

Report on Local Governance Reform Initiatives

June 2020



Executive Summary

Local Governance in the Province and in Principle

- Local governments serve two basic functions, representative and administrative.
- To serve these functions well, a local government must have clearly distinguished responsibilities, identifiable geographic boundaries, a demographic and financial base appropriate to carrying out its responsibilities, and an internal organizational structure conducive to accountability.
- Many of New Brunswick's local governance entities such as Municipalities, Rural Communities, Regional Municipalities, and Local Service Districts do not meet these basic criteria, and piecemeal attempts to address these inadequacies in the past have been unsuccessful.

Challenges Facing New Brunswick's Local Governance Regime

- The majority of the province's cities are shrinking while bedroom communities continue to grow, placing undue tax burdens on the Province's economic hubs as the cities provide public services to the populations of entire regions without receiving the property taxes required to provide these services sustainably.
- The Province's smaller communities lack the populations required to maintain healthy democratic institutions and financial capacities to provide the services demanded of them.
- A third of the Province's population live in unincorporated areas and are accordingly without local representative government. This third of the population nonetheless receive local services provided by the Province at a rate disproportionate to their property tax rates worsening Provincial deficit spending.

Solutions: A New Framework

- The Province's hundreds of local governance entities should be replaced with 53 larger municipal entities amalgamating existing municipalities and incorporating all LSDs and previously unincorporated areas.
- These municipal entities would create administrative boundaries that better align with growth and settlement patterns, regional employment hubs, existing service centers and general commuting patterns, educational institutions, language profiles, current municipal service and cost-sharing arrangements between entities, and recent and current interest in restructuring.
- Equal Opportunity among municipalities would be maintained in principle with the impetus being shifted from equalization grants to expanded, comparable tax warrants. Equalization grants would continue to exist but would be smaller as municipal revenues from other sources would increase.
- Regional Service Districts would be created and entrenched in provincial legislation to facilitate cost-sharing and collaboration between neighboring municipalities in a common regional territory.
- Five "supra-municipal" services would be required to be provided through the RSD, but further collaboration could be explored on a voluntary basis by member municipalities.

- These 12 regions would serve as a model for future reform in other public sectors by creating a uniform administrative arrangement for service provision around pre-existing but informal economic hubs.

Appendixes

- Data tables by entity and by RSD
- Breakdown of equalization grants

Preface - New Brunswick has a long history of successful municipal government. In 1785, Saint John became the first incorporated city in Canada. While the area which would become Saint John had been inhabited prior to incorporation, in the words of the city's charter, there was no "regular Magistracy for the able and orderly government of the district." Though functioning as a community, the district lacked the "ordinances as are requisite for the good government of a populous place." Simply put, while there was a permanent population in a specified area, the community lacked the institutions necessary to truly function as a local government.

235 years later, New Brunswick's communities face a similar challenge. Despite numerous reforms and commissions throughout our province's history, as in 1735 today's communities lack the ordinances, powers, and financial capacities requisite for good government. Changes in population and settlement patterns have rendered our existing municipal boundaries anachronistic. Well-intentioned past attempts to guarantee equality of opportunity among municipalities have rendered local governments overly dependent on the province's central administration and left nearly a third of the population outside of these municipalities without local representative government. Nearly every other jurisdiction in Canada has drastically changed its local governance regime since the 1960s to reflect changing circumstances, but New Brunswick has not yet been able to find the political will to do the same. Though New Brunswick has updated its *Municipalities Act* since the 1990s to include Rural Communities and Regional Municipalities, these additions have been implemented in a piecemeal fashion. As shall be explored in section II of this report, however, wholesale reform is needed if New Brunswick's local governments are to remain viable.

Given the current global crisis, we now have a unique opportunity at systemic transformation. The pandemic has underscored to many of us just how important our communities are. Though the scale of the crisis is global, our need to self-isolate has re-enforced the vitality of strong communities and regions for individual well-being and economic recovery. While the containment efforts of the Federal and Provincial governments are commendable and appreciated, much of the recovery from this crisis is going to occur at the regional level. As relapses occur, it will be smaller jurisdictions like the City of Campbellton which will need to reanalyze and reimplement their recovery strategies in conjunction with the Provincial government. This crisis therefore represents an unprecedented opportunity to reimagine the role of municipal governments in the context of our province and create truly sustainable communities and regions. Amidst the global uncertainty, now is the perfect time to harness New Brunswicker's desire for self-government and self-reliance and transform it into the political will required to change our local governance regime.

As a foundation for the recovery from COVID-19 as well as for future reforms to other sectors, the Coalition of Concerned Citizens would like to recommend that the Province revisit the prospect of substantive municipal reform outlined in the 2008's "Building Stronger Local Governments and Regions." The following report outlines the basics of this existing and relevant proposal to transform New Brunswick's local governance regime for the future while updating the data to underline how viable this new framework remains today. If changes such as these are implemented now, 2020 can serve as a turning point in the history of this province and serve as a model for the reformation of other important public sectors such as health and education.

I. Local Governance in the Province and in Principle

A local government is a legal entity that allows residents of a defined geographic area to provide services for a common interest, but unlike a province or country, it is an instrument that residents can use to influence change and development in their community directly.¹ Local government in the context of New Brunswick refers primarily to municipalities (cities, towns, villages, etc.), but also includes a variety of local special purpose bodies such as districts, agencies, boards, and commissions. Unlike the federal or provincial orders of government, municipalities have no constitutionally guaranteed role or responsibilities and can therefore serve a variety of functions as required by the unique wants and needs of a community.

The two basic roles or functions of local government are the *administration* of services and the *representation* of the people's views, and as such the effectiveness of a local government should be measured by its ability to carry out these two functions. Depending on circumstance, one function may be deemed more valuable than the other. Rather than stressing local government's relationship to democracy, New Brunswickers have generally equated the role of local government with the delivery of services. However, one function cannot be carried out without the other.² A municipal entity must strive to balance these two functions, being both *effective* in its *administration*, and *responsive* in its *representation*.

Representation

In their *representative* function, municipal institutions are a central element of democratic development and are essential for the preservation of civil liberties. While the workings of the country or province have a fairly high barrier of entry, it is far easier for someone to become involved in the governance of their own community. Because a municipality is governed by an elected council accountable to the resident and to which they can address their collective concerns, it is the most responsive and accountable level of government.³ Unlike the Prime Minister or even local member of the legislature, a representative of the local government is likely known personally throughout the community and is therefore approachable and uniquely accountable.

New Brunswick has three notable types of local governance entities, and each fulfill local government's *representative* function in different capacities. There are Local Municipalities (cities, towns, villages), Rural Communities, and Local Service Districts (hereafter referred to as LSDs).⁴ Previously the province also had county governments, and while the boundaries between counties still exist these entities are no longer used for local governance. Likewise, parishes are not local governance entities, but parish lines are often repurposed to serve as administrative boundaries for LSDs and Rural Communities.

¹ Jean-Guy Finn, *Building Stronger Local Governments and Regions: An Action Plan for the Future of Local Governance in New Brunswick: Report of the Commissioner on the Future of Local Governance* (Fredericton, Government of New Brunswick, 2008), 14.

² Jean-Guy Finn, *Building Stronger Local Governments*, 14.

³ Finn, 14.

⁴ Finn, 21.

Local Municipalities are entities governed by elected councils consisting of at least three councilors and one mayor elected by the general population within a defined set of boundaries every four years. Councilors may be elected on a ward by ward basis to represent the specific interests of a neighborhood, borough, or area, or at large as a representative of the whole community. Every council is supported by an administration, which may range from one individual to a staff complement of several hundred depending on the population of the municipal institution.⁵

Rural Communities are governed in the same way but are legally different from Local Municipalities. Rural Communities were created in 1995 to serve as a means for smaller villages and LSDs to amalgamate and take on the *representative* functions of a municipality without taking responsibility for the full-service provision expected of a local municipality.

Local service districts, on the other hand, were never intended to serve as true municipal institutions and therefore have no elected mayor or council.⁶ Instead, these entities are controlled directly by the provincial government with advisory committees elected for terms of two years at public meetings. These advisory committees have no decision-making authority and the positions frequently go unfilled⁷

Administration

In their *administrative* function, municipal institutions are service providers. Local municipalities have the authority to provide a specific set of services, though only two services are mandatory: policing and emergency measures planning. In practice, however, fire prevention and suppression, roads, and garbage disposal are also universally expected and supplied services.⁸ Municipalities have the options of delivering these services through one of their own departments, through an agency, board, or commission created by the municipality, through collaboration with the provincial government, the private sector, and neighboring municipalities, or simply through contracting out services. Municipalities are also authorized to enact by-laws governing various local activities.⁹

Rural Communities have the same authority as local municipalities to provide these services but are only actually required to assume responsibility of and provide land use and emergency measures planning services. Until such time as the Rural Community chooses to assume responsibility for services beyond these two mandatory services, they are provided by the province.

As mentioned previously, LSDs were not intended to be true municipal institutions, and so they also lack any true administrative functions. After the abolition of county governments in the 1960s, LSDs were introduced as a means of providing limited services to areas now denied local representation. All local services in LSDs are provided by the province. At a minimum the

⁵ Finn, 27.

⁶ Finn, 28.

⁷ Finn, 29.

⁸ Finn, 31.

⁹ Finn, 28.

province provides police protection, transportation (roads) and dog control, but if requested at a public meeting, the provision of further services may be provided.¹⁰

In addition to the province's hundreds of local governance entities, the province has established various sector-specific agencies to provide services on a region-wide basis such as the 12 district planning commissions, 12 solid waste commissions, and 15 economic development agencies.¹¹ There are also smaller-scale subregional bodies in place across the province offering specific services.

To finance their operations as *administrative* entities, municipalities receive revenues through several sources. Important sources of revenue include the unconditional grant received from the provincial government, sales of services to neighboring municipalities and LSDs, user fees associated with particular services (recreation programs and facilities, water and wastewater, garbage collection) and charging of fees for licenses and permits, but the primary source of revenue for municipalities is the property tax. In general, Local Municipalities have higher property tax rates than LSDs, but this tax rate is set by the municipality itself and accords with a greater variety and quality of service than that found in local service districts.

Preconditions for Being *Effective* and *Responsive*

But for these local governance entities to function *effectively* and *responsively*, certain preconditions must be met.¹² First, there should be a relatively clear and complete distinction in the attribution of municipal and provincial responsibilities. Municipalities are entities of their province's creation, but both parties should have a clear understanding of their respective duties.

Second, there must be easily identifiable geographic boundaries so that a given population can identify with its local government and be able to express approval or disapproval with its performance. While obvious natural boundaries such as rivers not available in all cases, it should at the very least be clear to the inhabitants what municipality they reside in.

Third, the geographic, demographic and financial base of a local government must be appropriate for carrying out the duties assigned to it. The optimal municipality will be of the appropriate size to be financially autonomous in its responsibilities.

Fourth, local government should be internally organized in a way that makes possible clear assignment of responsibilities between elected and appointed officials. The internal relationship between elected and appointed officials must be such that it contributes to the exercise of local leadership, sound decision-making and good coordination of activities within the local government.

As it stands, many of the province's local governance entities do not meet these preconditions. Repeated commissions and studies have been undertaken to address the problem of local governance in New Brunswick, most notably the 2008 Finn report from which this report draws

¹⁰ Finn, 28.

¹¹ Finn, 32.

¹² Finn, 14-15.

inspiration. No meaningful changes have been made in the decade since the report's publication, primarily because there is a natural resistance from the people to change. Folks may become attached to their community identities and are defensive of their respective property tax rates, but without reform, New Brunswick's local governance regime will not be able to survive. Many of New Brunswick's municipal entities are alarmingly dependent on the equalization grants that they receive from the Provincial government, just as the Provincial government is on transfer payments from the Federal government. The ongoing public health crisis and the financial crisis which is sure to follow has and will continue to threaten the security of these payments, threatening the very foundation of New Brunswick's status quo. Often times it seems more prudent to simply stick with a system that does not work than attempt to reform it into something unfamiliar, but the failure to address these systemic problems should not be taken lightly.

Alexis de Tocqueville notes in his study of the United States, *Democracy in America*, that democracies tend to lend themselves to a compromise between administrative centralization and sovereignty of the people because those who live in democracies crave equality over everything else. The simplest means of ensuring that everyone is treated equally is to centralize government with a single administrative authority, but doing so often comes with inefficiencies, corruption, and a loss of freedom. An important countermeasure in both the United States and Canada was the constitutional guarantee of a secondary orders of government: the provinces and states. In addition to these, however, local government was considered an important part of a healthy democracy. Unlike our provinces, local governments have no constitutionally guaranteed existence – they continue at the pleasure of the province and the people. If we fail to address the underlying conditions which enable local governments to function *effectively* and *responsively*, the people will come to believe that local governance is impossible or ill-advised in our modern world. This is not the case. Especially as our movements are becoming restricted by a global pandemic, the value of our neighbourhoods and communities has become more pronounced than ever. Control over our own recovery and more importantly control over how we wish to move forward should be left to the community as much as possible.

II. Challenges Facing New Brunswick's Local Governance Regime

Between 1991 and 2016, the population of New Brunswick has only increased 3%.¹³ Even this limited population increase can be deceiving, however, as this population increase has not been uniform across the province. The marginal growth that the province has witnessed in conjunction with population migrations has had dramatic impacts for the province's local governance entities. Beyond the legal distinction between cities, towns, villages, Rural Communities, and LSDs, the looming demographic crisis highlights the misalignment of boundaries with current realities and the unique challenges facing each of the three forms of local governance entity.

Challenges for Cities

Contrary to popular conceptions, population decline in New Brunswick is not limited to smaller communities. Five of the eight cities in the province experienced population declines between 2006 and 2016. For many communities, declining populations have resulted in a diminished financial capacity to provide local services. As populations decline, it often follows that property values either stagnate or decline, affecting the revenue raising capacity of the local and provincial governments.¹⁴

The small population increases that we have seen have been occurring largely in suburban municipalities or LSDs that are contiguous or in very close proximity to the major urban centers.¹⁵ Large residential municipalities or "bedroom communities" have seen the largest population increase by far, with populations reliant on the nearest economic hub for employment and services.¹⁶ The populations of Quispamsis and Riverview, the two largest bedroom communities, are both three times the size of the province's smallest city, Campbellton. The third bedroom community, Rothesay, is slightly smaller, with a population close to only twice that of Campbellton.¹⁷ The concentration of population growth in these communities exacerbates financial pressures on the province's largest and most productive economic centers, threatening their long term sustainability as independent entities. In the case of those living in LSDs near a more urban center, while tax rates are significantly lower the clear asymmetry between services offered to those within the municipality and without creates a sense of inequality even though there is little meaningful difference in living conditions between the two local governance entities.

The province's cities therefore find themselves in a situation where they provide local services to a population that is increasing, but that does not necessarily reside within their boundaries and cannot be taxed accordingly.¹⁸ Today an unprecedented number of rural residents travel to towns and cities for work every day, to a certain extent using the services of that city, but return home to

¹³ Statistics Canada. 2017. *New Brunswick and Canada* (table). *Census Profile*. 2016 Census. Statistics Canada Catalogue no. 98-316-X2016001. Ottawa. Released November 29, 2017. <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E> (accessed March 2, 2020).

¹⁴ Jean-Guy Finn, *Building Stronger Local Governments and Regions*, 50.

¹⁵ Finn, 51.

¹⁶ Finn, 47-48.

¹⁷ Campbellton's population in 2016 was 6883, down from 8404 in 1996. Quispamsis, Riverview, and Rothesay had populations of 18245, 19667, and 11659 in 2016 respectively.

¹⁸ Finn, 51.

their respective communities without paying into the services of that urban center.¹⁹ Ironically, suburban municipalities and LSDs are able to keep their tax rates low partly because of the services already available in the larger centers, which further encourages population migration out of the cities into these “bedroom communities.” Population growth has therefore had negative effects for the province’s municipalities both big and small. The smallest are getting smaller because of insufficient growth, but the biggest are being laden with unnecessary spillover costs by population increases in their bedroom communities. The province’s large number of administrative units in relatively confined areas has therefore led to a mismatch of administrative boundaries with communities of interest, with many administrative boundaries appearing largely artificial given the movement and linkage of our populations.²⁰

Challenges for Towns, Villages, and Rural Communities

The misalignment of boundaries also leaves the smallest municipal units without the ability to sustain their democratic and administrative functions. 485,916 New Brunswickers live in municipal units of 2000 or more, which translates to one unit for every 7,713 residents. However, 308 of the province’s 421 local governance entities have populations of fewer than 2000, giving an average of one unit for every 768 residents.²¹ While the province only has a single tier of municipal government, the disparity between the populations of the largest and smallest municipalities makes the two functionally dissimilar. By way of comparison, Nova Scotia’s 55 municipal units serve a population of 913,000 with an average of 16,600 per unit (and these 55 incorporated municipal units cover the entire geographical territory of the province).

The relative size of a community can affect levels of civic engagement and directly impact on fiscal capacity (the ability to raise revenues through property taxation or user fees to pay for services).²² Limitations on financial capacity hinder administrative and technical capabilities of individual local governments. In many cases, budgets in small municipalities are so constrained that hiring additional or specialized staff is difficult, given the potential impact on the local tax rate. Clerks or administrators of municipalities take on several roles, some of which require specialized training and knowledge, limiting a local government’s ability to properly manage risk associated with these specialized areas.²³

In terms of civic engagement, many smaller municipalities with populations of 2,000 or less have consistently experienced difficulties fielding enough candidates to have an election. Entire councils are often elected by way of acclamation.²⁴ While smaller municipal units in theory should provide a more representative and responsive local government, this apathy demonstrates that a certain minimum threshold is necessary to guarantee not only voter, but candidate engagement.

Challenges for LSDs

¹⁹ Finn, 21.

²⁰ Finn, 57.

²¹ Finn, 54.

²² Finn, 54.

²³ Finn, 57.

²⁴ Finn, 54.

The democratic deficit is even more pronounced in LSDs. While LSDs are often considered to be defined by their rural character, the actual distinction between LSDs and the other forms of municipal unit is their lack of democratic institutions. The province's urban rural divide is often portrayed as co-extensive with the division between incorporated (municipalities) and unincorporated areas (LSD), but in truth, there are many parts of New Brunswick that are unincorporated but suburban in nature. There are also many municipalities that are indeed serving truly rural areas.²⁵ However, unlike their incorporated counterparts, LSDs have no elected councils or mayors. The very existence of LSDs and the role played by the provincial government in providing direct municipal-type services in the nonincorporated areas have given rise to a dual system of local governance that is becoming more and more difficult to justify.²⁶

The result is that 35% of the population is not represented at the local level. The absence of formal elected community representation fosters individualized and fragmented decision-making within LSDs. The current public meeting process used in LSDs undermines collective approaches to development and decision-making within communities.²⁷ Any in-depth reform of local governance in New Brunswick hinges on addressing the present 'democratic deficit,' that is, the absence of true local government for 35 per cent of the population and 90 per cent of the provincial territory.²⁸

Beyond being detrimental to the health of New Brunswick's democracy, the lower tax rates in LSDs are damaging to the overall fiscal health of the province. LSDs' and Rural Communities' transportation, policing, administration, and dog control are provided by the province, but the 65-cent property tax levy does not actually cover the cost of these services. The 63 cent levy has not been substantially modified since 1984, unlike the tax rates of municipalities, despite the fact that the revenue shortfall of the GNB is upwards of 50 million dollars a year.²⁹

²⁵ Finn, 59.

²⁶ Finn, 76.

²⁷ Finn, 60.

²⁸ Finn, 70.

²⁹ Finn, 64.

III. Solutions: A New Framework

Municipal Entities

In order to properly address the challenges described above, what is truly needed is a major overhaul; a new set of rules, a new framework.³⁰ In this new framework, a uniform structure of 53 incorporated municipal governments will be established over all of the New Brunswick territory with all residents represented and governed by elected municipal councils.³¹

The 53 local municipalities of this new framework are designed to fulfill the aforementioned representative and administrative functions for all New Brunswickers. In addition to these two fundamental goals, the entities are designed with three characteristics in mind. Each entity will have a minimum total property assessment base of \$200 million, a minimum population of 4000, and include at least one former municipality in its borders. This base will give municipal councils the financial capacity to develop a budget that allows for adequate levels of service to their residents at an appropriate level of taxation and a population large enough to sustain adequate levels of civic engagement.³² Furthermore, the inclusion of at least one previously existing municipality as part of each of the new municipal entities ensures that as the new entity is being established there will be some basic infrastructure in place (e.g., personnel, office, and equipment) to assist in the transition phase.

Insofar as possible, the boundaries of the proposed entities also aim to align with current municipal, local service district and Rural Community boundaries, existing growth and settlement patterns, the nature of the economy and employment, the daytime/nighttime populations, the location of service centers and general commuting patterns, educational institutions, the population's linguistic profile, geography, current municipal service and cost-sharing arrangements between entities, and recent and current interest in restructuring.³³ In some cases, the predominant feature was that employment was found almost exclusively within the proposed new entity,³⁴ indicating a pre-existing community of interest. In configuring the 53 proposed entities using the criteria of assessment and population, only three proposed entities do not meet either of these thresholds while four do not meet one or the other because of particular circumstances relating to geography (e.g., islands, long distances between some communities) were too significant to recommend that they be part of another entity.³⁵

The new municipal councils will be based on a combination of councillors elected at-large and on a ward basis and that such composition be initially determined by the provisional committees. It is further recommended that populations of wards within a municipal entity not vary by more than 25 per cent from the average ward population, unless there are extenuating circumstances.³⁶ By

³⁰ Finn, 76.

³¹ Finn, 77; The sole exception being where a separate and distinct form of local government has been instituted for the indigenous population under federal legislation.

³² Finn, 84.

³³ Finn, 85-86.

³⁴ Finn, 89.

³⁵ Finn, 84-85.

³⁶ Finn, 91.

following these recommendations, it should be possible to design and develop council compositions appropriate to the maintenance of healthy and representative democratic communities.

As stated previously, one major challenge for New Brunswick’s local governance regime is the financial strain that communities big and small suffer from. While equalization grants from the provincial government have served to maintain equal opportunity among Local Municipalities and Rural Communities, these payments alone cannot provide New Brunswick’s communities with the financial autonomy they need to prosper and grow. Under the new framework, municipal revenues will come from a combination of equalization grants, municipal property taxes, and other user fees related to services like water and wastewater usage, but with a far greater emphasis on each municipality’s tax warrant than in the current local governance regime.

Beginning with equalization, the provincial government currently includes an equalization component in transferring unconditional grant funding to local governments in order to ensure that similar municipalities across the province to have similar tax efforts,³⁷ and while the new framework would modify the formula for the calculation of these payments, they would remain an important source of revenue for New Brunswick’s municipalities.

Under the new framework, equalization payments would be determined by each municipal entity’s group type. Municipalities with populations of 0-10000 would be considered to be Group A, Group B would have populations of 10000-40000, and Group C would have populations of 40000 and above. The size of a municipality’s annual equalization grant would be made on the basis of the group’s average assessed tax base. If a municipal entity’s property assessment base per capita is greater than the group’s average, it is not entitled to an equalization grant. If its base per capita is lesser than the group average,

Population by Municipal Entity

Entity	Group Type	Population 2011	Population 2016
1	Group A	4706	4404
2	Group B	20519	20306
3	Group A	6039	5906
4	Group A	9550	8992
5	Group A	10151	9429
6	Group A	6433	6403
7	Group B	13346	12473
8	Group A	9540	8982
9	Group A	2275	2120
10	Group B	14282	14441
11	Group B	19539	20130
12	Group A	6447	6316
13	Group B	11206	11259
14	Group A	6861	6437
15	Group A	5638	5574
16	Group B	16137	16114
17	Group A	5449	5324
18	Group B	26059	25417
19	Group A	4989	4705
20	Group A	5138	4919
21	Group A	4868	4779
22	Group A	6193	5979
23	Group A	6518	6416
24	Group A	7303	7240
25	Group A	4799	4546
26	Group B	10890	10592
27	Group C	77966	80611
28	Group B	13228	13789
29	Group A	8456	8801
30	Group B	10994	10412
31	Group A	4831	4778
32	Group B	23763	26398
33	Group B	21329	21900
34	Group A	4349	4133

³⁷ Finn, 36.

however, its equalization would be calculated as follows:

(Group average assessment base per capita – Entity X’s assessment base per capita) divided by 100, multiplied by (Group average tax rate) time Entity X’s population equals Entity X’s annual equalization grant.

e.g., $(\$55,000 - \$50,000) / \$100 * (\$1.15) * 6,000$ people = \$345,000.

Overall, the new formula for the calculation of equalization grants would reduce the provincial government’s contribution to municipal revenues from \$68,622,539 to \$42,469,228. However, as each municipal entity would have complete control over its own tax rate, the final number could be quite different. The estimated total cost to the provincial government for equalization grants has been calculated with the flat tax rate of \$1.15 but in reality, each of the three groups could have far different tax rates leading to a far a different total cost. No matter the tax rate, however, the total cost to the provincial government would certainly be less than it is today.

Population by Municipal Entity (Cont.)

Entity	Group Type	Population 2011	Population 2016
35	Group B	15664	15267
36	Group A	5082	4661
37	Group A	5634	5576
38	Group A	8332	8367
39	Group B	33425	33417
40	Group C	71263	68769
41	Group A	7489	7261
42	Group A	2539	2505
43	Group A	925	872
44	Group A	8697	8426
45	Group A	4113	4020
46	Group B	13339	12543
47	Group B	24497	25349
48	Group B	11049	10562
49	Group C	80337	82576
50	Group B	14583	14601
51	Group B	13340	13066
52	Group A	4841	4692
53	Group A	9982	9486

The lower cost to the provincial government for equalization payments will not necessarily translate into higher revenues for the provincial government though. The new framework will also allocate additional tax room equivalent to a property tax rate of \$2.25 per \$100 of valuation for the 53 municipal entities to use as they please³⁸ Unlike the equalization payments, this ‘tax room transfer’ from the provincial government to the municipalities is not a transfer of funds, but a transfer of fund-raising ability. The equalization payment ensures that no municipality will be unfairly burdened; the tax room transfer on the other hand represents an opportunity to become financially independent.

All properties other than owner-occupied residences are currently double taxed by both the province and the municipality. Under the new framework, all residential properties (owner-occupied or otherwise) would be taxed solely by the municipality, and non-residential properties would see a decrease in their provincial property tax rate of \$0.75 per \$100 of valuation. Accordingly, the municipalities would inherit the province’s tax room of \$1.50 per \$100 of valuation on residential properties and \$0.75 per \$100 on non-residential properties to use for their own revenue.

There will, of course, be transitional issues in implementing this new framework. Accordingly, it is recommended that the responsibility for local and regional roads in the currently unincorporated

³⁸ Finn, 34.

areas remain with the provincial government for several years following the establishment of the new or reconfigured municipalities. The responsibility for roads in the formerly unincorporated areas would remain with the provincial government. In addition, the responsibility for roads designated as “regional” within former villages would continue to reside fully with the provincial government. The primary reason for this continued provincial involvement in roads is the significant cost implications for tax payers in individual municipal units and would likely render many of the new municipalities unviable.³⁹

At the end of the day, while larger local governments may be formed to govern communities, smaller local communities will continue to exist and have continued significance and meaning for their residents.⁴⁰ The preservation of community identity does not require the existence of a corresponding municipal council. Dozens of local communities have kept their name and identity within LSDs for over 40 years now without municipal councils. There is no reason why more communities could not do so in the future.⁴¹ That being said, new community identities will also gradually form in conjunction with the 53 new entities.⁴²

Regional Service Districts

The creation of these geographically larger and more populous municipal entities constitutes only part of the solution to local governance challenges in the province. By Canadian standards, most of these entities are still relatively small and many would face the same struggles which the Province’s mid-sized towns and villages face today if left to their own devices. To significantly improve their service delivery capacity and to be able to contribute substantially to the overall provincial objective of self-sufficiency, New Brunswick municipalities will need to work more collaboratively on a regional basis.⁴³

In general New Brunswick must shift toward more regionalized planning and service provision in all sectors, but without a formal and uniform basis for subdivision, such reforms will only exacerbate the fragmentation of decision making and management mechanisms. Unlike other public sectors such as education and health care which can modify their administrative arrangements from the center with relative ease as we have witnessed with the changes to the boundaries of school districts and regional health authorities in recent decades, changes to the local governance framework are far more difficult to implement. Though municipalities are ultimately creations of the provincial government and exist at its pleasure, local governments are understandably resistant to external interference in their jurisdictions. Thus far attempts to establish regional cooperation and collaboration in service provision on a voluntary basis have been largely unsuccessful. If the province is to begin governing itself in a manner consistent with its demographic and financial realities, the regionalization of local government must come first as it is the public sector most resistant to such changes.

³⁹ Finn, 91-92.

⁴⁰ Finn, 85

⁴¹ Finn, 182.

⁴² For more detailed briefs on each of the 53 proposed entities see <http://coalitionnb.com/resources/> or the attached appendixes.

⁴³ Finn, 97.

Accordingly, the proposed new framework would attempt to formalize the province's existing economic hubs so as to better enable regional collaboration among the new municipal entities. Each of the proposed entities would belong to one of 12 Regional Service Districts. The boundaries of the 12 RSDs are based on those of the pre-existing 12 district planning commissions, 15 community economic development agencies, 12 solid waste commissions, and informal economic hubs. In contrast to the numerous heterogenous factors considered in conceptualizing the boundaries of the 53 municipal entities, the boundaries of these three types of regional service entities are already reasonably similar, suggesting a degree of consensus on what makes sense in terms of regions in the provide for the delivery and cost-sharing for municipal type services.⁴⁴

These RSDs would be legislatively entrenched service-sharing platforms that would achieve most of the benefits of regional government without the establishment of a second tier of local government.⁴⁵ As a *service structure*, the RSDs would enable member municipalities to collaborate in the planning, delivery, and financing of specified services on a regional basis and plan the future development of their regions in terms of land use, major infrastructure, and protection and use of resources. The five services mandated to be shared would include policing, emergency measures planning, economic development, planning, and solid waste management, but with the infrastructure for regional collaboration in place, a whole host of other regionalized services could be easily pursued.⁴⁶ As a *forum*, the RSDs will enable member municipalities to better address issues that cross municipal boundaries and are of regional significance; and advance the interests of a region as a whole, thus positioning regions as potential contributors to the province's well-being and growth.⁴⁷

Each of the 12 RSDs is to be constituted as a "body corporate" and governed by a board of directors that consists of a chair, vice-chair and a varying number of directors.⁴⁸ RSD boards would not exist independently of the individual municipalities and voters would not directly elect representatives to RSD boards.⁴⁹ Rather than existing as a second tier of local government, RSDs would "borrow" their powers from participating local governments.

Except for mandatory "supra-municipal services," participating municipalities would be able to withdraw from a service if they could not agree on changes to the terms and conditions for the service. However, because collaboration for at least five services would be provincially mandated, many of the barriers to collaboration which exist today would be far less influential. The regional infrastructure required for further collaboration would already be in place making further collaboration more appealing and approachable to individual municipalities.

While not directly related to the reformation of other sectors like education and healthcare, municipal reform is a relatively straightforward foundation from which to begin transforming the administrative arrangements of other important public sectors to function at the regional level.

⁴⁴ Finn, 99.

⁴⁵ Finn, 98.

⁴⁶ Finn, 93.

⁴⁷ Finn, 99.

⁴⁸ Finn, 100.

⁴⁹ Finn, 101.

Beyond their function as collaborative bodies, the boundaries of the 12 RSDs can serve as logical regional territories through which all other services can begin to be provided. As it stands, administrative arrangements differ between departments, exacerbating the challenges of regional collaboration. Each public sector has its own internal conception of how the province is divided and subdivided, further complicating any attempt at effective regional management. Municipal governments should not and will not have a say in how large, expansive, province-wide service networks are designed or operated, but the regional territories created by the 53 municipal entities and their prescribed regional service districts will serve as a model for uniform regional service provision across the public sector.

The new framework of 53 municipal entities with 12 supra-municipal RSDs would therefore address the fundamental internal and external challenges facing New Brunswick's local governance regime and enable a bright future for an engaged and responsible population.

Appendix I: Data Tables by Municipal Entity and Regional Service District
Regional Service District 1: Entities 1 to 6

Entity 1 : Regional Service District 1

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment ¹	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016 ²	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Haut-Madawaska	RC	\$200,610,700	\$55,872,300	\$256,483,000	3714	3987	-6.85%	205	3350
Lac Baker	Village	\$62,881,800	\$847,600	\$63,729,400	690	719	-4.03%	40	635
Totals		\$263,492,500	\$56,719,900	\$320,212,400	4404	4706	-6.42%	245	3985

1. Source: Department of Environment and Local Government

2. Source: Statistics Canada

Entity 2 : Regional Service District 1

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Edmunston	City	\$1,102,055,500	\$232,484,800	\$1,334,540,300	16580	16032	3.42%	925	15215
Saint Jacques	LSD	\$100,708,300	\$2,430,400	\$103,138,700	1596	1599	-0.19%	60	1530
Saint-Basile	LSD	\$35,395,900	\$563,400	\$35,959,300	592	717	-17.43%	10	585
Saint-Joseph	LSD	\$81,397,500	\$3,004,500	\$84,402,000	1538	2171	-29.16%	35	1480
Totals		\$1,319,557,200	\$238,483,100	\$1,558,040,300	20306	20519	-1.04%	1030	18810

Entity 3 : Regional Service District 1

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Rivière-Verte	Village	\$37,717,500	\$1,845,200	\$39,562,700	724	744	-2.69%	20	685
Rivière-Verte	LSD	\$32,306,200	\$2,418,400	\$34,724,600	711	686	3.64%	10	695
Sainte-Anne-de-Madawaska	Village	\$41,090,400	\$2,342,800	\$43,433,200	957	1002	-4.49%	30	870
Sainte-Anne	LSD	\$33,475,700	\$1,751,300	\$35,227,000	964	949	1.58%	25	940
Notre-Dame-de-Lourdes	LSD	\$11,169,300	\$23,500	\$11,192,800	275	263	4.56%	25	250
Saint-Léonard	Town	\$63,649,600	\$10,906,400	\$74,556,000	1300	1343	-3.20%	70	1165
Saint-Léonard	LSD	\$62,940,300	\$27,118,600	\$90,058,900	975	1052	-7.32%	75	875
Totals		\$282,349,000	\$46,406,200	\$328,755,200	5906	6039	-2.20%	255	5480

Entity 4 : Regional Service District 1

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Grand Falls	Town	\$355,852,100	\$117,102,700	\$472,954,800	5326	5706	-6.66%	935	4240
Saint-André	RC	\$125,815,000	\$42,108,900	\$167,923,900	772	819	-5.74%	95	670
Drummond	Village	\$49,947,300	\$3,302,300	\$53,249,600	737	775	-4.90%	70	665
Drummond	LSD	\$173,402,700	\$3,183,800	\$176,586,500	2157	2250	-4.13%	285	1855
Totals		\$705,017,100	\$165,697,700	\$870,714,800	8992	9550	-5.84%	1385	7430

Entity 5 : Regional Service District 1

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Denmark	LSD	\$68,309,000	\$1,756,200	\$70,065,200	1471	1592	-7.60%	1090	375
Grand Falls	LSD	\$68,584,500	\$3,309,100	\$71,893,600	1109	1172	-5.38%	710	395
Aroostook	Village	\$9,777,000	\$261,700	\$10,038,700	306	351	-12.82%	290	15
Perth-Andover	Village	\$92,442,000	\$18,373,900	\$110,815,900	1590	1778	-10.57%	1445	50
Andover	LSD	\$34,969,200	\$4,741,400	\$39,710,600	891	942	-5.41%	845	35
Perth	LSD	\$60,760,600	\$2,322,100	\$63,082,700	1082	1096	-1.28%	1015	510
Plaster Rock	Village	\$45,371,700	\$10,705,200	\$56,076,900	1023	1135	-9.87%	940	55
Gordon	LSD	\$76,050,800	\$3,500,200	\$79,551,000	1493	1567	-4.72%	1375	110
Lorne	LSD	\$44,943,900	\$761,100	\$45,705,000	393	439	-10.48%	345	40
Riley Brook	LSD	\$8,853,700	\$396,200	\$9,249,900	71	79	-10.13%	60	15
Totals		\$510,062,400	\$46,127,100	\$556,189,500	9429	10151	-7.11%	8115	1600

Entity 6 : Regional Service District 1

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Saint-Quentin	Town	\$116,124,700	\$13,418,000	\$129,542,700	2194	2095	4.73%	25	2085
Kedgwick	RC	\$98,865,800	\$14,386,800	\$113,252,600	1979	2089	-5.27%	45	1900
Saint-Quentin	LSD	\$92,356,300	\$18,748,100	\$111,104,400	1440	1385	3.97%	15	1500
St. Martin de Restigouche	LSD	\$4,223,900	\$77,400	\$4,301,300	92	104	-11.54%	0	90
Eldon	LSD	\$17,768,900	\$2,387,300	\$20,156,200	360	394	-8.63%	340	315
White's Brook A	LSD	\$1,031,850	\$22,200	\$1,054,050	81	79	2.53%	5	75
St. Jean de Restigouche	LSD	\$3,505,500	\$65,000	\$3,570,500	161	174	-7.47%	10	155
Menneval	LSD	\$1,280,200	\$69,800	\$1,350,000	55	51	7.84%	5	50
White's Brook B	LDS	\$1,031,850	\$22,200	\$1,054,050	41	62	-33.87%	0	35
Totals		\$336,189,000	\$49,196,800	\$385,385,800	6403	6433	-0.47%	445	6205

Regional Service District 1

Entity	Group Type	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
1	Group A	\$320,212,400	4404	4706	-6.42%	245	3985
2	Group B	\$1,558,040,300	20306	20519	-1.04%	1030	18810
3	Group A	\$328,755,200	5906	6039	-2.20%	255	5480
4	Group A	\$870,714,800	8992	9550	-5.84%	1385	7430
5	Group A	\$556,189,500	9429	10151	-7.11%	8115	1600
6	Group A	\$385,385,800	6403	6433	-0.47%	445	6205
	Totals	\$4,019,298,000	55440	57398	-3.41%	11475	43510

Regional Service District 2: Entities 7 to 9

Entity 7 : Regional Service District 2

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Campbellton	City	\$515,213,000	\$57,590,300	\$572,803,300	6883	7385	-6.80%	2940	3455
Atholville	Village	\$143,314,300	\$61,321,600	\$204,635,900	3570	3778	-5.51%	395	3135
Tidehead	Village	\$55,756,800	\$3,736,100	\$59,492,900	938	1036	-9.46%	520	410
Glencoe	LSD	\$8,165,400	\$272,100	\$8,437,500	207	216	-4.17%	120	85
McLeods	LSD	\$26,606,700	\$433,200	\$27,039,900	372	381	-2.36%	140	220
Flatlands	LSD	\$6,718,300	\$344,800	\$7,063,100	143	170	-15.88%	115	20
Mann Mountain	LSD	\$3,328,800	\$170,700	\$3,499,500	51	43	18.60%	45	5
Blair-Athol	LSD	\$1,557,300	\$0	\$1,557,300	54	49	10.20%	5	50
Addington	LSD	\$11,270,200	\$288,700	\$11,558,900	255	288	-11.46%	475	180
Totals		\$771,930,800	\$124,157,500	\$896,088,300	12473	13346	-6.54%	4755	7560

Entity 8 : Regional Service District 2

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Dalhousie	Town	\$163,713,300	\$43,653,800	\$207,367,100	3126	3512	-10.99%	1585	1350
Eel River Crossing	Village	\$71,594,600	\$8,315,800	\$79,910,400	1953	2032	-3.89%	1585	10
Balmoral	Village	\$93,937,000	\$5,528,100	\$99,465,100	1674	1719	-2.62%	110	1545
Charlo	Village	\$76,780,900	\$6,743,500	\$83,524,400	1310	1324	-1.06%	455	845
Point La Nim	LSD	\$13,457,900	\$190,000	\$13,647,900	231	259	-10.81%	145	75
Dalhousie Junction	LSD	\$21,594,600	\$640,600	\$22,235,200	396	427	-7.26%	195	5
Balmoral-St. Maure	LSD	\$5,499,500	\$22,000	\$5,521,500	148	147	0.68%	20	130
Dalhousie	LSD	\$2,558,500	\$441,200	\$2,999,700	68	56	21.43%	495	550
Balmoral-Maltais	LSD	\$5,499,500	\$22,000	\$5,521,500	76	64	18.75%	35	240
Totals		\$454,635,800	\$65,557,000	\$520,192,800	8982	9540	-5.85%	4625	4750

Entity 9 : Regional Service District 2

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Belledune	Village	\$61,501,600	\$218,059,600	\$279,561,200	1417	1548	-8.46%	1230	185
Lorne	LSD	\$11,363,100	\$176,100	\$11,539,200	600	682	-12.02%	420	165
Chaleur	LSD	\$35,996,400	\$7,655,300	\$43,651,700	103	45	128.89%	1005	275
Totals		\$108,861,100	\$225,891,000	\$334,752,100	2120	2275	-6.81%	2655	625

Regional Service District 2

Entity	Group Type	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
7	Group B	\$896,088,300	12473	13346	-6.54%	4755	7560
8	Group A	\$520,192,800	8982	9540	-5.85%	4625	4750
9	Group A	\$334,752,100	2120	2275	-6.81%	2655	460
	Totals	\$1,751,033,200	23575	25161	-6.30%	12035	12770

Regional Service District 3: Entities 10 to 11

Entity 10 : Regional Service District 3

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Beresford	Town	\$244,058,100	\$29,633,500	\$273,691,600	4351	4288	-1.45%	730	3515
Nigadoo	Village	\$48,109,400	\$4,856,400	\$52,965,800	952	963	1.16%	85	875
Petit-Rocher	Village	\$98,118,200	\$7,853,000	\$105,971,200	1908	1897	-0.58%	130	1710
Pointe-Verte	Village	\$42,974,700	\$740,600	\$43,715,300	976	886	-9.22%	90	795
Beresford	LSD	\$98,833,500	\$1,902,400	\$100,735,900	2522	2517	-0.20%	165	2355
Madran	LSD	\$8,154,400	\$89,800	\$8,244,200	276	260	-5.80%	15	240
Petit-Rocher-Nord	LSD	\$26,056,300	\$405,600	\$26,461,900	567	572	0.88%	40	530
Petit-Rocher-Sud	LSD	\$21,087,800	\$900,600	\$21,988,400	220	225	2.27%	30	195
LaPlante	LSD	\$10,066,800	\$200,300	\$10,267,100	312	328	5.13%	20	285
Tremblay	LSD	\$17,075,600	\$242,100	\$17,317,700	460	459	-0.22%	30	415
Robertville	LSD	\$50,837,400	\$613,300	\$51,450,700	895	937	4.69%	55	795
Dunlop	LSD	\$51,819,100	\$1,296,900	\$53,116,000	1002	950	-5.19%	175	770
Totals		\$717,191,300	\$48,734,500	\$765,925,800	14441	14282	1.11%	1565	12480

Entity 11 : Regional Service District 3

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Bathurst	City	\$782,630,900	\$197,877,600	\$980,508,500	12275	11897	-3.08%	5660	5660
North Tetagouche	LSD	\$59,390,000	\$246,800	\$59,636,800	933	945	1.29%	385	550
Big River	LSD	\$31,999,900	\$2,111,800	\$34,111,700	759	721	-5.01%	480	235
Bathurst	LSD	\$133,153,400	\$18,194,000	\$151,347,400	3287	3131	-4.75%	1215	1535
New Bandon-Salmon Beach A	LSD	\$25,007,800	\$287,850	\$25,295,650	462	459	-0.65%	430	35
New Bandon-Salmon Beach B	LSD	\$25,007,800	\$287,850	\$25,295,650	333	354	6.31%	310	40
Allardville	LSD	\$49,717,200	\$4,487,200	\$54,204,400	2081	2032	-2.35%	80	1930
Totals		\$1,106,907,000	\$223,493,100	\$1,330,400,100	20130	19539	3.02%	8560	9985

Regional Service District 3

Entity	Group Type	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
10	Group B	\$765,925,800	14441	14282	1.11%	1565	12480
11	Group B	\$1,330,400,100	20130	19539	3.02%	8550	9320
Totals		\$2,096,325,900	34571	33821	2.22%	10115	21800

Regional Service District 4: Entities 12 to 16

Entity 12 : Regional Service District 4

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Landry Office	LSD	\$21,065,000	\$308,400	\$21,373,400	417	398	4.77%	25	380
Notre-Dame-des-Erables A	LSD	\$5,584,650	\$11,750	\$5,596,400	782	705	10.92%	5	770
Notre-Dame-des-Erables B	LSD	\$5,584,650	\$11,750	\$5,596,400	52	52	0.00%	5	45
Paquetville	Village	\$43,031,000	\$6,915,700	\$49,946,700	720	706	1.98%	20	670
Paquetville	LSD	\$58,176,900	\$1,858,500	\$60,035,400	1547	1799	-14.01%	45	1480
Saint-Isidore	Village	\$44,960,400	\$4,213,100	\$49,173,500	764	748	2.14%	15	750
Saint-Isidore	LSD	\$56,707,000	\$16,131,200	\$72,838,200	1361	1368	-0.51%	20	1340
Saint-Sauveur	LSD	\$27,045,000	\$324,600	\$27,369,600	673	671	0.30%	10	665
Totals		\$262,154,600	\$29,775,000	\$291,929,600	6316	6447	-2.03%	145	6100

Entity 13: Regional Service District 4

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Anse-Bleue	LSD	\$12,015,900	\$1,058,400	\$13,074,300	327	345	-5.22%	5	325
Bas-Caraquet	Village	\$60,065,000	\$9,286,400	\$69,351,400	1305	1380	-5.43%	20	1280
Bertrand	Village	\$56,501,700	\$3,683,500	\$60,185,200	1166	1142	2.10%	30	1135
Blanchard Settlement	LSD	\$16,788,800	\$1,608,800	\$18,397,600	394	398	-1.01%	10	380
Caraquet	Town	\$311,083,400	\$54,969,500	\$366,052,900	4248	4169	1.89%	75	4010
Caraquet	LSD	\$1,011,700	\$130,600	\$1,142,300	15	10	50.00%	-5	15
Dugas	LSD	\$2,468,600	\$36,800	\$2,505,400	67	60	11.67%	0	65
Grande-Anse	Village	\$31,932,600	\$3,682,900	\$35,615,500	899	738	21.82%	95	805
Maisonnette	Village	\$24,324,700	\$1,633,900	\$25,958,600	495	573	-13.61%	15	480
New Bandon	LSD	\$9,687,500	\$53,900	\$9,741,400	685	638	7.37%	525	210
Poirier	LSD	\$3,936,900	\$87,400	\$4,024,300	83	95	-12.63%	0	85
Pokesudie	LSD	\$6,533,400	\$221,700	\$6,755,100	228	250	-8.80%	5	220
Saint-Léolin	Village	\$20,422,800	\$358,000	\$20,780,800	647	684	-5.41%	20	630
St. Simon	LSD	\$27,981,700	\$1,122,400	\$29,104,100	700	724	-3.31%	20	675
Totals		\$584,754,700	\$77,934,200	\$662,688,900	11259	11206	0.47%	815	10315

Entity 14: Regional Service District 4

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Cap-Bateau	LSD	\$6,233,000	\$8,400	\$6,241,400	262	276	-5.07%	0	220
Chiasson-Savoy	LSD	\$18,737,600	\$1,647,100	\$20,384,700	456	466	-2.15%	0	455
Coteau Road	LSD	\$12,440,700	\$1,022,900	\$13,463,600	410	449	-8.69%	0	415
Haut-Lameque	LSD	\$10,694,400	\$2,922,400	\$13,616,800	285	306	-6.86%	0	280
Lamèque	Town	\$73,192,300	\$16,981,200	\$90,173,500	1285	1432	-10.27%	10	1215
Miscou Island	LSD	\$25,099,400	\$1,884,400	\$26,983,800	530	585	-9.40%	110	415
Petite-Lameque	LSD	\$15,871,000	\$167,700	\$16,038,700	364	383	-4.96%	10	360
Pigeon Hill	LSD	\$17,161,600	\$605,800	\$17,767,400	443	489	-9.41%	5	440
Pointe Alexandre	LSD	\$18,665,800	\$931,800	\$19,597,600	303	317	-4.42%	0	300
Pointe Canot	LSD	\$8,344,200	\$42,900	\$8,387,100	247	254	-2.76%	5	245
Sainte-Marie-Saint-Raphaël	Village	\$31,104,100	\$1,934,700	\$33,038,800	879	955	-7.96%	10	870
Shippagan	LSD	\$2,855,100	\$6,551,500	\$9,406,600	241	220	9.55%	-70	445
Ste. Cécile	LSD	\$25,473,900	\$1,884,500	\$27,358,400	732	729	0.41%	15	560
Totals		\$265,873,100	\$36,585,300	\$302,458,400	6437	6861	-6.18%	95	6220

Entity 15 : Regional Service District 4

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Baie du Petit Pokemouche	LSD	\$7,655,800	\$79,100	\$7,734,900	162	176	-7.95%	0	165
Evangéline	LSD	\$11,246,900	\$349,200	\$11,596,100	368	356	3.37%	0	325
Haut-Shippagan	LSD	\$11,192,100	\$1,050,200	\$12,242,300	280	271	3.32%	5	280
Pointe Sauvage/Indian Point	LSD	\$2,166,900	\$4,400	\$2,171,300	85	83	2.41%	85	45
Inkerman Centre	LSD	\$33,195,300	\$4,509,500	\$37,704,800	816	786	3.82%	0	755
Le Goulet	Village	\$26,393,300	\$517,000	\$26,910,300	793	817	-2.94%	10	760
Pokemouche	LSD	\$39,550,300	\$8,078,500	\$47,628,800	490	518	-5.41%	25	465
Shippagan	Town	\$188,925,300	\$35,864,400	\$224,789,700	2580	2631	-1.94%	55	2475
Totals		\$320,325,900	\$50,452,300	\$370,778,200	5574	5638	-1.14%	180	5270

Entity 16 : Regional Service District 4

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Tracadie	RM	\$908,180,700	\$107,571,400	\$1,015,752,100	16114	16137	-0.14%	365	15405
Totals		\$908,180,700	\$107,571,400	\$1,015,752,100	16114	16137	-0.14%	365	15405

Regional Service District 4

Entity	Group Type	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
12	Group A	\$291,929,600	6316	6447	-2.03%	145	6100
13	Group B	\$662,688,900	11259	11206	0.47%	385	10280
14	Group A	\$302,458,400	6437	6861	-6.18%	95	6220
15	Group A	\$370,778,200	5574	5638	-1.14%	180	5270
16	Group B	\$1,015,752,100	16114	16137	-0.14%	365	15405
Totals		\$2,643,607,200	45700	46289	-1.27%	1170	43275

Regional Service District 5: Entities 17 to 21

Entity 17 : Regional Service District 5

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Alnwick	LSD	\$54,891,800	\$2,444,800	\$57,336,600	1594	1744	-8.60%	310	1285
Fair Isle	LSD	\$34,890,300	\$722,300	\$35,612,600	936	939	-0.32%	70	855
Neguac	Village	\$105,788,400	\$16,094,400	\$121,882,800	1684	1678	0.36%	195	1420
Oak Point-Bartibog Bridge	LSD	\$20,190,300	\$73,600	\$20,263,900	249	255	-2.35%	190	50
Tabusintac	LSD	\$50,250,000	\$2,699,300	\$52,949,300	861	833	3.36%	360	475
Totals		\$266,010,800	\$22,034,400	\$288,045,200	5324	5449	-2.29%	1125	4085

Entity 18 : Regional Service District 5

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Black River-Hardwicke A	LSD	\$34,596,200	\$1,144,350	\$35,740,550	690	691	-0.14%	475	200
Black River-Hardwicke B	LSD	\$34,596,200	\$1,144,350	\$35,740,550	358	377	-5.04%	340	15
Chatham	LSD	\$31,956,200	\$2,856,400	\$34,812,600	511	522	-2.11%	485	25
Glennelg	LSD	\$47,670,400	\$2,664,300	\$50,334,700	944	954	-1.05%	890	50
Hardwicke	LSD	\$2,006,700	\$2,953,300	\$4,960,000	26	39	-33.33%	755	1425
Lower Newcastle-Russellville	LSD	--	--	--	352	363	-3.03%	280	65
Miramichi	City	\$1,109,974,300	\$287,632,000	\$1,397,606,300	17537	17811	-1.54%	15745	1440
Newcastle	LSD	\$28,423,500	\$780,800	\$29,204,300	784	857	-8.52%	500	270
Northesk	LSD	\$90,821,800	\$13,417,300	\$104,239,100	1474	1584	-6.94%	1410	65
Southesk	LSD	\$93,858,600	\$1,751,800	\$95,610,400	1694	1833	-7.58%	1605	60
St. Margarets	LSD	\$8,044,900	\$192,000	\$8,236,900	258	279	-7.53%	235	30
Sunny Corner	LSD	\$50,722,800	\$2,663,400	\$53,386,200	789	749	5.34%	775	10
Totals		\$1,532,671,600	\$317,200,000	\$1,849,871,600	25417	26059	-2.46%	23495	3655

Entity 19 : Regional Service District 5

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Blissfield	LSD	\$21,071,700	\$498,100	\$21,569,800	451	501	-9.98%	445	5
Doaktown	Village	\$34,625,100	\$15,175,600	\$49,800,700	792	793	-0.13%	775	15
Stanley	Village	\$26,165,000	\$2,664,100	\$28,829,100	412	419	-1.67%	375	5
Stanley	LSD	\$45,241,300	\$1,091,000	\$46,332,300	832	903	-7.86%	810	20
Upper Miramichi	RC	\$110,512,500	\$4,070,000	\$114,582,500	2218	2373	-6.53%	2165	25
Totals		\$237,615,600	\$23,498,800	\$261,114,400	4705	4989	-5.69%	4570	70

Entity 20 : Regional Service District 5

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Blackville	Village	\$44,587,600	\$3,553,900	\$48,141,500	958	990	-3.23%	930	15
Blackville	LSD	\$69,519,700	\$1,135,400	\$70,655,100	1305	1384	-5.71%	1285	10
Derby	LSD	\$39,786,900	\$750,300	\$40,537,200	670	702	-4.56%	640	25
Nelson	LSD	\$47,792,400	\$1,231,400	\$49,023,800	957	935	2.35%	900	55
Renous-Quarryville A	LSD	\$19,184,050	\$27,106,800	\$46,290,850	723	831	-13.00%	585	15
Renous-Quarryville B	LSD	\$19,184,050	\$27,106,800	\$46,290,850	306	296	3.38%	290	0
Totals		\$240,054,700	\$60,884,600	\$300,939,300	4919	5138	-4.26%	4630	120

Entity 21 : Regional Service District 5

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Acadieville	LSD	\$16,977,000	\$843,600	\$17,820,600	709	744	-4.70%	90	615
Colette	LSD	\$15,979,700	\$219,100	\$16,198,800	456	543	-16.02%	75	375
Rogersville	Village	\$49,412,300	\$5,081,500	\$54,493,800	1166	1170	-0.34%	95	975
Rogersville	LSD	\$25,545,000	\$1,221,400	\$26,766,400	646	670	-3.58%	110	510
Saint-Louis	LSD	\$49,622,600	\$3,014,900	\$52,637,500	1802	1741	3.50%	170	1615
Totals		\$157,536,600	\$10,380,500	\$167,917,100	4779	4868	-1.83%	540	4090

Regional Service District 5

Entity	Group Type	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
17	Group A	\$288,045,200	5324	5449	-2.29%	1125	4085
18	Group B	\$1,849,871,600	25417	26059	-2.46%	23495	3655
19	Group A	\$261,114,400	4705	4989	-5.69%	4570	70
20	Group A	\$300,939,300	4919	5138	-4.26%	4630	120
21	Group A	\$167,917,100	4779	4868	-1.83%	540	4090
Totals		\$2,867,887,600	45144	46503	-2.92%	34360	12020

Regional Service District 6: Entities 22 to 25

Entity 22 : Regional Service District 6

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Baie Ste. Anne	LSD	\$58,969,900	\$3,453,800	\$62,423,700	1319	1387	-4.90%	215	1095
Carleton	LSD	\$11,815,500	\$1,162,500	\$12,978,000	231	420	-45.00%	130	575
Escuminac	LSD	\$9,747,100	\$2,441,400	\$12,188,500	166	212	-21.70%	60	105
Hardwicke	LSD	\$2,006,700	\$2,953,300	\$4,960,000	26	39	-33.33%	480	225
Pointe-Sapin	LSD	\$19,624,600	\$6,484,000	\$26,108,600	477	350	36.29%	30	450
Saint-Charles	LSD	\$39,868,100	\$1,657,600	\$41,525,700	1102	1114	-1.08%	70	1570
Saint-Ignace	LSD	\$23,093,500	\$488,100	\$23,581,600	567	606	-6.44%	55	505
Saint-Louis	LSD	\$50,751,200	\$3,014,900	\$52,637,500	1235	1135	3.50%	115	1110
Saint-Louis-de-Kent	Village	\$53,100,100	\$5,336,400	\$58,436,500	856	930	-7.96%	120	710
Totals		\$268,976,700	\$26,992,000	\$294,840,100	5979	6193	-3.46%	1275	6345

Entity 23 : Regional Service District 6

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Aldouane	LSD	\$54,070,700	\$742,200	\$54,812,900	895	868	3.11%	165	715
Cap-de-Richibucto	LSD	\$56,903,400	\$3,349,900	\$60,253,300	989	1011	-2.18%	225	765
Harcourt	LSD	\$18,166,000	\$1,946,400	\$20,112,400	346	390	-11.28%	270	70
Rexton	Village	\$77,172,700	\$5,165,200	\$82,337,900	830	818	1.47%	545	245
Richibucto	Town	\$63,649,600	\$32,635,300	\$96,284,900	1266	1286	-1.56%	440	805
Richibucto	LSD	\$85,624,400	\$7,799,700	\$93,424,100	752	827	-9.07%	500	240
Weldford	LSD	\$81,952,200	\$3,423,500	\$85,375,700	1338	1318	1.52%	1145	190
Totals		\$437,539,000	\$55,062,200	\$492,601,200	6416	6518		3290	3030

Entity 24 : Regional Service District 6

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Boucoucher	Town	\$165,709,800	\$38,192,800	\$203,902,600	2361	2423	-2.56%	215	2085
Saint Mary	LSD	\$112,353,200	\$2,347,400	\$114,700,600	1742	1730	0.69%	300	1420
Sainte-Anne-de-Kent A	LSD	\$40,403,050	\$1,380,900	\$41,783,950	902	899	0.33%	115	785
Sainte-Anne-de-Kent B	LSD	\$40,403,050	\$1,380,900	\$41,783,950	146	148	-1.35%	15	125
Wellington	LSD	\$155,796,600	\$4,667,000	\$160,463,600	2089	2103	-0.67%	370	1700
Totals		\$514,665,700	\$47,969,000	\$562,634,700	7240	7303	-0.86%	1015	6115

Entity 25 : Regional Service District 6

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Cocagne	RC	\$203,659,300	\$8,568,700	\$212,228,000	2649	2540	4.29%	495	260
Dundas	LSD	\$93,039,300	\$5,249,700	\$98,289,000	1500	1633	-8.14%	905	2840
Grand Saint-Antoine A	LSD	\$8,590,633	\$1,490,900	\$10,081,533	230	278	-17.27%	40	195
Grand Saint-Antoine B	LSD	\$8,590,633	\$1,490,900	\$10,081,533	153	155	-1.29%	15	140
Grand Saint-Antoine C	LSD	\$8,590,633	\$1,490,900	\$10,081,533	88	97	-9.28%	30	60
Saint-Paul	LSD	\$33,872,200	\$1,430,200	\$35,302,400	842	866	-2.77%	355	480
Saint-Antoine	Village	\$101,544,400	\$7,884,800	\$109,429,200	1733	1770	-2.09%	200	1440
Totals		\$254,227,800	\$19,037,400	\$273,265,200	4546	4799	-5.27%	1545	5155

Regional Service District 6

Entity	Group Type	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
22	Group A	\$294,840,100	5979	6193	0.00%	905	5500
23	Group A	\$492,601,200	6416	6518	0.00%	3290	3030
24	Group A	\$562,634,700	7240	7303	-0.86%	1015	6115
25	Group A	\$273,265,200	4546	4799	-5.27%	1035	3410
Totals		\$1,623,341,200	24181	24813	-2.55%	6245	18055

Regional Service District 7: Entities 26 to 34

Entity 26 : Regional Service District 7

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Brunswick	LSD	\$9,408,250	\$7,196,500	\$16,604,750	102	96	5.73%	90	10
Salisbury	Village	\$145,173,800	\$23,926,900	\$169,100,700	2284	2208	3.44%	2165	95
Salisbury	LSD	\$204,527,600	\$22,884,400	\$227,412,000	3388	3417	-0.85%	3255	80
Petitcodiac	Village	\$78,083,200	\$9,593,400	\$87,676,600	1383	1429	-3.22%	1365	20
Coverdale	LSD	\$168,071,650	\$3,335,650	\$171,407,300	2233	2201	1.48%	2100	125
Elgin	LSD	\$10,768,100	\$699,400	\$11,467,500	203	206	-1.46%	195	5
Parish of Elgin	LSD	\$50,332,000	\$15,374,600	\$65,706,600	689	968	-28.82%	660	30
Havelock Inside	LSD	\$16,346,100	\$3,261,700	\$19,607,800	310	365	-15.07%	310	0
Totals		\$682,710,700	\$86,272,550	\$768,983,250	10592	10890	-2.74%	10140	365

Entity 27 : Regional Service District 7

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Moncton	City	\$5,658,965,000	\$2,035,473,700	\$7,694,438,700	71889	69074	4.08%	47380	22055
Moncton (Irishtown, Painsec, M	LSD	\$789,037,300	\$68,517,500	\$857,554,800	8722	8892	-1.91%	6445	2220
Totals		\$6,448,002,300	\$2,103,991,200	\$8,551,993,500	80611	77966	3.39%	53825	24275

Entity 28 : Regional Service District 7

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Scoudouc Road	LSD	\$16,508,500	\$2,426,800	\$18,935,300	193	185	4.32%	105	80
Grande-Digue	LSD	\$271,554,400	\$4,931,000	\$276,485,400	2261	2182	3.62%	510	1745
Shediac Bridge-Shediac River	LSD	\$151,913,700	\$3,680,900	\$155,594,600	1098	1158	-5.18%	310	780
Shediac	Town	\$517,196,900	\$128,030,800	\$645,227,700	6664	6053	10.09%	1690	4485
Pointe-du-Chêne	LSD	\$165,020,100	\$5,589,600	\$170,609,700	716	761	-5.91%	505	210
Shediac Cape	LSD	\$119,022,600	\$4,272,100	\$123,294,700	838	837	0.12%	490	340
Shediac	LSD	\$27,416,200	\$3,216,100	\$30,632,300	935	980	-4.59%	445	500
Scoudouc A	LSD	\$32,518,950	\$14,459,150	\$46,978,100	1009	996	1.31%	260	730
Scoudouc B	LSD	\$32,518,950	\$14,459,150	\$46,978,100	75	76	-1.32%	30	30
Totals		\$1,333,670,300	\$181,065,600	\$1,514,735,900	13789	13228	4.24%	4345	8900

Entity 29 : Regional Service District 7

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Beaubassin East	RC	\$598,928,300	\$37,576,500	\$636,504,800	6376	6200	2.84%	1345	4995
Cap-Pelé	Village	\$164,824,900	\$28,758,700	\$193,583,600	2425	2256	7.49%	480	1805
Totals		\$763,753,200	\$66,335,200	\$830,088,400	8801	8456	4.08%	1825	6800

Entity 30 : Regional Service District 7

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Sackville	Town	\$578,109,500	\$52,881,000	\$630,990,500	5331	5558	-4.08%	4980	180
Dorchester	Village	\$26,432,100	\$22,084,600	\$48,516,700	1096	1167	-6.08%	395	5
Dorchester	LSD	\$14,055,800	\$1,682,000	\$15,737,800	429	477	-10.06%	350	75
Sackville	LSD	\$83,858,600	\$15,109,000	\$98,967,600	1182	1336	-11.53%	1120	60
Pointe de Bute	LSD	\$23,933,200	\$5,430,000	\$29,363,200	571	564	1.24%	555	10
Westmorland	LSD	\$16,128,800	\$3,283,800	\$19,412,600	21	26	-19.23%	20	5
Baie-Verte	LSD	\$16,201,200	\$3,342,500	\$19,543,700	316	374	-15.51%	310	10
Port Elgin	Village	\$18,938,500	\$4,125,400	\$23,063,900	408	418	-2.39%	360	20
Botsford	LSD	\$65,524,300	\$1,446,200	\$66,970,500	579	569	1.76%	885	25
Murray Corner	LSD	\$69,745,600	\$426,700	\$70,172,300	368	356	3.37%	40	25
Bayfield	LSD	\$2,011,800	\$66,000	\$2,077,800	34	41	-17.07%	0	0
Cap Tormentine	LSD	\$7,274,600	\$312,000	\$7,586,600	77	108	-28.70%	75	0
Totals		\$922,214,000	\$110,189,200	\$1,032,403,200	10412	10994	-5.29%	9090	415

Entity 31 : Regional Service District 7

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Memramcook	Village	\$299,382,000	\$17,044,600	\$316,426,600	4778	4831	-1.10%	930	3800
Dorchester (Calhoun Rd)	LSD	\$5,681,200	\$57,300	\$5,738,500					
Totals		\$305,063,200	\$17,101,900	\$322,165,100	4778	4831	-1.10%	930	3800

Entity 32 : Regional Service District 7

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Dieppe	City	\$2,118,262,700	\$770,065,900	\$2,888,328,600	25384	23310	8.90%	6660	18070
Greater Lakeburn	LSD	\$73,964,700	\$1,927,900	\$75,892,600	1014	453	123.84%	250	750
Totals		\$2,192,227,400	\$771,993,800	\$2,964,221,200	26398	23763	11.09%	6910	18820

Entity 33 : Regional Service District 7

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Riverview	Town	\$1,380,589,300	\$120,898,400	\$1,501,487,700	19667	19128	2.82%	17880	1560
Coverdale	LSD	\$204,527,600	\$22,884,400	\$227,412,000	3388	3417	1.48%	3255	80
Totals		\$1,585,116,900	\$143,782,800	\$1,728,899,700	23055	22545	2.26%	21135	1640

Entity 34 : Regional Service District 7

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Alma	Village	\$24,936,500	\$3,381,100	\$28,317,600	213	232	-8.19%	195	10
Alma	LSD	\$4,583,000	\$1,775,500	\$6,358,500	5	0	0.00%	0	0
Harvey	LSD	\$23,114,200	\$5,122,500	\$28,236,700	333	376	-11.44%	315	15
Riverside-Albert	Village	\$21,251,300	\$877,000	\$22,128,300	350	353	-0.85%	295	5
Hopewell	LAS	\$29,133,100	\$3,718,400	\$32,851,500	647	643	0.62%	620	15
Hillsborough	Village	\$80,816,800	\$3,820,300	\$84,637,100	1277	1350	-5.41%	1220	35
Hillsborough	LSD	\$76,076,200	\$1,713,600	\$77,789,800	1308	1395	-6.24%	1270	35
Totals		\$259,911,100	\$20,408,400	\$280,319,500	4133	4349	-4.97%	3915	115

Regional Service District 7

Entity	Group Type	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
26	Group B	\$768,983,250	10592	10890	-2.74%	10140	365
27	Group C	\$8,551,993,500	80611	77966	3.39%	53825	24275
28	Group B	\$1,514,735,900	13789	13228	4.24%	4345	8900
29	Group A	\$830,088,400	8801	8456	4.08%	1825	6800
30	Group B	\$1,032,403,200	10412	10994	-5.29%	9090	415
31	Group A	\$322,165,100	4778	4831	-1.10%	930	3800
32	Group B	\$2,964,221,200	26398	23763	11.09%	6910	18820
33	Group B	\$1,672,895,000	21900	21328.5	2.68%	19980	1685
34	Group A	\$280,319,500	4133	4349	-4.97%	3915	115
Totals		\$17,937,805,050	181414	175805	3.19%	110960	65175

Regional Service District 8: Entities 35 to 36

Entity 35 : Regional Service District 8

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Sussex	Town	\$274,341,100	\$97,381,400	\$371,722,500	4282	4312	-0.70%	4125	65
Sussex Corner	Village	\$88,993,200	\$9,106,200	\$98,099,400	1461	1495	-2.27%	1430	30
Brunswick	LSD	\$9,408,250	\$7,196,500	\$98,099,400	102	96	5.73%	90	10
Johnston	LSD	\$54,677,300	\$2,869,300	\$57,546,600	560	660	-15.15%	550	15
Havelock Outside	LSD	\$48,518,800	\$4,968,300	\$53,487,100	1061	1158	-8.38%	1035	25
Studholm	LSD	\$179,042,500	\$7,138,100	\$186,180,600	3522	3612	-2.49%	3455	45
Cardwell	LSD	\$87,442,900	\$62,700,900	\$150,143,800	1353	1414	-4.31%	1320	35
Waterford	LSD	\$36,217,200	\$723,100	\$36,940,300	469	458	2.40%	465	5
Hammond	LSD	\$14,585,600	\$809,100	\$15,394,700	251	295	-14.92%	245	5
Sussex	LSD	\$170,077,500	\$20,231,900	\$190,309,400	2516	2529	-0.51%	2450	40
Totals		\$963,304,350	\$213,124,800	\$1,257,923,800	15577	16029	-2.82%	15165	275

Entity 36 : Regional Service District 8

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Norton	Town	\$72,859,800	\$3,627,500	\$76,487,300	1382	1301	6.23%	1355	15
Norton	Village	\$89,071,100	\$1,847,000	\$90,918,100	1302	1296	0.46%	1260	30
Springfield	LSD	\$140,404,100	\$2,766,100	\$143,170,200	1525	1652	-7.69%	1480	25
Wickham	LSD	\$58,073,900	\$284,500	\$58,358,400	427	426	0.23%	420	10
Kars	LSD	\$54,891,400	\$613,300	\$55,504,700	25	407	-93.86%	320	0
Totals		\$415,300,300	\$9,138,400	\$424,438,700	4661	5082	-8.28%	4835	80

Regional Service District 8

Entity	Group Type	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
35	Group B	\$1,257,923,800	15267	15664	-2.54%	14855	275
36	Group A	\$424,438,700	4661	5082	-8.28%	4835	80
Totals		\$1,682,362,500	19928	20746	-3.95%	19690	355

Regional Service District 9: Entities 37 to 41

Entity 37 : Regional Service District 9

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
St. Martins	Village	\$20,150,300	\$1,443,800	\$21,594,100	276	314	-12.10%	275	0
Saint Martins	LSD	\$69,915,600	\$691,300	\$70,606,900	1132	1145	-1.14%	1115	15
Simonds	LSD	\$204,154,000	\$1,654,700	\$205,808,700	3549	3544	0.14%	3450	100
Fairfield	LSD	\$17,788,000	\$5,400	\$17,793,400	294	284	3.52%	290	5
Rothsay	LSD	\$23,598,800	\$308,100	\$23,906,900	325	347	-6.34%	290	30
Totals		\$335,606,700	\$4,103,300	\$339,710,000	5576	5634	-1.03%	5420	150

Entity 38 : Regional Service District 9

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Upham	LSD	\$74,049,900	\$637,800	\$74,687,700	1269	1306	-2.83%	1245	20
Hampton	Town	\$333,272,200	\$24,452,400	\$357,724,600	4289	4292	-0.07%	4090	110
Hampton	LSD	\$227,180,600	\$3,086,600	\$230,267,200	2809	2734	2.74%	2680	100
Totals		\$634,502,700	\$28,176,800	\$662,679,500	8367	8332	0.42%	8015	230

Entity 39 : Regional Service District 9

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Rothsay	Town	\$1,205,879,600	\$82,771,900	\$1,288,651,500	11659	11892	-1.96%	11135	450
Quispamsis	Town	\$1,691,674,100	\$72,727,800	\$1,764,401,900	18245	17941	1.69%	17235	810
Kingston	LSD	\$296,444,500	\$2,784,400	\$299,228,900	2913	2952	-1.32%	2825	70
Westfield (East)	LSD	\$65,393,100	\$379,800	\$65,772,900	600	640	-6.25%	590	15
Totals		\$3,259,391,300	\$158,663,900	\$3,418,055,200	33417	33425	-0.02%	31785	1345

Entity 40 : Regional Service District 9

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Saint John	City	\$4,275,036,840	\$1,851,765,400	\$6,126,802,240	67575	70063	-3.55%	62695	2670
Musquash	LSD	\$76,573,500	\$296,474,900	\$373,048,400	1194	1200	-0.50%	1150	40
Totals		\$4,351,610,340	\$2,148,240,300	\$6,499,850,640	68769	71263	-3.50%	63845	2710

Entity 41 : Regional Service District 9

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Grand Bay-Westfield	Town	\$368,832,400	\$9,125,300	\$377,957,700	4964	5117	-2.99%	4770	185
Westfield	LSD	\$93,482,100	\$1,542,200	\$95,024,300	762	828	-7.97%	1285	40
Petersville	LSD	\$27,885,500	\$3,300,200	\$31,185,700	681	723	-5.81%	650	30
Greenwich	LSD	\$72,614,700	\$1,211,600	\$73,826,300	1058	1047	1.05%	1045	15
Totals		\$562,814,700	\$15,179,300	\$577,994,000	7465	7715	-3.24%	7750	270

Regional Service District 9

Entity	Group Type	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
37	Group A	\$339,710,000	5576	5634	-1.03%	5420	150
38	Group A	\$662,679,500	8367	8332	0.42%	8015	230
39	Group B	\$3,418,055,200	33417	33425	-0.02%	31785	1345
40	Group C	\$6,499,850,640	68769	71263	-3.50%	63845	2710
41	Group A	\$577,994,000	7261	7489	-3.04%	7560	255
Totals		\$11,498,289,340	123390	126143	-2.18%	116625	4690

Regional Service District 10: Entities 42 to 46

Entity 42 : Regional Service District 10

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Grand Manan	Village	\$173,914,600	\$21,777,200	\$195,691,800	2360	2377	-0.72%	2310	15
Grand Manan	LSD	\$1,061,100	\$110,200	\$1,171,300	145	162	-10.49%	140	5
	Totals	\$174,975,700	\$21,887,400	\$196,863,100	2505	2539	-1.34%	2450	20

Entity 43 : Regional Service District 10

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Campobello Island	RC	\$90,837,700	\$4,994,200	\$95,831,900	872	925	-5.73%	840	10
	Totals	\$90,837,700	\$4,994,200	\$95,831,900	872	925	-5.73%	840	10

Entity 44 : Regional Service District 10

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
St. George	Town	\$92,014,900	\$31,485,800	\$123,500,700	1517	1543	-1.69%	1475	25
Blacks Harbour	Village	\$32,929,200	\$17,187,200	\$50,116,400	894	982	-8.96%	810	60
Lepreau	LSD	\$58,894,500	\$15,600,600	\$74,495,100	707	752	-5.98%	685	25
Pennfield	LSD	\$106,300,200	\$27,051,700	\$133,351,900	1893	1908	-0.79%	1810	65
Beaver Harbour	LSD	\$13,305,400	\$633,300	\$13,938,700	277	310	-10.65%	270	5
Fundy Bay	LSD	\$59,619,300	\$8,042,300	\$67,661,600	1167	1353	-13.75%	1155	10
Saint George	LSD	\$69,809,400	\$29,940,600	\$99,750,000	793	716	10.75%	785	10
West Isles	LSD	\$44,400,500	\$4,384,100	\$48,784,600	797	731	9.03%	770	25
Bonny-River - Second Falls	LSD	\$19,385,900	\$1,194,800	\$20,580,700	381	402	-5.22%	375	5
	Totals	\$496,659,300	\$135,520,400	\$632,179,700	8426	8697	-3.12%	8135	230

Entity 45 : Regional Service District 10

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Saint Andrews	Town	\$268,545,300	\$40,281,400	\$308,826,700	1786	1889	-5.45%	1675	45
Saint Patrick	LSD	\$79,498,200	\$12,628,900	\$92,127,100	689	647	6.49%	680	10
Saint Croix	LSD	\$11,587,800	\$4,655,700	\$16,243,500	657	616	6.66%	650	5
Bayside	LSD	\$46,154,400	\$14,223,200	\$60,377,600	347	304	14.14%	345	5
Chamcook	LSD	\$70,652,400	\$2,609,400	\$73,261,800	206	289	-28.72%	190	10
Dumbarton	LSD	\$15,259,500	\$20,646,400	\$35,905,900	335	368	-8.97%	355	5
	Totals	\$491,697,600	\$95,045,000	\$586,742,600	4020	4113	-2.26%	3895	80

Entity 46 : Regional Service District 10

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
St. Stephen	Town	\$227,108,500	\$76,545,600	\$303,654,100	4415	4817	-8.35%	4220	70
McAdam	Village	\$40,759,900	\$6,670,800	\$47,430,700	1151	1284	-10.36%	1105	10
Dufferin	LSD	\$50,236,900	\$197,500	\$50,434,400	573	573	0.00%	555	10
Saint Stephen	LSD	\$7,731,600	\$124,400	\$7,856,000	282	312	-9.62%	1790	25
Dennis-Weston	LSD	\$47,710,100	\$13,296,800	\$61,006,900	1023	1109	-7.75%	980	15
Western Charlotte A	LSD	\$20,776,600	\$8,112,300	\$28,888,900	435	499	-12.83%	435	5
Western Charlotte B	LSD	\$20,776,600	\$8,112,300	\$28,888,900	534	565	-5.49%	530	5
Saint David	LSD	\$92,409,000	\$12,444,800	\$104,853,800	1529	1605	-4.74%	1470	40
Saint James	LSD	\$27,844,900	\$15,640,900	\$43,485,800	751	742	1.21%	735	5
Manners Sutton	LSD	\$143,972,000	\$2,885,200	\$146,857,200	1777	1806	-1.61%	1740	35
McAdam	LSD	\$8,161,400	\$1,670,100	\$9,831,500	73	27	170.37%	75	0
Totals		\$687,487,500	\$145,700,700	\$833,188,200	12543	13339	-5.97%	13635	220

Regional Service District 10

Entity	Group Type	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
42	Group A	\$196,863,100	2505	2539	-1.34%	2450	20
43	Group A	\$95,831,900	872	925	-5.73%	840	10
44	Group A	\$632,179,700	8426	8697	-3.12%	8135	230
45	Group A	\$586,742,600	4020	4113	-2.26%	3895	80
46	Group B	\$833,188,200	12543	13339	-5.97%	13635	220
Totals		\$2,344,805,500	28366	29613	-4.21%	28955	560

Regional Service District 11: Entities 47 to 50

Entity 47 : Regional Service District 11

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Fredericton Junction	Village	\$38,882,200	\$2,175,700	\$41,057,900	704	752	-6.38%	635	25
Tracy	Village	\$24,763,700	\$742,700	\$25,506,400	608	611	-0.49%	590	10
Clarendon	LSD	\$7,513,400	\$738,900	\$8,252,300	63	52	21.15%	65	5
Wirral-Enniskillen	LSD	\$8,133,800	\$176,700	\$8,310,500	204	226	-9.73%	190	15
New Maryland	LSD	\$211,339,400	\$7,506,500	\$218,845,900	2606	2466	5.68%	2350	240
Rusagonis-Waasis	LSD	\$301,760,000	\$26,457,900	\$328,217,900	4252	3318	28.15%	3910	320
Oromocto	Town	\$583,796,700	\$85,346,700	\$669,143,400	9223	8932	3.26%	7700	1465
Burton	LSD	\$355,581,300	\$22,205,400	\$377,786,700	5119	5421	-5.57%	4695	395
Upper Gagetown	LSD	\$19,598,400	\$707,800	\$20,306,200	311	316	-1.58%	300	10
Gagetown	Village	\$60,108,300	\$1,651,000	\$61,759,300	711	698	1.86%	615	20
Hampstead	LSD	\$16,945,500	\$121,100	\$17,066,600	277	294	-5.78%	265	10
Gladstone	LSD	\$20,357,300	\$18,301,500	\$38,658,800	452	485	-6.80%	435	15
Blissville	LSD	\$36,177,200	\$1,145,600	\$37,322,800	819	926	-11.56%	800	20
Totals		\$1,628,422,700	\$147,830,400	\$1,776,253,100	25349	24497	3.48%	22550	2550

Entity 48 : Regional Service District 11

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Cambridge-Narrows	Village	\$95,725,400	\$472,100	\$96,197,500	562	620	-9.35%	545	15
Cambridge	LSD	\$75,772,000	\$826,400	\$76,598,400	647	651	-0.61%	555	10
Canning	LSD	\$113,110,280	\$1,533,800	\$114,644,080	924	952	-2.94%	885	40
Waterborough	LSD	\$99,089,800	\$4,096,600	\$103,185,800	847	851	-0.47%	815	20
Chipman	Village	\$45,377,500	\$15,617,300	\$60,994,800	1104	1236	-10.68%	1075	25
Chipman	LSD	\$47,831,100	\$19,555,400	\$67,386,500	913	962	-5.09%	895	20
Northfield	LSD	\$22,551,300	\$13,251,500	\$35,802,800	620	643	-3.58%	600	15
Minto	Village	\$89,303,700	\$11,034,100	\$100,337,800	2305	2505	-7.98%	2140	145
Sheffield	LSD	\$62,450,190	\$1,157,300	\$63,607,490	809	853	-5.16%	785	25
Maugerville	LSD	\$44,118,180	\$27,081,200	\$71,199,380	1831	1776	3.10%	1735	95
Totals		\$695,329,450	\$94,625,100	\$789,954,550	10562	11049	-4.41%	10030	410

Entity 49 : Regional Service District 11

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Fredericton	City	\$5,294,684,100	\$1,442,356,500	\$6,737,040,600	58220	56224	3.55%	52575	3930
New Marland	Village	\$346,928,500	\$4,057,600	\$350,986,100	4174	4232	-1.37%	3655	490
Hanwell	RC	\$415,362,200	\$77,425,200	\$492,787,400	4750	4740	0.21%	4195	530
Kingsclear	LSD	\$267,080,700	\$5,330,600	\$272,411,300	2822	2651	6.45%	2570	235
Harvey	Village	\$18,022,300	\$1,925,400	\$19,947,700	358	363	-1.38%	325	15
Estey's Bridge	LSD	\$171,991,300	\$3,694,300	\$175,685,600	2217	2204	0.59%	2105	110
Lincoln	LSD	\$199,124,200	\$20,821,200	\$219,945,400	2504	2715	-7.77%	2510	2295
Noonan	LSD	\$71,666,300	\$8,443,300	\$80,109,300	1042	949	9.80%	970	70
Saint Mary's	LSD	\$118,763,100	\$5,657,000	\$124,420,100	4837	4733	2.20%	4460	355
Keswick Ridge	LSD	\$135,838,200	\$21,147,300	\$156,985,500	1652	1526	8.26%	1565	80
Totals		\$7,039,460,900	\$1,590,858,100	\$8,630,319,000	82576	80337	2.79%	74930	8110

Entity 50 : Regional Service District 11

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Douglas	LSD	\$242,226,100	\$6,719,400	\$248,945,500	6154	6081	1.20%	5790	330
Bright	LSD	\$100,756,500	\$3,775,600	\$104,532,100	3289	3068	7.20%	3160	120
Millville	Village	\$9,477,300	\$295,400	\$9,772,700	273	307	-11.07%	270	0
Southampton	LSD	\$74,785,660	\$654,740	\$75,440,400	1484	1538	-3.51%	1445	35
Nackawic	Town	\$60,282,100	\$22,011,600	\$82,293,700	941	1049	-10.30%	865	60
Queensbury	LSD	\$91,760,200	\$311,900	\$92,072,100	1174	1272	-7.70%	1130	45
Dumfries	LSD	\$44,311,700	\$376,300	\$44,688,000	356	373	-4.56%	345	15
Prince William	LSD	\$110,997,800	\$3,342,600	\$114,340,400	930	895	3.91%	890	35
	Totals	\$734,597,360	\$37,487,540	\$772,084,900	14601	14583	0.12%	13895	640

Regional Service District 11

Entity	Group Type	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
47	Group B	\$1,776,253,100	25349	24497	3.48%	22550	2550
48	Group B	\$789,954,550	10562	11049	-4.41%	10030	410
49	Group C	\$8,630,319,000	82576	80337	2.79%	74930	8110
50	Group B	\$772,084,900	14601	14583	0.12%	13895	640
	Totals	\$11,968,611,550	133088	130466	2.01%	121405	11710

Regional Service District 12: Entities 51 to 53

Entity 51 : Regional Service District 12

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
North Lake	LSD	\$62,831,300	\$338,600	\$63,169,900	233	243	-4.12%	225	105
Canterbury	LSD	\$12,929,300	\$573,900	\$13,503,200	525	609	-13.79%	510	10
Canterbury	Village	\$69,949,900	\$1,694,500	\$71,644,400	336	336	0.00%	320	15
Meductic	Village	\$8,585,500	\$4,036,100	\$12,621,600	173	228	-24.12%	165	5
Benton A	LSD	\$2,652,800	\$800	\$2,653,600	50	57	-12.28%	50	5
Benton B	LSD			\$0	33	15	120.00%	0	0
Woodstock	LSD	\$124,789,500	\$18,379,100	\$143,168,600	2220	2165	2.54%	2140	45
Richmond	LSD	\$41,163,400	\$3,753,900	\$44,917,300	1205	1236	-2.51%	1190	1285
Debec	LSD	\$37,534,600	\$770,100	\$38,304,700	98	122	-19.67%	100	0
Upper & Lower Northampton	LSD	\$29,249,900	\$1,236,500	\$30,486,400	311	383	-18.80%	305	165
Woodstock	Town	\$351,660,400	\$109,603,700	\$461,264,100	5228	5254	-0.49%	4970	85
Northampton	LSD	\$82,929,700	\$1,658,500	\$84,588,200	1413	1442	-2.01%	1385	695
Wakefield	LSD	\$108,951,250	\$8,966,200	\$117,917,450	1147	1125	2.00%	1125	15
Totals		\$933,227,550	\$151,011,900	\$1,084,239,450	12972	13215	-1.84%	12485	2430

Entity 52 : Regional Service District 12

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Hartland	Town	\$55,744,000	\$19,801,600	\$75,545,600	957	947	1.1%	875	25
Wakefield	LSD	29249900	1236500	30486400	311	383	-18.8%	305	165
Somerville	LSD	\$14,974,400	\$1,968,500	\$16,942,900	286	315	-9.2%	285	0
Coldstream	LSD	\$4,103,500	\$365,100	\$4,468,600	151	150	0.7%	130	5
Brighton	LSD	\$72,486,800	\$509,800	\$72,996,600	1584	1614	-1.9%	1565	20
Simonds	LSD	\$28,687,300	\$1,410,200	\$30,097,500	473	565	-16.3%	465	5
Totals		205245900	25291700	\$230,537,600.00	3762	3974	-5.3%	3625	220

Entity 53 : Regional Service District 12

Communities	Entity Type	2020 Residential Property Assessment	2020 Non-Residential Property Assessment	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
Lakeville	LSD	\$15,889,000	\$397,700	\$16,286,700	305	308	-0.97%	285	5
Wilmot	LSD	\$81,592,100	\$4,473,100	\$86,065,200	717	777	-7.72%	710	10
Centreville	Village	\$23,913,500	\$8,855,200	\$32,768,700	557	542	2.77%	557	542
Florenceville-Bristol	Town	\$102,834,100	\$80,468,800	\$183,302,900	1604	1639	-2.14%	1550	45
Wicklow	LSD	\$81,592,100	\$2,923,300	\$84,515,400	1697	1738	-2.36%	1665	30
Upper Kent	LSD	\$4,272,400	\$117,200	\$4,389,600	160	151	5.96%	155	5
Peel	LSD	\$82,929,700	\$2,882,800	\$85,812,500	1196	1223	-2.21%	1170	15
Glassville	LSD	\$1,396,200	\$124,500	\$1,520,700	63	78	-19.23%	65	0
Aberdeen	LSD	\$44,864,900	\$2,462,200	\$47,327,100	718	903	-20.49%	685	30
Bath	Village	\$18,771,300	\$2,184,200	\$20,955,500	476	532	-10.53%	425	10
Kent	LSD	\$105,218,400	\$7,866,000	\$113,084,400	1993	2091	-4.69%	1975	15
Totals		\$563,273,700	\$112,755,000	\$676,028,700	9486	9982	-4.97%	9242	707

Regional Service District 12

Entity	Group Type	2020 Total Assessment Base	Population 2016	Population 2011	% Change	Anglophones	Francophones
51	Group B	\$1,084,239,450	13066	13340	-2.05%	12575	2433
52	Group A	\$317,968,650	4692	4841	-3.08%	4535	73
53	Group A	\$676,028,700	9486	9982	-4.97%	9242	707
Totals		\$2,078,236,800	27243	28162	-3.26%	26352	3212

V. Equalization Grants

Equalization Payments by Municipal Entity

Entity	Group Type	Population ¹	Assessment Base Per Capita ²	Group Assessment Base Per Capita	Equalization Payment
1	Group A	\$4,404	\$72,709	\$67,488	-
2	Group B	\$20,306	\$76,728	\$77,922	\$278,757
3	Group A	\$5,906	\$55,665	\$67,488	\$803,006
4	Group A	\$8,992	\$96,832	\$77,922	-
5	Group A	\$9,429	\$58,987	\$67,488	\$921,738
6	Group A	\$6,403	\$60,188	\$67,488	537479.0842
7	Group B	\$12,473	\$71,842	\$77,922	\$872,048
8	Group A	\$8,982	\$57,915	\$67,488	988779.6099
9	Insufficient POPs*	\$2,120	\$157,902	\$67,488	-
10	Group B	\$14,441	\$53,038	\$77,922	4132443.345
11	Group B	\$20,130	\$66,090	\$77,922	\$2,738,906
12	Group A	\$6,316	\$46,221	\$67,488	1544704.039
13	Group B	\$11,259	\$58,859	\$77,922	\$2,468,275
14	Group A	\$6,437	\$46,987	\$67,488	1517531.836
15	Group A	\$5,574	\$66,519	\$67,488	\$62,073
16	Group B	\$16,114	\$63,035	\$77,922	2758617.348
17	Group A	\$5,324	\$54,103	\$67,488	\$819,476
18	Group B	\$25,417	\$72,781	\$77,922	1502667.804
19	Group A	\$4,705	\$55,497	\$67,488	\$648,770
20	Group A	\$4,919	\$58,571	\$67,488	504382.2287
21	Group A	\$4,779	\$35,136	\$67,488	\$1,777,971
22	Group A	\$5,979	\$49,313	\$67,488	1249685.09
23	Group A	\$6,416	\$76,777	\$67,488	-
24	Group A	\$7,240	\$77,712	\$67,488	-
25	Group A	\$4,546	\$60,111	\$67,488	\$385,635
26	Group B	\$10,592	\$72,604	\$77,922	647743.0693
27	Group C	\$80,611	\$106,090	\$101,707	-
28	Group B	\$13,789	\$109,851	\$77,922	-
29	Group A	\$8,801	\$94,318	\$67,488	-
30	Group B	\$10,412	\$99,155	\$77,922	-
31	Group A	\$4,778	\$67,427	\$67,488	\$3,343
32	Group B	\$26,398	\$112,290	\$77,922	-
33	Group B	\$21,900	\$76,388	\$77,922	\$386,313
34	Group A	\$4,133	\$67,825	\$67,488	-
35	Group B	\$15,267	\$82,398	\$77,922	-
36	Group A	\$4,661	\$91,062	\$67,488	-
37	Group A	\$5,576	\$60,924	\$67,488	\$420,910
38	Group A	\$8,367	\$79,202	\$67,488	-
39	Group B	\$33,417	\$102,285	\$77,922	-
40	Group C	\$68,769	\$94,517	\$101,707	5685897.237
41	Group A	\$7,261	\$79,603	\$67,488	-
42	Insufficient POPs	\$2,505	\$78,588	\$67,488	-
43	Insufficient POPs	\$872	\$109,899	\$67,488	-
44	Group A	\$8,426	\$75,027	\$77,922	280477.8529
45	Group A	\$4,020	\$145,956	\$67,488	-
46	Group B	\$12,543	\$66,427	\$77,922	1658126.638
47	Group B	\$25,349	\$70,072	\$77,922	\$2,288,346
48	Group B	\$10,562	\$74,792	\$77,922	380138.1489
49	Group C	\$82,576	\$104,514	\$101,707	-
50	Group B	\$14,601	\$52,879	\$77,922	4204989.806
51	Group B	\$13,066	\$82,985	\$77,922	-
52	Group A	\$4,692	\$67,775	\$67,488	-
53	Group A	\$9,486	\$71,266	\$67,488	-

1. Source: Statistics Canada.

2. Source: Department of Environment and Local Government.

*'Insufficient POPs' group type indicates that the Entity in question falls below the 4000 person threshold for minimum requirement for sustaining a municipal entity. However, exceptional circumstances in the cases of Entities 42 and 43 excuse these comparatively small populations as the isolation of the islands of Campobello and Grand Manan make their inclusion in another larger entity unfeasible. Only Entity 9 at present demonstrates a large enough decrease in population as of 2008 to disqualify it as a viable municipal entity.