

Chatham Kent Municipal Infrastructure Investment Fund White Paper

A proposed framework for financing bounded enabling infrastructure

Standalone policy and feasibility proposal | October 1 2026 | Draft 2

Fund the bottleneck, not the whole project.

Executive recommendation

I recommend that Chatham-Kent design and test MIIF as a Council-governed, repeatable catalytic infrastructure program within its existing financial system. MIIF is Chatham-Kent's disciplined mechanism for assembling and deploying public capital to remove specific infrastructure bottlenecks that prevent otherwise credible projects from proceeding. Council should authorize policy and feasibility work, then consider a separately funded pilot with identified financing packages and adopted exposure controls. The initial design requires no corporation, development bank, lending institution or standalone bureaucracy.

MIIF should answer one question: what specific infrastructure bottleneck is preventing an otherwise credible project from proceeding, what bounded municipal investment would remove it, what measurable public value would that unlock, and how should that capital be funded, recovered or justified as a durable public asset? The rule is simple: fund the bottleneck, not the whole project.

CK already has capital budgets, reserve policies, development charges, borrowing tools, Community Improvement Plan instruments and industrial servicing practices. Its asset-management work includes capital prioritization and a developing long-term financial plan. These supply financing tools and existing controls; they do not by themselves establish that CK has a common institutional process for catalytic interventions. MIIF would assemble lawful, actually available tools through one bottleneck test, common gates, exposure controls, recovery classification, cross-departmental accountability and project accounting. It would measure leverage, verify delivery and recycle actual recoveries where permitted. No unique statutory financing power is necessary to justify that coordinated function. [1–10]

Treat the earlier approximately \$20-million concept as a historical policy hypothesis, not a gross-project eligibility ceiling. A \$10-million or \$12-million public servicing intervention may qualify if its causal bottleneck and engineering scope are bounded, the underlying development is credible, and its financing, municipal exposure, liquidity and lifecycle cost pass the tests. Outside parties may finance most of the intervention. Total development value, gross infrastructure cost, municipal permanent contribution and peak municipal cash need are different amounts; none should be substituted for another.

Treat \$2 million as a limited seed-capital hypothesis. In the illustrative cash-pool model, it supports approximately \$1.15 million of base-scope municipal allocations after planning, liquidity and overrun allowances. It cannot independently finance a broad infrastructure pipeline. It may nevertheless participate in larger MIIF interventions assembled from several lawful sources. The \$5-million, \$7.5-million and \$10-million scenarios test capacity rather than recommend an appropriation. Capitalization must follow the candidate pipeline and Finance-certified affordability; no amount should be locked away beforehand. None is verified available funding. [3, 4, 6]

The first decision should commission the design of this repeatable capital mechanism, an authority and duplication review, an accounting protocol, a funded work plan and a candidate pipeline. By 90 days, staff should identify financing combinations, municipal exposure, recoveries, capitalization need, reserve justification and recommended ceilings. By 180 days, any separately authorized pilot should bring project-specific packages to Council. Use a simpler existing route where it provides equivalent discipline. Retain MIIF's common architecture unless evidence shows that current governance already performs the full function. Stopping an unsuitable project is a successful outcome.

How to read the evidence

This is a proposed policy and feasibility paper for Council, staff, journalists and residents. It uses public records available during research on October 1, 2026. It is not a certified municipal financial-capacity report or a transaction-specific legal opinion. The supplied Land Bank Draft 3 is a consistency reference only; no provision of that paper is rewritten or amended here. CK-145 is treated only under the financial principles specified in the commission for this paper; its detailed current text was not used as an authority.

The paper distinguishes five evidence classes. Verified fact means a published primary document or official program statement was read. Historical evidence means a dated record that establishes what was reported or decided then. Modelling assumption means an invented input used to test mechanics, rather than a forecast or quotation. Proposed policy means a rule recommended for later adoption. Unresolved question means the evidence does not establish the answer. Indexed primary extracts are separately identified because direct document retrieval was blocked in some cases.

Current CK policies were examined where accessible, including the November 27, 2023 Debt Management Strategy, published reserves policy, bridge financing policy, purchasing By-law 19-2026, development-charge materials and asset-management review. Older debt-policy copies remain online and contain draft principles and 2014 balances. They are not used to estimate 2026 capacity. The published 2026 budget listing and budget-update records establish the planning context; a complete reconciled 2026 operating and capital ledger, current reserve availability and updated Annual Repayment Limit were not obtained. No conclusion about money available for MIIF is drawn from historical balances. [1–7, 11]

Program webpages can change. Every grant and loan requires another dated eligibility and intake check before application and before commitment. A program announcement, searchable extract or Council endorsement does not establish an executed funding agreement, cash received or permission to incur costs.

1 The infrastructure problem MIIF would address

A project can have credible demand, land control, an acceptable use and a workable building budget, yet fail because a particular piece of public infrastructure is missing. A wastewater extension may lack an agreed payer. An access upgrade may serve several owners whose construction schedules differ. A grant may reimburse eligible costs later than the municipality must pay contractors. These are possible coordination or timing problems; each must be demonstrated rather than assumed.

The project sponsor must present a counterfactual. Without the intervention, identify the capacity, access, approval or financing condition that prevents construction or materially delays it. With the intervention, show that the condition changes and that the remaining project has a credible path to financing, approvals and delivery. If the development still lacks a viable business case after servicing, MIIF is being asked to rescue it rather than remove a bottleneck.

For example, an employer with financing and a controlled industrial site might need one public road connection. MIIF could evaluate that connection, while the employer finances its building, equipment and ordinary private site works. An approved housing phase might require a municipal wastewater capacity increase. MIIF could evaluate the public capacity increment, while the housing program separately establishes construction finance, buyer assistance and affordability. Neither example implies approval or lawful authority for any particular arrangement.

The strongest argument for MIIF is a consistent way to identify, structure, finance, coordinate, recover and verify catalytic interventions across departmental and sector boundaries. The strongest objection is that existing project governance may already perform that function adequately. Assess the actual process, not merely whether CK technically possesses a financing power. A promotional project list does not demonstrate additional value, and the existence of a financing source does not demonstrate duplication.

2 Mandate and exclusions

Proposed mandate: assemble, coordinate and, following later project-specific approval, deploy existing lawful financing tools around the minimum practicable enabling infrastructure intervention that removes a documented obstacle to a credible underlying project. Use common gates, exposure controls, accountability and accounting to demonstrate measurable public value. Record full lifecycle consequences and classify every funding and recovery obligation honestly before commitment.

MIIF is not the general infrastructure fund, capital budget, development bank, housing fund or subsidy program. It should not finance the whole underlying development merely because that development has public benefits. It should not buy speculative land, make venture investments, assume general developer obligations or operate municipal utilities.

Normally exclude routine maintenance, ordinary road reconstruction, normal sewer replacement, facility renewal, departmental operating costs, speculative development, bailouts and projects without an identified sponsor. Exclude political favourites, unbounded commitments and private assistance lacking a lawful route. A price below a ceiling is never sufficient for eligibility.

A mixed renewal and growth project requires an engineering allocation. The ordinary renewal portion remains in its normal capital program; only the incremental scope demonstrated to remove the bottleneck may be evaluated under MIIF. Show the whole project budget and procure compatible works together where efficient. Separate funding attribution must not encourage inefficient construction packages or conceal the complete cost.

Early engineering and diligence may be authorized under a separately funded planning budget. That authorization does not promise construction funding. MIIF should reject applications whose main purpose is to move already funded costs to another account or obtain an easier approval route.

3 Existing Chatham Kent mechanisms and the duplication test

CK's 2024–2027 multi-year budget is reviewed through annual updates. The municipality distinguishes operating, capital and lifecycle budgets, and publishes capital planning and financial policies. The 2026 budget-update announcement described a 4.63% increase, including 1.76% for capital infrastructure. Those percentages describe the announced update, not an unallocated MIIF financing source. [1, 2]

The 2023 Debt Management Strategy prioritizes lifecycle maintenance, growth and new initiatives, supports pay-as-you-go renewal, and recognizes development charges and debt for growth assets. It calls for business

cases, lifecycle consideration and protection of reserves. MIIF should work within those principles. Repayment of old debt does not automatically create permission to issue new debt, and lower historical debt does not prove spare 2026 capacity. [3]

CK's published reserves policy governs establishment, contributions, drawdowns, investment and reporting. Its surplus policy distinguishes tax-supported, water-supported and wastewater-supported budgets. MIIF cannot pool restricted reserves or rate funds into a freely spendable account. Finance must identify the legal source, purpose, available balance after existing commitments and replenishment consequences. A discretionary reserve balance is also not synonymous with available cash. [4, 5]

The 2026 asset-management review reports a capital prioritization framework and an integrated long-term financial plan targeted for February 2027. This is particularly strong evidence against a parallel MIIF capital-ranking system. MIIF should supply additional bottleneck and recovery evidence to that framework, with affordability checked against the same renewal and service obligations. [6]

Existing mechanism	What it can already accomplish	MIIF decision
Annual capital and lifecycle budgets	Appropriate and deliver public works through ordinary controls	Use ordinary appropriations; MIIF may coordinate a qualifying package through common gates and accounting
Reserves and project borrowing	Match payment timing to lawful capital obligations	No new authority; disclose source, debt service and displaced priorities
Municipal and PUC development charges	Fund eligible growth costs under applicable studies and bylaws	Reconcile eligible growth, local service, benefit to existing users and exemptions
Developer works and statutory front ending	Allocate servicing costs and provide permitted credits or recoveries	Prefer where workable; do not subsidize a developer obligation by renaming it
Community Improvement Plan	Provide specified lawful incentives for eligible projects	Keep assistance approvals and costs separate from municipal infrastructure
Community organization bridge financing	Address defined short-term timing gaps for eligible nonprofit groups	Use the existing policy where it fits; no extension to commercial lending by implication
Business park servicing and land sales	Prepare employment land through approved municipal projects	Test whether existing catalytic practice would benefit from common rules and cross-sector coordination
Asset management and long-term planning	Rank capital needs and provide service and financial context	MIIF cannot leapfrog safety or renewal priorities through a separate score

The bridge financing policy is specific to not-for-profit community organizations. It requires 75% of funding received or firmly committed, financial disclosure, satisfactory agreements and security, a term no longer than five years and interest at least equal to municipal opportunity cost. It is not a general commercial infrastructure loan policy. Where a nonprofit proposal fits it, MIIF should not create a competing loan channel. Any different servicing advance requires its own legal authority and financial structure. [7]

The public municipal development-charge page identifies By-law 149-2022 and a revised 2022–2027 schedule. Water and wastewater have separate 2024 materials and published 2026 fees under By-law 30-2024. The PUC background study discusses front-ending and local-service responsibilities. A background study is not proof of an executed local front-ending agreement, nor permission to spend DC reserves on any infrastructure. Confirm amendments, current rates, credits, exemptions and any 2026 program-related changes before a project report. [8, 9]

CK's November 2025 CIP provides an existing incentive framework. The paper confirms its existence but does not certify every program, eligible area or current administrative limit: full PDF retrieval was unavailable. Obtain the adopted plan and amendments before invoking it. An incentive that reduces municipal revenue must be shown in the financing plan; a tax increment grant is not cash recovery to MIIF. [10]

The duplication review should trace at least five recent comparable capital or servicing cases. Distinguish the availability of a funding source from an institutional process that already performs the full MIIF function. Compare handoffs, decision time, staff cost, funding combinations, exposure disclosure, recovery enforcement and outcome verification across sectors. Where the current route delivers equivalent discipline more simply, use it without adding a parallel MIIF process. Where functions remain fragmented or project-specific, MIIF should provide common capital architecture while using those same tools. Establish a dedicated reserve only if a recurring pipeline, cash timing and Finance-certified affordability justify one. Reducing the framework to a checklist is warranted only if existing governance demonstrably supplies the coordinated function already.

4 Legal authority and constraints

MIIF is a Council-governed catalytic capital framework within the municipal financial system. It creates no spending, borrowing, lending, guarantee, assistance, planning or procurement power. Each financing tool must derive from legislation and be exercised through the required instrument by the correct decision-maker. Finance certification verifies affordability and accounting; it does not appropriate money. Legal certification identifies authority; it does not substitute for Council or statutory approvals. The institutional value is coordinated deployment of existing powers, not a new exemption or statutory power.

Ontario's Municipal Act provides broad municipal powers, subject to specific restrictions. Sections 106 and 107 are central: grants remain subject to the prohibition on direct or indirect assistance to manufacturing, industrial or commercial enterprises through bonusing. A municipal purpose or an expected job benefit does not remove that restriction. Planning Act section 28 and qualifying municipal capital facilities under section 110 and Regulation 603/06 provide specific routes with their own requirements, rather than blanket exemptions. [12–15]

A public watermain or road delivered as municipal infrastructure can lawfully benefit private development. The legal assessment must examine its municipal function, ownership, access, beneficiary allocation and what would normally be charged to the developer. Risk increases where MIIF pays a private internal work, forgives a legally payable amount, provides a below-market loan or guarantees private debt. Public ownership alone is not a conclusive answer if the arrangement effectively gives selective assistance. Require a written transaction-specific determination and, where assistance exists, the exact enabling exception and compliant instrument. [12–15]

Council should see the recipient and ultimate beneficiary, the assistance value, the reason private financing is insufficient, any competitive selection and the enforceable public obligations. A CIP label is inadequate if the cost, applicant or area falls outside the adopted plan. A municipal capital facilities arrangement must qualify under its prescribed facility class and satisfy required agreements, bylaws, notices and housing requirements

where applicable. MIIF should not manufacture a facilities designation to finance an ordinary commercial development.

Long-term borrowing engages Municipal Act Part XIII, particularly the borrowing and financial-obligation provisions, and Regulation 403/02. The Treasurer must update the Annual Repayment Limit for obligations incurred after the Ministry's calculation. The general 25% regulatory benchmark concerns annual debt servicing and long-term obligations relative to relevant own-source revenues, not a permission to borrow 25% of the budget or proof that CK can afford a transaction. Tribunal approval may be required where the applicable limit is exceeded. CK policy and actual liquidity can require a much lower practical ceiling. [16, 17]

Borrow only for a legally eligible capital purpose with an approved repayment source and debt-service budget. Do not borrow a speculative lump sum to capitalize future loans. A temporary financing requirement must be assessed under the applicable statutory route; short-term operating borrowing powers are not general authority for a multi-year grant bridge. Developer default does not cancel municipal debt. Guarantee authority, financial-obligation treatment and maximum call exposure require separate review; the proposed pilot prohibits guarantees.

Development Charges Act tools include properly structured credit, payment and front-ending arrangements. Allocate eligible growth costs, benefits to existing development, grants, local services and any statutory exemptions before identifying a DC contribution. A future DC forecast is neither an enforceable developer receivable nor unrestricted cash. Do not charge the same cost through a subdivision agreement and DC funding without the required allocation or credit. Statutory agreements have notice, objection and other procedures that an ordinary repayment contract cannot bypass. [8, 9, 18]

Municipal services corporations require a separate assessment under Municipal Act section 203 and Regulation 599/06, including business case, consultation and asset-transfer requirements. The section 203 framework is distinct from Electricity Act section 142 electricity corporations and related regulatory requirements. Neither incorporation nor common municipal ownership automatically makes inter-entity assistance, debt or transfers lawful. MIIF should start without incorporation. [19–21]

Purchasing By-law 19-2026 is the operative published 2026 instrument, with transition rules for purchases begun under its predecessor. It distinguishes budgeted procurement approval from purchases without approved funding and provides different authorities for PUC and police matters. Its schedules include specified professional, utility and real-property solicitation exemptions. Procurement must determine the applicable process for each intervention, including developer-delivered cost-sharing works. A solicitation exemption supplies no budget or financing authority. Trade-agreement and applicable provincial requirements remain relevant. [11]

Before commitments, obtain a certified authority matrix covering appropriation, signing, award, advance, borrowing, guarantees, land interests, PUC decisions and corporate dealings. The Clerk and Legal Services must check applicable strong-mayor budget and organizational powers, delegation instruments and election-transition restrictions. No assumption is made that CK is currently restricted. Required environmental, water, drainage, conservation, highway, heritage, archaeological and Indigenous consultation processes remain in force and belong in the delivery schedule. Asset-management requirements under Regulation 588/17 remain applicable to the public infrastructure created. [22, 23]

5 Capitalization and financing choices

MIIF assembles financing around the bottleneck. Its gross enabling-infrastructure cost is not equal to the cash held in a designated account. Each project must report total intervention cost, gross municipal committed

exposure, peak municipal cash exposure, recoverable municipal exposure, permanent municipal contribution, outside capital, debt if applicable and lifecycle municipal obligations. Capitalization follows the portion and timing of those obligations that CK must fund, together with portfolio risk and affordability.

The preferred starting route is staged appropriation within the MIIF program. Council funds a capped design exercise, then considers each pilot intervention's complete financing package and identified sources. Seed capitalization may provide early catalytic participation, lawful recoverable advances, required municipal shares, limited permanent contributions and cash-flow bridges where lawful. It is not intended to equal the gross value of all infrastructure governed through MIIF. A dedicated reserve or reserve fund may later support a recurring pipeline, tracking permanent contributions and recoverable capital separately. Actual recoveries may be reused only where source restrictions and Council's rules permit; receivables are not spendable capitalization.

Potential sources are a lawful tax-supported appropriation, eligible discretionary reserves, restricted grants used for their permitted costs, lawful project-specific borrowing, enforceable developer contributions, eligible DC funding and net land or lease proceeds expressly assigned through the proper process. None is assumed available. Rate-supported contributions require PUC and finance reconciliation; the tax budget must not silently subsidize utility growth, or utility users finance unrelated municipal projects.

MIIF as a capital assembler

Municipal appropriations, reserves, lawful project-specific borrowing, development charges, developer contributions, lawful front-ending or reimbursement agreements, senior-government funding, recoverable advances and other existing mechanisms are financing tools. MIIF determines when and how to assemble those tools around a qualifying intervention, subject to their separate powers, restrictions and availability. A dedicated account is optional support for that function, not the definition of MIIF.

Modelling assumption: an \$8-million enabling intervention has a \$3-million provincial/federal contribution, a \$2-million developer contribution, a \$2-million permanent municipal contribution and a \$1-million recoverable municipal advance. The senior-government amount is one combined external contribution, not \$3 million from each government. All outside amounts are assumed legally committed for this example; an unapproved grant would be zero in the base case. The whole \$8-million intervention can be governed through MIIF without an \$8-million reserve.

The \$3-million municipal financing share comprises \$2 million permanent and \$1 million recoverable, assuming outside contributions and advance repayment arrive. If CK signs the full \$8-million construction contract, gross municipal committed exposure is \$8 million before recoveries, not \$3 million. If the \$5 million of outside cash arrives after CK pays contractors, peak project cash need is \$8 million. If that cash is irrevocably received and applied before payments, peak net municipal cash need may be \$3 million; monthly cash flow must establish the actual peak and any clawback exposure. Appropriations, lawful bridges or other approved sources must fund it. The advance is a receivable, not cash available until repaid.

Report outside capital of \$5 million, actual debt or zero if none, the \$1-million enforceable recovery separately, and all municipal operation, renewal and retirement obligations. Those lifecycle costs are not quantified in this invented example and must be costed before approval. Default or grant loss increases the permanent cost without creating new authority to spend. This distinction also applies to a \$10-million or \$12-million intervention: size alone determines neither MIIF eligibility nor affordable municipal exposure.

Illustrative starting envelopes

All numbers in this table are illustrative cash-pool modelling assumptions in millions of dollars. They are not recommended policy thresholds, CK financial forecasts, quotations or appropriations. The base-scope allocation is the amount this pool can supply under the assumed liquidity and overrun protections, not the total infrastructure value MIIF can govern. The planning allowance includes shared finance, legal, engineering and reporting capacity. Existing staff effort has an opportunity cost even without new positions.

Cash capitalization	Planning and administration	Uncommitted liquidity allowance	Base scope allocation	Separate 30% overrun allowance
\$2.00	\$0.10	\$0.40	\$1.15	\$0.35
\$5.00	\$0.15	\$1.00	\$2.96	\$0.89
\$10.00	\$0.20	\$2.00	\$6.00	\$1.80
\$7.50	\$0.15	\$1.50	\$4.50	\$1.35

Illustrative pool capacity is (capitalization minus planning allowance minus liquidity allowance) divided by 1.30, rounded down where necessary. The separate 30% overrun allowance and liquidity allowance are stress-test assumptions, not recommended permanent percentages or CK's corporate floor. The same contingency cannot be counted twice. Delayed outside receipts may require substantially more cash and reduce capacity. Outside funds received directly by another delivery party must also be disclosed, even when they never pass through an MIIF account.

At \$2 million, a municipal allocation near \$1 million may consume most of the illustrated pool's prudent capacity. Two simultaneous \$1-million municipal allocations exhaust it before adequate stress cover. The historical Minnie estimate of up to \$7 million demonstrates why that pool alone cannot promise to finance the requirement; it does not establish current demand or a pilot budget. A larger intervention could still be governed by MIIF if its outside financing, municipal share and peak cash exposure are lawfully funded and controlled. [24]

A \$5-million pool could supply approximately three \$0.9-million or two \$1.4-million base-scope municipal allocations in this illustration, subject to cash timing and the actual ceilings later adopted by Council. Their total interventions could be larger if other sources participate. The \$7.5-million alternative is derived from \$4.5 million of modelled allocations, \$1.35 million of overrun cover, \$1.5 million of liquidity and \$0.15 million of planning. That is arithmetic evidence, not a CK pipeline. A \$10-million pool creates more participation capacity while reducing cash available to other priorities; it is not a recommendation to establish that reserve.

The verified pipeline and Finance-certified affordability should determine capitalization. If municipal participation needs total \$1 million, a \$10-million reserve is unnecessary. If a lawful bridge requires \$6 million, a \$5-million pool cannot provide it without a separately approved source or revised timing. Projects still require ordinary budget and statutory approvals while governed through MIIF. Gross project size alone should not divert a qualifying intervention out of the framework.

Funding routes and repayment

Pay-as-you-go financing avoids external interest but uses money otherwise available for services or renewal. Reserve financing uses previously collected money and may require replenishment. Debt spreads payments while adding financing costs and future fixed obligations. A grant reduces municipal cost only when awarded, eligible and actually received; it may also impose match, procurement, reporting and clawback obligations. A developer advance reduces ultimate cost only when collected from an enforceable obligation.

Illustratively, a \$3-million municipal borrowing amortized annually over 15 years costs approximately \$269,800 per year at 4%, \$308,900 at 6%, and \$350,500 at 8%. Total nominal interest is approximately \$1.05 million, \$1.63 million and \$2.26 million respectively. These are modelling rates, not current offers; the annual-payment formula is principal times rate divided by [1 minus (1 plus rate) to the power of minus 15]. An actual financing report must include fees, draw timing, term, eligible purpose, rate conditions and the asset's useful life.

MIIF can support both recyclable capital with enforceable external recovery and permanent catalytic public investment that creates useful municipal infrastructure without repayment. Both are legitimate when lawfully approved and honestly classified. Seek recovery where lawful and sensible, but do not manufacture loans or receivables to call permanent works revolving. A sewer may provide value for decades while never returning cash; replenishment then requires a deliberate budget decision. Borrowing for an advance remains risky because municipal debt survives developer default.

6 Eligible interventions and proof of deliverability

Intervention	Required evidence of the bottleneck	Boundary of MIIF evaluation
Housing water wastewater and stormwater capacity	Engineer confirms an actual constraint tied to a credible development phase	Public extension or capacity increment; exclude building finance and ordinary private works
Employment land servicing	Identified sponsor, controlled land, capacity evidence and credible demand or committed employer	Minimum access and public servicing scope with cost allocation
Roads and access works	Required access or safety condition demonstrably prevents the project	Bounded connection or upgrade; broader reconstruction remains in normal capital plan
Municipal site preparation	Approved use, parcel control and defined physical constraint	Specific enabling preparation with separate Land Bank diligence accounting
Utility or energy enabling works	Utility confirms constraint, ownership and connection responsibilities	Lawful municipal works only unless separately approved entity finance is established
Transportation and logistics	Credible operator or sponsor and approvals showing one bounded municipal barrier	A defined access or capacity intervention; exclude complete speculative terminals or fleets
Approved CK-145 phase	Housing and financing tests independently pass; public servicing is the remaining constraint	Public infrastructure only; no automatic allocation or buyer subsidy

Intervention	Required evidence of the bottleneck	Boundary of MIIF evaluation
Other community infrastructure	Credible delivery sponsor and a specific blockage to an approved public use	Costed intervention with durable public service and lifecycle rationale

An employer's expression of interest, an assumed land-price increase or a general housing target is insufficient by itself. Demand evidence can include committed leases, deposits, finance commitments, phased development agreements, independent market evidence or an approved public program with financing. Confidential commercial evidence should receive independent review and a publishable summary.

MIIF must assess whether it changes the project's timing or probability of delivery, rather than simply improving a proponent's margin. Show alternatives such as another site, a smaller phase, developer-financed servicing and waiting for planned municipal capacity. Where several infrastructure constraints remain unresolved, cost them together; financing one piece without a credible path through the others fails the test.

A public intervention may need to serve future phases efficiently. Engineering should explain sensible oversizing and distinguish the minimum unlocking scope from optional expansion. Full municipal lifecycle cost and the funding source for excess capacity must be visible. No unsupported forecast of future beneficiaries should justify an unlimited commitment.

7 Classifying expenditure and recovery

Finance should use two linked classifications for each dollar. One states how the transaction is recognized in the accounts, including asset, expense, receivable, liability and impairment treatment. The other states the expected cash recovery and who bears the economic cost. These are different dimensions: a retained sewer is a municipal asset even if a developer repays part of its construction cost.

Funding treatment	Cash expectation	Accounting and approval implication
Permanent municipal infrastructure expenditure	No contractual cash repayment	Identify public purpose and tax or rate cost; capitalize qualifying retained assets or expense nonqualifying costs under municipal accounting policy
Retained municipal capital asset	Asset remains publicly owned and operated	Record asset ID, useful life, amortization, operations, renewal and retirement obligations; ownership is not cash recovery
Recoverable advance	Identified obligor owes enforceable principal	Record appropriate receivable and loss allowance; assess security, maturity and collection independently
Partially recoverable contribution	Only a specified amount has enforceable repayment	Split recoverable and permanent shares; do not record the entire contribution as revolving
Lawful permanent assistance	No repayment unless agreement provides a clawback	Cite exact legal authority and quantify support; no general commercial subsidy power assumed

Funding treatment	Cash expectation	Accounting and approval implication
Other Finance approved treatment	Terms define receipts and obligations	Explain treatment explicitly; unresolved classification prevents approval

A project report must reconcile gross expenditure to external grants and contributions, municipal cash, recoverable balances and permanent municipal cost. Separately show the retained public asset. Those measures overlap and must not be added into a fictional return. Principal repayment restores financing capacity; it is not profit. Interest may be revenue but must be compared with financing, administration and credit-loss costs.

Jobs, homes, assessment growth, avoided costs and private investment are outcome measures. They do not automatically replenish MIIF. DC receipts remain subject to statutory uses and existing commitments. General taxes from new assessment must support added services as well as existing obligations. A forecast fiscal impact can be reported separately, with service costs and assumptions, but cannot be booked as a repayment receivable.

Recyclable and permanent catalytic capital

MIIF should deliberately seek lawful and sensible recovery from identified beneficiaries, then recycle actual external receipts only where restrictions and Council approvals allow. Its permanent catalytic investment stream should openly fund the justified municipal share of durable public infrastructure. Report the two streams separately within the same program. Recoverability is a financing characteristic, not a substitute for the bottleneck test; permanent public investment is not a failure to revolve.

Legitimate cash recovery

Contractual developer repayments and recoverable servicing advances require a lawful basis, obligor, amount, maturity, security and remedies before disbursement. Specify conditions to each draw, assignment or ownership change, default, insolvency, dispute, termination and repayment acceleration. Test collateral value after senior claims, enforcement costs and a market downturn. A company guarantee is only as good as the guarantor's assets and legal enforceability.

Land-sale or lease proceeds can be allocated only if the municipality has the right to receive them, restrictions permit it and the proper approval assigns them. Use net receipts after transaction costs, taxes, encumbrances and any required repayment. Until closing or collection, the expected proceeds are neither liquid funding nor cash recovery. Sale of a public asset converts an asset into cash; it is not recurring revenue or newly created wealth.

An interdepartmental or inter-entity repayment must be shown in both ledgers and eliminated where appropriate on consolidation. It can restore the MIIF account while leaving the municipality as a whole no better off. Only external receipts should be described as external municipal recovery. A Land Bank payment to MIIF from an earlier municipal appropriation is an internal transfer, not two successes.

Infrastructure serving existing residents or the public at large may properly have no repayment. Council should accept that permanent catalytic public cost openly where the bottleneck and public-service case warrant it. The absence of recovery does not invalidate MIIF. Its recyclable component must rely on real enforceable external obligations and actual receipts; its permanent component must rely on a durable municipal-asset or

lawful public-expenditure rationale. Never force an artificial loan onto a permanent municipal asset to create a revolving-fund narrative.

Worked classification example

Modelling assumption: a public sewer extension costs \$3 million and enables a \$60-million private development. A lawful agreement requires the developer to repay \$1.2 million, and an executed provincial agreement reimburses \$0.6 million. CK supplies \$3 million during construction if no receipts arrive before contractor payments. After both external receipts, the ultimate municipal construction contribution is \$1.2 million. The municipality retains a \$3-million sewer asset subject to Finance's capitalization rules; the asset value is not added to the \$1.8 million of receipts as profit.

Private development leverage is \$60 million divided by the \$3-million intervention, or 20 to 1, if the private amount is actually committed and attributable. Also show the private amount relative to ultimate municipal contribution, but label the denominator. The \$60 million is not repayment. If the developer defaults, the municipal share rises to \$2.4 million before enforcement and financing costs; if the grant also fails, it rises to \$3 million. At every stage disclose peak cash need separately from ultimate cost.

8 Project approval gates

The MIIF gates are evidence requirements alongside existing authority. They authorize no commitments. Approved diligence can move a case between gates, but construction, financing and property decisions each need the correct approval. A project may be returned, deferred or stopped at any gate.

Gate 1 Define the project and bottleneck

The sponsor identifies the underlying development or public project, parcel and project identifiers, ownership, delivery party, intended outcomes and remaining approvals. Engineering confirms the specific infrastructure obstacle and the counterfactual with and without intervention. Provide demand and financing evidence, rather than a promotional valuation. Record whether the work is renewal, growth or an enabling increment, and set an expiry date for evidence. An unidentified sponsor, speculative demand or no causal bottleneck stops the application.

Gate 2 Test alternatives and additional value

Finance, Engineering and the sponsor compare developer delivery, ordinary capital governance, DC tools, other government programs, another site, phasing and doing nothing. Identify why the financing package benefits from MIIF coordination or capital, including its best ordinary-process alternative, timing and cost. An existing financing source can be part of MIIF. Refer the project outside MIIF only where an existing institutional route provides equivalent coordinated discipline more simply. A project gains no priority merely by applying to MIIF.

Gate 3 Establish engineering scope and full cost

Engineering defines the minimum intervention, design maturity, estimate range, quantities, utility relocation, land or easement requirements, environmental approvals, capacity, construction sequencing and dependencies. Include contingency, unrecoverable tax, design, procurement, inspection, commissioning, enforcement and safe closure costs. Show incremental operating and renewal obligations, useful life and retirement exposure. Obtain independent review for unusual designs, significant uncertainty or material

municipal exposure or delivery complexity. A preliminary estimate may support diligence; it cannot support a binding construction promise.

Gate 4 Establish legal and financial structure

Legal identifies powers, restrictions, decision-makers, approvals and assistance treatment. Finance certifies each funding source, appropriation request, monthly cash flow, debt-service implications, recovery classification and portfolio stress result. Assemble the financing package with outside commitment evidence and draft enforceable agreements. Show total intervention cost, gross municipal obligations, peak cash need, recoverable exposure, permanent share, lifecycle cost and exit obligations. Resolve funder restrictions, beneficiary allocation and land consents. No advance is presumed lawful because infrastructure is public.

Gate 5 Obtain final commitment approval

Council receives the complete business case, independent certifications, alternatives, public outcomes, funding, procurement route and agreements. For the pilot, reserve every new project commitment, advance, permanent assistance and material financing change for project-specific Council approval through lawful instruments. PUC and other legally required approvals remain additional. Officers execute only after substantive approvals, approved funding and required conditions are satisfied. Stage notice to proceed and payments so municipal construction follows credible outside delivery commitments where practicable. A gate certificate alone is not an award, loan approval or construction authorization.

Gate 6 Verify delivery and recovery

Engineering certifies completed scope and capacity; the sponsor verifies actual development, occupancy, employment or service outcomes at defined intervals. Finance reconciles expenditure, receipts, arrears, debt and permanent cost to the ledgers. Report failure, delay and attribution limits. Do not close the recovery file when construction ends. Require annual follow-up until agreed outcomes and repayment duties are resolved, followed by an asset and renewal handover to the operating department.

A material change after any clearance reopens affected gates. A cost increase, private withdrawal, scope change, failed funding source or changed land use requires fresh evidence. The sponsor may not rely on sunk cost as authority to continue. Mandatory safety and contract obligations remain lawful obligations; pausing discretionary work must not breach existing contracts without advice.

9 Taxpayer and portfolio safeguards

Use four exposure measures. Committed exposure is the maximum binding municipal obligation, including construction, advances, termination, guarantees and contractual contingencies. Peak cash exposure is cumulative external municipal payments less external receipts actually received at each point in time. Debt exposure is borrowing and debt service, with contingent obligations separately disclosed. Ultimate economic cost is unrecovered municipal cost plus financing, operations, renewal and loss effects over a stated horizon; present nominal cash and discounted analysis separately.

Gross entity exposure and consolidated external exposure must both be shown. Do not add repayment of borrowed principal to the construction cost already financed by that principal when calculating total economic cost. Add interest and fees, and show principal repayment as a financing cash flow. Conversely, eliminating an inter-entity balance does not make external municipal borrowing disappear.

Pilot controls for Council adoption

The required control categories below are proposed policy. Their numerical values cannot be recommended from an uncertified financial position or an unverified pipeline. The Treasurer should recommend actual pilot ceilings after reviewing certified financial capacity, liquidity, current capital obligations, candidate sizes, recovery and counterparty risk, concentration and debt affordability. Council must adopt the ceilings before funding projects. Modelled percentages and dollar amounts elsewhere are stress-test inputs, not standing permissions. Aggregate related phases, affiliated counterparties and interdependent works as one project.

Control	Required pilot decision	Rationale and safeguards
Municipal exposure per project	Treasurer-recommended ceiling on gross municipal obligations and peak cash, adopted by Council	Include contingencies, termination and counterparties; outside funding does not automatically cap contractual exposure
Gross infrastructure size	No arbitrary absolute gross-project ceiling	Require bounded scope and credible financing; larger interventions may qualify when municipal risk is controlled
Permanent municipal contribution	Council-adopted per-project and portfolio limits based on affordability and lifecycle cost	Permanent capital reduces reusable capacity; classify it honestly rather than disguising it as a loan
Recoverable advance	Council-adopted advance and counterparty limits based on lawful authority, security and loss risk	Model zero repayment and collection costs; assess maturity, collateral and senior claims
Total portfolio exposure	Council-adopted ceilings for obligations, peak cash and permanent cost	Include all packages and related phases; protect funding for current capital obligations
Sector and counterparty concentration	Treasurer-recommended concentration limits and documented exception rules	Measure correlated risks across sectors, developers, contractors and funders
Contingency and liquidity	Engineering-based contingencies and Finance-certified liquidity floor, adopted before commitments	The modelled 30% overrun and 20% liquidity assumptions are illustrative, not permanent rules; test delays and corporate emergencies
Borrowing	No authority under design approval; separate lawful project-specific approval and debt affordability test	Include draw timing, annual service, repayment source, updated ARL and refinancing risk
Municipal guarantees and partner equity	Remain excluded from the initial pilot as a proposed safeguard	Any later proposal needs separate legal, capital, contingent-liability and business-case decisions

Each Council-adopted municipal exposure, permanent-contribution, advance and portfolio limit applies independently. Passing one cannot waive another. A recoverable label does not reduce gross obligations or justify more exposure without a credible credit case; stress even secured advances as unpaid. No absolute \$3-million gross-project ceiling is proposed. A larger bounded intervention may qualify if its financing and exposure pass every gate. Failure of affordability, liquidity or an adopted ceiling is a stop condition, regardless of project size or leverage.

A minimum percentage of the total development cost is not recommended. It would disadvantage small rural or public-service projects, and could encourage inflated private valuations. Report municipal intervention as a share of enabling infrastructure and total development separately. Council should assess leverage and public value alongside risk, rather than apply one universal leverage ratio.

Contingency and liquidity

Engineering must set a design-appropriate estimate range and contingency for each approved intervention. The 30% overrun model in this paper is an illustrative adverse scenario, not a recommended permanent portfolio percentage, permission to spend or substitute for engineering judgment. Finance must test whether it adequately reflects candidate risks. Reconcile already funded contingencies with the scenario so the same allowance is not added twice, and show residual stress beyond them.

Before every commitment, Finance should test monthly cash flow over at least 36 months and the whole contract period if longer. Exclude expected land sales and unapproved grants from available liquidity. Stress legally committed grant reimbursement by 24 months, all advances as unpaid, approved construction commitments at the cost-to-complete stress and a simultaneous corporate capital emergency. Protect statutory and restricted balances, required reserves and already approved municipal payment schedules.

An exposure shortfall is a hard stop, not an invitation to raid another reserve. Any proposed replacement funding must identify the exact source and displaced projects, tax or rate consequences and replenishment plan. Approval of a nominal reserve does not satisfy the cash test if its assets mature too late to pay contractors.

Overruns and changes

Council should adopt an early-reporting trigger on the Treasurer's recommendation, informed by project scale and current delegations. The Draft 1 illustration of a 10% or \$100,000 forecast increase, whichever is lower, is not an adopted or permanent policy threshold. Material changes in promised outcomes, funding, recovery or scope require reassessment. No reporting trigger authorizes unbudgeted expenditure; commitments above lawful authority or approved ceilings require prior approval. Do not turn a default into permanent support without reporting the write-down and a new public-value case.

Before additional spending on a failing project, compare safe completion, reduced scope, mothballing, transfer and lawful termination using remaining costs and achievable benefits. Sunk costs cannot establish the case for further funding. Apply existing emergency and contractual authority where mandatory work is required, and disclose the exception promptly.

10 Relationship with the Land Bank

The supplied Land Bank Draft 3 answers the property question: the legal asset, ownership and control, constraints, competing public uses and actual readiness. MIIF answers the capital question: the infrastructure blockage, its bounded cost, allocation among beneficiaries, municipal exposure and recovery or permanent-asset rationale. Land Bank does not become a capital fund; MIIF neither controls land nor changes land use, disposition or retention rules. [R1]

Use one project identifier linked to every parcel and asset identifier. Land Bank gate 3 can establish the preferred public use, while MIIF gates 1 and 2 assess the bottleneck and alternatives. Land Bank gate 4 requires delivery readiness and separate MIIF authority where applicable; MIIF gates 3 through 5 require the

relevant property evidence. Neither set of gates substitutes for the other. Finance and the project sponsor should use one evidence file with separate signoffs, rather than demand duplicate studies.

The joint accounting protocol must identify the legal owner, cost owner, funding source, invoice, asset or receivable, transfer, recovery and public-outcome attribution. Land acquisition, remediation, property diligence, municipal servicing and private building expenditure remain distinct. Allocate shared studies once using a documented basis. Record costs in the appropriate account, then cross-reference them rather than posting them again as a second project cost.

Modelling example: Land Bank separately accounts for land with a \$1-million acquisition basis and \$0.2 million of preparation. MIIF funds \$0.8 million of public servicing. A sale produces \$1.5 million net cash, of which Council lawfully assigns \$0.5 million to MIIF. MIIF reports a \$0.5-million external recovery and \$0.3-million unrecovered servicing contribution. Land Bank reports the gross net sale receipt and the \$0.5-million allocation; consolidated municipal receipts remain \$1.5 million, not \$2 million. Consolidated stated cash costs are \$2 million and the resulting shortfall is \$0.5 million before other costs, with the public servicing asset separately reported. Book, market and contributed land values must not be mixed to change that arithmetic.

An assignment of proceeds requires lawful approval, available net proceeds and compliance with purpose restrictions. It cannot retrospectively justify construction without cash funding. Preserve Draft 3's existing housing-retention, property transaction, independent valuation and statutory controls. This paper proposes no amendment to them.

11 Relationship with CK 145

CK-145 may apply for a defined public servicing intervention only after its phase passes independent housing, builder, delivery and financing tests. It receives no automatic allocation, dedicated percentage, preferred gate treatment or claim on MIIF capital. Housing supply is one public outcome among eligible outcomes, and MIIF is not a housing fund.

Every public dollar must be identified honestly as recoverable capital, permanent public expenditure or expenditure creating or maintaining a public asset. Keep land value, servicing cost, builder payments, buyer assistance and housing subsidy separate. MIIF financing cannot lower a reported home price by hiding infrastructure in another municipal account.

The CK-145 phase report should show its total public cost and cash exposure across all municipal functions, including any intentional land discount and subsidy. If the phase must make an internal payment to MIIF, record who supplies the cash. A housing-program payment funded by a municipal appropriation restores MIIF's account but does not recover money from outside the municipality. Any enforceable builder recovery needs its own legal and credit case; no recovery is assumed from future buyer proceeds.

The phase's affordability and financing case must remain viable after including the correctly allocated infrastructure cost or explicit public contribution. If it requires an unapproved permanent subsidy, MIIF cannot rescue the case through an optimistic receivable. Public infrastructure may nonetheless be justified on its own public-service merits, with Council accepting the cost openly.

12 Relationship with Maple City Power

Maple City Power is a proposed future entity, not an approved MIIF investment. MIIF must provide neither automatic equity nor financing. The ownership and statutory framework of any energy intervention must be

established before choosing the payer. The Land Bank distinction between an ordinary section 203 MSC and a section 142 electricity corporation is preserved. [R1, 19–21]

Proposed transaction	Required separate analysis	MIIF treatment
Public road water or stormwater serving an energy site	Municipal function, public ownership, beneficiary allocation and lawful cost sharing	May enter ordinary MIIF tests without entity preference
Generation batteries distribution or grid connection owned by MCP	Actual entity powers, OEB and connection requirements, business case and entity financing	Normally outside the MIIF pilot; the utility or entity should finance its assets
Recoverable municipal advance to MCP	Statutory permission, assistance restrictions, interest, security, maturity and consolidated exposure	No automatic eligibility; separate Council approval required
Shareholder equity or debt instrument	Corporate authority, return and loss risk, capital structure and municipal affordability	Separate shareholder investment proposal; exclude from catalytic pilot
Guarantee	Guarantee authority, beneficiary, maximum call and debt-obligation treatment	Prohibited in the pilot
Permanent assistance or below-market transfer	Exact statutory exception and quantified public support	Never disguised as ordinary infrastructure expenditure

Municipal ownership of both parties does not remove risk. If MCP borrows externally, show that debt and any municipal support separately from internal balances. Loan repayment funded by new municipal equity is not external recovery. A municipal road supporting a lawful energy site may be justified as public infrastructure, but MIIF should not silently fund the generation business or bypass its own financing tests.

13 Federal provincial and other leverage

Assume zero unapproved grant revenue in every base case. An approved project can wait for an award, be resized, or proceed only if Council independently funds the entire exposure. An announced program is not capitalization. Signed reimbursement funding reduces ultimate cost but can leave the municipality paying the full construction bill for months or years.

Funding opportunities and constraints at the research date

The following is a screening register. Stated cost shares come from the referenced program material, not from a CK award. Where exact match, stacking or reimbursement terms were not established, the uncertainty is stated rather than filled with an assumed percentage.

Program or route	Applicant and relevant use	Funding and municipal exposure	Intake and verification status
Ontario HEWSF under MHIP [27]	Municipalities; housing-enabling drinking water wastewater and stormwater	Published maximum provincial share 73% up to \$35 million; at least 27% plus ineligible costs remains; actual agreement governs cash timing and stacking	First and second intakes closed; no new CK award or capacity assumed
MHIP Housing Enabling Core Servicing [28]	Municipalities; eligible roads bridges and culverts enabling housing	Published maximum 50% up to \$20 million; remaining match and ineligible costs required	Intake closed; its \$20-million grant maximum is not an MIIF project limit
MHIP Health and Safety Water [29]	Municipalities and First Nations; aging water and flood infrastructure protecting existing housing	Published maximum 73% up to \$30 million; remaining costs and reimbursement bridge required	Intake closed; ordinary renewal often belongs outside MIIF
Ontario Development Charge Reduction Program [30]	Municipalities meeting active-DC-bylaw and residential reduction requirements	Minimum municipal share 10%; cost share is not blanket replacement of all lost DC revenue; quantify reduced collections and eligible infrastructure separately	Initial intake now closed; CK application award and executed terms unresolved
MHIP Non DC Municipalities Stream [31]	Municipalities meeting non-DC eligibility criteria	Grant and match terms require actual guidelines and agreement; no CK allocation	Announced opening October 29 2026; CK has published DC bylaws, so eligibility must not be assumed
Federal CHIF Direct Delivery [32]	Eligible public applicants; housing-enabling water wastewater stormwater and solid waste	Contribution grant; historical guide and agreement determine eligible share and remaining costs; no fresh match assumed	Intake closed for all applicants; existing awards require contract verification
BCSF Provincial and Territorial [33]	Provincial or territorial selection and municipal projects under agreements	Cost-shared contribution through Ontario; no automatic municipal allotment	Current program exists; project selection and CK allocation unresolved
BCSF Community stream and existing CCBF agreement [34]	Local governments through applicable delivery arrangements; eligible infrastructure	Allocation-based contribution; previously allocated dollars remain restricted and committed; receipt timing follows agreement	Existing CCBF is moving within the BCSF framework; do not count old and new labels as two grants

Program or route	Applicant and relevant use	Funding and municipal exposure	Intake and verification status
BCSF Direct Delivery and Local Impact [35]	Eligible public and other recipients; specified regional community or adaptation projects	Contribution subject to stream criteria; exact match eligible costs and cash timing require dated guide	Live page thanks applicants; October 1 open status not conclusively established from retrieved material; confirm before relying
FCM Green Municipal Fund [36]	Municipalities and eligible partners; specified energy environmental and adaptation projects	Many capital offers combine loans and grants up to 80% of eligible costs with product-specific caps; loan is repayable and cannot be counted as grant	Current offers published; project-specific intake and approval required
Infrastructure Ontario [37]	Eligible municipalities and qualifying municipal corporations; capital works	Loan not grant; municipal terms generally 5 to 30 years; rates security and repayment require offer and lawful authority	Active lending program; no CK borrowing approval or quote assumed
CIB Infrastructure for Housing [38]	Municipalities eligible public sponsors or qualifying developers; revenue-supported enabling infrastructure	Lending investment rather than automatic subsidy; published October 2025 overview requires project investment of at least \$50 million subject to specified exceptions	Current initiative; scale may exceed a limited pilot cash pool without excluding a larger bounded MIIF package; obtain current terms
Building Faster Fund [39]	Eligible municipalities meeting program conditions	Restricted performance-related funding; unspent uncommitted balance must be verified	Ontario announced \$440000 for CK's 2025 housing performance; announcement is not available MIIF cash

Grant-funded infrastructure should be screened for environmental and Indigenous consultation obligations, eligible start dates, procurement conditions, cost categories, audit requirements, asset-retention duties and clawbacks. Reimbursement timing and holdbacks must be entered in monthly cash flow, including a 12- and 24-month delay test. Do not incur costs early merely because an application was submitted.

The DCRP and Non-DC streams require particular care. CK's published DC framework does not establish that it is eligible for a stream aimed at municipalities without DCs. Nor does a proposed DC reduction establish eligibility, an award or net fiscal advantage. Finance should compare foregone DC collections, grant-supported works, municipal match and restrictions before any bylaw change. [8, 9, 30, 31]

BCSF stream amounts and federal-provincial matching announcements are national or provincial envelopes. A federal dollar flowing through Ontario is the same federal dollar in the combined project ledger. The BCSF FAQ also identifies stream-specific restrictions: Local Impact-funded projects cannot also receive Direct Delivery or Provincial and Territorial stream funding, while Direct Delivery may be combined with Community stream funding subject to rules. This prevents a general assumption that all programs stack. [40]

For each funding source, maintain status fields for announced, application submitted, approved, agreement executed, conditions satisfied, claimed, cash received and possible clawback. Track private equity and loans separately from government grants and loans. Show gross project funding and each funder's eligible-cost claim so the same invoice cannot be claimed twice beyond permitted stacking.

Leverage should be reported as a set of ratios with explicit denominators. Show private capital legally committed divided by MIIF gross intervention cost, senior-government grants divided by gross infrastructure cost, and municipal permanent contribution after actual receipts. Do not add private investment, asset value, housing and jobs into a financial return. Outside loan proceeds finance expenditure but leave repayment obligations.

14 Chatham Kent case studies

Minnie Street and the cost of readiness

Historical evidence: the August 2024 staff report on 199 Westcourt Boulevard described surrounding underground improvements at 55 Minnie Street, including water, wastewater and stormwater, estimated at up to \$7 million. Staff redirected the housing priority to the 72-unit Westcourt project. The relevant primary text was verified through indexed municipal extracts; direct PDF retrieval was blocked. This is a historical reported estimate, not a 2026 tender price or proof that Minnie is currently unviable. [24]

The MIIF lesson is to cost the infrastructure before declaring a site ready. Land ownership and a housing concept do not resolve off-site capacity. Minnie would have to pass a current use and readiness review, refreshed engineering, alternatives including Westcourt or another site, beneficiary allocation and a viable housing case after servicing. It is an illustration of the test, not a pilot recommendation. A \$2-million seed account would not itself solve the reported \$7-million requirement; MIIF would have to assemble a lawful financing package and prove the resulting municipal exposure affordable.

Bloomfield Business Park and existing catalytic financing

Verified official announcement: CK awarded a \$1.38-million construction tender for Bloomfield Phase 3, extending municipal infrastructure along Seventh Line West. The announcement anticipated spring 2026 construction and late-summer completion; it does not establish actual completion or receipts. Earlier 2022 park expansion used more than \$1.5 million of Canada Community-Building Fund support for road, water and sewer infrastructure over a 26-acre area, according to the program administrator's 2023 account. [25, 26]

Bloomfield is evidence that CK already sometimes performs the type of bounded catalytic infrastructure intervention MIIF is intended to systematize. It does not automatically establish that a common MIIF framework is unnecessary. Assess whether the existing business-park route provides consistent gates, transparent financing, exposure rules, recovery accountability and verification of what was actually unlocked, and whether those disciplines transfer across sectors. MIIF cannot retrospectively count Bloomfield spending as its own capital or claim the whole park as new leverage. A future phase needs current capacity and demand evidence, a specific obstacle and clear municipal, DC, developer and utility allocations. Use the existing route if it already supplies equivalent discipline more simply.

Westcourt and a separately governed housing project

The official tender portal records the 199 Westcourt affordable housing build RFP as awarded June 4, 2026, with servicing documentation listed in the tender materials. That is procurement-status evidence, not a certification that construction, occupancy or all financing is complete. [41]

The project illustrates why an enabling infrastructure scope must be separated from the housing building. Housing capital, affordability obligations and operating arrangements belong in their own approved program. MIIF should only evaluate an otherwise unresolved public servicing increment, and should not retrospectively relabel the awarded building contract or claim those units as additional MIIF delivery.

Talbot Trail and ordinary capital priorities

CK's official project page states that the preferred realignment relocates the closed section approximately 130 metres northwest, and that detailed design continued as of July 2026. The municipality's AMO announcement sought \$4 million in provincial support. A funding request is not an award. [42]

Restoring an erosion-threatened public route is principally a safety, resilience and transportation capital obligation. It should normally remain in the ordinary capital program, even if its budget falls below \$20 million or it benefits businesses. Only a separately evidenced incremental development-enabling component could satisfy MIIF. MIIF must not become the account used to avoid choosing between road safety, renewal and growth.

Routine stormwater remediation

The official 2026–2027 stormwater remediation consulting tender describes preliminary assessment, design, tender preparation, contract administration and inspection for remediation works. This is a documented example of ordinary infrastructure management. Without a specific credible development bottleneck, it belongs in the normal asset-management and capital process. [43]

The local record demonstrates real servicing constraints and catalytic investments delivered through existing tools. It supports testing a common framework across sectors, rather than assuming that a new reserve is necessary or that existing funding makes MIIF redundant. The candidate list should include financing packages assembled through MIIF, cases referred to equivalent existing processes, and rejected cases. Local examples remain illustrations, not approved MIIF projects.

15 Pressure tests and hard stops

All figures in this section are modelling assumptions, not CK project estimates, available reserves or approved commitments. A stress test changes the financing decision; it is not permission to spend the stressed amount. The base case assumes zero unapproved grant revenue. A signed grant is included only where the agreement, eligible costs, conditions and collection timing have been verified.

Individual downside tests

Shock	Required calculation and response
Construction costs rise 25–30%	Reprice the remaining scope, contingency and cancellation cost. A \$2 million base scope becomes \$2.5–\$2.6 million before other delay costs. Include the entire exposure in the ceiling; obtain new authority before additional commitments.
Interest rates rise	Recalculate borrowing and interim finance at the approved rate plus 2 and 4 percentage points. Test debt service against the operating forecast and updated statutory capacity. Asset benefits do not pay the interest bill.

Shock	Required calculation and response
Grant denied	The unapproved-grant base case already excludes it. If an approved grant becomes unavailable or ineligible, stop uncommitted work and return the full replacement funding decision to Council.
Reimbursement delayed 12–24 months	Fund the gross eligible expenditure and interest until actual receipt. A receivable is not spendable cash. Obtain bridge authority before tender, rather than assuming the Treasurer can find cash later.
Private partner withdraws or investment does not materialize	Reassess whether the public asset has sufficient standalone service value. Stop before irreversible works where possible. Do not retain the original housing or employment forecast as a delivered outcome.
Developer insolvent or advance unpaid	Recognize collection risk, enforce security and establish an allowance as Finance requires. Model zero repayment, collection costs and recovery delay. A legal promise is not equivalent to liquid first-ranking security.
Cancellation after works are built	Account for completed assets, restoration, safe holding and maintenance. Report stranded capacity. The sunk cost is not a reason to fund the underlying private development.
Land proceeds 15–20% lower or delayed	Use net proceeds after authorized disposition costs and senior allocations. Test both price and timing. Do not borrow against an unapproved sale, or spend the same proceeds through the Land Bank and MIIF.
Guarantee called	The proposed pilot permits no guarantees. Any later proposal must separately model the full guaranteed amount, interest and enforcement costs, including correlation with an advance default. A hypothetical \$750,000 call requires \$750,000 cash; a reported small probability does not cap exposure.
Multi-year construction delay	Reprice outstanding works, insurance, inspection, financing and lifecycle costs. Confirm grant deadlines and permits. Set a reassessment date and a maximum funded holding period.
Several projects fail together	Stress common contractors, sectors, developers, grant programs and weather risks simultaneously. Diversification by project name does not diversify shared risks.
Another major capital emergency	Test MIIF liquidity against a separate municipal emergency without assuming MIIF assets or receivables can be sold immediately. Finance must protect the certified corporate reserve floor.
Pressure to rescue a failing project	Require a fresh alternatives and public-value case for every rescue request. No automatic top-up, retrospective exemption or change in classification to conceal the loss.

Compound downside portfolio

Consider a proposed, deliberately demanding portfolio before Gate 4. Three independent enabling works each have a \$2 million base construction scope: A supports housing; B supports employment servicing; C provides access. Gross works total \$6 million. A has a verified \$1 million reimbursement agreement, B has a \$1 million contractual advance recovery, and C has an authorized \$1 million net land-proceeds allocation. These are separate receipts. The expected permanent municipal cost is \$3 million, before administration, and peak construction cash is \$6 million if none of the receipts precedes construction.

This is a screening example, not an approved portfolio. The \$2.6 million stressed construction exposure per project is a modelled amount, not a breach of an invented \$2-million ceiling. Compare each project and the combined portfolio with the actual municipal-exposure, permanent-contribution, advance and liquidity limits Council adopts on the Treasurer's advice. The arithmetic below identifies a liquidity failure under the stated assumptions independently of any arbitrary gross-project ceiling. A gate that rejects an inadequately funded package is working.

Assume a hypothetical \$10 million approved financing envelope, including \$200,000 of design/diligence spending and a \$2 million protected liquidity floor. For this borrowing sensitivity only, its sources are \$9 million of municipal cash and a separately authorized \$1 million interim bridge; the bridge is within the \$10 million envelope, not an additional dollar of capacity. Apply the following failures together: all construction rises 30%; the grant reimbursement is delayed 24 months; the developer fails and the \$1 million advance has no cash recovery; the private housing partner withdraws after servicing is built; net land proceeds fall 20% and arrive after the cash peak. Add \$300,000 of safe holding and inspection plus \$100,000 of enforcement, expressly additional to the construction allowance. At an assumed 8% simple annual interest on that \$1 million bridge for two years, interest adds \$160,000. This is a modelling device, not available CK credit or a recommended borrowing transaction.

Cash and cost measure	Baseline	Compound downside
Gross construction outlay	\$6.00 million	\$7.80 million
Additional holding and enforcement	\$0	\$0.40 million
Assumed additional interim interest	\$0	\$0.16 million
Peak external project cash required before receipts	\$6.00 million	\$8.36 million
Diligence already spent	\$0.20 million	\$0.20 million
Total cash consumed at peak	\$6.20 million	\$8.56 million
Financing capacity remaining from \$10 million	\$3.80 million	\$1.44 million

Cash and cost measure	Baseline	Compound downside
Shortfall against \$2 million protected floor	\$0	\$0.56 million
Later grant receipt if retained	\$1.00 million	\$1.00 million
Later advance repayment	\$1.00 million	\$0
Later assigned net land receipt	\$1.00 million	\$0.80 million
Ultimate project economic cost after receipts	\$3.00 million	\$6.56 million
Ultimate cost if grant also denied or clawed back	\$4.00 million	\$7.56 million

The peak is cumulative payments to external parties before offsetting external receipts. Internal reserve transfers do not lower it. The assumed \$1 million bridge funds part of that peak, and creates \$1 million debt exposure plus interest; it does not reduce the gross municipal financing requirement. The later grant receipt must first satisfy the bridge repayment obligation. It cannot simultaneously replenish unrestricted MIIF cash. Without lawful borrowing authority, the full envelope would need another \$1 million of municipal cash or reduced scope. The \$1 million default is already embedded in the loss of repayment and must not be added again to construction cost. Public assets may remain useful; their carrying value is a separate accounting measure, not a cash receipt.

Now add a hypothetical \$3 million urgent municipal capital priority at the peak. Total cash demand including diligence becomes \$11.56 million, exceeding the hypothetical total financing envelope by \$1.56 million. Preserving the \$2 million floor requires \$3.56 million of additional lawful funding, scope deferral or cancellation. Without another source, \$1.56 million—52% of that hypothetical \$3 million priority—cannot be paid from this financing envelope when needed. A safety obligation may not be deferrable. This is an illustration of opportunity cost, not a finding that CK has such a cash shortfall or that its existing priorities should be cut.

The compound test therefore fails the liquidity gate even though the initial \$6 million scope appears to fit a \$10 million fund. Finance should reduce simultaneous commitments, require earlier outside cash, improve security, resize the financing packages, or reassess them alongside other approved capital priorities. The later \$1.8 million of receipts does not cure a cash shortage that occurs two years earlier. If the grant is actually revoked, the ultimate cost grows but the model must also include any clawback payment timing; it cannot assume that the government absorbs the abandoned-project risk.

Mandatory refusal and stop conditions

MIIF must refuse commitment where there is no identified lawful authority, no appropriated funding, no credible underlying project, no documented causal bottleneck, inadequate engineering, unbounded exposure, missing required outside financing, inadequate liquidity, speculative repayment, no lawful procurement route, no enforceable agreement or no practical way to protect the public investment.

After approval, a material scope change, funding withdrawal, sponsor insolvency, expired permits, security impairment, ceiling breach or collapse of the underlying delivery case triggers an immediate hold on new discretionary commitments. The CAO coordinates safe preservation of works within existing authority; Finance and Legal identify contractual obligations that cannot simply be abandoned. Council receives a decision on stop, resize, transfer to the capital plan or separately justified continuation. Essential safety work and amounts already contractually owed remain obligations, not exemptions permitting a broader rescue.

A stop report must identify sunk costs, remaining liabilities, asset usefulness, recoveries and lessons. Stopping a bad project is a successful MIIF outcome.

16 The strongest objections

Perspective	Legitimate criticism	Safeguard or unresolved weakness
Treasurer	A second fund can disguise debt, fragment reserves and promise recycling that never occurs.	Keep the program inside municipal books; consolidate exposure and cash, classify every dollar and certify liquidity. Demonstrate institutional benefits rather than assume a new reserve is required.
Municipal solicitor	Public benefit and Council approval do not cure bonusing, lending, guarantee or corporate-law defects.	Identify the actual enabling authority and transaction structure before Gate 5. Counsel may reject an arrangement. A general MIIF policy is never sufficient legal authority.
Infrastructure engineer	A small extension can trigger major downstream capacity, approvals and lifecycle costs.	Require system-level capacity verification and a bounded service area, independent estimate review where warranted, and full asset-management costing. Some apparently small projects will fail this test.
Taxpayer	Developers may privatize gains while residents absorb losses and maintenance.	Establish the normal developer obligation first, negotiate enforceable contributions, publish permanent cost and annual operating effects, and compare alternative uses of the same capital. Some public growth infrastructure remains legitimately unrecoverable.
Developer	Another six-gate process may add delay without adding money.	Reuse verified studies and one accountable lead. Run gates alongside existing approvals. Refer outside MIIF where an existing process supplies equivalent coordinated discipline more simply.
Housing advocate	“Unlocking” market housing may displace affordable housing priorities and claim units never built.	Separate housing delivery from service capacity, track actual completions and affordability commitments, and give CK-145 no automatic allocation. MIIF alone does not ensure affordability; that remains an unresolved housing-program task.

Perspective	Legitimate criticism	Safeguard or unresolved weakness
Economic-development professional	Strict security and public-value rules may lose time-sensitive employers.	Set expedited evidence review for credible deadlines, not lower legal or funding standards. Accept that some commercially attractive opportunities cannot justify municipal risk.
Rural resident	Urban growth projects may consume capacity while rural roads, drainage and water needs wait.	Publish geography, service effects and opportunity costs; protect ordinary lifecycle priorities. Allow rural bottlenecks on the same evidence test. Geographic quotas would not establish project merit.
Skeptical councillor	MIIF may be branding for projects already approved, inviting political favourites and opaque exceptions.	Publish the duplication test, decisions, reasons and exceptions. Use a 12-month review and sunset for new commitments unless Council renews the framework. Demonstrable additional value is the condition for continuation.

The hardest unresolved criticism is institutional additionality. CK has many lawful financing tools, but their existence does not establish a common cross-sector process for assembling and verifying catalytic interventions. MIIF must materially improve identification, structuring, funding coordination, recovery discipline and exposure transparency compared with current project-specific practice. A separate reserve remains conditional on demonstrated pipeline and affordability. If existing governance already supplies the full coordinated function more simply, integrate MIIF there; if the pilot adds no measurable value, resize or discontinue it.

17 Governance and public reporting

An initial municipal framework

Council should retain policy, appropriation, adopted exposure ceilings, material exceptions, project approvals, borrowing and any separately lawful assistance decisions. MIIF should initially operate as a catalytic infrastructure program/framework within CK's financial system, using existing departments and staff. It supplies common capital architecture and discipline without a corporation, development bank, lending institution or standalone bureaucracy. A dedicated reserve or reserve fund may support it once Finance demonstrates that a recurring pipeline justifies one, with a defined lawful purpose and Council-approved contributions. Neither the framework nor the account changes municipal financial reporting or delegated authority.

The CAO appoints one accountable coordinator and resolves interdepartmental sequencing. The Treasurer certifies funding, classification, cash timing, debt compliance, exposure and recoveries, and controls the ledger. Legal Services certifies the transaction-specific authority, agreements, security, statutory requirements and corporate boundaries. Engineering establishes system capacity, estimate quality, technical dependencies, asset ownership and lifecycle obligations. Procurement establishes the lawful route, competition, delegated limits and tender readiness. The sponsoring department supplies the credible underlying project, counterparties and outcome evidence, and remains accountable for delivery. The Land Bank supplies parcel facts and property readiness where relevant, while retaining its separate gates and authority.

Independent engineering, cost, credit or legal review is warranted for unfamiliar technology, concentrated exposure, material estimate uncertainty, unusual recoveries or a conflict of interest. Review cost belongs in the approved project or separately funded diligence envelope. Existing staff workload, time and incremental costs must be measured before proposing permanent positions. No committee, coordinator or outside reviewer may approve spending through an evidence gate.

A conflict register should include staff, elected officials and advisers, with recusals and applicable statutory procedures. Evaluation records must demonstrate why a project passes the causal test. Council can choose among compliant projects; it cannot waive statutory authority. The strong-mayor budget framework and election-period restrictions require current procedural review before approvals or delegation. [12,22]

Quarterly public statement

Publish an accessible quarterly report within 60 days of quarter-end, reconciled to Finance's records. Use confidential appendices only for information lawfully withheld, with aggregate public exposure maintained. Report at least:

- Opening seed capitalization, authorized project-specific sources, contributions, available cash, liquidity floor, legally available commitment capacity and closing balances, including financing held outside any designated MIIF reserve.
- Each project's approved scope, identifier, gate, sponsor, geographic location, start and completion forecast, and stop or failure status.
- Total enabling-infrastructure cost, approved and forecast cost, contingency, expenditure to date, gross municipal committed exposure, peak cash exposure, remaining obligations and forecast versus actual cost.
- Permanent municipal contribution and expenditure, retained asset additions, recoverable municipal exposure, advances outstanding, allowances, overdue amounts, actual cash recovered and lifecycle municipal obligations.
- Borrowing principal and debt service, guarantees, contingent liabilities, security status and consolidated exposure.
- Private, provincial and federal capital separately shown as announced, approved, legally committed and received. Municipal matching costs and grant deadlines must be visible.
- Forecast versus actual housing, employment, investment, capacity and service outcomes; methodology, verification date and reasons for variance.
- Exceptions to ceilings, cost changes, recovery amendments, rejected and stopped projects, and impacts on other municipal priorities.

The summary must reconcile opening cash plus actual external receipts and authorized internal allocations less cash payments to closing cash. Report internal transfers separately. A second reconciliation connects approved commitments, cash expenditure, payable obligations and remaining capacity. A third reconciles the Land Bank and other municipal programs for shared projects. Cash balance alone is not uncommitted capacity. Reconcile the whole financing package even when outside money is paid directly to a delivery partner. Distinguish infrastructure value governed through MIIF from municipal capital deployed and cash retained in a reserve.

Annual review should accompany the budget process and audited financial reporting. Finance should publish the accounting policy and material estimation changes. An independently reviewed pilot evaluation is warranted if its cost is proportionate; no new permanent oversight institution is required for a handful of projects.

18 Implementation milestones

Time	Work and reviewable deliverables	What remains unauthorized
First 30 days	Appoint existing-staff lead. Inventory CK capital, reserve, debt, DC, PUC, CIP, grant and servicing tools. Obtain current legal consolidations and Finance-certified 2026 balances, commitments and ARL. Establish a common identifier with the Land Bank.	No project capital, lending, guarantee, construction or property commitment.
By 60 days	Produce the authority matrix, accounting/recovery rules, gates, duplication assessment and financing models. Identify a candidate pipeline, source combinations, municipal exposure and potential recoveries, including referral and rejection cases.	Candidate status creates no entitlement or funding promise.
By 90 days	Report the repeatable catalytic capital design, pipeline and financing packages. Present capitalization need, reserve justification, verified sources, corporate liquidity floor and Treasurer-recommended ceilings for Council adoption. Identify costs and preserve Land Bank policy.	No capital appropriation by implication; Council must expressly vote any identified appropriation.
By 180 days	If separately authorized, prepare two or three pilot packages: engineering, lawful source combinations, exposure, recoveries and liquidity. Bring each Gate 5 report to Council with procurement, contracts, asset plan and stress test. Start quarterly reporting, including stopped candidates.	No construction until lawful approvals, funding, procurement and enforceable agreements are complete.
By 12 months	Evaluate delivered milestones, cash, exposure, administrative cost and additionality. Reconcile jointly involved programs. Decide renewal, redesign, transfer into ordinary capital planning or closure to new commitments. Existing obligations and recoveries continue under their agreements.	No automatic expansion, corporation, larger ceiling or continuing appropriation.

These are targets for evidence production, not deadlines that waive missing studies. A project that cannot be engineered and legally structured within 180 days should remain at the appropriate gate. Candidate screening should first ask whether an existing CK tool offers an immediate solution.

19 Measures of success

MIIF succeeds when it removes a documented constraint at a justified and controlled municipal cost. It does not succeed merely by spending its allocation.

Measure	Definition and verification
Additional delivery	Compare the documented no-intervention timetable with actual approved development milestones. Count units completed separately from units serviced, permitted or forecast. Identify other causes of delay.
Housing unlocked	Report new capacity and units actually able to proceed, then starts and completions. Do not re-count already funded units or claim all surrounding housing as MIIF-enabled.
Employment land in use	Hectares serviced, hectares occupied and actual operating sites, with dates. Distinguish capacity created from demand realized.
Private investment	Executed commitments, verified expenditure and delivered operating investment separately. Exclude municipal and senior-government money from private capital.
Employment	Verified jobs created or retained, duration and method; distinguish forecasts from actual payroll or credible employer certification.
Infrastructure	Capacity added, service performance, ownership, useful life and annual lifecycle cost. Avoided cost requires an explicit comparator and evidence.
Recoveries	Actual cash received, principal restored, arrears, write-downs and collection cost. Principal is not profit. Report realized interest separately from financing and administration costs.
Taxpayer cost	Permanent contributions, lifecycle subsidy, debt interest, losses and contingent obligations. Asset creation and economic benefit are separate from cash return.
Leverage	Outside legally committed or received capital divided by clearly stated municipal gross or net capital. Publish both denominator and timing; never combine commitments with receipts in one ratio.
Discipline	Referrals to existing tools, rejected/stopped projects, ceiling exceptions, cost variance, review duration and staff cost. More rejection can be evidence of effective screening.

The 12-month evaluation should compare MIIF with the baseline project-governance process: decision speed without weaker controls, cross-department coordination, funding-source combinations, consistent recoveries, exposure transparency, comparison across sectors, avoided duplicate or ad hoc design and actual projects unlocked. Record administrative cost as well as improvements. Existing financing powers are not the measure of failure. If institutional benefits do not materialize, Council should resize the framework, integrate it into ordinary capital governance or discontinue new commitments under the sunset, while preserving existing obligations and recoveries.

20 Proposed Council direction

The following is proposed policy language for procedural and legal review, not a statement that Council has approved MIIF.

That Council direct the CAO, Treasurer and relevant departments to design and undertake feasibility work for a repeatable Municipal Infrastructure Investment Fund catalytic capital program/framework within Chatham-Kent's existing financial system, organized around the principle "Fund the bottleneck, not the whole project," and to report back within 90 days with:

1. An inventory of existing lawful financing tools and an assessment of whether current project governance already provides equivalent coordinated catalytic-project discipline; and cases where an existing route can be used more simply without MIIF.
2. A transaction-specific legal authority framework, common project gates and accounting, recovery classifications, engineering and procurement requirements, and cross-departmental responsibilities compatible with, but independent of, the Municipal Land Bank framework.
3. A credible candidate pipeline and project financing-source combinations, actual municipal exposure and potential recoveries, capitalization and liquidity options including \$2 million, \$5 million, \$7.5 million and \$10 million illustrations, verified named sources, compound downside tests and effects on existing priorities.
4. A recommendation whether a dedicated reserve or reserve fund is justified; Treasurer-recommended numerical ceilings for Council adoption before project funding; governance, quarterly reporting, staff and diligence costs; and a work plan for project-specific pilot packages by 180 days if separately authorized.

That the work be undertaken within existing authorized resources, or that any additional policy/diligence expenditure be brought to Council first with a specific amount and identified lawful funding source.

That this direction does not appropriate unspecified project capital; authorize borrowing or guarantees; approve loans or recoverable advances; authorize private-business assistance; establish a municipal services corporation; invest in Maple City Power; authorize construction; commit Land Bank property; or override procurement, budget, debt, reserve, development-charge or statutory controls.

That approval or passage through MIIF evidence gates does not itself authorize any expenditure or transaction, and that every actual project require later project-specific approval, identified lawful authority, an express appropriation and funding source, completed procurement requirements and enforceable agreements before commitment.

That the Land Bank Draft 3 mandate and its property authority remain unchanged; CK-145 and any future Maple City Power receive no automatic allocation; and jointly involved programs use common identifiers and reconciled accounting to prevent double counting.

That any funded pilot recommendation include a 12-month review and sunset for new commitments unless Council renews the framework, without impairing existing contractual obligations, lawful debt service or collection of recoveries.

21 Evidence register and outstanding verification

The register distinguishes primary facts from historical illustrations and proposed rules. Online records were reviewed for this October 1, 2026 paper. Search-indexed extracts are identified where the full primary text could not be retrieved. They support cautious factual description, not a municipal solicitor's certification of the current law. No unapproved grant or unverified reserve balance is treated as available funding.

Required certifications before a funded pilot

Finance must supply the adopted 2026 operating and capital budgets and amendments; uncommitted reserve balances by lawful purpose; existing commitments, receivables and interfund borrowing; the current debt schedule, latest applicable ARL and capacity calculation; PUC and municipal cost allocations; and the effect on already approved priorities. The public budget announcements and published policies do not replace those ledgers.

Legal must confirm current consolidated statutes and regulations, CK's DC by-laws and exemptions, the adopted CIP and any amendments, current delegations, procurement transitional provisions, election-period restrictions, ownership powers, agreement authority and the treatment of any assistance, security, advance or corporation transaction. An independently indexed statutory extract does not establish every exception or prerequisite.

The sponsoring department must supply the current capital pipeline, actual sponsor commitments, servicing agreements, engineering estimates, downstream capacity studies, land title/control information where relevant, grant agreements and eligible-cost schedules. Funding intakes and terms must be checked at application and commitment; future intake announcements confer no award. These are unresolved inputs, not reasons to assume the project is affordable.

Source register

Source numbers refer to the records below. Primary means the municipality, Ontario, Canada or the responsible program administrator. Research and source qualifications are retained from Draft 1. Draft 2 institutional recommendations, control categories, implementation targets and Council direction are proposed policy. Numerical capitalization, exposure and stress inputs are modelling assumptions unless explicitly identified as verified fact; actual pilot ceilings remain for Finance recommendation and Council adoption.

[1] CK municipal budgets

Primary municipal budget portal and multi-year budget context. Full adopted 2026 ledger and amendments remain to be certified.

<https://www.chatham-kent.ca/localgovernment/budget/Pages/Our-Municipal-Budgets.aspx>

[2] CK Council recommends 4.63 per cent budget increase

Official 2026 budget announcement. Announcement wording is not a substitute for the adopted detailed budget.

[Open primary source](#)

[3] CK Debt Management Strategy

Primary PDF, revision November 27, 2023; growth financing, prioritization and business-case framework. Current headroom not established.

[Open primary source](#)

[4] CK Reserves and Reserve Funds Policy

Primary policy PDF. Purpose, governance and financial controls; no balance inferred.

[Open primary source](#)

[5] CK Surplus and Deficit Policy

Primary indexed policy, November 3, 2025. Budget/fund distinctions; no available surplus assumed.

[Open primary source](#)

[6] CK Annual Asset Management Program Review

Primary 2026 report, capital prioritization and long-term planning. Reported future planning work is not completed financing.

[Open primary source](#)

[7] CK Bridge Financing Policy

Primary two-page policy, nonprofit interim financing and conditions. Not a general developer-lending power.

[Open primary source](#)

[8] CK Municipal Building Development Charges

Primary municipal DC page, By-law 149-2022 and revised schedules. Obtain current amendments and eligible-service balances.

[Open primary source](#)

[9] CK Water and Wastewater Development Charges

Primary PUC DC page and linked background study. Indexed study discusses financing tools; executed local front-ending agreements were not verified.

<https://www.chatham-kent.ca/services/water/Pages/Water-Wastewater-Development-Charges.aspx>

[10] CK Community Improvement Plan

Primary program page and linked November 2025 adopted by-law. Full large PDF retrieval was limited; precise incentives, eligibility and authority require Legal confirmation.

[Open primary source](#)

[11] CK Purchasing By-law 19-2026

Primary 43-page PDF, February 23, 2026 enactment and transition. Approval and developer cost-sharing provisions examined; no exemption created by MIIF.

[Open primary source](#)

[12] Ontario Municipal Act 2001

Primary e-Laws indexed consolidation, including powers, bonusing, capital facilities, corporations, budgets, reserves and borrowing. Full-page retrieval limited; counsel must certify applicable sections and amendments.

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/01m25>

[13] Ontario municipal councillors guide fiscal context

Primary explanatory guidance on municipal finance and legal restrictions. Guidance does not replace legislation.

<https://www.ontario.ca/document/ontario-municipal-councillors-guide/9-fiscal-context>

[14] Ontario Planning Act

Primary indexed e-Laws source, including community improvement provisions. Current transaction-specific prerequisites require counsel review.

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13>

[15] Ontario Regulation 603/06 municipal capital facilities

Primary indexed regulation governing prescribed capital facilities and associated agreements. MIIF eligibility is not statutory eligibility.

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/060603>

[16] Ontario Regulation 403/02 debt and financial obligation limits

Primary indexed e-Laws regulation. Treasurer calculation and any required approval remain transaction-specific.

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/020403>

[17] Ontario understanding municipal debt

Primary guidance; read with the Ministry FIR Annual Repayment Limit archive at

<https://efis.fma.csc.gov.on.ca/fir/index.php/en/arl/>. Published ARLs require adjustment for subsequent obligations.

[Open primary source](#)

[18] Ontario Development Charges Act 1997

Primary indexed e-Laws source, including credits and front-ending. Current amendments, by-laws and eligible service treatment require confirmation.

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/97d27>

[19] Ontario Regulation 599/06 municipal services corporations

Primary indexed e-Laws source for municipal services corporation prerequisites and restrictions. Does not establish MCP.

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/060599>

[20] Ontario Electricity Act 1998

Primary indexed current e-Laws source, including section 142 electricity corporation framework. Distinct from an ordinary section 203 MSC.

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/98e15>

[21] Ontario Energy Board Act 1998

Primary indexed e-Laws source for electricity regulatory framework. Licensing and activity-specific obligations need separate review.

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/98o15>

[22] Ontario strong mayor powers and duties guide

Primary procedural guidance. Applicability, current regulations and election transition must be checked when an approval is scheduled.

[Open primary source](#)

[23] Ontario Regulation 588/17 asset management planning

Primary indexed regulation, read with <https://www.ontario.ca/page/municipal-asset-management-planning>. Infrastructure asset and lifecycle obligations persist after construction.

<https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/170588>

[24] CK 55 Minnie Street report

Historical August 2024 primary municipal report, indexed extract identifying surrounding servicing requirements up to \$7 million. Direct retrieval restricted. Not a current estimate or an approved MIIF candidate.

<https://pub-chatham-kent.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=14941>

[25] CK Bloomfield Business Park Phase 3 contract announcement

Primary official announcement of \$1.38 million contract and anticipated 2026 works. Announcement is not completion verification.

[Open primary source](#)

[26] Building Communities industrial park expansion

Program-administrator historical account, August 13, 2023, of more than \$1.5 million CCBF investment in 2022 and 26 acres. Demonstrates an existing financing route.

[Open primary source](#)

[27] Ontario Housing Enabling Water Systems Fund

Primary indexed program page. Historical maximum 73 per cent and \$35 million; intake closed. No available award inferred.

<https://www.ontario.ca/page/housing-enabling-water-systems-fund>

[28] Ontario Housing Enabling Core Servicing Stream

Primary indexed program page. Historical maximum 50 per cent and \$20 million; intake closed.

<https://www.ontario.ca/page/housing-enabling-core-servicing-stream>

[29] Ontario Health and Safety Water Stream

Primary indexed program page. Historical maximum 73 per cent and \$30 million; intake closed. Often ordinary capital rather than MIIF.

<https://www.ontario.ca/page/health-and-safety-water-stream>

[30] Ontario Development Charge Reduction Program

Primary indexed page and June 1, 2026 guidelines at [Open primary source](#) Initial intake closed; conditions include active DC by-law, reduction and match requirements. Not an assumed CK allocation.

<https://www.ontario.ca/page/development-charge-reduction-program>

[31] Ontario Non Development Charge Municipalities Stream

Primary indexed page and August 24, 2026 program guidelines. Announced opening October 29, 2026. CK has active DC mechanisms; eligibility is not assumed.

<https://www.ontario.ca/page/non-development-charge-municipalities-stream>

[32] Canada Housing Infrastructure Fund

Primary federal page. Direct delivery intake closed. Historical applicant guide: [Open primary source](#) Conditions differ by agreement and stream.

<https://housing-infrastructure.canada.ca/housing-logement/chif-fcil/index-eng.html>

[33] Build Communities Strong Fund provincial territorial stream

Primary federal program page. Ontario delivery and allocation need confirmation; an announced national envelope is not CK funding.

<https://housing-infrastructure.canada.ca/bcsf-fbcf/provincial-territorial/index-eng.html>

[34] Build Communities Strong Fund community stream

Primary federal page and March 2026 Canada announcement. CCBF transition must not be counted as new money in addition to the same allocation.

<https://housing-infrastructure.canada.ca/bcsf-fbcf/community-communautaire/index-eng.html>

[35] Build Communities Strong Fund direct delivery stream

Primary federal page, including applicant status language; current intake availability requires confirmation. FedDev Ontario June 11, 2026 Local Impact announcement is historical opening evidence, not proof of an October open intake.

[Open primary source](#)

[36] Federation of Canadian Municipalities Green Municipal Fund

Responsible program administrator current catalogue. Grants and loans vary by product; no universal match or stacking rule inferred.

<https://greenmunicipalfund.ca/funding>

[37] Infrastructure Ontario municipal loan eligibility

Primary provincial lender page, municipal capital financing and term options. A loan remains debt; no approval or CK capacity inferred.

[Open primary source](#)

[38] Canada Infrastructure Bank Infrastructure for Housing Initiative

Primary federal Crown lender page and October 2025 overview. Typical \$50 million project scale, with exceptions; not a grant or automatic small-pilot fit.

<https://cib-bic.ca/en/infrastructure-for-housing-initiative/>

[39] Ontario Building Faster Fund CK award

Primary provincial announcement, 2026, \$440,000 based on 2025 housing results. Uncommitted availability and permitted use require Finance confirmation.

[Open primary source](#)

[40] Build Communities Strong Fund frequently asked questions

Primary federal program guidance on stream and stacking restrictions. Actual agreement governs eligibility, receipts and total assistance.

<https://housing-infrastructure.canada.ca/bcsf-fbcf/faq-eng.html>

[41] CK 199 Westcourt affordable housing tender

Primary official tender record, award June 4, 2026. Award does not establish occupancy or MIIF additionality.

[Open primary source](#)

[42] CK Talbot Trail realignment

Primary project page, July 2026 design status and approximately 130 metre realignment. Read with CK 2026 AMO priorities announcement seeking \$4 million; request is not award.

[Open primary source](#)

[43] CK stormwater remediation consulting tender

Primary official 2026–2027 tender record. Ordinary remediation illustration, not an MIIF candidate.

[Open primary source](#)

[R1] Chatham Kent Municipal Land Bank White Paper Draft 3

User-supplied Chatham-Kent_Municipal_Land_Bank_White_Paper_Draft_3(1).docx, read as a consistency reference. Its property mandate, six gates, joint accounting requirements and corporate distinctions are preserved. It is a proposed policy reference, not enacted legal authority. No edits have been made to it.

Reading the conclusion

The verified record demonstrates existing CK financing tools and historical catalytic investments. The proposed MIIF program would assemble those tools within a repeatable institutional framework; it does not require new statutory powers or a reserve equal to total infrastructure value. The modelling shows why limited seed capital and delayed recoveries demand disciplined municipal exposure and liquidity controls. Additionality depends on better coordination, structuring, recovery and verified delivery than current practice, and remains subject to the pilot review. Certified municipal capacity, lawful project agreements and delivery evidence must precede commitment.

Credible project → documented bottleneck → bounded infrastructure intervention → financing package → honest municipal exposure and recovery classification → Council approval → delivery → verification.

Fund the bottleneck, not the whole project.