Response to Applicant - Partial Access Granted
Form 4B

COR/2017/02180

May 4, 2017

Dear [Redacted]

RE: Your request for access to information under Part II of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (Our File TW/059/2017)

On April 19, 2017, the Department of Transportation and Works received your request for access to the following records/information:

"A copy of the following briefing notes: Land to be acquired in Carbonear which was not acquired in 1977 when the Conception Bay North Highway was built Transfer of Land to the town of Stephenville Contingency Plan for the Labrador Straits Ferry Service Canadian Union of Public Employees"

I am pleased to inform you that a decision has been made by the Deputy Minister of Transportation and Works to provide access to some of the requested information.

Access to the remaining record information contained within the records, has been refused in accordance with the following exceptions to disclosure, as specified in the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (the Act):

- 29. (1) The head of a public body may refuse to disclose to an applicant information that would reveal
  - (a) advice, proposals, recommendations, analyses or policy options developed by or for a public body or minister;

- 40. (1) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose personal information to an applicant where the disclosure would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy.
Please be advised that you may ask the Information and Privacy Commissioner to review the processing of your access request, as set out in section 42 of the Act. A request to the Commissioner must be made in writing within 15 business days of the date of this letter or within a longer period that may be allowed by the Commissioner.

The address and contact information of the Information and Privacy Commissioner is as follows:

Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner
2 Canada Drive
P. O. Box 13004, Stn. A
St. John’s, NL. A1B 3V8
Telephone: (709) 729-6309
Toll-Free: 1-877-729-6309
Facsimile: (709) 729-6500

You may also appeal directly to the Supreme Court Trial Division within 15 business days after you receive the decision of the public body, pursuant to section 52 of the Act.

Please be advised that responsive records will be published following a 72 hour period after the response is sent electronically to you or five business days in the case where records are mailed to you. It is the goal to have the responsive records posted to the Completed Access to Information Requests website within one business day following the applicable period of time. Please note that requests for personal information will not be posted online.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me by telephone at 709-729-5303 or by e-mail at MichaelCook@gov.nl.ca.

Sincerely,

Michael Cook
ATIPP Coordinator
Department of Transportation and Works
Enclosures
Policy advice or recommendations

29. (1) The head of a public body may refuse to disclose to an applicant information that would reveal

(a) advice, proposals, recommendations, analyses or policy options developed by or for a public body or minister;

(b) the contents of a formal research report or audit report that in the opinion of the head of the public body is incomplete and in respect of which a request or order for completion has been made by the head within 65 business days of delivery of the report; or

(c) draft legislation or regulations.

(2) The head of a public body shall not refuse to disclose under subsection (1)

(a) factual material;

(b) a public opinion poll;

(c) a statistical survey;

(d) an appraisal;

(e) an environmental impact statement or similar information;

(f) a final report or final audit on the performance or efficiency of a public body or on any of its programs or policies;

(g) a consumer test report or a report of a test carried out on a product to test equipment of the public body;

(h) a feasibility or technical study, including a cost estimate, relating to a policy or project of the public body;

(i) a report on the results of field research undertaken before a policy proposal is formulated;

(j) a report of an external task force, committee, council or similar body that has been established to consider a matter and make a report or recommendations to a public body;

(k) a plan or proposal to establish a new program or to change a program, if the plan or proposal has been approved or rejected by the head of the public body;
(l) information that the head of the public body has cited publicly as the basis for making a decision or formulating a policy; or

(m) a decision, including reasons, that is made in the exercise of a discretionary power or an adjudicative function and that affects the rights of the applicant.

(3) Subsection (1) does not apply to information in a record that has been in existence for 15 years or more.
Disclosure harmful to personal privacy

40. (1) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose personal information to an applicant where the disclosure would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy.

(2) A disclosure of personal information is not an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy where

(a) the applicant is the individual to whom the information relates;

(b) the third party to whom the information relates has, in writing, consented to or requested the disclosure;

(c) there are compelling circumstances affecting a person's health or safety and notice of disclosure is given in the form appropriate in the circumstances to the third party to whom the information relates;

(d) an Act or regulation of the province or of Canada authorizes the disclosure;

(e) the disclosure is for a research or statistical purpose and is in accordance with section 70;

(f) the information is about a third party's position, functions or remuneration as an officer, employee or member of a public body or as a member of a minister's staff;

(g) the disclosure reveals financial and other details of a contract to supply goods or services to a public body;

(h) the disclosure reveals the opinions or views of a third party given in the course of performing services for a public body, except where they are given in respect of another individual;

(i) public access to the information is provided under the Financial Administration Act;

(j) the information is about expenses incurred by a third party while travelling at the expense of a public body;

(k) the disclosure reveals details of a licence, permit or a similar discretionary benefit granted to a third party by a public body, not including personal information supplied in support of the application for the benefit;

(l) the disclosure reveals details of a discretionary benefit of a financial nature granted to a third party by a public body, not including...
(i) personal information that is supplied in support of the application for the benefit, or

(ii) personal information that relates to eligibility for income and employment support under the Income and Employment Support Act or to the determination of income or employment support levels; or

(m) the disclosure is not contrary to the public interest as described in subsection (3) and reveals only the following personal information about a third party:

(i) attendance at or participation in a public event or activity related to a public body, including a graduation ceremony, sporting event, cultural program or club, or field trip, or

(ii) receipt of an honour or award granted by or through a public body.

(3) The disclosure of personal information under paragraph (2)(m) is an unreasonable invasion of personal privacy where the third party whom the information is about has requested that the information not be disclosed.

(4) A disclosure of personal information is presumed to be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy where

(a) the personal information relates to a medical, psychiatric or psychological history, diagnosis, condition, treatment or evaluation;

(b) the personal information is an identifiable part of a law enforcement record, except to the extent that the disclosure is necessary to dispose of the law enforcement matter or to continue an investigation;

(c) the personal information relates to employment or educational history;

(d) the personal information was collected on a tax return or gathered for the purpose of collecting a tax;

(e) the personal information consists of an individual's bank account information or credit card information;

(f) the personal information consists of personal recommendations or evaluations, character references or personnel evaluations;

(g) the personal information consists of the third party's name where

(i) it appears with other personal information about the third party, or
(ii) the disclosure of the name itself would reveal personal information about the third party; or

(h) the personal information indicates the third party’s racial or ethnic origin or religious or political beliefs or associations.

(5) In determining under subsections (1) and (4) whether a disclosure of personal information constitutes an unreasonable invasion of a third party’s personal privacy, the head of a public body shall consider all the relevant circumstances, including whether

(a) the disclosure is desirable for the purpose of subjecting the activities of the province or a public body to public scrutiny;

(b) the disclosure is likely to promote public health and safety or the protection of the environment;

(c) the personal information is relevant to a fair determination of the applicant’s rights;

(d) the disclosure will assist in researching or validating the claims, disputes or grievances of aboriginal people;

(e) the third party will be exposed unfairly to financial or other harm;

(f) the personal information has been supplied in confidence;

(g) the personal information is likely to be inaccurate or unreliable;

(h) the disclosure may unfairly damage the reputation of a person referred to in the record requested by the applicant;

(i) the personal information was originally provided to the applicant; and

(j) the information is about a deceased person and, if so, whether the length of time the person has been deceased indicates the disclosure is not an unreasonable invasion of the deceased person’s personal privacy.
Access or correction complaint

42.(1) A person who makes a request under this Act for access to a record or for correction of personal information may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting a decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request.

(2) A complaint under subsection (1) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days
   (a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or
   (b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16(2).

(3) A third party informed under section 19 of a decision of the head of a public body to grant access to a record or part of a record in response to a request may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting that decision.

(4) A complaint under subsection (3) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days after the third party is informed of the decision of the head of the public body.

(5) The commissioner may allow a longer time period for the filing of a complaint under this section.

(6) A person or third party who has appealed directly to the Trial Division under subsection 52(1) or 53(1) shall not file a complaint with the commissioner.

(7) The commissioner shall refuse to investigate a complaint where an appeal has been commenced in the Trial Division.

(8) A complaint shall not be filed under this section with respect to
   (a) a request that is disregarded under section 21;
   (b) a decision respecting an extension of time under section 23;
   (c) a variation of a procedure under section 24; or
   (d) an estimate of costs or a decision not to waive a cost under section 26.

(9) The commissioner shall provide a copy of the complaint to the head of the public body concerned.
Direct appeal to Trial Division by an applicant

52. (1) Where an applicant has made a request to a public body for access to a record or correction of personal information and has not filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42, the applicant may appeal the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request directly to the Trial Division.

(2) An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (1) not later than 15 business days

(a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16(2).

(3) Where an applicant has filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42 and the commissioner has refused to investigate the complaint, the applicant may commence an appeal in the Trial Division of the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request for access to a record or for correction of personal information.

(4) An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (3) not later than 15 business days after the applicant is notified of the commissioner’s refusal under subsection 45(2).
Decision/Direction Note
Department of Transportation and Works

Title: Land to be acquired from [redacted] Carbonear, which was not acquired in 1977 when the Conception Bay North Highway was built.

Decision/Direction Required:
• Proceed with an offer of compensation for land required from [redacted] measuring approximately 100 sq. m. at the 1977 rate of $7.81 sq. m for a total compensation of $781.

Background and Current Status:
• The Department built the Conception Bay North Highway through Carbonear in 1977 and expropriated land for the highway reservation and on-off ramp at [redacted]. Several land owners were impacted, one being [redacted]. The front boundary of the lands as being setback 10m from the centre of [redacted]. This has since been deemed an incorrect location for the front boundary of properties at [redacted].

Further to this effort, it was brought to the attention of the Department that the [redacted] may own more land than was previously expropriated for the Highway, as an incorrect reservation may have been placed on [redacted] by Department officials. The [redacted] have suggested a land swap as a form of settlement, with the [redacted] acquiring land adjacent to the Department on-off ramp to increase the frontage of their lot in return for conveyance of the [redacted] title to a strip of land along [redacted], which they view as belonging to them.

Subsequent meetings with Highway Maintenance Officials have revealed that no surplus Department land is available adjacent to the ramp to convey to the [redacted].

The claim of the [redacted] to ownership of a strip of land which was missed by the 1977 expropriation was researched by the Department and it has confirmed that the front boundary of the [redacted] lands may in fact be about 5m from the center of [redacted], not 10m as the Department survey relates, hence the [redacted] may still hold title to a strip of land 5 metres wide along [redacted].

This view is based on a review of available aerial photography dated from 1951 to 1969 and deeds of the subject lands from 1932 to 1977. The dated aerials show fences, houses and other evidence of occupation within 5m of the centre of [redacted], which would indicate a valid claim of squatters' title, considering this land was not subject to a crown grant. The deeds to the subject land traces back to 1932 and are vague meets and bounds descriptions, with the land being described as bounded by the road and the river, 225' deep. This measurement conflicts with the 1977 deed, which also meets and bounds description with the land being described as bounded by the road and the river, 370/360' deep. A review of aerials from 1951 to 2008 confirms the river did not significantly change, with the distances from the road to the river ranging from 354' to 367'.
• The variance in the depth measurements can be addressed when considering hierarchy of evidence used in land survey law which places more weight on a natural boundary over a deed measurement when conflicts exist between the two. Neither the road nor the river has changed location, hence the earlier deed noting the land as being 225' deep can be considered flawed.

The amount paid to the for the settlement was $8700, for a release on the approximately ¼ acre expropriated, which equates to $7.81 sq. m. This amount far exceeded the 1977 value, as ½ acre building lots were selling in the $3500 - $5000 range in Carbonear in 1977. Of note the did not hold title to the land when the expropriation occurred. The land was owned by in 1977 when it was expropriated; hence a release should have been obtained from The Department held title to the expropriated land when it was conveyed by

A recent 2015 sale of crown land for similar utility land was conveyed at the rate of $4.51 sq. m by Crown Lands Division.

Analysis:

• The hold title to a strip of land measuring approximately 5m from the original center of to 10m from original center of

• The Department has been occupying this 5 metre wide strip of land without benefit of title since the highway was built in 1977. The Department should hold title to land its infrastructure is located on.

This strip was excluded from the expropriation; hence title would have flowed unimpeded to As the strip was not expropriated present day values should be applied not 1977 rates, however present day values are near half the rate paid for release of the 1977 expropriation, hence the higher rate should be used for the sake of consistency, as the onus was on the Department to ensure a proper survey was completed. And had a proper survey been done the would have been compensated at the 1977 rate of $7.81 sq. m.

This file was opened when the requested land adjacent to their own land. TW reviewed the request and it was determined that the land is not available due to the required 15m clearance from the edge of the road.

Prepared/Approved by: M. Nolan/A. McKenna/C. Grandy
Deputy Ministers Approval: T. King
March 6, 2017
Title: Transfer of Land to the Town of Stephenville

Issue: To advise that the Department of Transportation and Works intends to proceed with the transfer of a 393 acre parcel of land in Stephenville, to the Town of Stephenville, as per section 15(2) of the Executive Council Act.

Background and Current Status:
- Federal PC1971-1055 authorized the transfer of a parcel of land by Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada to Her Majesty the Queen in right of the Province of Newfoundland, for lease to the Harmon Golf and Country Club, on June 1, 1971.

- One of the terms of the transfer was: ‘That the land will not be sold by the Province without the consent of the Minister of Transport.’ Other conditions included that the land continue to be used for a Golf Course and for no other purpose, and that no structures or installation will be constructed or erected on the land without the approval of the Minister of Transport. The conditions outlined in the original transfer are attached in Annex A.

Analysis:
- On April 14, 2011, the Town of Stephenville wrote then-Minister Tom Hedderson, requesting that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador consider the conveyance of the property that is currently leased to the Harmon Seaside Links (including golf course and park) to the Town of Stephenville for a nominal fee. A map of the parcel of land is attached in Annex B.

- On January 9, 2012, then-Minister Hedderson wrote then-Federal Minister Denis Lebel seeking approval of the Minister of Transport to sell this parcel of land to the Town of Stephenville for $1.00.

- Following a meeting on July 14, 2011, then-Minister Hedderson responded to the Town of Stephenville on September 1, 2011, advising that TW officials would be commissioning a survey of the land occupied by the Harmon Seaside Golf Course, and that upon completion of the survey and necessary legal documentation, the parcel of land would be deeded to the Town of Stephenville for the sum of $1.00.

- Based on the terms of the transfer authorized by PC1971-1055, TW subsequently wrote then-Federal Minister of Transport Lebel on January 9, 2012, seeking approval to sell the parcel of land to the Town of Stephenville for $1.00.

- Following numerous discussions with Transport Canada (TC), TC advised that it was not willing to amend the terms and conditions related to its initial transfer to the Province and thus, would like the Town of Stephenville to accept the same terms.

- On December 8, 2014, the Town of Stephenville wrote TW seeking an update on the conveyance of the property. The Town noted that since the 2011 correspondence, that they had not received any information on the status of transfer. The correspondence also requested that the transfer be expedited, as the property is located within the Town’s municipal boundary, and could have a potentially positive economic impact.
TW was made aware that the potential positive economic impact referred to in the Town’s December 8, 2014 correspondence was based on the Town’s intent to sell the parcel of land as cottage lots upon transfer from the Province.

On December 15, 2014, then-Minister David Brazil wrote the Town of Stephenville, advising them of TC’s conditions for transfer, including that the land will be used for a Golf Course and Public Park only, and that the plans of the Golf Course and Public Park layout and any subsequent major re-arrangements of the Golf Course and Public Park layout will require the approval of the Minister of Transport. The correspondence noted that should the Town of Stephenville be in agreement, TW officials would request approval from TC to transfer the property to the Town of Stephenville with all original conditions included.

On December 23, 2014, the Town of Stephenville advised TW that the conditions of the transfer, as outlined in the December 15, 2014 letter and as originally stipulated by TC, were acceptable to the Town of Stephenville, which TW subsequently advised TC.

The transfer documents which include the conditions referenced in Annex A have been reviewed and approved by Transport Canada. On January 26, 2017, Transport Canada provided consent to the sale and transfer of the 393 acre parcel of land from Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Newfoundland and Labrador to the Town Council of the Town of Stephenville.

Section 15(2) of the Executive Council Act provides the Minister with the authority to dispose of this land.

To note, Crown Lands typically sells land to a municipality for $1.00 if the land is intended to be used for municipal purposes (i.e. town hall, fire hall, etc.), but otherwise it sells land to a municipality at fair market value.

**Action Being Taken:**

- TW has drafted an agreement between Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Newfoundland and Labrador and The Town Council of the Town of Stephenville, and will proceed with the transfer of the parcel of land to the Town of Stephenville; the transfer will be subject to the conditions outlined in Annex A.

**Prepared/Approved by:** K. Martin/A. McKenna/D. Woodrow

**Ministerial Approval:** Received from Hon. Al Hawkins

March 21, 2017
Annex A

Conditions Outlined in the Original Transfer to the Province (June 1, 1971)

1. That the land will be used for a Golf Course and for no other purpose.

2. That no structure or installation will be constructed or erected on the land without the approval of the Minister of Transport.

3. That the plans of the Golf Course layout and any subsequent major re-arrangements will require the approval of the Minister of Transport.

4. That the land will not be sold by the Province without the consent of the Minister of Transport.

5. That the Golf Club and its patrons will not interfere in any way with the buildings and installations of the Department of Transport located on the land and will provide rights-of-way to these structures as may be required.

6. That the province will continue to provide a suitable parcel of land from the area to be transferred, together with an access thereto, for a V.O.R. Site.

7. That the Province will permit the free passage of Department of Transport officials and agents requiring pedestrian and vehicular access across the land, at such locations to be determined and mutually agreed upon, as may be necessary for the construction and maintenance of harbour and airport facilities.

8. That the Province will undertake a legal survey at its expense within one year from the effective date of the transfer, to delineate the proposed boundaries of the parcels of land described in Schedules “A” and “B”.
Annex B
Map Outlining Land Requested by the Town of Stephenville
Title: Contingency Plan for the Labrador Straits Ferry Service – Wednesday, March 29, 2017 – Thursday, March 30, 2017

Issue: A contingency plan is required for the Labrador Straits ferry service as the MV Apollo has been unable to travel due to significant ice pressure since Friday, March 24, 2017.

Background and Current Status:
- The MV Apollo is operated by Labrador Marine Inc. (LMI) between St. Barbe and Blanc Sablon, Quebec. The vessel can carry 240 passengers and 85 vehicles.
- On Friday, March 24, 2017, the MV Apollo made one crossing from Blanc Sablon to St. Barbe, but was unable to make any subsequent crossings due to excessive ice pressure that was unable to be cleared by an icebreaker.

Analysis:
- The MV Apollo will have been out of service for five days as of Wednesday, March 29, 2017, and accommodations for those who have been unable to travel have been limited due to the significant number of transmission line contractors (Nalcor and Valard) staying in the Labrador Straits area. As such, TW is proposing a contingency plan be implemented, effective on Wednesday. The proposed contingency plan involves the use of a Twin Otter aircraft flying between the Blanc Sablon airport and the St. Anthony airport. It is anticipated that two round-trips per day will be completed via the Twin Otter.
- The Twin Otter has the capacity to transport 19 passengers per trip. This will allow for the movement of up to 76 passengers per day. Vehicles will not be able to be transported between St. Barbe and Blanc Sablon until the MV Apollo resumes service.
- LMI currently has 79 passengers on its reservation list awaiting transportation from Blanc Sablon to St. Barbe, and 69 on their reservation list awaiting transportation from St. Barbe to Blanc Sablon. Under the proposed contingency plan, it is anticipated that these passengers can be moved in 4 round trips over the two day period. The passenger reservation numbers include some individuals who were transported via private air charter over the weekend at their own cost, so fewer trips could potentially be required to clear the backlog of passengers on the reservation list. LMI has advised that no additional reservations were taken effective Friday, March 24, due to the presence of ice on the Labrador Straits.
- LMI will contact passengers who are currently on their reservation list, starting with those passengers who have been on the list the longest, to schedule transportation for these individuals via the Twin Otter.
- The current MV Apollo passenger rates will be charged for this service.
- TW issued a request for quotes to three service providers; the lowest bid for the provision of air services for the two day period of Wednesday, March 29, 2017 to Thursday, March 30, 2017, assuming two round-trips per day, was $12,387 (including HST). This cost includes aircraft repositioning, airport fees, flight costs, landing fees, and crew expenses. Additional costs would be incurred should additional trips or additional days of service be required.
• There is sufficient funding available under Coastal Labrador Ferry Operations – 4.2.03 for the provision of this contingency service. TW has saved approximately $10,000 in fuel costs while the vessel has not been running.

• The MHA for Cartwright L’Anse au Clair has been briefed and is supportive of the implementation of the contingency plan.

• TW does not have a policy for the provision of air service in lieu of marine service on the Labrador Straits, as commercial flights are available for purchase in this area. Consideration has been given to the provision of a contingency plan in this particular case due to the lack of accommodations available for those passengers who have been unable to travel on the MV Apollo due to the significant ice pressure on the Labrador Straits. Under normal circumstances, travelers would either avail of the commercial flight services available, or secure accommodations while awaiting the re-entry of the MV Apollo into service, once ice conditions allow.

**Action Being Taken:**

• The contingency plan will be implemented on Wednesday, March 29, 2017 until Thursday, March 30, 2017.

• A public advisory will be issued prior to the implementation of the contingency plan.

• Should ice conditions improve prior to March 30, 2017, marine service provided by LMI via the MV Apollo will resume.

• Should significant ice pressure continue on the Labrador Straits beyond Thursday, March 30, 2017, additional days of air services may be required, at additional cost.

**Prepared/Approved by:** K. Martin/J. Baker/T. English/T. King

**Ministerial Approval:** Hon. Allan Hawkins

March 28, 2017
Meeting Note  
Department of Transportation and Works  
Canadian Union of Public Employees  
March 28, 2017, at 11:00 a.m.  
TW Executive Boardroom  

Attendees:  
- Department of Transportation and Works  
  o Hon. Al Hawkins – Minister  
  o Tracy King – Deputy Minister  
  o Cory Grandy – Assistant Deputy Minister (Works)  
  o Tracy English – Assistant Deputy Minister (Strategic and Corporate Services)  
  o Margot Pitcher – Executive Assistant  
- Human Resources Secretariat  
  o Hon. Cathy Bennett – Minister  
  o Geoff Williams – Deputy Minister  
  o Kathy Dicks-Peyton – Executive Assistant  
- Canadian Union of Public Employees  
  o – President  
  o – Senior Economist  

Purpose of Meeting:  
- The meeting was requested by the Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) to discuss the proposed public private partnership (P3) for the Corner Brook Long Term Care Facility.  

Background:  
- In fall 2016, TW engaged EY to undertake value for money (VFM) assessments of the Waterford Hospital Facility replacement, Corner Brook Hospital, and long term care facilities in western and central regions. A VFM assessment is a financial evaluation that compares the full lifecycle costs (i.e., 30 years) of different ways of designing, constructing, financing, and maintaining a facility compared to traditional methods of procurement. Based on the results of the assessment, EY recommended a design, build, finance and maintain (DBFM) approach for the procurement of the long term care facility in Corner Brook.  
- On January 20, 2017, the Provincial Government announced the Corner Brook Long Term Care project and started the DBFM procurement process. The new facility marks the beginning of a new Western Memorial Regional Hospital campus and will include 120 long-term care beds, 15 palliative care beds, and 10 rehabilitative care beds. Construction on the new long-term care home is scheduled to begin in fall 2017.  
- On February 17, 2017, the Provincial Government confirmed its commitment to construct a new acute care regional hospital in Corner Brook under a DBFM procurement process. The new regional hospital will include the same services available at Western Memorial Regional Hospital, as well as an expanded cancer care program that includes radiation services. The new 50,000 square metre facility will include 164 acute care beds. Construction on the new acute care facility is expected to start in spring 2019.
Construction of the Corner Brook Acute Care Facility is expected to generate a total of 3,200 person years of employment with the annual peak in construction employment expected to occur in 2020 to 2022 at roughly 700 person years in each year. There are 1,770 people employed at the current hospital.

Agenda item #1 (Issue #1)
- Public Private Partnerships

Analysis:
- CUPE has been critical of government’s decision to pursue a P3 for the long term care facility and acute care hospital in Corner Brook, questioning the protection of public sector jobs, particularly maintenance jobs. Under a DBFM procurement method, major building maintenance services, such as HVAC and building envelope maintenance, will be provided by the successful proponent as part of the maintenance component of the project. Services such as patient care, laundry, housekeeping and food services are not part of the P3 arrangement and will continue to be provided by public sector employees.

- There will be no job losses in any service area, including maintenance services, for the new long term care facility in Corner Brook. As a new facility that is expanding capacity for long term care, there are no existing jobs associated with the project. However, jobs created for the new long term care facility will be in the private sector.

Potential Speaking Points:
- Ensuring value for taxpayers dollars is a critical consideration as we work to reduce the province’s deficit while building much needed health infrastructure. Partnerships with private sector are necessary to ensure people access appropriate services in the current fiscal climate.

- We have heard that it’s important to the people of the province that health care services be provided by public sector workers. That is part of the approach we are using for the acute care hospital and the long term care facility. Nursing care services and hospital support services such as laundry, housekeeping and dietary, will be provided by Western Health staff, as is currently the case.

- Current maintenance and trades workers will be treated fairly and all specific issues related to employment will be addressed in detail as we negotiate an agreement with a proponent.

Prepared/approved by: J. Garrett/C. Grandy/T. King

March 27, 2017