

November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2008

The Chairman  
Public Works Committee  
Township of Beckwith

Dear Mr. Chairman,

Beckwith Township Council, upon a recommendation from the Public Works Committee agreed to the establishment of a Study Group to address the issue of Private Roads in the Township. The Study Group was established and received a mandate from Council to investigate and report on various issues respecting Private Roads in the Township.

The Study group has worked diligently over the past year and has consulted with the various Private Road groups in the Township gathering relevant data. We have also enjoyed excellent cooperation and support from the Township staff without which our task would have been much more difficult.

The central theme of the Study Group's investigation was the imbalance between the services received by the residents on the private roads and the taxes paid, specifically the summer and winter maintenance of the roads. This imbalance was brought about by the MPAC assessment changes, which no longer considers whether the dwelling is on a public or a private road.

Our Study Group has investigated several methods to address this condition and created the enclosed report that recommends a proposed solution to address the issue in a fair and equitable way for all concerned. It is hoped that this recommendation meets with your approval and can lead to early implementation.

Thank you for the opportunity to assist Beckwith Township to put in place policies, that are fair and equitable for all residents and that will continue to make Beckwith Township a desirable place to live and work.

Yours truly,

The Private Roads Study Group

Consisting of and endorsed by: -

Wayne Bowes.....David Kirkpatrick.....  
Frank Mills.....Roy Mooney.....  
Sharon Mousseau.....Ken Ray.....  
Vern Runnells.....Ross Trimble.....

Beckwith Private Roads Study Group

Report to the Public Works Committee

November 10, 2008

# Table of Contents

## 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Background
- 1.2 Definition of a Private Road
- 1.3 Formation of the Working Group
- 1.4 Resolutions by Council
- 1.5 Study Group Terms of Reference and Structure
  - 1.5.1 Background
  - 1.5.2 Mandate
  - 1.5.3 Membership and Term
- 1.6 Objectives and Schedule

## 2.0 Data Gathering

- 2.1 Definition of Scope and Issues
- 2.2 Methodology
- 2.3 Private Roads Database
- 2.4 Relevant Township Information

## 3.0 Situation Analysis

- 3.1 Three Kinds of Roads in the Township
- 3.2 Importance of Private Roads to the Township
- 3.3 Problems Facing Private Roads

## 4.0 Conclusions

- 4.1 Imbalance of Services
- 4.2 Inequity Within Assessment System
- 4.3 Enhanced Co-operation Between Township and Private Roads
- 4.4 Wide Variety of Private Road Management
- 4.5 Equalization of Services Would Help Residents of Private Roads
- 4.6 Assistance Program Must be Fair to All and Easy to Administer
- 4.7 Township Assumption of Private Roads Impractical

## 5.0 Recommendations

- 5.1 Establishment of a Permanent Private Roads Sub-Committee
  - 5.1.1 Services in Kind Program
  - 5.1.2 Local Improvement Program for Private Roads
  - 5.1.3 Trailer Parks Treated Separately
- 5.2 Private Roads Equalization Program (PREP)

## Appendices

A1 - Private Road Data Collection Template

A2 - Private Road Database

A3 - MPAC Response to Treatment of Properties on Private Roads

A4 - Comparison of Subdivision and Private Roads

A4.1 Subdivisions Density Data

A4.2 Private Roads Density Date

A5 - Private Road Equalization Program (PREP)

# Foreword

Beckwith Township Council appointed a Study Group to collect and review information and make recommendations relative to a recognized inequity in property taxes collected relative to the services rendered to private roads property owners within the Township.

At present, services being supplied by Beckwith Township to property owners on private roads include Police, Fire, and waste management services plus programs relative to sports and recreation etc. The imbalance rests solely in the area of year-round road maintenance, which includes snow removal, surface upkeep, signs, brushing and weed control.

It is the conclusion of the Study Group that, as a direct result of the implementation of Market Value Assessment by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), the property owners in Beckwith Township living on private roads have become victims of unfair treatment regarding services rendered by the Township.

Previous to Market Value Assessment (MVA) special consideration was given to properties situated on private roads, which in effect lowered their assessed value. This would lower the property taxes and consequently property owners would have a rationale for paying road dues for the above mentioned maintenance issues. Subsequent to the implementation of MVA the consideration previously applied to properties on private roads is no longer part of the process. Therefore, two equally assessed properties, one on a private road and one on a municipal road, pay the same amount of taxes, but do not receive the same services.

Based on significant amount of data collection and analysis the Study Group recommends that Beckwith Township Council implement the "Equalization Program" described within that will provide financial assistance to residents who live on private roads. This program is based on using comparable costs of road maintenance for public roads within the Township. In addition the Study Group proposes an application process, specific parameters for work programs, and very clear accounting procedures.

# 1.0 Introduction - Beckwith Private Roads Study Group Report to the Public Works Committee

## 1.1 Background

During the 2006 Municipal Election campaign the Mississippi Lakes Association (MLA) organized an All-Candidates Meeting to assure that issues that affected lake property owners were brought forward and discussed as part of the campaign. As an adjunct to this meeting, the MLA created a Questionnaire and requested a written response from all of the candidates prior to the meeting. One of the questions asked the candidates to state their position on forming a Committee of Council to study Township Support of Private Roads. All candidates supported the formation of such a Committee.

## 1.2 Definition of a Private Road

Private roads are roads not publicly maintained and having two or more residences owned by separate owners and have been named a private road by the Township.

## 1.3 Formation of the “Working Group”

On June 19, 2007, a delegation of interested citizens attended a meeting of the Township Public Works Committee to request that Council implement this Committee. The chairman of the Public Works Committee agreed to support this request and recommend the formation of such a Committee at a meeting of full Council.

In order to assess public support for this initiative prior to its consideration by Council it was decided to advertise for volunteers to serve on what was called a “working group” to study private roads in the Township. Six residents of the Township responded positively to the newspaper ad that was published in the *Carleton Place Canadian* on August 27, 2007.

## 1.4 Resolutions by Council

At the regular session of Beckwith Township Council held on October 2, 2007, Council adopted the following resolutions:

1. **BE IT RESOLVED THAT**, Council on the recommendation of the Public Works Committee forms a working group to study private roads in the Township;  
**AND THAT**, the working group consist of six appointed volunteers.
2. **BE IT RESOLVED THAT**, Council on the recommendation of the Public Works Committee appoints the following volunteers to the Private Roads Study Group: Frank Mills, Wayne Bowes, Ken Ray, Roy C. Mooney, Vern Runnells and Paul Roy.

At a special session of Beckwith Township Council held on August 14, 2007, Council adopted the following resolution:

3. **BE IT RESOLVED THAT**, the Council of the Township of Beckwith appoints Councillor Ross Trimble and Deputy-Reeve Sharon Mousseau to the Private Roads Study Group.

## 1.5 Study Group Terms of Reference and Structure

### 1.5.1 BACKGROUND

Beckwith Township Council has been requested by owners of property accessed by private roads to explore options available in managing private roads. Currently, the maintenance of private roads is the responsibility of the property owner.

### 1.5.2 MANDATE

The study will involve data collection, research and analysis of a number of factors including but not limited to:

- Data Collection
  - Private Road Analysis – Length, Width, Property Classes, Density, Ownership, Condition (ie drainage, gravel/surface treatment)
- Research Current Examples and Practices
  - Assumption of Private Roads – Minimum Standards
  - Road Associations – Number, Structure
  - Programs offered by other Municipalities including Local Improvement Charges
  - Identification of Options/Opportunities/Challenges
- Analysis of Options/Opportunities/Challenges
  - Legal/Liability

The study group will prepare a timely detailed report for the Public Works Committee.

### 1.5.3 MEMBERSHIP AND TERM

The working group will be comprised of a maximum of seven (7) members; two (2) of whom shall be elected officials. The other five (5) members shall be appointed by Council. It is expected that this study group will meet once a month starting in September 2007.

Staff resources to the Study Group will be allocated by the Chief Administrative Officer.

The mandate of the Study Group shall terminate upon the delivery of the report to the Public Works Committee.

Revised: August 7, 2007

## 1.6 Objectives and Schedule

The Study Group was tasked, by its Council representatives, to execute its Terms of Reference and deliver its report to the Public Works Committee in time for 2009 Budget deliberations in the September/October time frame. This report should include recommendations for future actions by Council.

## 2.0 Data Gathering - Beckwith Private Roads Study Group Report to the Public Works Committee

### 2.1 Definition of Scope and Issues

Although a group representing lake property owners initiated this study, Beckwith has several private roads that are not on Lake Mississippi. Therefore it was deemed imperative that any private road in the Township be factored into the scope of the study. Also, data on the private roads was scarce and the records of the Township needed to be significantly enhanced to permit a detailed analysis of the private road status and issues.

### 2.2 Methodology

Each member of the Study Group volunteered to obtain detailed information on a subset of the list of private roads provided by Township staff. A Study Group member created a template for information collection (See Appendix A1) and the details for every private road were captured using this form. This data was incorporated into a spreadsheet database along with information provided by the Township staff.

### 2.3 Private Roads Database

In order to make the collected data easier to analyze and manipulate, Township staff created a spreadsheet database. Each record in the database represents one of the forty-six (46) private roads in the Township. Considerable discussion and modification to the fields of the database led to a configuration that permitted analysis and comparisons to be easily constructed. The complete spreadsheet is provided in Appendix A2.

### 2.4 Relevant Township Information

To facilitate the comparison of private roads to the situation that exists for residents living on roads maintained by the Township it was necessary to collect more general information about the Township. The assessment values for non-private road residences, the length of roads maintained by the Township, the annual expenditure on the maintenance of Township roads are examples of such information. This type of information was supplied by the Township staff and is included in Section 3.2.



## 3.0 Situation Analysis - Beckwith Private Roads Study Group Report to the Public Works Committee

### 3.1 Three Kinds of Roads in the Township

It is important to recognize that there are actually three different and distinct types of roads that need to be considered when determining the fairness of the current Township road maintenance practices.

First, there are the concessions and other main roads that can be viewed as the roadways that all residents use for entering and leaving the Township and for generally getting from place to place in the Township. These roads are definitely “public roads” and it is without question that the cost of maintaining such roads should be borne by all ratepayers.

Second, there are many subdivisions roads, which the Township has assumed ownership and maintains. Such roads, while being open to public use, are primarily used for access by resident on these roads. Currently all Township ratepayers fund the cost of maintaining these roads. Relevant data on these subdivision roads are provided in Appendix A4, Table A4.1.

Third, there are the so-called private roads that are open to the general public, but are primarily used for access of residents on these roads. The cost of maintaining these roads is borne by the owners of property on such roads. From a functional perspective private roads are no different than the roads in Township’s subdivisions. It can be seen from the data in Appendix A4, Tables A4.1 and A4.2, that the average density of Private and Subdivision roads are very similar

The fairness of the maintenance cost allocation brings to question whether subdivision roads should be supported by taxes paid by all ratepayers when private roads are not. In many cases one can argue that subdivision residents paid to bring their road up to the Township standard in the cost of their lots and that the summer maintenance cost for such roads is minimal because of this and the low traffic levels. However, the annual snow clearing cost of the subdivision roads is publicly funded and residents in the purchase price of their properties did not cover this cost. Snow removal represents a significant portion of the annual road maintenance budget for the Township and varies from year to year depending on the snowfall amount. This means, that private road residents are at a financial disadvantage for reasons that have nothing to do with the construction standards of their roads.

### 3.2 Importance of Private Roads to the Township

In 2007, the forty-six (46) identified private roads in the Township provided access to some 623 residential properties, which represented 23 percent of the 2,703 total residential properties in the Township.

The total 2007 assessed value of the properties on private roads was \$94.6 million, which represented 17.9 percent of the total \$529 million of residential assessment in the Township.

This \$94.6 million assessment yielded \$312,200 in tax revenue to the Township in 2007. There are 20 kilometres of private roads in the Township, which is an 11.2 percent increment to the 185 kilometres of roads maintained by the Township.

The table below summarizes this 2007 data and provides a convenient method for comparing various parameters of private and public roads.

Parameter	Public Roads*	Private Roads	Private Roads as Percentage of Total
Total Length in Km.	185	20.0**	10%
No. of Residences	2080	623**	23%
Total Assessment (\$ Millions)	434.4	94.6	18%
Total Municipal Tax	\$1,433,612	\$312,200	18%
Average Assessment per Residence	\$208,846	\$142,900	N/A
Average Tax Yield per Km	\$7,749	\$15,082	N/A

\* Includes Subdivision Roads

\*\* Includes Trailer Park Residents/Roads

### 3.3 Problems Facing Private Roads

#### 3.3.1 Market Value Assessment

As a direct result of the implementation of "Market Value Assessment" by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), the private road property owners have become the victims, albeit not intentional, of unfair treatment relative to services rendered by the Township versus taxes paid. Refer to Appendix A3 to see evidence that no assessment adjustment is made by MPAC for properties situated on private roads.

#### 3.3.2 Lower Level of Township Services

The majority of the private roads serve waterfront properties and market value of such properties has risen faster than non-waterfront properties in the past several years. This has led to a shifting of more of the tax burden onto many private road residents, a situation that exacerbates the feeling of inequitable treatment for those living on private roads.

#### 3.3.3 High Property Density

The property density of private roads is, on average, nearly three times that found on Township roads in total. This means that private roads are more efficient tax generators than most other roads in the Township with respect to land use and road length.

#### 3.3.4 Rising Vehicle Traffic and Maintenance Costs

The traffic levels on private roads have been steadily increasing over the past few years placing stress on any marginal surfaces, which in turn increases maintenance costs. Much of this increased traffic is beyond the control of the residents. Heavy construction vehicles, fuel and garbage trucks are often identified as major concerns. Rising road repair costs make it difficult for residents to keep their roads in a safe and passable condition. With the recent dramatic cost increase of petroleum products, upgrading to a more stable surface like “black-top” is now beyond the collective resources of most private road residents.

#### 3.4 Private Road Support Programs in other Townships

Rideau Lakes, Elizabethtown-Kitley and Cramahe Townships have instituted support programs for private roads. Each of these programs has been tailored to suit the characteristics of each of the areas, but all recognize the need to create equity in the treatment of private roads.

## 4.0 Conclusions - Beckwith Private Roads Study Group Report to the Public Works Committee

### 4.1 Imbalance of Services

At present, services being supplied by Beckwith Township to property owners on private roads include Police, Fire, and waste management services plus programs relative to sports and recreation etc. The imbalance rests solely in the area of year-round road maintenance such as snow removal, surface upkeep, signs, brushing and weed cutting.

### 4.2 Inequity Within Assessment System

Previous to Market Value Assessment (MVA) consideration was given to properties situated on a private road which would in effect lower the assessed value. This would lower the property taxes and consequently most property owners would have some rationale in having to pay for road maintenance costs.

Subsequent to the implementation of MVA by MPAC, the consideration previously afforded properties on private roads is no longer part of the process (see Appendix A3). Therefore, two equally assessed properties, one on a private road and one on a municipal road, pay the same amount of taxes, but do not receive the same services. Add to this the above average assessment increases experienced by waterfront properties since the introduction of MVA, and it is not difficult to see why private road residents feel they are victims of the current assessment system.

### 4.3 Enhanced Co-operation Between Township and Private Roads

There is a need for better communication with the residents of the forty-six (46) private roads. A simple system should be developed so that the residents of the private roads know what roadwork the Township is planning in their area. Information on issues such as changes in the garbage contract, issued building permits, and access for emergency vehicles would enhance planning and management of private roads.

The Study Group concluded that the best way to address this need would be to establish a permanent sub-committee of the Public Works Committee that would focus on private roads.

### 4.4 Wide Variety of Private Road Management

Private road organization varies widely. Many roads are maintained by informal groups of residents with a significant number of these groups having formed their own private road associations with elected executives, formal records of meetings and bank accounts. Creating any Township programs to deal with this situation would be difficult, as forcing groups to provide a common structure to interface with the Township would likely cause many groups to not conform to the required structure. Unless all new programs are accessible and useful to all private roads groups, then another problem will be created. There are more than fifteen (15) different groups of private road residents, either as a formal or informal group. The formal organizations usually have an elected executive, meetings and bank accounts. The informal groups are often composed of a small number of property owners along the private road who agree collectively on what has to be done and take the appropriate action. All groups currently raise funds for maintenance by voluntary contributions from residents with varying degrees of success. The Study Group concluded that any new programs must effectively address this diversity.

#### 4.5 Equalization of Services Would Help Residents of Private Roads

Among the options available to Council to assist the residents on private roads, a grant program is one of the simplest to understand and administer. There are a variety of mechanisms that a grant program could follow but, in essence, it would be a program to transfer funds from the tax base to residences on private roads for the purpose of summer and winter road maintenance. The program could address the total imbalance in one year or stage the implementation over a short period. The details as to the administration of the grant should be as simple as possible while maintaining the financial accountability Council would require.

#### 4.6 Assistance Program must be Fair to All and Easy to Administer

It is a given that any assistance program must be totally defensible by Council to all Township ratepayers and fall within the legal framework that Council must respect. The argument has been well presented outlining the origin and history of the imbalance caused by the assessment methodology. Non-private road taxpayers are receiving certain municipal services not currently available to residents on private roads and this needs to be rationalized by Council to all taxpayers in a clear and concise manner. Any program must also be administratively simple. This must be accomplished with minimum of effort on the part of Township staff. Also, the administrative burden must be simple for the private roads groups as they often lack resources. A simple dollar per kilometre assistance equalization payment could be set up with minimum of paper work and easily verified.

#### 4.7 Township Assumption of Private Roads Impractical

While it may be considered by some as the ultimate scenario for the Township to assume private roads into the public works program; this would be impractical for a variety of reasons. As most private roads are not up to subdivision standards, the Township would not be able to use its current equipment for maintenance. The cost to upgrade to standard would need major financial assistance from a government body. Also, bringing private roads to subdivision standard could impact the character of the private road communities. These reasons alone make recommending the Township should "take over" private roads impractical at this time. However, somewhere down the road, Township assumption of private roads may be feasible.

## 5.0 Recommendations

### 5.1 Establishment of a Permanent Private Roads Sub-Committee

The Study Group recommends that Council form a permanent sub-committee of the Public Works Committee to act as an advisory committee that would deal with private road issues in the future. This sub-committee should consist of volunteers living on private roads and represent as wide a cross-section of areas as possible. The exact membership would be determined in consultation with the Public Works Committee. An important sub-committee role would be facilitating the private road groups seeking inclusion in Township assistance programs. Also, as part of its mandate this sub-committee would establish programs that would assist private roads without incurring cost to the Township, examples of which are given below.

#### 5.1.1 Services in Kind Program

The sub-committee should create a program, which would permit private roads to benefit from purchasing services from the Township. Such a program would allow private roads access to the bulk purchasing power of the Township and access to extensions of Township contracts with its suppliers and service vendors.

#### 5.1.2 Local Improvement Program for Private Roads

The sub-committee should define a process which would permit private road residents to fund significant improvements to their roads using a well defined and documented "local improvement" program targeted at private roads.

#### 5.1.3 Trailer Parks Treated Separately

The two Trailer Parks included in this study, while classified as private roads, have characteristics that merit special consideration. The sub-committee would be responsible to craft recommendations to the Public Works Committee concerning the fair treatment of the trailer parks.

### 5.2 Private Roads Equalization Program (PREP)

The Study Group recommends that Council implement a "Equalization Program" that provides financial assistance to residents of private roads for the maintenance of their roads as described in Appendix A5.

# Appendix A1

## Private Road Data Collection Template

### General Road and Occupation Information:

Name of Main Private Road \_\_\_\_\_

Name of all Other Roads in this Association: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of landowner on which your road(s) are located. \_\_\_\_\_

Road Type: Paved \_\_\_\_\_ Gravelled \_\_\_\_\_ Mixed \_\_\_\_\_

Total length of all roads within the Association \_\_\_\_\_ (kilometres)

Total length of all paved roads \_\_\_\_\_ (kilometres)

Total length of all gravelled roads \_\_\_\_\_ (kilometres)

Approximate costs for summer mtce. \_\_\_\_\_

Approximate costs for winter mtce. \_\_\_\_\_

Total number of properties in the Association \_\_\_\_\_.  
(Include year-round residences, cottages, commercial, and vacant lots.)

Total number of members that contribute to mtce. costs. \_\_\_\_\_

Total number of year-round residence \_\_\_\_\_

Does your Association carry liability insurance? \_\_\_\_\_

Identify ongoing or planned activities regarding private road.

\_\_\_\_\_

Comments/Issues:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

# BECKWITH TOWNSHIP PRIVATE ROADS INFO.

Information taken by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

(A) Road Association – Formal \_\_\_\_\_

Road Association Name \_\_\_\_\_

Road Association Officers.

- Name & Title \_\_\_\_\_
- Address \_\_\_\_\_
- Phone & Fax #s \_\_\_\_\_
- E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

- Name & Title \_\_\_\_\_
- Address \_\_\_\_\_
- Phone & Fax #s \_\_\_\_\_
- E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

(B) Road Association – Informal \_\_\_\_\_

Road Association Name \_\_\_\_\_

Road Association Contact Person (s)

- Name \_\_\_\_\_
- Address \_\_\_\_\_
- Phone & Fax #s \_\_\_\_\_
- E-mail \_\_\_\_\_

Location of Private Road.

- Lot and Concession \_\_\_\_\_
- Driving instructions \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

---



PRIVATE RD NAME	PRIME	PROPERTY STATUS			ASSESS	TAXES	CONDITION	OWNER	MINIMUM/ SUM. WIN.	Y/N	CONTACT	RMS	
		YEAR ROUND	SEASONAL	VACANT TOTAL									
		km	km	km									
1	AB'S ROAD	Roy	5	2	0	7	1,520,000	\$5,107.66	Gravelled	John Duhamel	1,500 - 2,000	JOHN COBURN	INFORMAL ROAD AS
2	ARKLAN ROAD	Frank	12	8	0	20	2,809,000	\$9,775.11	Gravelled	Private Decided Right of Way	900	BILL FRASER	ARKLAND ROAD ASS
3	BECKWITH LANE	Brian	2	0	0	2	698,000	\$2,345.49	Gravelled				
4	DALTON LANE	Frank	2	0	0	2	655,000	\$2,201.00	Gravelled				
5	DOWDALL SHORE* shared driveway - 0.35	Ken	7	1	0	8	1,603,000	\$5,386.56	Gravelled	Bill Dowdall, Elsie Rathwell, Ernie Rathwell, Jeff McMaster	750	JOHN TAYLOR	INFORMAL ROAD AS
6	ELM AVE	Wayne	11	6	0	17	2,129,500	\$7,155.76	Gravelled	Private Decided Right of Way	400	SUZANNE LAVERGNE	LAKE PARK HUNTING
7	FATHER POINT ROAD	Frank	5	3	0	8	1,417,000	\$4,761.55	Gravelled	Private Decided Right of Way		BOB LITTLE	FATHER POINT ROAD
8	GARDINER SHORE (Main & Lower Rds)	Frank	43	48	1	92	11,604,500	\$38,994.60	Deteriating Surfaced	Twp	10,000	ROD MCGIBBON	GARDINER SHORE A
9	KNOWLTON PLACE	Vern	9	1	0	10	2,615,000	\$8,787.18	Gravelled	Twp	500	GERRY BROWN	KNOWLTON PLACE
10	LAKE PARK - BIRCH AVENUE	Wayne	17	24	1	42	5,228,000	\$17,567.65	Gravelled	Private	2,000	MARK AMIRAULT	LAKE PARK COMMUNI
11	LAKE PARK - CHRISTINE STREET	Wayne	1	0	0	1	170,000	\$571.25	Gravelled	Private	*	MARK AMIRAULT	LAKE PARK COMMUNI
12	LAKE PARK - DAVID STREET	Wayne	8	3	0	11	1,143,500	\$3,842.50	Gravelled	Private	*	MARK AMIRAULT	LAKE PARK COMMUNI
13	LAKE PARK - RUTH STREET	Wayne	7	1	0	8	1,112,000	\$3,736.65	Gravelled	Private	*	MARK AMIRAULT	LAKE PARK COMMUNI
14	LAKE SIDE DRIVE	Frank	18	13	0	31	6,907,000	\$23,209.59	Recently Surfaced	Private Decided Right of Way	Major Restoration	CATHY CAVANAUGH	LAKESIDE DRIVE RC
15	LAKEWOOD ESTATES (Trailer Pk)	Vern	60	0	0	60	2,285,000	\$7,678.29	Gravelled	Killam Properties Inc.	5,000	JANET DOYLE	
16	LOCH END	Vern	3	1	0	4	892,000	\$2,997.39	Gravelled	Township			
17	MAPLE LANE	Frank	1	0	0	1	237,000	\$796.39	Gravelled	?			
18	METCALFE LANE	Frank	1	1	0	2	1,000	\$922.40	Gravelled	?			
19	MITCHELL LANE	Frank	2	0	0	2	498,000	\$1,673.43	Gravelled				
20	MUNRO LANE	David	8	7	0	15	3,789,500	\$12,733.86	Gravelled	Private Decided Right of Way	1,200	DAVE KIRKPATRICK	MUNRO LANE ROAD
21	OTTERSLIDE LANE	Roy	5	1	0	6	1,213,000	\$4,076.04	Gravelled	Multiple	500	ROY MOONEY	INFORMAL ROAD AS
22	PATTY PLACE	Cynthia	4	1	0	5	714,000	\$2,399.25	Surfaced	Twp		RON NESRALLAH	PATTY PLACE
23	PATTY PLACE	Cynthia	8	1	0	9	1,630,000	\$5,477.29					
24	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 3	Frank	10	2	0	12	2,694,000	\$9,052.65	Gravelled	Private Decided Right of Way	580	JOHN TUBMAN	
25	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 2	Frank	7	3	1	11	2,890,000	\$9,711.27	Gravelled	Private Decided Right of Way		DAVE WILLOUGHBY	
26	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 3A	Frank	6	2	0	8	1,432,000	\$4,811.95	Gravelled	Private Decided Right of Way	360	JOHN TUBMAN	
27	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 4	Frank	4	2	0	6	1,010,500	\$3,395.58	Gravelled	Private Decided Right of Way			
28	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE A	Frank	3	2	0	5	781,000	\$2,624.39	Gravelled	Private Decided Right of Way			
29	PRETTIES ISLAND - FREEDOM HILL	Ken	2	4	0	6	1,369,000	\$4,600.25	Gravelled	Fred Book, Kirk Burgess, Twps, Beckwith & Drummond/NE, Prov.	8,000	JIM BROWN	PRETTIES ISLAND P
30	PRETTIES ISLAND - PRICKERAL POINT RD	Ken	5	2	0	7	1,695,000	\$5,698.07					
31	PRETTIES ISLAND - WINDING LANE	Ken	2	1	0	3	698,000	\$2,345.49					
32	RATHWELL SHORE* shared driveway - 0.35	Ken	17	5	0	22	3,451,300	\$11,597.40	Gravelled	Ernie Rathwell Jeff McMaster Kyle Wright	800	STEVE FARRELL	RATHWELL SHORE
33	RICHARDS LANE	Vern	3	1	0	4	748,000	\$2,513.50	Gravelled	Right of Way	800	DAVID WHITTLE	
34	RIVERSIDE ROAD	Ross	6	3	0	9	1,188,000	\$3,982.04	Gravelled		200	CALVIN RINTOULLE	
35	ROCKHAVEN TRAILER PARK	Ross	80	0	0	80	3,466,000	\$11,646.80	Paved	Joyesta Estates Inc.	3,000	ROBERT CAMPBELL	
36	ROCKY LANE	Frank	3	0	0	3	527,000	\$1,770.88				TERRY ROBERTS	
37	ROSEHILL LANE	Vern	5	1	0	6	1,260,000	\$4,233.98	Gravelled	Hans Rose, Richard Stone, June MacMillan, Joan Friend	200	HANS ROSE	INFORMAL ROAD A
38	SCOTCH CORNERS PRIVATE	Roy	6	6	0	12	1,901,800	\$6,380.62	Gravelled	Tom Gardiner	600	ROY MOONEY	WILLIS ISLAND ROA
39	SQUAW POINT ROAD	Ken	8	16	0	24	4,472,000	\$15,027.26	Deteriating Surfaced		5,000	KEN RAY	SQUAW POINT ROA
40	SQUAW POINT - BLUEJAY LANE	Ken	2	6	0	8	1,723,500	\$5,791.48	Mixed	Tom Gardiner	Inc in above	KEN RAY	SQUAW POINT ROA
41	SQUAW POINT - CHICKADEE LANE	Ken	1	3	0	4	648,500	\$2,179.15			Inc in above	KEN RAY	SQUAW POINT ROA
42	SQUAW POINT - FINCH LANE	Ken	2	1	0	3	845,000	\$2,839.45			Inc in above	KEN RAY	SQUAW POINT ROA
43	SQUAW POINT - HERON LANE	Ken	8	1	0	9	2,181,000	\$7,328.81			Inc in above	KEN RAY	SQUAW POINT ROA
44	SQUAW POINT - MALLARD LANE	Ken	3	1	0	4	928,000	\$3,118.36			Inc in above	KEN RAY	SQUAW POINT ROA
45	SQUAW POINT - MORNING DOVE LANE	Ken	1	4	0	5	755,000	\$2,537.03			Inc in above	KEN RAY	SQUAW POINT ROA
46	SUNSET LANE	Frank	6	3	0	9	1,581,000	\$5,312.63	Gravelled	Bront Lewis	1,000	DAVE SULLIVAN	SUNSET LANE ROA
TOTALS			429	191	3	623	89,491,100	\$300,717					

APPENDIX A2 - PRIVATE ROADS DATABASE

## Appendix A3 - Beckwith Private Roads Study Group Report to the Public Works Committee

### MPAC Response to Assessment of Properties on Private Roads

Dear Roy Mooney,

Thank you for your enquiry to the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC).

Whether your property is on a private road versus a municipal road this wouldn't affect your assessment.

Your assessment is based on analyzing the sale prices of similar resale properties within a specific time period arrived at the assessed value for your property. For homes to be similar, we consider many factors including a) location, b) lot size, c) house size, d) age, and e) overall condition. We then use an average value, thereby smoothing out the high and low prices in the market. This creates a fair treatment for all property owners. Although you may not have made any changes to your property, market conditions may create a change in your assessment.

If we can be of further assistance to you, please contact the Customer Contact Centre or visit our website at [www.mpac.ca](http://www.mpac.ca).

Yours truly,  
Karen  
Customer Contact Centre  
1-866-296-6722  
[enquiry@mpac.ca](mailto:enquiry@mpac.ca)  
October 31, 2006

# Appendix A4 - Beckwith Private Roads Study Group

## Comparison of Subdivision and Private Roads

Table A4.1 Subdivision Density Data

#	SUBDIVISION ROAD NAME	ROAD LENGTH KILOMETRES	NUMBER OF LOTS	LOTS PER KILOMETRE
1	BAYVIEW DRIVE	1.000	19	19.0
2	CATHERINE AVENUE	0.575	16	27.8
3	FAYE AVENUE	0.710	13	18.3
4	TIMBERWOOD DRIVE	1.380	41	29.7
5	BALMORAL DRIVE	2.400	62	25.8
6	NORTHCOTE DRIVE	1.083	20	18.5
7	HAWKINS DRIVE	0.760	21	27.6
8	LEE CRESCENT	0.775	28	36.1
9	MEGAN DRIVE	0.710	24	33.8
10	BROOKS ROAD	0.283	13	45.9
11	DOE ROAD	0.460	19	41.3
12	ARTHUR LANE	0.050	3	60.0
13	NESBITT LANE	0.075	6	80.0
14	MCGREGOR DRIVE	1.430	42	29.4
15	PINE RIDGE DRIVE	0.750	24	32.0
16	RHODA DRIVE	0.400	6	15.0
17	GOODWOOD CRESCENT	0.500	12	24.0
18	HIGHFIELD CRESCENT	0.690	15	21.7
19	ST FILLIANS ROAD	0.785	6	7.6
20	CEDAR CREST DRIVE	1.660	43	25.9
21	HEMLOCK DRIVE	0.700	25	35.7
22	EDEY DRIVE	0.220	8	36.4
23	DEER LANE	0.210	7	33.3
24	JOCKRIDGE DRIVE	0.415	14	33.7
25	HUMMINGBIRD LANE	0.150	7	46.7
26	MOCKINGBIRD LANE	0.300	13	43.3
27	ASHTON CREEK CRESCENT	1.500	43	28.7
28	WINDMILL CRESCENT	0.550	23	41.8
29	EJ'S LANE	0.885	25	28.2
30	MALCOLMS WAY	0.750	18	24.0
31	FORD ROAD	1.425	35	24.6
32	TRILLIUM WAY	0.760	9	11.8
33	LAWFORDS LANE	1.100	30	27.3
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>25.4</b>	<b>690</b>	
			<b>Average</b>	<b>27.12</b>

Table A4.2 Private Roads Density Data

#	PRIVATE ROAD NAME	ROAD LENGTH KILOMETERS	NUMBER OF LOTS	LOTS PER KILOMETER
1	AB'S ROAD	2.000	7	3.5
2	ARKLAN ROAD	0.700	20	28.6
3	BECKWITH LANE	0.700	2	2.9
4	DALTON LANE	0.325	2	6.2
5	DOWDALL SHORE* <i>shared causeway - 0.35</i>	0.862	8	9.3
6	ELM AVE	0.225	17	75.6
7	FATHER POINT ROAD	0.120	8	66.7
8	GARDINER SHORE - Main and Lower Roads	1.100	92	83.6
9	KNOWLTON PLACE	0.300	10	33.3
10	LAKE PARK - BIRCH AVENUE	0.600	42	70.0
11	LAKE PARK - CHRISTINE STREET	0.035	1	28.6
12	LAKE PARK - DAVID STREET	0.140	11	78.6
13	LAKE PARK - RUTH STREET	0.265	8	30.2
14	LAKE SIDE DRIVE	1.000	31	31.0
15	LOCH END	0.100	4	40.0
16	MAPLE LANE	0.100	1	10.0
17	METCALFE LANE	1.000	2	2.0
18	MITCHELL LANE	0.060	2	33.3
19	MUNRO LANE	0.550	15	27.3
20	OTTERSLLIDE LANE	0.625	6	9.6
21	PATTY LANE	0.120	5	41.7
22	PATTY PLACE	0.550	9	16.4
23	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 3	0.400	12	30.0
24	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 2	0.500	11	22.0
25	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 3A	0.250	8	32.0
26	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 4	0.200	6	30.0
27	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE4 A	0.100	5	50.0
28	PRETTIES ISLAND - FREEDOM HILL	0.205	6	29.3
29	PRETTIES ISLAND - PICKERAL POINT RD.	0.350	7	20.0
30	PRETTIES ISLAND - WINDING LANE	0.225	3	13.3
31	RATHWELL SHORE* <i>shared causeway - 0.35</i>	0.442	22	49.8
32	RICHARDS LANE	0.300	4	13.3
33	RIVERSIDE ROAD	0.400	9	22.5
34	ROCKY LANE	0.070	3	42.9
35	ROSEHILL LANE	0.300	6	20.0
36	SCOTCH CORNERS PRIVATE	0.430	12	27.9
37	SQUAW POINT - BLUEJAY LANE	0.100	8	80.0
38	SQUAW POINT - CHICKADEE LANE	0.050	4	80.0
39	SQUAW POINT - FINCH LANE	0.100	3	30.0
40	SQUAW POINT - HERON LANE	0.230	9	39.1
41	SQUAW POINT - MALLARD LANE	0.130	4	30.8
42	SQUAW POINT - MORNING DOVE LANE	0.100	5	50.0
43	SQUAW POINT ROAD	1.500	24	16.0
44	SUNSET LANE	0.240	9	37.5
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>18.1</b>	<b>483</b>	
			<b>Average</b>	<b>26.7</b>

# Appendix A5 - Beckwith Private Roads Study Group Report to the Public Works Committee

## PRIVATE ROADS EQUALIZATION PROGRAM (PREP)

### A5.1 INTRODUCTION

The Private Roads Study Group recommends that Beckwith Township Public Works Committee approve the implementation of a Private Roads Equalization Program along the lines described herein and recommends to Council that the program be approved and implemented in the next fiscal year.

### A5.2 OVERVIEW OF THE PROGRAM

There are 18.1 kilometres of private roads in Beckwith Township, excluding the trailer parks. Based on the average cost per kilometre for maintenance on public roads in Beckwith Township \$4,075/km, 2006 report the extent of the imbalance equates to \$73,758 per annum.

It is proposed to make available an equalization payment relevant to each private road for maintenance purposes. This payment will be a function of the annual average cost per kilometre for road maintenance on public roads in Beckwith Township, the length of the private road, and a predetermined density/traffic factor.

### A5.3 DENSITY ADJUSTMENT FACTOR

As can be seen from Table A4.2, the residential density of private roads varies greatly. In cases where the density is high, there is more traffic and thus more wear and tear on the roads. The reverse is true for roads with low density. However, in the winter, all roads require equal maintenance effort to clear snow and provide basic mobility and access for residents as well as emergency services.

It was therefore determined that a density/traffic factor should be applied to each private road to reflect an appropriate allocation based on public road maintenance history. Based on these density/traffic factors, each private road was assigned to one of nine categories, four above the mid range and four below. Information for determining these density/traffic factors was obtained from Beckwith Township staff with actual existing examples to support their input.

The appropriate density/traffic factor is then applied to each individual private road for use in the PREP calculation.

### A5.4 BASIC COMPENSATION

Each private road organization could apply and receive an amount up to a calculated value using the length of the private road in kilometres, multiplied by \$4,075 (2006 public road mtce. costs) multiplied by the density/traffic factor assigned for each individual road. Table A5 shows the application of this procedure to all of the private roads in the Township except the trailer parks. It should be noted that the use of the density/traffic factor, when applied to each private road reduces the overall award expenditure to \$59,466.

Table A5 – Private Roads Equalization Distributions

#	PRIVATE ROAD NAME	NUMBER OF RESIDENCES	ROAD LENGTH KILOMETERS	RESIDENCES PER KILOMETER	TRAFFIC FACTORS	MAXIMUM ASSISTANCE
1	AB'S ROAD	7	2.000	3.5	0.6	\$4,890
2	ARKLAN ROAD	20	0.700	28.6	0.8	\$2,282
3	BECKWITH LANE	2	0.700	2.9	0.6	\$1,712
4	DALTON LANE	2	0.325	6.2	0.6	\$795
5	DOWDALL SHORE* <i>shared causeway - 0.35</i>	8	0.862	9.3	0.6	\$2,108
12	ELM AVE	17	0.225	75.6	1.3	\$1,192
6	FATHER POINT ROAD	8	0.120	66.7	1.2	\$587
7	GARDINER SHORE Main and Lower	92	1.100	83.6	1.4	\$6,276
8	KNOWLTON PLACE	10	0.300	33.3	0.9	\$1,100
9	LAKE PARK - BIRCH AVENUE	42	0.600	70.0	1.2	\$2,934
10	LAKE PARK - CHRISTINE STREET	1	0.035	28.6	0.8	\$114
11	LAKE PARK - DAVID STREET	11	0.140	78.6	1.3	\$742
13	LAKE PARK - RUTH STREET	8	0.265	30.2	0.8	\$864
14	LAKE SIDE DRIVE	31	1.000	31.0	0.9	\$3,668
15	LOCH END	4	0.100	40.0	0.9	\$367
16	MAPLE LANE	1	0.100	10.0	0.6	\$245
17	METCALFE LANE	2	1.000	2.0	0.6	\$2,445
18	MITCHELL LANE	2	0.060	33.3	0.9	\$220
19	MUNRO LANE	15	0.550	27.3	0.8	\$1,793
20	OTTERSIDE LANE	6	0.625	9.6	0.6	\$1,528
21	PATTY LANE	5	0.120	41.7	1.0	\$489
22	PATTY PLACE	9	0.550	16.4	0.7	\$1,569
23	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 3	12	0.400	30.0	0.8	\$1,304
24	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 2	11	0.500	22.0	0.8	\$1,630
25	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 3A	8	0.250	32.0	0.9	\$917
26	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 4	6	0.200	30.0	0.8	\$652
27	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 4 A	5	0.100	50.0	1.0	\$408
28	PRETTIES ISLAND - FREEDOM HILL	6	0.205	29.3	0.8	\$668
29	PRETTIES ISLAND - PICKERAL POINT RD.	7	0.350	20.0	0.7	\$998
30	PRETTIES ISLAND - WINDING LANE	3	0.225	13.3	0.7	\$642
31	RATHWELL SHORE* <i>shared causeway - 0.35</i>	22	0.442	49.8	0.9	\$1,621
32	RICHARDS LANE	4	0.300	13.3	0.7	\$856
33	RIVERSIDE ROAD	9	0.400	22.5	0.8	\$1,304
34	ROCKY LANE	3	0.070	42.9	1.0	\$285
35	ROSEHILL LANE	6	0.300	20.0	0.7	\$856
36	SCOTCH CORNERS PRIVATE	12	0.430	27.9	0.8	\$1,402
37	SQUAW POINT - BLUEJAY LANE	8	0.100	80.0	1.3	\$530
38	SQUAW POINT - CHICKADEE LANE	4	0.050	80.0	1.3	\$265
39	SQUAW POINT - FINCH LANE	3	0.100	30.0	0.8	\$326
40	SQUAW POINT - HERON LANE	9	0.230	39.1	0.9	\$844
41	SQUAW POINT - MALLARD LANE	4	0.130	30.8	0.9	\$477
42	SQUAW POINT - MORNING DOVE LANE	5	0.100	50.0	1.0	\$408
43	SQUAW POINT ROAD	24	1.500	16.0	0.7	\$4,279
44	SUNSET LANE	9	0.240	37.5	0.9	\$880
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>18.1</b>			<b>\$59,466</b>
			<b>PR AVG</b>	<b>26.7</b>		
	<b>Road Mntce Allowance per Km</b>	<b>2445</b>				
	<b>Snow Removal Allowance per Km</b>	<b>1630</b>	<b>SUB DIV AVG</b>	<b>27.1</b>		
	<b>Total Allowance per Km</b>	<b>4075</b>				

## A5.5 PROCESS

Some basic rules and criteria will have to be set up to administer the program. Mindful of the intent to keep the administration of the program as simple as possible with the least impact on Township staff, the following points are suggested:

- It is recommended to use the Representatives from the proposed Public Works Sub-Committee to coordinate and, over time, upgrade the PREP Program, assist road groups, and present applications to the Township for consideration.
- All private road organizations within the Township have the right to apply for compensation through the PREP. A draft application form is shown on the next page.
- The supporting documentation for monies spent would determine the amount of compensation to be paid, but will not exceed the pre-calculated amount based on the PREP Program and allocated to that individual private road or group of roads.
- All submissions would require the following:
  1. Name of the private road(s) to be maintained;
  2. Name of the Private Road Organization, formal or informal;
  3. Name of two persons with signing authority on their bank account;
  4. Bank Account information, bank, account number;
  5. Annual financial statement reconciled with the bank book;
  6. Budget and work plan for the upcoming year;
  7. Completed calculation for the PREP.
- All submissions for a given year would have to be submitted to the Township Offices by a date to be determined by Township Administration in order to allow for inclusion in the annual budget deliberations.

# TOWNSHIP OF BECKWITH PRIVATE ROADS EQUALIZATION PROGRAM

Private Road Name(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Private Road Association  
 Name:

*Please check one.*

Formal

Informal

Signing Authority

# 1

#2

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Position: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Postal Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Bank: \_\_\_\_\_

Branch: \_\_\_\_\_

Bank Account Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Attachments

Budget

Work Plan

Financial Statement

To be completed by the Sub-committee Representative

Density/Traffic Factor \_\_\_\_\_

Equalization  
 Payment: \_\_\_\_\_

Authorization: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



## Private Road Equilization Program Distributions

#	PRIVATE ROAD NAME	NUMBER OF RESIDENCES	ROAD LENGTH KILOMETERS	RESIDENCES PER KILOMETER	TRAFFIC FACTOR	MAXIMUM ASSISTANCE	2009 BUDGET
							\$30,000
1	AB'S ROAD	7	2.000	3.5	0.6	\$4,890	\$2,467
2	ARKLAN ROAD	20	0.700	28.6	0.8	\$2,282	\$1,151
3	BECKWITH LANE	2	0.700	2.9	0.6	\$1,712	\$863
4	DALTON LANE	2	0.325	6.2	0.6	\$795	\$401
5	DOWDALL SHORE* <i>shared cosway - 0.35</i>	8	0.862	9.3	0.6	\$2,108	\$1,063
6	ELM AVE	17	0.225	75.6	1.3	\$1,192	\$601
7	FATHER POINT ROAD	8	0.120	66.7	1.2	\$587	\$296
8	GARDINER SHORE Main and Lower	92	1.100	83.6	1.4	\$6,276	\$3,166
9	KNOWLTON PLACE	10	0.300	33.3	0.9	\$1,100	\$555
10	LAKE PARK - BIRCH AVENUE	42	0.600	70.0	1.2	\$2,934	\$1,480
11	LAKE PARK - CHRISTINE STREET	1	0.035	28.6	0.8	\$114	\$58
12	LAKE PARK - DAVID STREET	11	0.140	78.6	1.3	\$742	\$374
13	LAKE PARK - RUTH STREET	8	0.265	30.2	0.8	\$864	\$436
14	LAKE SIDE DRIVE	31	1.000	31.0	0.9	\$3,668	\$1,850
15	LOCH END	4	0.100	40.0	0.9	\$367	\$185
16	MAPLE LANE	1	0.100	10.0	0.6	\$245	\$123
17	METCALFE LANE	2	1.000	2.0	0.6	\$2,445	\$1,233
18	MITCHELL LANE	2	0.060	33.3	0.9	\$220	\$111
19	MUNRO LANE	15	0.550	27.3	0.8	\$1,793	\$905
20	OTTERSLIDE LANE	6	0.625	9.6	0.6	\$1,528	\$771
21	PATTY LANE	5	0.120	41.7	1.0	\$489	\$247
22	PATTY PLACE	9	0.550	16.4	0.7	\$1,569	\$791
23	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 3	12	0.400	30.0	0.8	\$1,304	\$658
24	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 2	11	0.500	22.0	0.8	\$1,630	\$822
25	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 3A	8	0.250	32.0	0.9	\$917	\$463
26	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 4	6	0.200	30.0	0.8	\$652	\$329
27	PETRIE SHORE - AVENUE 4 A	5	0.100	50.0	1.0	\$408	\$206
28	PRETTIES ISLAND - FREEDOM HILL	6	0.205	29.3	0.8	\$668	\$337
29	PRETTIES ISLAND - PICKERAL POINT RD.	7	0.350	20.0	0.7	\$998	\$504
30	PRETTIES ISLAND - WINDING LANE	3	0.225	13.3	0.7	\$642	\$324

## Private Road Equilization Program Distributions

#	PRIVATE ROAD NAME	NUMBER OF RESIDENCES	ROAD LENGTH KILOMETERS	RESIDENCES PER KILOMETER	TRAFFIC FACTOR	MAXIMUM ASSISTANCE	2009 BUDGET
31	RATHWELL SHORE* <i>shared cosway - 0.35</i>	22	0.442	49.8	0.9	\$1,621	\$818
32	RICHARDS LANE	4	0.300	13.3	0.7	\$856	\$432
33	RIVERSIDE ROAD	9	0.400	22.5	0.8	\$1,304	\$658
34	ROCKY LANE	3	0.070	42.9	1.0	\$285	\$144
35	ROSEHILL LANE	6	0.300	20.0	0.7	\$856	\$432
36	SCOTCH CORNERS PRIVATE	12	0.430	27.9	0.8	\$1,402	\$707
38	SQUAW POINT - BLUEJAY LANE	8	0.100	80.0	1.3	\$530	\$267
39	SQUAW POINT - CHICKADEE LANE	4	0.050	80.0	1.3	\$265	\$134
40	SQUAW POINT - FINCH LANE	3	0.100	30.0	0.8	\$326	\$164
41	SQUAW POINT - HERON LANE	9	0.230	39.1	0.9	\$844	\$426
42	SQUAW POINT - MALLARD LANE	4	0.130	30.8	0.9	\$477	\$241
43	SQUAW POINT - MORNING DOVE LANE	5	0.100	50.0	1	\$408	\$206
44	SQUAW POINT ROAD	24	1.500	16.0	0.7	\$4,279	\$2,159
45	SUNSET LANE	9	0.240	37.5	0.9	\$880	\$444
	<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>18.1</b>			<b>\$59,466</b>	<b>\$30,000</b>
	<b>Road Mintce Allowance per Km</b>	<b>2445</b>	<b>PR AVG</b>	<b>26.7</b>			