

NFLD.
HF
395
NO 3
T&S
1990
C. 1

REPORT OF COMMISSIONERS
MADE PURSUANT TO THE
MUNICIPALITIES REPORTS REGULATIONS, 1980, AS AMENDED
IN RELATION TO THE PROPOSED AMALGAMATION OF THE
TOWNS OF TRINITY, CENTREVILLE, WAREHAM AND INDIAN BAY

Commissioners: Mr. S. Frank Manuel
Mr. Melvin L. Saunders

CENTRE FOR NFLD. STUDIES
SEP 22 1994
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY
OF NEWFOUNDLAND

CENTRE FOR NFLD. STUDIES
NOV 2 1994
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY
OF NEWFOUNDLAND

SECTION 1

1.0 - Authority for Feasibility Study

The Feasibility Study was ordered by the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs, Honourable Eric A. Gullage, by order dated October 12, 1989. The Commissioners were appointed in accordance with the Municipalities Feasibility Reports Regulations, 1980 as amended.

SECTION 2

2.0 - Purpose of Study

The Municipalities Feasibility Reports Regulations, 1980 required the Commissioners to prepare a Feasibility Report pursuant to the regulations and in accordance with Section 8 and 9.

In this case, the purpose of the study is to determine the feasibility of amalgamating the Towns of Trinity, Centreville, Wareham and Indian Bay, as outlined in the Notice of Intent dated September 1, 1989 and as outlined in the plan attached as Appendix A.

SECTION 3

3.1 - Background

3.1 - Town of Trinity

The Town of Trinity is located on Route 320 in the electoral district of Bonavista North. It has a population of 419, comprising 117 residences.

Trinity has a Town Council and charges a property tax of 5.5 mills, and a water and sewer rate of \$180.00 per year. Business tax is 10 mills and charges a minimum poll tax of \$125.00. They have approximately 6 kilometres of road. Trinity adopted the National Building Code as their town plan.

Trinity has its own waste disposal site. The town has 100 percent water and 65 percent sewer. The town has a part-time clerk and part-time maintenance man. Town equipment consists of a 1979 cat loader with backhoe attachment and a 500 gallon pumper shared with Centreville, Wareham and Indian Bay. They now have a full council in place. Total budget for 1990 is \$501,032.25.

3.2 - Town of Centreville

The Town of Centreville is located on Route 320. The population of Centreville is 589, comprising 145 residences. They have their own town plan, with land use, zoning and subdivision regulation. Town taxes imposed are: property tax 5 mills, water and sewer \$180.00, business tax 10 mills, and a poll tax of \$90.00. They have 5.0 kilometres of road.

Centreville has its own town hall. 100 percent serviced with water and sewer. Staff consist of town clerk and maintenance man. They have a waste disposal site shared with Indian Bay. Recreation facilities consist of an outdoor rink. Fire equipment is shared with Wareham. Town equipment consist of a 910 loader with backhoe attachment and a town pickup. Five year plan submitted. Total budget for 1990 is \$189,335.00.

3.3 - Town of Wareham

The Town of Wareham is located off Route 320. It has a population of 438, with 107 residences. The total budget for 1990 is \$147,252. The town tax structure comprises of property tax 5.0 mills, water and sewer rate of \$216.00, and a minimum poll tax of \$100.00. Business tax is 15 mills.

The town has adopted the National Building Code as their town plan. Fire fighting equipment consist of a 1971 500-gallon pumper, shared with Centreville. Staff consist of a town clerk and part-time maintenance man. Town buildings consist of a Town Hall and Development

Association (combined). Recreation facilities consist of two ball fields and a soccer field (under construction). Town equipment consists of a loader with backhoe attachment. Wareham has its own waste disposal site.

3.4 - Town of Indian Bay

The Town of Indian Bay is located off Route 320. It has a population of 215, consisting of 53 residences. The total budget for 1990 is \$60,138.38. Tax structure of Indian Bay consist of water and sewer \$240.00, poll tax \$50.00, business tax 15 mills, and property tax 0 mills. Staff consist of a part-time town clerk. Five year plan not submitted.

Fire fighting equipment consist of a 500-gallon pumper, shared with Centreville, Wareham and Trinity. Indian Bay has a new Town Hall. Recreation facilities consist of a municipal park. Indian Bay has adopted the National Building Code. There are 2.7 kilometres of road.

SECTION 4

4.0 - Public Hearing

A joint feasibility public hearing was held at the S.U.F. Hall, Centreville, December 6, 1989, commencing at 7:00 p.m. There were approximately 40 people in attendance. Also in attendance were Mr. Ron Ozon, Senior Planner; Ray Lush, Regional Manager (Central), Department of Municipal and Provincial Affairs; two Commissioners, Mr. Frank Manuel, Deputy Minister and Mr. Melvin Saunders.

4.1 - Written Briefs

There were no written briefs submitted.

4.2 - Oral Briefs

Oral presentations were made from the floor by the following:

- (1) Mr. George Ackerman Town of Indian Bay
- (2) Mr. Jim Hewitt Concerned citizen, Centreville
- (3) Mr. Robert Pickett Centreville
- (4) Mr. John Ackerman Centreville
- (5) Mr. Stan Hunt Mayor of Wareham
- (6) Mr. Ern Rogers Mayor of Trinity
- (7) Mr. Tony Rogers Concerned citizen

SECTION 5

5.0 - Record of Briefs

5.1 - Record of Oral Briefs

I. George Ackerman felt there would be no advantage to Indian Bay to amalgamate with Trinity, Centreville and Wareham because of location and distance from other towns. His major concerns were as follows:

1. They were already sharing fire equipment, waste disposal site and these came about without amalgamation.
2. Boundaries only look good on paper.
3. Concerned about loss of jobs.
4. Felt higher taxes would be imposed.
5. Decrease in service.
6. As it is, the future of Indian Bay looks good on its own.

II. James Hewitt, concerned citizen, highlights of his oral presentation were as follows:

1. Agreed with concepts of amalgamation.
2. Concerned why the big rush.
3. Afraid of losing identity.
4. Feels there should be something in it for them.
5. Concerned there were no capital expenditure - 5 years.
6. Three towns were practically same, using same equipment, schools, etc.
7. Feels there should be amalgamation.
8. Feels Indian Bay should not be included in amalgamation.

III. Robert Pickett highlights of his oral presentation were:

1. Felt amalgamation was a good thing, would have a good tax base.
(Fire brigade, recreation centre and regional library)
2. Felt the town clerk would have good working conditions, higher wages, etc.
3. Afraid Centreville would get the biggest part of taxes.
4. Centreville has its own town plan and they would like to keep it.
5. Centreville and Wareham, at one time, was one town.
6. They did not want to be forced into amalgamation.

IV. John Ackerman, Centreville, highlights of his oral presentation were:

1. Polled town to see if there was enough interest in amalgamation.
2. Out of 117 homes, 91 in favour, 11 not in favour, 15 undecided.

3. All councillors were leaning toward amalgamation.
4. Concerned they did not receive any information on what government was prepared to do for the area.
5. Concerned raw sewer has been pumped into the harbour.
6. Afraid of losing identity.
7. They did not want councillors elected at large.
8. Mayor to be elected.
9. Felt government should bring each town on an equal basis (water and sewer, paving, etc.) before amalgamation.
10. Did not receive much information before this public meeting.
11. Feels amalgamation should be done over a period of time and not overnight.

V. Stan Hunt, Mayor of Wareham, highlights of his presentation were as follows:

1. They did not receive much information.
2. Felt there was not much interest in his town.
3. Councillors agreed they should amalgamate.

VI. Mr. Ern Rogers, Mayor of Trinity, highlights of his presentation were as follows:

1. They were not very far apart in boundaries.
2. They felt they should not have to go to St. John's and fight with government for services.
3. They have not received any capital expenditure in six years.
4. They wanted to be treated as equal partners in Newfoundland.
5. Wondered what would happen to town buildings.
6. They felt the Minister should come forward with a better package.

7. All towns should be dealt with as one.
8. Changes should be made in property tax assessment.
9. Main water line should be increased from 6" to 12" to accommodate any expansion.
10. Each town should retain its present name.
11. He felt town equipment is too small.
12. All differences should be set aside and amalgamate.

VII. Tony Rogers, Centreville, highlights of his oral presentation were:

1. Did not see any gains.
2. Felt amalgamation will happen without their permission.
3. He felt they should not have to use their town revenues to bring others on an equal keel.

SECTION 6

Feasibility Evaluation

6.0.1 - General

It should be noted that the speaker from the Town of Indian Bay presented a petition showing that the town's people were not in favour of amalgamation. It did not give any information pertaining to the age of those signing it, nor did it indicate that the people had any information available to them upon which to base their opinions or decisions.

An analysis of a map showing the proximity of the four areas and personal knowledge of the area, and the distance of Indian Bay from the other towns, we feel we should not recommend amalgamation of Indian Bay.

The presentation made by all seemed to be in favour of amalgamation. They did express a number of concerns. Amongst these were the feeling that a ward system would not work. This fear is not considered a valid concern because the ward system will provide representation in relation to the population of the towns concerned.

Other areas of concern were raw sewer dumped into the harbour, loss of jobs and buildings, and they felt equipment would not be able to handle snow clearing with a creation of a new town. Also, they felt the positive side of having one central town office, one recreation,

one library, etc. They were also concerned that revenues would go to maintain facilities of town with largest tax population.

A new town council would decide on any taxation rates for the towns and the new town would be involved in the setting of any rates. It should be noted that each area within a new town would only pay taxes based on the level of services received. If one area was serviced and another lacked these services, this would be reflected in an assessment of properties which would indicate a lower value and a lower rate of taxation to reflect a reduction in these services.

6.0.2 - Financial

The present combined revenue and expenditure of these towns is \$823,411.00. For the purpose of this study, we propose the introduction of a standard property tax of 6.0 mills, a water and sewer rate of \$200.00, and a poll tax of \$125.00. The fixed revenues of a combined town would increase from the existing \$823,411.00 to \$842,313.80 for a total additional revenue of \$18,902.80. The proposed expenditure of a combined town amounts to \$739,873.00. At the end of the first year the surplus would be \$102,440.80. (Appendix B)

6.0.3 - Other Criteria

The following criteria is specifically evaluated as outlined in the "Municipalities Feasibility Reports Regulations", 1980 as amended:

(A) Access of the people to be elected and appointed officials

It is not considered that elected and appointed officials would be materially affected as all three towns are relatively close to one another. If a new town is comprised of a ward system, there would be councillors living in each of the areas of the present townships and these would be equally accessible as are present councillors to people in these areas. In any event, access is not seen as a problem as residents can easily travel anywhere within the combined area within 10 minutes.

(B) Representation in accordance with the distribution of population

A combined town with a total population of 1446 is considered to be small enough to allow a council elected at large to be representative of the whole area. The Commissioners are recommending however that the initial council be comprised of nine members, (eight plus a Mayor) based on a ward system, which would have two councillors from Trinity, two from Centreville, two from Wareham, two councillors and a Mayor elected at large. While this is not strictly in accordance with the population rating, it ensures adequate representation of all areas.

The new council would decide after its first term in office whether it wished to continue a ward system, or have a full elected council elected at large, depending on its experience during its first four years of operation.

(C) Community Identity

There is no reason why amalgamation of these areas should cause the loss of community identity. All three towns could continue to carry their individual names, as is the case in other areas. The three towns could continue to be listed by existing names on the provincial map. The municipality would adopt a single common name for legal purposes.

(D) Suitability and the needs of the area for municipal servicing

The servicing needs of the Town of Trinity has been identified in the five year plan developed and submitted to government for approval. The Towns of Centreville and Wareham are 100% serviced. A new council will prepare a comprehensive five year development plan for the full area.

(E) Physical Constraints to Municipal Servicing

There are no obvious physical constraints to servicing of the Town of Trinity. There is some distance between the Towns of Trinity and Centreville. The possibility of increasing the

size of the water line from 6" to 12" to accommodate future expansion should be considered. By combining these towns and developing a comprehensive development plan for the full area, any open undeveloped areas could be used for infilling in an effort to better utilize future servicing systems.

(F) Administrative Capability of a Municipality

There is already considerable experience in municipal administration, both on the elected side and on the appointed side within the area. Each town has had elected councils in place for some time and there is a combination of full time and part time employees who have been servicing these towns and gained a considerable amount of experience which would be available to a new council. A combination of these towns would facilitate a greater choice of people from which to choose a single council and also would allow the new council to better utilize the existing four full time and two part time staff.

(G) Coordination of Municipal Services and Functions throughout the Area concerned

There are a number of services within the three towns which could be operated more efficiently and economically if they were combined. They include the fact that there are at present three Town Halls, where one could serve the area adequately and the others could be used for other purposes. At present there are libraries, Development Associations, hair dressers, etc. The existing Fire Department could be made more efficient to serve all three areas. At

present the equipment is shared with other towns. Garbage collection could be combined into one, with a larger piece of equipment purchased. With another piece of equipment purchased snow clearing could be combined.

(H) Cost Efficiency of the Type of Administration proposed for the Scale of Services Required

By combining all three towns, the size would be increased to 1446 residents. Commonly required services of these three areas could be much more efficiently delivered through the introduction of a single combined service for each existing contract.

(I) Feasibility - Terms of Revenue and Expenditure

As noted previously, the three towns now have town taxes and all have property tax in place. If the three towns were brought in line with the same mill rate and charged at an annual rate of 6.0 mills, the fixed revenues of a combined town would be increased by over \$18,902.80. This would provide the towns with more flexibility to deliver a better level of services to its residents and to increase the pace of the provision of Capital Works required in some of the area. An improved revenue base would also put these towns in a better position to compete for Capital Works Program from the Province and put them in a better position to pay their portion of the repayment schedule.

(J) Equity in Both the Taxpayers Ability to Pay and The Benefits Received

If a common property tax of 6.0 mills were implemented for the area, this would improve the towns revenue base by \$18,902.80 as indicated previously, while at the same time is not considered to be overly burdensome on the individual residents.

(K) Response of Tax Yields to Changes in Economic Activity

If a new town imposes a common tax rate of 6.0 mills throughout its jurisdiction, the combined revenue will be increased by approximately \$18,902.80. Based on a proposed expenditure of a combined town of \$739,873.00 at the end of the first year of operation, there would be a surplus of approximately \$102,440.80.

(L) Equity amongst Adjoining Municipalities considering their Different Needs and Assets

A new Council should develop a plan which would ensure that the three areas are developed pursuant to the needs already identified in a matter of time, the problems of not being serviced with water and sewer will be addressed and the three present areas will be on an equal keel. This has been addressed in different phases.

(M) Simplicity of Proposed Municipal Structure

The combination of these three towns would make one better defined town. The boundaries of these three towns to be addressed by the Planning Department. The new town would be relatively geographically self contained having most of the services within its area to support itself and having a combined tax base sufficient to better manage its affairs.

(N) Acceptability of Proposals at Local and Regional Levels

The Town of Trinity has a population of 419 and has basically supported the amalgamation proposal. The Town of Centreville with a population of 589 and the Town of Wareham with a population of 438 indicated they would go along with amalgamation. The Town of Indian Bay, with a population of 215, was not in favour of amalgamation; the reasons stated in their proposals were legitimate based on location and distance from the other three areas.

The Town of Indian Bay is sharing services with the other three towns at present and we see no reason for this to change. The possibility exists that in a few years time when they see how well the amalgamation of the other three towns is working, they will want to be a part of this process.

Recommendations

- (1) The Towns of Trinity, Centreville and Wareham be amalgamated into a single new town.
- (2) The Town of Indian Bay not be included in the amalgamation with the other three towns.
- (3) A ward system of Council be introduced, having two Councillors from each of the towns of Trinity, Centreville and Wareham, two Councillors elected at large, and a Mayor elected at large.
- (4) The new town to develop an integrated five year plan identifying the Capital Works needs of all areas. These needs should be provided for over a five year period.
- (5) A new town plan should be adopted by the new council and used as a blueprint for the future development of the new area.
- (6) The three towns to retain their individual names so as to maintain local identity. Within twelve months, the new council should develop a new municipal name for the combined area. The new name should not be the name of one of the existing towns.
- (7) All assets and liabilities of the individual towns should be assumed by the new town.

- (8) The new town should continue to provide snow clearing and road maintenance to all the roads they presently maintain in the area. In the case of Indian Bay, if they wish to continue to avail of these services, the new town should impose a fee for service.
- (9) In providing services to the new town, the new council should purchase a dump truck for garbage collection and sanding roads.
- (10) A Municipal Election to be held in the new town sometime during the calendar year and become effective January 1, 1992.
- (11) Town boundaries should be addressed by Government's Planning Department.
- (12) There seems to be a duplication of equipment in existing towns. This equipment may not be adequate to look after the needs of a new town. A larger piece of equipment may have to be purchased to address these concerns.

FEASIBILITY STUDY
Amalgamation of Centreville, Wareham
Trinity and Indian Bay

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs has decided to Order the preparation of a Feasibility Study into the amalgamation of the Municipalities of Centreville, Wareham, Trinity, and Indian Bay. This statement has been prepared to satisfy the requirements of the municipal legislation and to enable the general public to be informed about the proposal.

The Feasibility Study will be conducted by a Commissioner(s) appointed by the Minister of Municipal and Provincial Affairs. The Commissioner(s) will hold a public hearing(s) in the area and will thoroughly study the matter and make a report to the Minister.

2.0 PURPOSE OF AMALGAMATION

It should be emphasized that amalgamation does not mean one municipality "taking over" the other, but rather it means the coming together of two or more equals in order to create a more viable unit, and one capable of administering municipal programs more efficiently. Amalgamation of the above noted municipalities, will generate a larger tax base and the resultant, increased revenues, will enable the larger town to hire qualified staff, purchase needed machinery and generally operate much better than is now the case. That is not to say however, that the present municipalities are not operating efficiently, rather, the present situation if it continues will result, as it has elsewhere in the Province, in unnecessary competition and duplication of facilities and staff.

3.0 LOCATION AND DEVELOPMENT PATTERN

The four municipalities are located along Route 320, and on the western shoreline of Bonavista Bay. The attached map shows the proximity of the four municipalities in terms of their boundaries, but perhaps more importantly, it also shows just how physically integrated is the development pattern of the four. It can be seen from the attached map also that there is no significant break in development between Trinity and Wareham and the only break in this ribbon of development is between Wareham and Indian Bay. As Well, because of the continued outward movement of development from these municipalities along the highway, the gap between them is in fact closing. Such A development pattern underscores the possibilities for providing better and more economical municipal services as well as creating a sense of community. As a single town it would have a population of 1,661 persons.

4.0 TAXES, SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

All of the municipalities provide about the same number and variety of municipal services, and in this regard, all four have made considerable progress especially in the provision of water and sewer services . For example, Wareham and Centreville have full servicing, Trinity has full water services and 65 percent sewer, while Indian Bay has full water and an on-site sewer system.

In the area of municipal taxation, all municipalities impose a similar number of taxes though Indian Bay does not at the moment impose a tax on real property. Tax rates do not vary significantly and this is reflected in the total yearly per capita revenues which are \$138, \$142, \$153, and \$87 for Centreville, Wareham, Trinity, and Indian Bay respectively. All four already share the same disposal site, and fire fighting, but other facilities such equipment and recreational facilities are duplicated. In terms of

staff, all four communities combined employ a total of only seven persons.

5.0 BENEFITS OF AMALGAMATION

Based upon municipal government experience in the province, some expected benefits are outlined below. However, realization of the potential benefits will be the responsibility of the new municipality. For example, decisions about a single municipal building, priority of areas for servicing, the direction of development and staffing etc., will be the responsibility of the elected council.

5.1 Administration

One benefit of amalgamation will be the elimination of duplication. Administrative costs and building and equipment overheads of the consolidated municipality may be reduced from that of the individual municipalities taken together provided they are surplus to the needs of the new municipality. Similarly, it may be possible to more fully utilize existing equipment, recreational facilities, and staff in a larger consolidated municipality. In this regard the consolidated municipality may also be able to provide equipment and staff which the other could not afford on its own. The resulting new town will be able to improve overall services and administration. The new municipality will be able to take advantage of some "economies of scale" in providing services and, in some cases, take advantage of the potential to share servicing arrangements of systems. Amalgamation of the four municipalities will most certainly provide the new municipal government with the opportunity and challenge to operate a single municipality.

5.2 Financial Resources

The new town will have access to greater local resources in the form of enlarged tax bases. It will better be able to meet the cost of basic services such as garbage collection, street lighting and fire protection, road maintenance, and municipal administration.

5.3 Larger Population Size

Over the years, a number of smaller municipalities have suffered from not being able to attract people to sit on council. The onerous duties of a municipal councillor in a small community, where councillors often have to carry out some staff functions, have discouraged many from coming forward. Inadequate financial resources have also contributed to resignations and created an unwillingness in some municipalities to serve on council. The new municipality, with its enlarged population, should be able to improve its chances of avoiding this serious problem.

5.4 Planning

The new municipality will benefit from being covered by a single planning and development control program. Just as it will be necessary for Council to rationalize and coordinate its various services, equipment, facilities and tax structure, so also must it decide in what direction it wishes to develop and grow. With the amalgamation of four separate municipalities into one, the new town will be faced with additional planning issues since only Centreville has an adopted municipal Plan. That is to say it will be necessary to look at future planning of the new town in a much broader context than is now the case. Overall planning for the three municipalities can only

be addressed by a single planning program which sets priorities; allocates growth to those areas that are the most economical to service and develop; and furthermore which both directs and confines conflicting land uses to their most appropriate locations. Finally, a single planning program would eliminate unproductive and expensive competition for development that would normally exist between separate municipalities.

6.0 RESPONSE OF PROPOSAL TO FEASIBILITY CRITERIA

6.1 Access of People to Officials

Because of the nature of the present development pattern of the new town, amalgamation would not materially change the ease of access by the public to elected and appointed officials. By replacing four existing councils with one new one, the physical distance to be travelled to reach the council office would be increased slightly for some residents, conceivably Indian Bay, however the difference would not be great.

6.2 Representation in Accordance with Population Distribution

The new town when amalgamated, although larger both in population and territory, will still remain sufficiently small to allow councillors to be elected at large--if the new Town so wished.

6.3 Community Identity

There is no reason why an administrative reorganization should reduce or destroy community identity. Many municipalities have well recognized districts within them in which, although the environment and life style is significantly different, local identity is still preserved. The four communities are relatively close together and so there is no doubt that there is a community of interest in the area which will be reflected and enhanced by amalgamation.

6.4 Suitibility and Need of the Towns for Servicing

The four communities for the most part have a complete range of services which are in need of some extension. There appears

to be adequate water supply and location for sewage and garbage disposal. Since this is an amalgamation of existing developed areas, the suitability for servicing has previously been determined.

6.5 Physical Constraints

The communities are well served by road and there should be little physical difficulty in intergrating the services of the existing councils. The proposed municipality includes much territory that is not serviced.

6.6 Administrative Capability

There is ample local experience in municipal administration and amalgamation should create an opportunity to improve the standard of municipal management and perhaps enable technical and specialist staff to be employed, and/or improve equipment to be purchased.

6.7 Cost efficiency

As noted above amalgamation should produce a more cost efficient administration. This will enable existing services, or services to be expanded, to be provided at less cost per capita or a better standard to be provided for the same cost.

6.8 Financial Feasibility

As seen earlier, there is only a slight variation between the tax rates at this moment which is reflected in per capita revenues. The new municipality could without raising present tax rates, realize some additional revenue by merely instituting a uniform tax rate throughout and thereby taking

advantage of the resultant increase in the provincial tax incentive grant. It should be emphasized however, that this is merely a suggestion, in point of fact, it will be solely within the jurisdiction of the new Council to determine its own budget, and the type and amount of taxes it wishes to impose.

6.9 Response to Tax Yields

There does not appear to be any need for the new municipality to set taxes at levels substantially above those paid elsewhere in the province, and those currently in effect in the area.

6.10 Equality

Any inequality between the two existing municipalities would obviously be removed by amalgamation and there is no indications that any undue burden will be placed on any group by virtue of this proposal.

6.11 Potential Impact

Amalgamation will enable the new town to provide a more even standard of services and a coordinated control. The surrounding geography and the disposition of development should cause no problems for the new administration to handle.

MUNICIPAL PROFILE

POPULATION	CENTREVILLE		WAREHAM		TRINITY, B.B.		INDIAN BAY	
	\$	Per/Cap	\$	Per/Cap	\$	Per/Cap	\$	Per/Cap
1981	604		458		522		192	
1986	589		438		419		215	
% Change	-2.5%		-4.4%		-19.7%		12.0%	
TAX RATES								
Property	5 mills		5 mills		5.5 mills		NONE	
Water & Sewer	180.00		216/annual		180.00		240.00	
Business General	10 mills		15 mills		10 mills		15 mills	
Poll Tax	90.00/YR.		100.00/YR.		125.00		50.00	
ASSESSED PROPERTY VALUE								
Residential	3 733 250.00	6 338.29	1 903 850.00	4 346.69	2 173 400.00	5 187.11		
Commercial	545 400.00	925.98	79 750.00	182.08	163 300.00	389.74		
TOTAL	4 278 650.00	7 264.26	1 983 600.00	4 528.77	2 336 700.00	5 576.85		
Year Of Assessment			1983		1989		NONE	
PLANNING PROGRAM								
Municipal Plan	yes		no		no		no	
Zoning Regulations	yes		no		no		no	
Building Regulations	yes		yes		yes '85		yes '85	

BUDGET	CENTREVILLE		WAREHAM		TRINITY, B.B.		INDIAN BAY	
	\$	Per/Cap	\$	Per/Cap	\$	Per/Cap	\$	Per/Cap
REVENUES								
Local Revenue	81 440.00	138.27	61 988.00	141.53	64 341.00	153.56	18 700.00	86.98
Prov. Grants & Subsidy:								
GMA Grant	16 936.00	28.75	20 172.00	46.05	19 497.00	46.52	9 548.00	44.41
Tax Incentive	23 040.00	39.12	18 992.00	43.36	24 076.00	57.46		
Prov. Share of Debt Charges:								
Water & Sewer	61 817.00	104.95	28 551.00	65.18	395 567.00	944.07	31 826.00	148.03
Paving	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	
Other	0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	
Provincial Subtotal	61 817.00	104.95	28 551.00	65.18	439 135.00	1 048.05	41 374.00	192.44
Other Income	0.00		7 000.00	15.98	0.00		0.00	
TOTAL REVENUE	183 233.00	311.09	136 703.00	312.11	503 476.00	1 201.61	60 074.00	279.41
EXPENDITURES								
Administration	20 871.00	35.43	31 472.00	71.85	20 584.00	49.13	7 700.00	35.81
Protection to Persons and Property	11 400.00	19.35	9 100.00	20.78	12 950.00	30.91	3 400.00	15.81
Public Works	14 000.00	23.77	12 000.00	27.40	10 203.00	24.35	5 400.00	25.12
Garbage Collection	8 000.00	13.58	3 000.00	6.85	4 842.00	11.56	2 000.00	9.30
Recreation	0.00		0.00				0.00	
Basic Services Total	54 271.00	92.14	55 572.00	126.88	48 579.00	115.94	18 500.00	86.05
DEBT CHARGES								
Total Council	38 589.00	65.52	30 980.00	70.73	19 934.00	47.58	5 570.00	25.91
Total Prov. Subsidy	61 817.00	104.95	28 551.00	65.18	395 567.00	944.07	31 826.00	148.03
Total Debt Charges	100 406.00	170.47	59 531.00	135.92	415 501.00	991.65	37 396.00	173.93
Operation & Maintenance								
Water & Sewer	27 700.00	47.03	8 020.00	18.31	20 148.00	48.09	4 178.00	19.43
Miscellaneous	856.00	1.45	13 380.00	30.55	19 248.00	45.94	0.00	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	183 233.00	311.09	136 503.00	311.65	503 476.00	1 201.61	60 074.00	279.41