Dear [Redacted]:

Re: Your request for access to information under Part II of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015 [Our File #: MAE/056/2019]

On March 13, 2019, the Department of Municipal Affairs and Environment received your request for access to the following records/information:

"I would like to request the following briefing materials:
- January 2019 Decision Note titled Limiting ERSB’s Allowable Billing Period.
- January 2019 Information Note titled Request for Authority for Municipalities to Levy an Accommodations Tax.
- January 2019 Information Note titled Request for Zoning Amendment to the Provincial Butterpot-Witless Bay Line Enviros Development Control Regulations to Accommodate a Cannabis Production Facility.
- January 2019 Meeting Note titled Meeting with Town of Marystown."

I am pleased to inform you that a decision has been made by the Deputy Minister for the Department of Municipal Affairs and Environment to provide access to some of the requested information.

However, certain text 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, 2015 (the Act):

Section 27(2)(b): “The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose to an applicant information in a record other than a cabinet record that would reveal the substance of deliberations of Cabinet.”

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

Section 30(1): “The head of a public body may refuse to disclose to an applicant information that is subject to solicitor and client privilege or litigation privilege of a public body; or that would disclose legal opinions provided to a public body by a law officer of the Crown.”

Section 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.”
As required by 8(2) of the Act, we have severed information that is unable to be disclosed and have provided you with as much information as possible. In accordance with your request for a copy of the records, the appropriate copies have been enclosed. To clarify the responsive records enclosed, please see the list below.

- Page 8 is redacted in full and removed from the enclosed package due to section 29(1)(a)

Please be advised that you may appeal this decision and ask the Information and Privacy Commissioner to review the decision to provide partial access to the requested information, as set out in section 42 of the Act (a copy of this section of the Act has been enclosed for your reference). 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. Your appeal should identify your concerns with the request and why you are submitting the appeal.

The appeal may be addressed to the Information and Privacy Commissioner 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 (a copy of this section of the Act has been enclosed for your reference).

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 709-729-7183 or by e-mail at ryan.collins@gov.nl.ca.

Sincerely,

Ryan Collins
ATIPP Coordinator
Municipal Affairs and Environment

Enclosures
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).
Title: Request for zoning amendment to the provincial Butterpot-Witless Bay Line Environ Development Control Regulations to accommodate a cannabis production facility.

Decision/Direction Required:

- Whether to proceed with the request by [Redacted] to amend the zoning of a parcel of Crown land located off the Trans-Canada Highway ("TCH") opposite Butterpot Park from "Rural" to "Industrial" to accommodate a proposed medical marijuana production facility.

- It is recommended that the Minister:
  - Accept the Interdepartmental Land Use Committee ("ILUC") recommendation to refuse the rezoning request; and
  - Sign the attached letter of refusal.

Background and Current Status:

- [Redacted] (the "Applicant") has identified a parcel of Crown Land that [Redacted] wishes to develop for a medical marijuana production facility.

- Initially the Applicant had stated that [Redacted] intended use of the subject property was "root crop production". The Applicant's proposal required approval from the Crown Lands Division of the Department of Fisheries and Land Resources to acquire the land, as well as a development permit from the Government Service Centre of Service NL (the provincial permitting agency).

- The application was processed as an "Agriculture" use, and was given approval-in-principle with conditions by Service NL, on Aug 8, 2017. When the application was later clarified to be a proposal to develop a medical marijuana production facility, Service NL (Government Service Centre as the provincial permitting agency) as well as Fisheries and Land Resources (Crown Lands Division) required that new referrals be circulated to reflect the accurate details of the proposed development.

- The Applicant was denied the required approvals due to the fact that the proposed use (a cannabis production facility) does not comply with the current "Rural" zone and is therefore contrary to the Regulations.

- The Applicant is requesting that the current "Rural" zoning be changed to "Industrial" under the Butterpot-Witless Bay Line Environ Development Control Regulations (the "Regulations") and the St. John's Urban Region Regional Plan, 1976 (the "SUJRRP"). The Applicant is requesting the rezoning [Redacted]...

- On July 10, 2018, MAE sent a referral through the Interdepartmental Land Use Committee (ILUC) to request comments on the proposed rezoning from the various departments and agencies with an interest in land use. For such amendments, it is common practice to seek input and recommendations regarding provincial interests to be considered in relation to requested zoning amendments to accommodate proposed development; particularly to inform the decision of the Minister wherein he is the authority and not a municipal Council.
• Due to the proximity of the proposed site, located off the TCH and across from Butterpot Park, the ILUC referral was sent directly by MAE Land Use Planning ("LUP") staff to the Department of Transportation and Works as well as Parks and Natural Areas to expedite feedback regarding these two key provincial interests.

• The November 7, 2018 ILUC Summary Report recommends refusal of the proposed amendment.

Analysis:

• The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment ("MAE") is the authority for the Regulations and the SUJRRP. As such, the Minister has the discretion to decide whether to proceed with an amendment.

• Regulations, the SJURRP, and any amendments thereto, must conform to the requirements of the Urban and Rural Planning Act, 2000 ("URPA").

• The ILUC report recommended refusal of the proposed amendment due to several land use conflicts and concerns, the key points being:
  
  o There is high potential for land use conflicts with existing uses in proximity of the site, including:
    ▪ established mining operations in the area; and
    ▪ existing NL Hydro transmission lines associated with the Lower Churchill Project.
  
  o The proposed access to the site poses land use conflicts with existing utility and resource development.

  o There is only one approved access from the TCH, which currently services the noted transmission lines and quarries; therefore, limitations to the use of the access road would not be in keeping with the federal Health Canada requirements for gating and access control for cannabis production facilities.

• As the proposed zoning change poses concerns related to multiple provincial interests, it is therefore recommended that the amendment request be refused by the Minister.

Alternatives:

1. Refuse to proceed with the proposed amendment to change the zoning of the subject Crown Land’s property from rural to industrial [Recommended].
2. Agree to entertain the amendment process and proceed with public consultation

Prepared/Approved by: K. Blanchard/ M. Oley/ T. Kelly/ J. Chippett [pending]
Ministerial Approval: Received from Hon. Graham Letto, MHA [pending]

January 21, 2019
Title: Limiting Eastern Regional Service Board's (ERSB'S) Allowable Billing Period

Background and Current Status:
- The Regional Service Boards Act, 2012 (the Act) and its associated regulations provide the regional service boards (RSBs) with the authority to deliver prescribed services within their region, and to charge user fees on a cost-recovery basis.

- The Cabin Owners' Against Trash Tax (COATT) group, established in early 2018, is dissatisfied with ERSB's service delivery and fees in Eastern Region. The group is active on social media and talk radio, and has met with the Minister, ERSB, and local MHAs.

- On November 23, 2018 the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment (MAE) wrote to the Chair of ERSB to request that it cease from advancing further court action against cabin owners until proposed changes to ERSB's governance structure could be implemented to better represent cabin owners' concerns. The Chair's response indicated that the Board did not agree with the proposed governance structure changed, or with ceasing court actions.

Analysis:

- Cabin owners have complained that it is unfair to receive an initial invoice for multiple years of fees and interest from ERSB given their view that the service is unnecessary and not being adequately provided, and that sufficient notice has not been provided to them.

- ERSB has argued that they have made reasonable efforts to notify property owners when they expand their waste collection services into new areas, and that charging interest and arrears for past-due amounts is their only means of deterring fee avoidance activities.

- The Office of the Citizens' Representative 2017-18 Annual Digest noted that ERSB's approach has not helped mitigate citizens' hostility to additional fees, and recommended changes in the areas of complaint handling, proactive disclosure, and exemption policies.
Title: Request for Authority for Municipalities to Levy an Accommodations Tax

Decision/Direction Required:
- Whether to allow municipalities to require patrons of tourist accommodations to pay an accommodation tax (levy)
- It is recommended that the Minister:

Background and Current Status:
- Municipalities Newfoundland and Labrador ("MNL") and Hospitality Newfoundland and Labrador ("HNL") have requested that all municipalities be given authority to implement accommodations levies through applicable municipal legislation, such as the Municipalities Act, 1999, the City of Mount Pearl Act and the City of Corner Brook Act.

- MNL and HNL have jointly proposed the following with respect to accommodations levies:
  - They be re-invested in tourism marketing and tourism development;
  - They be invested through mechanisms that the municipality is not prohibited from using through legislation;
  - They be coordinated through a Memorandum of Understanding (an "MoU") between municipal councils and representatives of the accommodations sector in the municipality, or an organization comprising representatives from both the municipality and the accommodations sector;
  - They be collected by the accommodations operators and remitted to the municipality with oversight from the parties to the MoU, or the coordinating organization; and
  - They be used to fund the administrative costs associated with a coordinating organization so it does not rely on core municipal operational funding.

- Currently, section 28 the City of St. John’s Municipal Taxation Act, allows the City of St. John’s to levy an accommodation tax. Section 28 provides as follows:
  "28(1) The council may impose a tax to be known as the "accommodation tax" upon a person who, for a daily charge, fee or remuneration is accommodated, lodges or stays in a room in a building in the city which is
    (a) licensed under the Tourist Establishments Act; or
    (b) owned by the Memorial University of Newfoundland.
  (2) A tax imposed under subsection (1) shall be not more than 4% of the amount charged for the accommodation, lodging or stay referred to in that subsection.
  (3) Subsections (1) and (2) shall not apply to
(a) a person who pays for accommodation, lodging or a stay in a room for which the daily charge or remuneration is not more than $20;
(b) a student who is accommodated, lodges or stays in a room in a building referred to in paragraph (1)(b) while he or she is registered at and attending a post-secondary educational institution; and
(c) a person who is accommodated, lodges or stays in a room for more than 30 consecutive days.

(4) A tax collected under this section shall be paid into an account established for that purpose, and that account shall be audited and money paid out of the account in the manner required by the Memorandum of Understanding executed on October 23, 1998 by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, the City of St. Johns and the Avalon Convention and Visitors Bureau, and amendments to that memorandum.

(5) The council may, in the manner required by law, prescribe those resolutions and by-laws which are necessary to implement a tax under this section in accordance with the Memorandum of Understanding referred to in subsection (4).
Meeting Note  
Department of Municipal Affairs and Environment (MAE)  
Meeting with Town of Marystown  
11:00 am Tuesday, January 29, 2019  
Executive Boardroom, 4th Floor, West Block  

Attendees: Minister Graham Letto, MHA Mark Browne, Dan Michielsen (ADM), Tara Kelly (ADM), Judith Hearn (TCII ADM), Isobel O’Shea (JPS)  
Municipal Officials: Mayor Sam Synard and Dennis Kelly (Chief Administrative Officer)  

Purpose of Meeting: The Town of Marystown (the Town) requested this meeting to discuss the proposed purchase of the Marystown shipyard, approval to lease the Shipyard to Marbase, McGettigan Boulevard upgrades, Municipal Capital Works (MCW) Applications 2019-2020, approval to sell lots in the Marine Industrial Park, economic development costs, green funding and other business.  

Background:  
- The Town is located in the MAE Eastern region. As of 2016, the Town has a population of 5,316.  

Agenda Item #1 & 2: Marystown Shipyard- Approval to Purchase and Lease  
- The Town has recently engaged in discussions with officials from the Departments of Municipal Affairs and Environment ("MAE") and TCII regarding the potential acquisition and subsequent disposal (lease) of the Shipyard.  
- The Town is seeking to acquire the Shipyard from “Kiewit” and subsequently lease the Shipyard to Marbase for $1M over a 20 year period with an option to renew for utilization as an aquaculture service cluster center. Marbase plans to use the Shipyard to accommodate all manner of aquaculture and industrial services and also for ship repair and vessel construction.  
- The Shipyard was established in 1966 to secure the needs of the Province’s fishing industry for new vessel construction and repair. In 1988, Newfoundland Ocean Enterprises Limited ("NOEL") was established as the Parent Corporation of the Shipyard.  
- In 1998, the Shipyard was sold to Friede Goldman Newfoundland Limited ("FGNL"). Prior to the sale, in December 1997, the Province (TCII) and FGNL entered into an Environmental Indemnification Agreement ("EIA") with respect to the Shipyard.  
- In March 2002, the Shipyard was sold to Kiewit. As part of that transaction, the EIA was transferred to Kiewit. The EIA covers environmental impacts up to the date of sale in December 1997.  
- Between 2001 and 2009, the Province completed additional Environmental Site Assessments (ESA) and environmental remediation at a cost of $7.5 million. The work included petroleum hydrocarbons ("PHC") remediation, a fuel tank removal and replacement program, and asbestos and lead-based paint abatement program  

Analysis  
- The Town’s proposal requires two separate exercises of ministerial discretion regarding 1) approval of the Town’s purchase of the shipyard, and 2) approval of the Town’s subsequent lease to Marbase.
Approval for Acquisition of Property

- From a legislative perspective, a town looking to acquire a property that is not necessary for the operations of council, must comply with section 201 of the Municipalities Act, 1999 (MA) and first obtain Ministerial approval to purchase the property. The Town has requested Ministerial approval to acquire the Shipyard, under section 201 and provided a draft purchase and sale agreement negotiated between the parties.

- MAE is in receipt of business plans for the site from both the Town and Marbase, which indicate an estimated 75-100 people will be employed in the first year of operation, 120 in the second year, and over 200 by year three.
- MAE recently hired a consultant (GHD Limited) to perform an ESA to determine remaining landbased and marine liabilities on the site. GHD Limited has provided MAE with the following estimates:
  - $1,062,456 for remediation of the land portion of the Shipyard;
  - $44,638 for short term groundwater and soil vapour monitoring following remediation; and
  - $375,000 for hazardous materials remediation on the land portion.

- GHD Ltd. also reviewed the potential liability and associated costs of remediating the marine portion of the Shipyard. GHD Ltd. determined that no remediation is required for the marine portion.

Approval for Lease of Property

- Towns intending to lease property must comply with section 201.2 of the MA. Section 201.2 requires towns disposing of property valued at or above $500 to publically advertise their intention to dispose of the property. In the present case, the Town has advised that it complied with the public advertisement requirements in compliance with section 201.2 on November 28, 2018. The Town has confirmed that it has not received any additional offers in response to the public notice.

- Under section 201.2, towns must also accept the highest bid and cannot accept a bid that is below the estimated fair market value of the property. However, section 201.2 does allow towns to accept a lower bid or less than fair market value with prior Ministerial approval and a 2/3's majority vote, where the purpose of the sale or lease is for a social benefit or economic development.
Agenda Item 3: McGettigan Boulevard Upgrades

- The Town has submitted an application for $1,625,778 to complete the following upgrades to McGettigan Boulevard (see Annex A for project funding totals):
  - An additional turning lane for vehicular traffic, and traffic lights upgrades to allow for smoother traffic flow;
  - Installation of curb and gutter to rectify drainage issues;
  - Sidewalk will be added to one side of the road to allow for safe pedestrian access; and,
  - New water and sewer laterals installed to accommodate future development.
McGettigan Boulevard is a main thoroughfare through the Town, and a provincial road (part of Route 210) that is owned and operated by Transportation and Works (TW).

Analysis:

Potential Speaking Points:
- I can confirm that the Department has received the Town’s application for upgrades to McGettigan Boulevard.

Proposed Actions
- No further action is required by MAE.

Agenda Item 4: Capital Works Applications 2019-20
- The Town participates in the Multi-Year Capital Works (MYCW) program, through which they receive three-year allocations to support their infrastructure priorities. The Town’s current MYCW allocation for 2017-20 is $2,226,206 in provincial funding, $4,491 of which remains unallocated (see Annex A for a list of approved projects since 2016).
- MYCW communities are ineligible for the Municipal Capital Works (MCW) program; however, they can still apply for federal programs, including the Investing in Canada Infrastructure Program (ICIP).
- The Town has submitted seven applications for 2019-20, with total projects costs of $7,079,756 (see Annex A for list of submitted applications). Department officials are currently reviewing and evaluating applications, with approvals anticipated in spring 2019.

Analysis:
Potential Speaking Points:
- Departmental officials are currently reviewing all applications reviewed for 2019-20 programs, and I expect to be in a position to announce new projects in the spring.

Proposed Actions:

Agenda Item #5: Marine Industrial Park – Approval to Sell Lots
- The Town has been developing the local Marine Industrial Park. This area includes 16 fully serviced lots.
- The Town intends to sell lots 7, 9, 11, 13 and 15 to Greig NL Nurseries. They have also issued a Call for Proposals for lots 1, 2A, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14. They have had offers from numerous potential purchasers, wishing to supply services to the aquaculture industry.
- The sale of property within a municipality is governed by 201.2 of the Municipalities Act, 1999 (the Act). Section 201.2 states that ministerial approval is required to sell these lots.

Analysis

- MAE staff assess section 201.2 requests for the following:
  - Requirements of section 201.2 being met:
    - A council resolution to sell the property
    - Public notice of the intention to sell the property for less than fair market value
    - An explanation of the intended social or economic development benefit to be achieved
  - The rationale for selling the property for less than fair market value.
  - A survey and description of the property as well as any information establishing a clear title to the property.
• Local Governance and Land Use Planning Division can prioritize this new request, but will not have completed the review in advance of this meeting.

Potential Speaking Points

Proposed Actions
• MAE staff will review the request for Ministerial approval.

Agenda Item #6: Economic Development Costs
• The Town has indicated that it wishes to discuss Economic Development costs at this meeting.

Analysis

Potential Speaking Points
• Please be advised that any requests for economic development funding will be reviewed by officials within the Department of Tourism, Culture, Industry and Innovation.

* Please note that officials from TCII will be attending this meeting and can speak to application processes.

Proposed Actions
• No further action required by MAE.

Agenda Item #7: Provincial Green Fund
• It is anticipated that the Town wishes to discuss funding opportunities under the recently announced the Low Carbon Economy Fund. The former department of Environment and Conservation also had a Green Fund, which has been exhausted since 2014.

• On January 25, 2019, the provincial and federal governments formally announced $89.4 million in joint funding for the LCELF to support Newfoundland and Labrador’s climate action programs.
• As part of the announcement, the Province launched the first two programs to be supported through LCELF funding: the expansion of the Home Energy Savings Program (HESP) and the Energy Efficiency and Fuel Switching in Public Buildings Program (EEFS-PB). The HESP will provide incentives for low-income earners to undertake energy efficiency retrofits. The EEFS-PB Program will support energy retrofits and fuel switching in public buildings, including schools, health care facilities and post-secondary institutions.

Analysis
• It is anticipated that further programming will be announced in the coming months through the LCELF that will enable businesses, industry, municipalities and Indigenous organizations to undertake projects to reduce their GHG emissions. Precise program details are still being finalized by Climate Change Branch.

Potential Speaking Points
• If you would like more information on the forthcoming programs, I encourage you to contact my officials in the Climate Change Branch.

Proposed Actions
• MAE staff will review any and all applications for the Town when funding components are finalized.

Prepared/Approved by: R. Evans/ E. Thompson/ T. Kelly/ D. Michielsen (pending)
Ministerial Approval: Received from Hon. Graham Letto (pending)

January 29, 2018

Applications for 2019-20 Infrastructure Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Applicant Priority</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>GST/HST Rebate</th>
<th>Federal/Provincial Contribution</th>
<th>Municipal Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McGettigan Boulevard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,625,778</td>
<td>$151,466</td>
<td>$1,179,450</td>
<td>$294,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creston Blvd, Culvert Replacement &amp; Road Upgrades</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$768,908</td>
<td>$71,635</td>
<td>$348,636</td>
<td>$348,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marystown Fire Hall – Exterior Upgrades</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$342,295</td>
<td>$31,980</td>
<td>$186,243</td>
<td>$124,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolp Road</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$803,131</td>
<td>$74,824</td>
<td>$582,645</td>
<td>$145,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pidgeon’s Road - Water, Sewer and Road Upgrades</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$996,139</td>
<td>$92,805</td>
<td>$722,667</td>
<td>$180,667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ville Marie Drive – Water, Sewer and Road Upgrading Phase 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2,175,100</td>
<td>$202,644</td>
<td>$1,577,965</td>
<td>$394,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunphy’s Road – Water, Sewer &amp; Road Upgrading</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$368,406</td>
<td>$34,323</td>
<td>$267,266</td>
<td>$66,817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Totals: $7,079,756 $659,587 $4,864,873 $1,555,297

Approved Projects (since January 1, 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Approval</th>
<th>Total Project Costs</th>
<th>GST/HST Rebate</th>
<th>Provincial Contribution</th>
<th>Municipal Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CWWF2016</td>
<td>Water &amp; Sewer Upgrade</td>
<td>2016-07-27</td>
<td>$2,053,000</td>
<td>$191,268</td>
<td>$556,520</td>
<td>$372,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYCW2014</td>
<td>Canning Bridge Water Line Replacement</td>
<td>2017-05-24</td>
<td>$553,852</td>
<td>$24,081</td>
<td>$423,817</td>
<td>$105,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYCW2014</td>
<td>Exterior Envelope Replacement - Fire Station</td>
<td>2017-05-24</td>
<td>$425,854</td>
<td>$18,515</td>
<td>$325,871</td>
<td>$81,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYCW2014</td>
<td>Stapleton’s Road - Upgrade Storm/Sewer Main, Replace Retaining Wall</td>
<td>2017-05-24</td>
<td>$247,587</td>
<td>$10,765</td>
<td>$189,458</td>
<td>$47,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYCW2017</td>
<td>Ville Marie Drive (Alwards Apt to Drakes Rd) – Upgrading, Paving, and Water Laterals</td>
<td>2017-06-21</td>
<td>$913,584</td>
<td>$85,114</td>
<td>$414,235</td>
<td>$414,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYCW2017</td>
<td>Road Upgrading 2017 - Wilson Street Upgrading, Paving, and Water Laterals</td>
<td>2017-06-21</td>
<td>$649,633</td>
<td>$60,523</td>
<td>$412,377</td>
<td>$176,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYCW2017</td>
<td>Water Transmission Main Replacement 2017</td>
<td>2017-06-21</td>
<td>$1,676,706</td>
<td>$156,211</td>
<td>$1,216,397</td>
<td>$304,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYCW2017</td>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>2018-07-05</td>
<td>$328,446</td>
<td>$30,600</td>
<td>$178,708</td>
<td>$119,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYCW2017</td>
<td>Purchase and Replace Condenser at Kaitlyn Osmond Arena</td>
<td>2018-07-13</td>
<td>$92,500</td>
<td>$12,065</td>
<td>$48,261</td>
<td>$32,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF2017</td>
<td>Road Upgrading 2017 - Forest Road Upgrading, Paving and Water Laterals</td>
<td>2017-09-11</td>
<td>$552,834</td>
<td>$51,505</td>
<td>$125,332</td>
<td>$250,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF2017</td>
<td>Marine Drive Water Laterals - Pidgeon’s Rd to Kelly Pond Rd</td>
<td>2018-05-28</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$32,608</td>
<td>$148,127</td>
<td>$63,478</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Totals: $7,843,997 $673,255 $4,041,102 $1,967,655