

Original rec center funding conditions

From “Original December, 2016 Recreation center proposal”, page 10 available on this link: [Montreal West | Village-Project v1 \(laos-village-project.com\)](http://Montreal West | Village-Project v1 (laos-village-project.com)).

Items identified by numbers are referenced on the second page.

Costs and the Effect on Our Taxes

1

As Council has stated numerous times, this project will not go ahead without significant government funding. As it stands, the new program under which we have applied generally provides a grant of 66%. That means the Town (and by extension, we the taxpayers) would have to absorb 1/3 of the cost.

Estimates for the whole project (building, pool, soccer field, basketball court, demolition costs, landscaping and professional fees) come in at \$20M after sales tax recovery. We specifically asked that the estimate ensure there are substantial contingencies for unforeseen expenses. That means we would have to fund approximately \$7M outside government grants.

2

3

Therefore, to finance this project, if we do not raise any of that \$7M from private sources or use any of our accumulated surplus, the net effect on the average Montreal West tax bill (property valuation of \$608K in 2016) would be approximately \$230 per year in a “special tax” over 25 years. If we are able to fundraise \$1.5M privately and use \$1.5M of our accumulated surplus the net effect on the average tax bill would be approximately \$130 per year in a “special tax” over 25 years.

4

	Grants at 66%	Grants at 66%	Grants at 66%	Grants at 66%	Grants at 66%	Grants at 66%	Grants at 66%	Grants at 66%
Cost	\$19,134,594	\$19,134,594	\$19,134,594	\$19,134,594	\$19,134,594	\$19,134,594	\$19,134,594	\$19,134,594
GST	\$956,730	\$956,730	\$956,730	\$956,730	\$956,730	\$956,730	\$956,730	\$956,730
TVQ	\$1,908,676	\$1,908,676	\$1,908,676	\$1,908,676	\$1,908,676	\$1,908,676	\$1,908,676	\$1,908,676
Total Cost	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000
GST Recovery	100% -\$956,730	100% -\$956,730	100% -\$956,730	100% -\$956,730	100% -\$956,730	100% -\$956,730	100% -\$956,730	100% -\$956,730
TVQ Recovery	50% -\$954,338	50% -\$954,338	50% -\$954,338	50% -\$954,338	50% -\$954,338	50% -\$954,338	50% -\$954,338	50% -\$954,338
Net Cost	\$20,088,932	\$20,088,932	\$20,088,932	\$20,088,932	\$20,088,932	\$20,088,932	\$20,088,932	\$20,088,932
Private Donations	\$0	-\$500,000	-\$500,000	-\$1,000,000	-\$1,000,000	-\$1,500,000	-\$1,500,000	-\$2,000,000
Payment from Surplus	\$0	\$0	-\$500,000	-\$500,000	-\$1,000,000	-\$1,000,000	-\$1,500,000	-\$2,000,000
Net Loan By-Law	\$20,088,932	\$19,588,932	\$19,088,932	\$18,588,932	\$18,088,932	\$17,588,932	\$17,088,932	\$16,088,932
LTD Service								
Interest Rate	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
Amortization (years)	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Annual Payment	\$1,140,317	\$1,111,935	\$1,083,554	\$1,055,172	\$1,026,790	\$998,408	\$970,027	\$913,263
Government Grants								
Grant	66% \$13,258,695	66% \$13,258,695	66% \$13,258,695	66% \$13,258,695	66% \$13,258,695	66% \$13,258,695	66% \$13,258,695	66% \$13,258,695
Interest Rate	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
Amortization (years)	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
Annual Grant	\$752,609	\$752,609	\$752,609	\$752,609	\$752,609	\$752,609	\$752,609	\$752,609
Net Increase LTD Service	\$387,708	\$359,326	\$330,944	\$302,563	\$274,181	\$245,799	\$217,417	\$160,654
Impact on Tax Bill								
\$500,000 evaluation	\$187	\$173	\$160	\$146	\$132	\$119	\$105	\$77
\$608,000 evaluation	\$227	\$211	\$194	\$177	\$161	\$144	\$127	\$94
\$750,000 evaluation	\$280	\$260	\$239	\$219	\$198	\$178	\$157	\$116
\$1,000,000 evaluation	\$374	\$347	\$319	\$292	\$264	\$237	\$210	\$155

1 The **2/3rds** figure for grants as a percentage of total cost was calculated using the grant, **\$13,258,695**, and the \$22M cost net of GST/PST tax rebates, **\$20,088,932**:

$$13,258,695 * 100 / 20,088,932 = 66.0\%$$

2 The **\$7M** to be funded outside of government grants was calculated as:

$$20,088,932 - 13,258,695 \text{ (grants)} = \$6,830,237 \text{ (rounded up to \$7M)}$$

3 For the actual conditions that the Town was presenting, the \$7M net new debt would be reduced by the **\$1.5M each** from fundraising and the accumulated surplus giving **\$3,830,237**,

$$6,830,237 - 3,000,000 = \$3,830,237 \text{ (net new debt)}$$

4 The Town was working with the values in the 2nd column from the right, which for the average single family dwelling – highlighted in green, would give a tax increase of **\$127** which they rounded up to **\$130**. This later morphed down to **\$100**, presumably as the Town felt there might be greater fundraising.

5 The Loan bylaw for this accounting, which changed in the 2023 proposal, deducts tax rebates, fundraising and money taken from the accumulated surplus, to give: **\$17,088,932**.