the results have been objected. Most of the respondents, three out of four, also acknowledged that LSD citizens are most concerned with whether or not they could pay for the service – another reason to determine whether services should be voted on in the first place if the LSD cannot pay for them. While the Province of New Brunswick does not have a service impact assessment for individual communities when exploring a service, developing a guideline to assist communities with shared services may be beneficial in reducing future objections to agreements that have been agreed to and voted on by communities.

A report produced by Drummond MacFarlane for the Local Government Association in England called *Shared Services: Costs Spared?* looks into five high profile
shared service agreements between councils across England. The report concludes that together they have managed to save 200 communities £30 million across the lifetime of the agreements by reducing redundancy and increasing service performance. This is a significant savings considering they have had to make up for a 28% cut in local government funding - a similar situation to New Brunswick due to reduced funding from the Province to communities.

As part of Drummond MacFarlane’s research on shared services, a three step evaluation tool was developed and tested to determine shared services benefits amongst communities. The evaluation tool is a spreadsheet designed to help communities identify and track the benefits being delivered or forecasted to be delivered from shared service arrangements (Appendix II). The model begins with determining the financial contribution of each of the community partners with regard to the shared service agreement, identifying costs of staff, property, procurement, and any other costs. It also helps to identify any income that is currently generated by the potential partners.

Drummond MacFarlane’s second step focuses on financial benefits of moving to a shared services model, such as: redundancy costs, one-off savings of selling property, reduced salary costs, rent, utility costs, redesigning processes and reducing errors, and investments in technology and other equipment. The third step identifies non-financial benefits. This ranges from improvements in customer experience and service standards, to benefits from process improvement. Wider economic benefits such as a carbon footprint impact are also included in the evaluation tool as a non-financial benefit. Some non-financial benefits are difficult to quantify, but for others it is possible to calculate a financial impact; for example, reduced sickness absence is an increase in productivity.
that could applied to generate income for the community. The listing of nonfinancial benefits is not extensive; instead it illustrates a range of different benefits that may be relevant for a shared service agreement.

The evaluation tool is designed to suggest a wide range of benefits when creating a shared service agreement, such as measuring the baseline and on-going performance, financial savings, and non-financial benefits from their new arrangements. While this process doesn’t initially engage the public in compiling the evaluation tool, it does create information to provide to the public prior to a community discussion and/or plebiscite. Adapting Drummond MacFarlane’s evaluation tool as a guideline for communities to use prior to entering into a shared service agreement in New Brunswick may have long-term savings in reducing the amount of communities that would opt-out of shared service agreements and may also be an effective tool for demonstrating meaningful engagement. Implementing a transparent process may keep politics and special interests groups at bay by letting the facts speak for themselves. Community interest groups differ from special interest groups in that community interest groups often have a variety of issues that they are interested in rather than a special interest group that often has a single issue for which they are advocating. When a community interest group becomes a special group is difficult to define but when a registered lobby group, union, or single issue community group emerges, these would be examples of special interest groups.

5.2 Engaging and Empowering Citizens

Much of the focus of local government should be centered on communications, as it keeps citizens informed and encourages them to be involved in the consulting process about important community issues and needs. Local governments that encourage citizens
to become directly involved in community improvements and in setting community
direction will reap further rewards. In addition to harnessing the energy and ideas of
citizen groups toward addressing community needs, such programs usually provide
citizens with a sense of ownership in the community. Community programs and
volunteer opportunities are examples of programs that directly involve citizens in
community improvement.

A citizen should be viewed as a partner in government rather than a mere
customer. One municipal organization suggests that communities may be better served
by a ‘barn-raising’ approach where citizens join together to accomplish what they cannot
accomplish alone (Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington). In this
model, citizens share responsibility for shaping programs that best meet their needs,
balanced with the needs of the community as a whole. This coincides with a
recommendation in the New Brunswick Advisory Council on Youth’s report Rock the
Boat: Here Today, Here to Stay where many youth acknowledged that if they had a sense
of belonging and pride in their community they would be more likely to stay in their
respective community. Citizen involvement is essential for tasks such as developing a
vision for the community's future, choosing strategies for community development,
participating in making communities safe, and meeting service delivery needs.

Despite one participant’s comment that “[h]istory has proven that an imposed
system is the only solution, as voluntary regrouping hasn’t worked to the level expected
or desired by government or task forces on the issue”, government should not force
amalgamation of LSDs. Since LSDs currently have more of a say in a plebiscite, which is
a direct form of democracy and not available at the municipal level. According to the
respondents there does not seem to be an overwhelming cry to change the current local government structure. Only one of the respondents agreed that New Brunswick’s LSDs should be incorporated like Nova Scotia. As well, not forcing amalgamation of local service districts reduces the influence of municipalities over LSDs. Continuing with the LSD model perpetuates local engagement and a sense of belonging for many citizens through the volunteering and voting process required through a plebiscite. This model may attract people who do not currently live in a LSD to live in a LSD where they would have more involvement and control over their services and tax dollars.

5.3 Communicating about Government Spending

Most importantly, the Department of Environment and Local Government needs to engage and inform New Brunswickers regarding services and how the taxes paid for these services are not equal to cost of the services rendered. Many of the services rendered are subsidized or provided by the provincial government, meaning a taxpayer in one area of the province is paying for the services rendered in another area where they do not own property. Many rural residents would be surprised to learn that the services they incur are at the cost of other citizens. Rural residents may not have a problem with this as they may view the additional funds as an equalization plan (from the rich to the poor – although this is not necessarily the case); however, citizens of municipalities may not be content with this arrangement.

The respondents acknowledged that tax and budget issues are often the focal points for citizen anger with government. Citizen anger over taxes may not be primarily about the total amount of the taxes levied, but rather the feeling that tax dollars are wasted, or are not being spent where citizens would like to see their tax dollars spent.
The respondents agreed that citizens frequently express the feeling that they have little influence over how their money is spent. Moreover, there is confusion over the different levels of government and how the tax dollar is split.

There is a lack of understanding about the connection between the tax dollars government collects and the services that it provides. Budget documents, even though they are open to the public, are often lengthy and obtuse. More focused and understandable messages about budget decisions and tax dollar spending are urgently needed. Clear and concise communication regarding convoluted issues such as taxation, may increase citizen engagement within their communities and may address decreased youth participation as mentioned in Paul Howe's *Citizens Adrift*. Howe recognizes that citizens are disengaged from politics and their communities, especially those of a younger generation. He asserts that the two trends that underlie these issues are: lack of knowledge and attentiveness. Providing concrete examples of where collected tax dollars are spent, such as revenue from gas tax, aids citizen knowledge of how the system works.

5.4 Communicating about Services

Most citizens undervalue the day-to-day services local governments provide. The Department of Environment and Local Government needs to increase its efforts in communicating the variety of services available to citizens and identify the services citizens are paying for. In doing so, government should provide a list of services outlining the costs associated with each service. They should use language that emphasizes how these services respond to their citizens' needs and interests. Comparing services citizens receive from their tax dollars to regular household expenditures may help citizens understand complex budget issues. For example, if the Department of
Environment and Local Government listed the value citizens are receiving for services or shared services versus the costs associated with a ‘night out on the town’, it may look like this:

Service provided (costs per month for a property assessed at $100,000):

- Police services and road maintenance – $53.33
- Recreation – $0.42
- Dog Control - $0.42

Night on the Town Costs:

- Dinner for two - $60.00
- Movie tickets for two, popcorn, drinks - $33.00

With the Department of Environment and Local Government exploring a new local governance model and subsequent tax model, it will be important to communicate the value of services, as any new model will most likely cost rural residents more. New taxation changes and further complexity would add to the frustration of citizens as noted by the respondents. If the Department does not communicate with the public, citizens will view the additional costs of services as a transfer of responsibilities from one bureaucracy to another as identified by Ruether, St. Claire, and Coffman. The Department’s responsiveness to citizens’ needs will greatly shape citizens' perception about the value of their local government.

As it stands, the Province needs to implement fair taxes for services rendered as the current method is not working. This causes the Province (and non-LSD residents) to pay for shortfalls, consequently adding to the provincial debt. Promoting a shared services model may create more urban areas, reduce New Brunswick’s carbon footprint
(especially sprawl and its impact on the environment, roads, land, and fuel by reducing construction and demolition of trees), require fewer services being rendered to rural areas, and eventually decrease taxes for all LSD property owners.

5.5 Communicating on Roles and Responsibilities

As the New Brunswick Advisory Council on Youth suggests in its report *Capturing the Process: An Examination of the New Brunswick Youth Dialogue Project*, clearly defining the roles of the government and the citizens of the LSD are important so that expectations are realistic. Some citizens, especially those who are new to a LSD, may not understand the process whereby services are provided to a LSD by the provincial government. These roles and responsibilities should be communicated every time a plebiscite occurs. Communicating these roles and responsibilities are consistent with the Municipal Representative Committee’s first recommendation on identifying the purpose of local government.

When organizing plebiscites, it is important to establish ground rules for the process, including the expectation of behaviour. These issues being voted on at plebiscites can be emotional for some of the citizens and it is important to maintain composure for all parties involved. This may require a moderator, facilitator, even security personnel, if required, to be on hand for the plebiscite.

The Department of Environment and Local Government should use laymen terms when communicating with the public. Much of their publicity uses legal jargon and references legislation which the average citizen may not understand. Clarity is a priority when communicating with the public. How the Department communicates their message to the LSD(s) involved should be taken into consideration, especially given that most
LSDs are in rural areas of the province. Therefore, online engagement should not solely be relied upon to deliver these messages of government spending, services, and roles and responsibilities. This was made clear by the respondents that LSD citizens prefer face-to-face interaction as opposed to electronic means. In communicating with the public, the provincial government must ensure that publicity is delivered via several methods to meet the needs of citizens that do not have access to a computer or television, or who do not live in a central area of the LSD.

5.6 Adopting a Revised Process in Legislation and Regulations

Adopting a new process will require not just the process itself, but may require changes to the legislation and regulations that give the authority and procedures for conducting a shared service agreement. Obviously, the New Brunswick Department of Justice would decide which acts and regulations need be changed to legally implement this process; however, the following Acts and Regulations have been identified that will require amendments.

Under the New Brunswick legislation Municipalities Act, Chapter M-22, section 7(4)(b) allows for municipalities to enter into an agreement with one or more municipalities or rural communities whereby the cost and use of the service may be shared by the parties to the agreement. While it does note that municipalities can enter into agreements with any person, including the Crown, it does not explicitly mention that local service districts can enter into shared service agreements. I am recommending that the Province of New Brunswick allow for a section that gives local service districts the ability to solicit municipalities, rural communities, or other local service districts to enter into an agreement to be part of a shared service agreement whereby the cost and use of
the service may be shared by the parties to the agreement under the Municipalities Act. I also recommend a provision that allows communities to change an existing service, or change the level of funding provided through property taxes of an existing service as a contingency plan if, or for when, a community opts-out of an agreement at a future date.

With respect to Regulation 2005-98 called the Shared Service Agreement Regulation under the Municipalities Act, local service districts need to be included under section 3(1) which would allow the regulation of shared service agreements to apply to LSDs as well as municipalities and rural communities. Section 3(3) of Regulation 2005-98 provides a process for shared service agreements; however, it does not determine if a shared service agreement would be of value for communities, how to engage citizens, how to communicate with citizens, how the service is of value to citizens, and the role and responsibilities of the participating communities including the Province of New Brunswick. The manner in which government addresses these items is for government to decide, but these items need to be addressed as evidenced by the comments made by the respondents. Prior to voting upon a shared service agreement, I would also recommend including under the Municipalities Act that communities must adhere and provide to the public what is required by Regulation 2005-98 section 3(3).

Last but not least, I recommend amending Regulation 84-168 Local Service Districts. Currently only section 4 outlines how a “meeting to provide additional services or to discontinue any service in a LSD under section 25 of the Municipalities Act must be called by publication or prominent posting, or both, of Form 3 in the area concerned”. The Department of Environment and Local Government are applying Regulation 84-168 to shared service agreements for LSDs since a provision for shared service agreements is
lacking. The lack of a provision has been called into question several times by citizens in the media. I recommend adding a section that would read “a meeting to provide additional services or to discontinue any service under a shared service agreement in a local service district under section 25 of the Municipalities Act shall be called by publication or prominent posting, or both, of Form 6 in the area(s) concerned”. This addition, as well as Form 6 (Appendix III), would relieve any speculation about the legitimacy of the process for shared service agreements.

These recommendations still allow for latitude in how local service districts deliver results. The evaluation tool is non-prescriptive in how it is used or how costs and benefits are calculated and monitored. I also recommend that the Department of Environment and Local Government consult local service districts on any changes in policy or legislation by creating a LSD committee made up of LSD advisory committee chairs. These last two suggestions are in line with the Municipal Representative Committee’s recommendations with regard to reducing prescriptive legislation and consulting with local governments on policy issues that affect them directly.
6.0 CONCLUSION

The Province of New Brunswick continues to deal with financial and economic difficulties while communities struggle to sustain themselves. This is especially true due to the aftermath of the economic recession, a provincial budget deficit, demographic challenges, and reduced transfers from the federal government. Government has been consistently making claims that it will be taking on some form of municipal reform as stated in the Speech from the Throne on November 23rd, 2010; “your government will forge a new local governance and service delivery system in New Brunswick” (p.13).

While the provincial government has made great strides to provide information on the process of restructuring the current local government system, it does not go the length it should in providing information to the public. Many of the documents, handouts and brochures provided by the Department of Environment and Local Government are repetitious and lack details. They do not get to the heart of the matter of money and autonomy. The financial implications of local governance restructuring are of great importance, obviously for the Province of New Brunswick, but also for the citizens of LSDs as they are the individuals affected. The reporting structure and clarifying who is the authority for LSDs in a regionalized structure, has also been very vague and the provincial government has done little to quell these fears and criticisms.

This report argued for a legislative process of shared service agreements. A legitimate shared service agreement process would address transparency and accountability concerns from citizens, and local government structural problems the provincial government is eager to modernize. It does so using tools of participatory democracy since a representative democracy is absent.
The Province of New Brunswick is encouraging amalgamation and incorporation of LSDs as part of regionalization. Regionalization may work, especially given the reality of the province’s austere financial situation, however, government should still allow LSDs the option of remaining as a LSD despite the efficiencies of resources gained through service delivery in the regionalized structure. Caution should be given to comments and criticism from municipal staff as they are advocating for incorporation of the LSDs and to gain LSD tax dollars. From the questionnaire, while the respondents’ responses acknowledge that efficiencies may exist with regionalization and shared service delivery, many LSDs want to remain on their own because of the skepticism and mistrust of government. I would suggest not forcing LSD amalgamation with municipalities, specifically with cities, but to encourage amalgamation among LSDs. LSD amalgamation gives an even ground between the participating LSDs while still allowing them to operate and reap the benefits as LSDs.

There are benefits to allowing LSDs to remain as LSDs: LSDs have more control over their tax dollars than a municipality as citizens of municipalities are not afforded the luxury of plebiscites when there are changes to their tax rate; finding volunteers and leaders for plebiscites is not a problem; and there is more transparency in decision making in LSDs through plebiscites. There are some disadvantages as well: they are at the mercy of the Minister of Environment and Local Government who can overturn a decision voted on at a plebiscite and, currently, the system allows for constant petitioning of the Minister if a plebiscite is not in favour of a service or vice versa. This constant petitioning will require further plebiscites, inefficiencies of tax dollars, reduced service
quality, and tax base reduction which may mean increased tax rates to the remaining partnering communities to make up for the loss of tax dollars.

Creating a process for shared service agreements that can be applied to all local service districts in New Brunswick aims to improve, if not remedy, some of these disadvantages. The recommendations provide concrete examples how to better engage the public in policy creation and in a manner that has not been examined previously. The recommendations for a new shared service agreement process may also build a stronger connection between the provincial government and local governments.

With a majority government, the current provincial government is poised to make great strides to move the province forward both in terms of the future of local governance and increasing the financial stability of the province. When citizens feel themselves to be partners in government, they will have restored confidence in their government. Local government can and should serve as a catalyst to bring resources, people, and plans together to accomplish common goals. In doing so, people need to have faith, information, and be connected to be engaged in their communities.
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APPENDIX I

Questions
All questions will be followed by the option of N/A (either representing Not Applicable, Not Available, Not sure, or Prefer Not to Answer) and an additional comments section for participants to provide further information. If you prefer not to answer this question, please select N/A.

Population Information:
1. Where are the local service districts (LSDs) from your region located in the province of New Brunswick?
   a. North
   b. South
   c. East
   d. West
   e. North-East
   f. South-East
   g. South-West
   h. North-West
2. What language do most citizens in your region speak?
   a. English
   b. French
   c. Both
3. How many local service districts are in your region?
4. What is the average population size of a local service district in your region? If exact number is known, please indicate.
   a. <500
   b. 500-1,000
   c. 1,000-2,000
   d. >2,000
   e. Exact number ______
5. Have the LSDs in your region been decreasing in population size over the last 5 years?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Same
6. Do you feel that once a local service district reaches a certain population size or tax base that they should become a municipality?
   a. Yes
   b. No
7. Do you feel that the population size of the local service district impacts the engagement of citizens? (i.e.: smaller population are more involved in town hall meetings rather than larger populations). Please explain.

8. Where do you find your statistical information to determine percentage of eligible voters for plebiscites?

9. Do you feel these sources kept up to date?
   a. Yes
   b. No

Tax Information:
10. Has the tax base been decreasing in the last 5 years?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. Same

11. What is the average tax base for a local service district in your region?
12. What is the average tax rate for a local service district in your region?
13. Do you think that the majority of citizens of local service districts aware of the 63 cent issue (i.e.: the property tax collected from LSD property owners but does not cover the true costs of service delivery)?
    a. All
    b. Most
    c. Half
    d. Some
    e. None

14. Do you think citizens of local service districts would be willing to pay any discrepancies in service costs through their property taxes?
    a. All
    b. Most
    c. Half
    d. Some
    e. None

15. Do you think citizens would they be more willing to pay an increased tax rate if there were another local governance model that would give them more autonomy over their own local service district?
    a. All
    b. Most
    c. Half
    d. Some
    e. None
Engaging Citizens:

16. What are the current ways that the province of New Brunswick engages citizens in developing localized government policies (i.e.: consultations)? Please provide examples.

17. Of the different methods to engage citizens (listed below) which of these do you feel are effective in obtaining feedback from citizens?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>Not very Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plebiscites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail-out Surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door-to-Door Campaigns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Networking Websites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter Writing Submissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Of these methods, which ones spark the most participation?

19. What would you say voter turnout is for plebiscites in your region?
   a. 0-25%
   b. 25-50%
   c. 50-75%
   d. 75-100%

20. Why do you think citizens are participating and/or not participating?

Local Government Structures:

21. There are different local government structures across the country of unincorporated areas (ex: regional structures of unincorporated areas). Are there any best practices or structures that should be included in New Brunswick?

22. Do you feel that any of the other provincial/territorial local government structures would increase citizen engagement? Which ones?

For questions 23-27, on a scale of 1-5 (1- Strongly Agree, 2 - Agree, 3 - N/A, 4 - Disagree, 5 - Strongly Disagree) how strongly to you agree with the following statements. Please feel free to elaborate on your answers in the comment box:

23. New Brunswick needs to be more democratic at the local service district level.

24. New Brunswick should implement an incorporated structure, such as Nova Scotia, where there are no unincorporated areas.
25. A regionalized structure would make better use of citizen's tax dollars for services.

26. New Brunswick is fractured by language, geography, and ideology which make it difficult to get consensus across the province on an ideal government structure.

27. Are there any other issues that need to be addressed if the current structure is re-designed?

Shared Services:

28. Have LSDs in your region been requesting for more services in the last 5 years?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Same

29. Do a majority of citizens in your region find it difficult paying and maintaining services that are provided to them?
   a. Yes
   b. No

30. Has there been an increase or a move towards sharing services between LSDs in your region? Please explain why or why not.
   a. Yes
   b. No

31. Shared service agreements are becoming more popular in New Brunswick. However, some citizens have expressed concerns with a lack of a defined process with regard to shared service agreements for local service districts. Do you feel a defined shared service agreement process will be more appealing to citizens? Please explain.
   a. Yes
   b. No

32. Do you think that citizens will be more engaged and participate in a defined process? Please explain.
   a. Yes
   b. No

33. What would you change for an improved process in sharing services?

34. Do you feel that shared service agreements give more authority to the provincial government than to LSDs?
   a. Yes
   b. No
35. Do some LSDs feel pressured into service agreements? Please explain.

36. Do some LSDs feel pressured into shared service agreements? Please explain.
APPENDIX II

SHARED SERVICES EVALUATION TOOL – INTRODUCTION

What is it for?

Local government is facing a harsh financial climate and many councils are sharing services, mainly back office ones, to improve efficiency and effectiveness and to save money. The LGA understands the importance of shared services and has created a shared

This evaluation tool is designed to help councils and their partners understand the costs and benefits of moving to new shared services arrangements.

It is also designed to monitor and evaluate progress and benefits from existing, more well-established shared services arrangements.

The approach taken means costs and benefits are clear and transparent to councils and other partners, which supports good decision making and improvement

What is it not?

It is not designed to be a business case or to monitor risks, but information from the tool could be included within a business case. It can be used to help establish the viability of a new shared service arrangement, or to help track delivery of intended.

How does it work?

The tool is designed to be flexible. It includes worked examples which can be adapted to suit your own circumstances. It captures information about the baseline position and then monitors changes over time. Finance staff will be able to provide the financials.

Who in your council needs to see this?

This tool can be used by all senior officers and elected members with overall responsibility for monitoring the benefits accrued by existing shared services and also those making the decision to embark upon new shared service arrangements.
STEP 1: DETERMINE THE PRE-SSA FINANCIAL BASELINE

This worksheet is designed to show the baseline position for each organisation before the establishment of the Shared Service Arrangement. Issues to be considered by the partners include:

i) the extent to which it is possible to separate out costs for individual services (e.g. property costs for ICT service which may be shared with other services e.g. HR)

ii) whether there needs to be a separate baseline position calculated for multiple services e.g. one for ICT, another for HR, where many services could be within an SSA

iii) the extent to which this baseline position informs a view about relative proportions of benefit to be accrued from the shared service arrangement.

It is for partners to agree how the baseline costs will be calculated. This may be complex as overheads may be treated differently between partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partner A (£)</th>
<th>Partner B (£)</th>
<th>Partner C (£)</th>
<th>etc</th>
<th>Pre-SSA Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Costs</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Costs</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operating Costs (please specify)</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenditure</td>
<td>3,700,000</td>
<td>8,500,000</td>
<td>9,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>21,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Expenditure</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>8,100,000</td>
<td>8,900,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STEP 2: FINANCIAL BENEFITS

It is advised to include estimated and actual figures to aid transparency, analysis and management decision making. Only cashable costs and savings should be included, those that would be reflected in the cost of the service.

In particular, any reduction in apportioned central administration costs or SSA charge that falls as a result of, for example, lower headcount should not be included unless there is a cashable reduction in costs in the relevant central department.

There is space for up to three items of costs and savings within each of the four sections on this worksheet. For example, the one-off costs could include items such as project management costs, investment in new IT systems and redundancy costs. Each of these could be included as separate items.

### PART 2A: ONE-OFF COSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description of the cost</th>
<th>All Figures [£]</th>
<th>Year 0 Estimated</th>
<th>Year 1 Estimated</th>
<th>Year 2 Estimated</th>
<th>Year 3 Estimated</th>
<th>Year 4 Estimated</th>
<th>Year 5 Estimated</th>
<th>Total Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSA OC1</td>
<td>Third Party Income</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Redundancy costs for senior staff 30% year 1 and 70% year 2 reduction on base cost of £600,000**

- **Staff Costs**
  - 0 0 180,000 200,000 420,000 450,000 0 60,000 0 0 0 0 600,000 750,000

- **Property Costs**
  - 150,000 200,000 25,000 25,000 75,000 150,000 0 0 0 0 175,000 225,000

- **Procurement of Goods & Services**
  - 50,000 75,000 25,000 25,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 75,000 150,000

- **Other Operating Costs (please specify)**
  - 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

- **Capital Expenditure**
  - 100,000 10,000 100,000 10,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 100,000 10,000

| Total Expenditure | 0 0 | 480,000 485,000 | 470,000 525,000 | 0 85,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 950,000 1,095,000 |
| Cumulative One-Off Costs | 0 0 | 480,000 485,000 | 950,000 1,010,000 | 950,000 1,095,000 | 950,000 1,095,000 | 950,000 1,095,000 |

### PART 2B: ONE-OFF SAVINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description of the saving</th>
<th>All Figures [£]</th>
<th>Year 0 Estimated</th>
<th>Year 1 Estimated</th>
<th>Year 2 Estimated</th>
<th>Year 3 Estimated</th>
<th>Year 4 Estimated</th>
<th>Year 5 Estimated</th>
<th>Total Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSA OS1</td>
<td>Third Party Income</td>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Expenditure**
  - **Staff**
    - 2,000,000 2,500,000 0 300,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 2,000,000 2,800,000

| Total Expenditure | 0 0 | 2,000,000 2,500,000 | 0 300,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 2,000,000 2,800,000 |
| Total One-Off Savings | 0 0 | 2,000,000 2,500,000 | 0 300,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 2,000,000 2,800,000 |
| Cumulative One-Off Savings | 0 0 | 2,000,000 2,500,000 | 2,000,000 2,800,000 | 2,000,000 2,800,000 | 2,000,000 2,800,000 | 2,000,000 2,800,000 |

### NOTES

One-off costs and savings are the one-off investment costs or savings associated with the shared services arrangement. They could include any redundancy costs, project management costs, costs associated with upgrading systems. While some or all of these costs might have been met from capital resources no distinction is made for the purposes of this analysis.
## PART 2C: SET-UP CONSOLIDATION SAVINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description of the saving</th>
<th>All Figures ($)</th>
<th>Year 0 Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Year 1 Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Year 2 Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Year 3 Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Year 4 Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Year 5 Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Total Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSA DCC1</td>
<td>Third Party Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fewer directors and managers; Some savings mitigated by higher salaries for rent and other accommodation costs from properties exited (includes utility, security, reduction in software licence fees and transfer to lowest cost procurement)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Income Impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Costs</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property Costs</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>280,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>830,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement of Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Operating Costs (please specify)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expenditure Savings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>780,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>990,000</td>
<td>1,060,000</td>
<td>1,080,000</td>
<td>1,110,000</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>1,410,000</td>
<td>4,180,000</td>
<td>4,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Set-Up Consolidation Savings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>780,000</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>990,000</td>
<td>1,060,000</td>
<td>1,080,000</td>
<td>1,110,000</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>1,410,000</td>
<td>4,180,000</td>
<td>4,530,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These are recurring savings so figures already cumulative.

## PART 2D: BUSINESS CHANGE SAVINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description of the saving</th>
<th>All Figures ($)</th>
<th>Year 0 Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Year 1 Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Year 2 Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Year 3 Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Year 4 Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Year 5 Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Total Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSA PIC1</td>
<td>Third Party Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income from Third Party Contracts</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,700,000</td>
<td>1,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associated Costs</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,450,000</td>
<td>1,390,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Net Income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>410,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Costs</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>1,490,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Property Costs</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>1,340,000</td>
<td>1,650,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement of Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Operating Costs (please specify)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>435,000</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>720,000</td>
<td>865,000</td>
<td>1,090,000</td>
<td>1,195,000</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>1,805,000</td>
<td>3,720,000</td>
<td>4,905,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Business Change Savings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>435,000</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>605,000</td>
<td>720,000</td>
<td>865,000</td>
<td>1,090,000</td>
<td>1,195,000</td>
<td>1,350,000</td>
<td>1,805,000</td>
<td>3,720,000</td>
<td>4,905,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These are recurring savings so figures already cumulative.

### NOTES
- Business change savings or associated costs are through any process improvement following implementation of shared services.
- These are savings and additional costs associated with the direct consolidation element of the shared service arrangement. These reflect the savings associated with bringing the service or activity under a single management structure. Procurement savings as shown are for goods and services procured for the shared service arrangement e.g. stationery, transport etc.
- Where the focus of the shared service arrangement is procurement on behalf of partners, an additional line needs to be inserted into the model to reflect the savings from this activity.
### STEP 3: NON-FINANCIAL BENEFITS

This worksheet sets out a basket of indicators that may be relevant for a shared service arrangement. It is for partners to determine which indicators they wish to monitor.

The non-financial benefits have been grouped into four categories - internal benefits (e.g., improved governance); relationships with partners/customers; process improvement; and wider benefits.

For each indicator there is a success criterion (S), baseline measure (B), target measure (T), and actual measure (A).

Type G-I can be used to show baseline measures for each of the shared service partners. This could be increased for more partners if necessary.

Columns J-O can be used to show forecast and actual performance.

Three rows (12, 31, and 41) have been fully completed to illustrate how this worksheet could be used for monitoring purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Service Benefit</th>
<th>Success Criteria / KPI / how would you know it has happened?</th>
<th>Base Year Measure - what you would measure as a baseline</th>
<th>Target End Measure and Date</th>
<th>Baseline partner A</th>
<th>Baseline partner B</th>
<th>Baseline partner C</th>
<th>Performance Year 1</th>
<th>Performance Year 2</th>
<th>Performance Year 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 1: INTERNAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESTIMATED</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>ESTIMATED</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>ESTIMATED</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear roles and</td>
<td>SSA customers and providers clear about</td>
<td>Feedback on understanding of roles and</td>
<td>95% customers and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountabilities</td>
<td>responsibilities for</td>
<td>responsibilities by end of year 1</td>
<td>clear on roles and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>delivery of agreed</td>
<td></td>
<td>responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics of scale</td>
<td>Reduced costs through bulk purchasing and</td>
<td>Costs from pre-SSA organisations or year 3</td>
<td>Non-staff costs reduced by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reduced other scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5% per cent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>related savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced staff attrition</td>
<td>Reduced costs of</td>
<td>Recruitment costs pre-SSA</td>
<td>Attrition maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>between x and y per cent of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced sickness</td>
<td>Reducing number of days lost to staff sickness</td>
<td>Sick absence pre-SSA</td>
<td>Sick absence reduced</td>
<td>3.3 days</td>
<td>2.6 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absence</td>
<td></td>
<td>baseline year</td>
<td>by x per cent per year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased capacity</td>
<td>SSA reduces or eliminates</td>
<td>Audit of use of additional</td>
<td>Reduced spend on</td>
<td>7.3 days</td>
<td>6.2 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to meet</td>
<td>eliminates spend on additional</td>
<td>seasonal/temporary staff</td>
<td>seasonal/temporary staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operations in demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to meet peaks in workload</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability</td>
<td>SSA trains own staff or recruits new skills to meet</td>
<td>Skill mix audit to assess</td>
<td>Reduction in spend on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wider range of needs</td>
<td>ability of SSA to meet</td>
<td>consultation/specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>across partners</td>
<td>range of needs from</td>
<td>advice by x% through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>partner organisations</td>
<td>increased use of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SSA resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased expertise</td>
<td>Use of SSA skills and</td>
<td>Audit of internal provision of services only and</td>
<td>By year 3 spare capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expertise by third parties</td>
<td>any specialist staff function</td>
<td>of specialists staff (e.g.,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>legal, occupational health)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fully provided by third</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 2: RELATIONSHIP WITH PARTNER/CUSTOMER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESTIMATED</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>ESTIMATED</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
<td>ESTIMATED</td>
<td>ACTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong SLAs focused on</td>
<td>SSA customers agree that</td>
<td>Feedback from customers on whether or not SSA</td>
<td>Customer feedback agrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td>SSA is delivery clear</td>
<td>on whether or not SSA targets are outcome</td>
<td>SSA targets are outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreed outcomes</td>
<td>focused</td>
<td>focused by end of year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes designed</td>
<td>Customer needs clearly</td>
<td>Feedback from customers on</td>
<td>Customer feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>around customers</td>
<td>identified and recognised</td>
<td>unmet needs</td>
<td>identifies areas for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as met by customers</td>
<td></td>
<td>improvement in year 1 which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>following process redesign</td>
<td></td>
<td>are addressed in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>year 2 and beyond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased levels of</td>
<td>Customers agree service</td>
<td>Customer satisfaction and</td>
<td>All compliments and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>customer satisfaction</td>
<td>responsive and meets</td>
<td>number of compliments and</td>
<td>complaints used to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their needs</td>
<td>complaints</td>
<td>identify areas for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>improvement. Customer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>satisfaction increases year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate accessibility</td>
<td>Customers agree access to</td>
<td>Mapping access routes and</td>
<td>Targets set for customer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SSA meets their needs</td>
<td>customer needs</td>
<td>access in line with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>customer feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>90% satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95% satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Service Benefit</td>
<td>Success Criteria / KPI/ how would you know it has happened?</td>
<td>Base Year Measure - what you would measure as a baseline</td>
<td>Target End Measure and Date</td>
<td>Baseline partner A</td>
<td>Baseline partner B</td>
<td>Baseline partner C</td>
<td>Performance Year 1</td>
<td>Performance Year 2</td>
<td>Performance Year 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 3 - PROCESS IMPROVEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built in continuous process improvement</td>
<td>SSA customers acknowledge continuous improvement in services provided that meet their needs</td>
<td>Feedback from customers on whether or not improvements are being delivered</td>
<td>Customer feedback agrees current year has delivered improvements in performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process simplification</td>
<td>Streamlined, simplified processes leading to increased customer satisfaction and/or increased capacity</td>
<td>Mapping of processes</td>
<td>Processes reviewed and reduced by y steps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 4 - WIDER BENEFITS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impact on the wider area</td>
<td>Local economic sustainability supported through employment, training and/or procurement from SSA</td>
<td>Mapping of number of jobs or procurement spend in the local area</td>
<td>Percentage of services procured by SMEs in the local area - target the following year 1 audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impact on specific communities</td>
<td>Improvement in profile of the workforce to show increased recruitment of e.g. BME or young previously unemployed</td>
<td>Current staffing profile</td>
<td>Within 3 years workforce profile to be representative of local population, or 50% of recruitment to entry level jobs from unemployed aged 16 - 25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impact on carbon footprint</td>
<td>Carbon audit shows reduction of baseline</td>
<td>Baseline audit in year 1</td>
<td>Reduction in carbon footprint by 30% within 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spare capacity to service wider public sector</td>
<td>Income generated through work for third parties without increase in staff costs</td>
<td>Mapping of third party income</td>
<td>By year 3 % of revenue generated through utilisation of excess capacity e.g. invoice processing, recruitment or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximise value from fixed cost base</td>
<td>Additional income generated from sub-letting office accommodation</td>
<td>No additional third party income</td>
<td>By year 3 office space fully utilised and generating £x in income from third parties</td>
<td>£0 income</td>
<td>£0 income</td>
<td>£20k income</td>
<td>£50k</td>
<td>£20k</td>
<td>£75k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These benefits are non-financial but many have the potential to have a financial impact. Those shown in bold are more amenable to quantitative analysis if partners can agree a standard methodology.

It is important for partners to agree indicators that are relevant and how they will be measured and monitored consistently over time, particularly where no national guidance is available on data collection.

In setting targets for performance partners may wish to consider floor targets (below which performance should not drop) as well as improvement targets over time.
Shared Service Benefits

Financial

F1 One off Cost and Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total One Off Costs</td>
<td>950,000</td>
<td>1,085,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total One Off Savings</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,800,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Cost/Savings</td>
<td>1,050,000</td>
<td>1,705,000</td>
<td>655,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Net Cost/Savings of Total Baseline Service Costs</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>8.53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F2 Non One off Cost and Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Consolidation Savings</td>
<td>4,180,000.00</td>
<td>4,180,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Business Change Savings</td>
<td>4,010,000.00</td>
<td>5,315,000.00</td>
<td>1,305,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non One Off Savings</td>
<td>8,190,000.00</td>
<td>9,485,000.00</td>
<td>1,655,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Net Cost/Savings of Total Baseline Service Costs</td>
<td>40.95%</td>
<td>49.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F3 Cash Flow Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Total net Cost or Saving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,810,000</td>
<td>1,220,000</td>
<td>2,045,000</td>
<td>1,960,000</td>
<td>13,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total net Cost or Saving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,070,000</td>
<td>690,000</td>
<td>1,960,000</td>
<td>2,080,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F4 Present Value Analysis

Using the start year as the start of the present value analysis

Discount rate % 3.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Value actual Total net Cost or Saving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,714,976</td>
<td>1,158,883</td>
<td>1,844,473</td>
<td>1,708,027</td>
<td>13,740,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Total Net Cost or Saving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>644,122</td>
<td>1,797,808</td>
<td>1,986,888</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F5 Improvement in Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the service more effective - improved outcomes for service or organisation?</th>
<th>Significant</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have shared services directly improved outcomes? Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have shared services indirectly improved outcomes? Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have shared services improved customer satisfaction? Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the capacity of the service improved - organisation in better able to deliver more or better quality services? Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was this benefit anticipated? Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent has the benefit been realised?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant reduction in performance Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in performance Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in line with expectations Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement exceeds expectations Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is there a financial benefit associated with improvement? Y/N

Is this included in the financial benefits? Y/N
**Improvement in Efficiency**

Is the service more efficient - greater outputs for the same input? Significant | Moderate | None

Have shared services caused the speed of service improved? Y/N

Have shared services resulted in a reduction in errors? Y/N

Was this benefit anticipated? Y/N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant reduction in performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in line with expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement exceeds expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is there a financial benefit associated with improvement? Y/N

Is this included in the financial benefits? Y/N

**Improvement in Sustainability**

Has the sustainability of the service improved - more resilient and better able to meet future challenges? Significant | Moderate | None

Have shared services meant that the service is better able to meet future challenges? Y/N

Has shared services meant that the service is better able to meet uneven workloads? Y/N

Was this benefit anticipated? Y/N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant reduction in performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in line with expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement exceeds expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is there a financial benefit associated with improvement? Y/N

Is this included in the financial benefits? Y/N
APPENDIX III

FORM 6
NOTICE OF MEETING
(Municipalities Act, R.S.N.B. 1973, c.M-22, s.25 (1))

Under subsection 25(1) of the Municipalities Act, the Minister of Environment Local Government calls a meeting of the residents of the local service district(s) of:

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

who are qualified to vote under the Elections Act and the Municipalities Act for the purpose of providing the shared service(s) of:

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

or for the discontinuance of shared service(s) of:

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

Between the local service district(s)/rural community(ies)/municipality(ies) of:

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________

Date and Time of Information Meeting and Voting:

________________________________________________________

Place of Information Meeting and Voting:

________________________________________________________

Dated the _____ day of ____________, 20__.

________________________________________________________

Minister of Environment and Local Government
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