



REVIEW REPORT 346-2025

Resort Village of Shields

May 01, 2026

Summary:

The Applicant submitted the prescribed *Access to Information Request* form to the Resort Village of Shields (Village). The Village issued a fee estimate to the Applicant in the amount of \$285.00. The Applicant requested the Village waive the fees and the Village denied the request. The Applicant requested a review by the Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner (OIPC) of the decision by the Village to not grant their request for a fee waiver and a review of the fee estimate provided by the Village.

Upon review, the Commissioner found that:

- (1) the Village properly exercised its discretion in refusing a waiver of fees;
- (2) the overall fee estimate of \$285.00 issued by the Village was unreasonable; and
- (3) this office re-calculated the reasonable fees to be \$218.50.

The Commissioner recommended that:

- (1) the Village take no further action regarding the Applicant's fee waiver request;
- (2) the Village issue a revised fee estimate in that amount of \$218.50; and
- (3) if the Applicant pays the 50% deposit of \$109.25, the Village should continue to process the Applicant's access to information request.

I BACKGROUND

[1] On December 6, 2025, the Resort Village of Shields (Village) received the prescribed *Access to Information Request Form*¹ from the Applicant. The Applicant requested the following:

Request all municipal records (Mar 1, 2025-present) referencing my name [Applicant's first and last name]², my address [Applicant's address] or drones/UAV's³. Include all emails, letters, notes, memoranda, complaint forms, internal reports, text/SMS/WhatsAppMessenger messages used for municipal business, staff notes, bylaw files, council discussions (incl. in-camera references if applicable) and any other written or recorded communication held by Council, CAO⁴, staff, bylaw enforcement, RCMP, contractors, or citizens.⁵

Also include:

- Bylaw enforcement logs, complaint databases, spreadsheets, ticketing systems
- Phone records: call logs, voicemail, staff call notes.
- Handwritten notes of CAO/Mayor/Council/bylaw staff.
- Social media-related records: screenshots, messages, monitoring involving me, my address, or drones.
- External communications with Ombudsman, SARM/SUMA⁶, Transport Canada, RCMP, or provincial agencies referencing me, my property, or drones.

¹ The Access to Information Request Form is Form A, extracted from [The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Regulations](#), RRS c.L-27.1 Reg1 (July 1, 1993), as amended at Form A, Part III of the Appendix.

² The words in square brackets protect the personal information of individuals.

³ Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (drone).

⁴ Chief Administrative Officer.

⁵ The use of square brackets in this Report are amendments by OIPC to preserve the identity of the Applicant.

⁶ Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities/Saskatchewan Urban Municipalities Association.

- Drafts & working papers: draft bylaws, internal memos, briefing notes, staff recommendations.
- Calendar entries: Outlook/meeting notes or reminders referencing me or my property.
- Legal correspondence or opinions related to complaints or issues involving me.
- Enforcement guidelines or bylaw interpretations used in matters involving me or my drones.
- Metadata for all responsive records (dates, times, authors, recipients, file numbers).

[2] On December 8, 2025, the Village confirmed receipt of the *Access to Information Request* form and the \$20.00 application fee from the Applicant.

[3] On the same date, December 8, 2025, the Village provided the Applicant with a fee estimate of \$285.00. The Village informed the Applicant it would proceed to work on the request upon receipt of a deposit of 50% (\$142.50).

[4] On December 8, 2025, the Applicant emailed the Village to request a fee waiver.

[5] On December 19, 2025, the Village sent a letter to the Applicant denying the fee waiver request and stating as follows:

... I understand that you are asking for information regarding your own personal information; however, in searching for the information you are requesting the search may also include a lot of content that is not your own personal information.

...Also, if the document with your personal information includes others personal information, their information must be redacted.

...I don't feel the quote from Administration is excessive.

[6] On December 20, 2025, the Applicant emailed the Village asking for the fee estimate to be reissued based on records being provided electronically. As a result, on December 22, 2025, the Village emailed the Applicant to explain that the approximately 150 pages it

anticipated would be responsive would need to be printed, manually redacted and then scanned back into the computer to provide them electronically. In the same correspondence, the Village also emphasized that this is an estimate only and that the Applicant would only be charged for the time it takes to complete the work.

[7] On December 22, 2025, the Applicant requested a review by the Office of the Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner (OIPC) of the denial of their fee waiver request and the fee estimate issued by the Village.

[8] On January 16, 2026, OIPC notified the Village and the Applicant that a review would proceed. OIPC requested the Village provide its submission by February 17, 2026. The Applicant was also invited to provide a submission.

[9] On January 22, 2026, the Applicant provided OIPC with a submission.

[10] On February 17, 2026, the Village provided OIPC with a submission.

II RECORDS AT ISSUE

[11] There are no records at issue in this review. At issue is the decision of the Village to deny the Applicant's fee waiver request. In addition, at issue is the fee estimate issued by the Village.

III DISCUSSION OF THE ISSUES

1. Jurisdiction

[12] The Village qualifies as a “local authority” under section 2(1)(f)(i) of *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (LA FOIP)*.⁷ OIPC has jurisdiction to undertake a review of this matter, under Part VI of *LA FOIP*.⁸

2. The Village properly exercised its discretion in refusing a waiver of fees

[13] The Applicant requested OIPC review the decision of the Village to refuse a fee waiver, which would include the \$20.00 application fee paid by the Applicant on the same day the access for information request was made (December 8, 2025).

[14] Section 9(5) of *LA FOIP* provides that a local authority can waive payment of all or part of the prescribed fees as outlined at section 5 of *The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Regulations (LA FOIP Regulations)*⁹ as follows:

9(5) Where a prescribed circumstance exists, the head may waive payment of all or any part of the prescribed fee.

[15] Section 8 of *LA FOIP Regulations* outlines circumstances in which local authorities may waive the payment of fees. Section 8 of *LA FOIP Regulations* provides as follows:

8(1) For the purposes of subsection 9(5) of the Act, the following circumstances are prescribed as circumstances in which a head may waive payment of fees:

⁷ [*The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*](#), SS 1990-91, c.L-27.1, as amended.

⁸ The authority to consider the Applicant’s request for review can be found at section 38(1)(a.2) of *LA FOIP*, which provides that an applicant may apply to the Commissioner for a review where an applicant believes that all or part of the fee estimated should be waived pursuant to section 9(5) of *LA FOIP*.

⁹ *Supra*, footnote 1.

(a) with respect to the fees set out in subsection 5(1), if the application involves the personal information of the applicant;

(b) with respect to the fees set out in subsections 5(2) to 5(4), if payment of the prescribed fees will cause a substantial financial hardship for the applicant and, in the opinion of the head, giving access to the record is in the public interest;

(c) if the prescribed cost or actual cost for service is \$100 or less.

[16] On December 9, 2025, the Applicant emailed the Village requesting a fee waiver:

The fee-waiver authority comes from the Act, not the Regulations. Section 9(5) of The Local Authority Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Section 8(1) of the Regulations provides additional circumstances where a waiver may be granted, including 8(1)(a), which applies where the request involves the applicant's own personal information. My request includes records referring to me, so this prescribed circumstance also applies.

Therefore, **my fee waiver request is supported on two grounds:**

1. Fairness under section 9(5) of the Act, and
2. Section 8(1)(a) of the Regulations, as the request includes my personal information.

...

[Emphasis in original]

a. Application of section 8(1)(a) of *LA FOIP Regulations*

[17] Above, the Applicant argues that a waiver of the fee provided for in section 8(1)(a) of *LA FOIP Regulations* should be granted as the access to information request involves their personal information. Section 8(1)(a) of *LA FOIP Regulations* provides that the waiver is however only with respect to the fees set out in section 5(1) of *LA FOIP Regulations*. Section 5(1) of *LA FOIP Regulations* prescribes that a \$20 application fee is due when an access to information request is made:

5(1) An application fee of \$20 is payable at the time an application for access to a record is made.

[18] Even if the Applicant's access to information request involves the Applicant's own personal information, it is still within the discretion of the local authority to refuse to waive the application fee. Fees, however, should be fair and judiciously applied.¹⁰

[19] In this case, to determine if circumstances exist for a waiver of the application fee, the head of a local authority must first determine whether the application involves the personal information of the Applicant. If it does, then the head must consider whether the fee waiver should be granted having regard to all relevant interests.¹¹

[20] Personal information is defined by means of a non-exhaustive list in section 23(1) of *LA FOIP*. Personal information is information that is about an identifiable individual, and that is personal in nature. Information is about an identifiable individual if the individual can be identified from the information; examples include a person's name or social insurance number. Further, information is personal in nature if it provides something personal in nature about the individual.¹²

[21] On December 19, 2025, the Village responded to the Applicant's request for a fee waiver under section 8(1)(a) of *LA FOIP Regulations*:

...

Your request for a fee waiver has been reviewed and denied.

I understand that you are asking for information regarding your own personal information; however, in searching for the information you are requesting the search may also include a lot of content that is not your own personal information. When searching for documentation that has mention of your name, address or the word drone, there is a lot of information that comes up that is not pertinent to this request, so it requires weeding through documents which takes a lot of time. Also, if the document with your personal information includes others personal information, their information must be redacted.

¹⁰ OIPC [Review Report 231-2025](#) at paragraph [19].

¹¹ *Ibid*, at paragraph [20].

¹² *Ibid*, at paragraph [23].

[22] This office has not reviewed the records responsive to this request because they have not yet been produced, but the Village concedes that some responsive records may contain the Applicant's personal information. In the past this office has considered that since the access request *involves* the Applicant's own personal information, circumstances may exist for a waiver of the application fee.¹³

[23] As this request will also involve a review for not only the Applicant's personal information but information which may include the personal information of others in this community as well as many other areas of interest, we are loathe to request a reconsideration of the discretion in waiving the \$20.00 application fee in this instance.

b. Application of section 8(1)(b) of *LA FOIP Regulations*

[24] Section 8(1)(b) of *LA FOIP Regulations* allows the head of a local authority to waive the payment of fees if payment would cause substantial financial hardship for an Applicant and access to the requested records is in the public interest. The statements are conjoined by the word "and" in *LA FOIP Regulations*, so both circumstances need to be met for the conditions for a fee waiver to be met.¹⁴

[25] For fee waiver requests under section 8(1)(b) of *LA FOIP Regulations*, this office has previously stressed the importance of determining if a record would be in the public interest before collecting details of substantial hardship from an applicant. A local authority must be careful to collect the least amount of personal information necessary. Still, an applicant must supply documentation to support a claim of substantial hardship after the public interest determination.¹⁵

[26] "Public interest" means a matter that is central to public discussion or debate and that is closely aligned to the fundamentals of democracy. The issues at the core of the disclosure

¹³ *Ibid* at paragraphs [27] and [31].

¹⁴ OIPC [Review Report 165-2025](#) at paragraph [23].

¹⁵ *Ibid*, at paragraph [24].

must relate to a shared concern of national or provincial consequence.¹⁶ The Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario (ON IPC) has provided seminal guidance on this issue. On page 5 of the bulletin “*Access Fact Sheet: Public Interest Disclosure*,” the ON OIPC wrote:¹⁷

For there to be a compelling public interest in disclosure of a record, the information must serve the purpose of informing the citizenry about the activities of their government, adding in some way to the information the public has to make effective use of the means of expressing public opinion or to make political choices.

[27] On December 8, 2025, the Applicant emailed the Village requesting a fee waiver for the fees associated with the search, preparation and reproduction of records associated with the fee estimate. The Applicant stated that the fees should be waived because:

...

1. The records relate directly to the Village administrative conduct, ongoing delays (138 day dock space application), and misdirected bylaw enforcement concerns (Recreational Vehicle Complaint).
2. Access to these records is necessary for public accountability and is in the public interest.

...

[28] The Village emailed the Applicant on February 25, 2026, requesting detail on the public interest issue. The Village also indicated that *if* the records were to be considered in the public interest, proof of financial hardship would need to be provided for a fee waiver. The Village gave the Applicant a deadline of March 5, 2026.

[29] The Applicant did not provide an argument for public interest and failed to provide details regarding financial hardship.

[30] On March 5, 2026, the Village emailed the Applicant formally denying the request for a waiver of fees.

¹⁶ OIPC [Investigation Report 178-2025](#) at paragraph [24] and [25].

¹⁷ [Access Fact Sheet: Public Interest Disclosure](#). ON OIPC, September 2021.

[31] The Applicant chose not to provide additional supporting arguments or materials to enable the Village to exercise discretion provided for in section 8(1)(b) of *LA FOIP Regulations*. There are no viable circumstances for a waiver of fees.

3. The fee estimate issued by the Village was unreasonable

[32] Sections 9(1) and (2) of *LA FOIP* provide as follows:

9(1) An applicant who is given notice pursuant to clause 7(2)(a) is entitled to obtain access to the record on payment of the prescribed fee.

(2) Where the amount of fees to be paid by an applicant for access to records is greater than a prescribed amount, the head shall give the applicant a reasonable estimate of the amount, and the applicant shall not be required to pay an amount greater than the estimated amount.

[33] The interaction of section 9(2) of *LA FOIP* and section 6(1) of *LA FOIP Regulations* requires a local authority to provide a fee estimate, if the cost for providing access will be in excess of \$100.00.¹⁸ This office has long emphasized that fees should not present an unreasonable barrier to access in Saskatchewan. Therefore, fees should be reasonable, fair, and at a level that does not discourage a resident from exercising access rights. At the same time, the fee regime should promote and encourage applicants to be reasonable and to cooperate with local authorities in defining and streamlining their access requests.¹⁹

[34] A “reasonable fee estimate” is one that is proportionate to the work required by the local authority to respond effectively and efficiently. A fee estimate is “equitable” when it is fair and even-handed and supports the principle that applicants should bear a reasonable portion of the costs to produce the records they are seeking. They should not bear costs arising from administrative inefficiencies or poor records management.²⁰

¹⁸ OIPC [Review Report 252-2024](#) at paragraph [27].

¹⁹ *Ibid*, at paragraph [28].

²⁰ OIPC [Review Report 127-2025](#) at paragraph [18].

[35] Three types of fees under consideration in this fee estimate are the following:²¹

- (1) Fees for searching for records;
- (2) Fees for preparing the records for disclosure; and
- (3) Fees for reproducing the records.

[36] In its February 17, 2026, submission, the Village explained that it had identified 150 possible responsive records. The Village failed to segregate the costs for search, preparation and reproduction fees. The original fee estimate was presented as follows:

Item	Quantity	Price per unit	Total Cost Estimate
Printed Pages	~150	\$0.25	\$37.50
Photocopied pages	~150	\$0.25	\$37.50
Time to search, review, redact	8 hrs. (minus one hour free for search/prep)	\$15/0.5 hours	\$210.00
Total Estimate			\$285.00
Total 50% Deposit Due			\$142.50

[37] The Applicant’s submission to OIPC outlined a concern that the proposed cost was unfair:

...
I did not request paper copies. Therefore, I request that **all records be provided electronically**, consistent with LA FOIP Regulations, s. 5(2) – fees apply only to the reproduction format requested.

...
 Because **inefficient record management cannot be passed to the applicant**, the 8-hour estimate requires justification.

[Emphasis in original]

[38] During the course of the review, the Village amended its fee estimate by withdrawing fees for reproduction of the records and altering its calculations for the time estimated to search for responsive records and prepare the records for disclosure. The Village estimated the

²¹ OIPC [Review Report 256-2025](#) at paragraph [15].

time to search for responsive records to be 344 minutes and estimated the time to prepare the records for disclosure to be 300 minutes, for a total of 644 minutes or 10 hours and 44 minutes.

[39] Our office was left to review the calculation of the fee in this case.

(1) Reasonableness of the Fees for Searching

[40] Section 5(3) of *LA FOIP Regulations* states:

5(3) Where time in excess of one hour is spent in searching for a record requested by an applicant or in preparing it for disclosure, a fee of \$15 for each half-hour or portion of a half-hour of that excess time is payable at the time when access is given.

[41] OIPC has previously outlined the following guidance with respect to what can be included in the calculation of search time.²²

Fees for search time consist of every half hour of manual search time required to locate and identify responsive records. For example:

- Staff time involved with searching for records.
- Examining file indices, file plans or listings of recordings either paper or electronic.
- Pulling paper files/specific paper records out of files.
- Reading through files to determine whether records are responsive.

Search time *does not* include:

- Time spent to copy records.
- Time spent going from office to office or off-site storage to look for records.
- Having someone review the results of the search.

²² *Ibid*, at paragraph [18].

[42] OIPC has set out the following general standards for estimating search time:²³

- It should take an experienced employee one minute to visually scan 12 pages of paper or electronic records for responsiveness.
- It should take an experienced employee five minutes to search one regular file drawer for responsive file folders.
- It should take 3 minutes to search one active email account and transfer the results to a separate folder or drive. (This standard will also be applied to searching other electronic devices such as cell phones.)

[43] The following table captures the details of the search completed by the Village in locating responsive records:

Search Location	Number of Locations	Time in Minutes
Email Accounts	8 email accounts ²⁴ 3 separate search parameters: Name Address Drones/UAVs	8 x 3 minutes per account x 3 phrases 72 minutes
Electronic Computer Files	13 files 3 separate search parameters: Name Address Drones/UAVs	13 files x 3 minutes per file x 3 phrases 117 minutes
Cell Phone Devices	7 cell phones 3 separate search parameters: Name	7 devices x 3 minutes ²⁵ per device x 3 phrases to search

²³ *Ibid*, at paragraph [24].

²⁴ The Village stated that there are email accounts for: four staff, three council members, and one additional email account.

²⁵ *Supra*, footnote 21 at paragraph [27] for a similar search.

	Address Drones/UAVs	63 minutes
Notebooks	564 pages: Has 2 full 192 page notebooks, as well as 3 other notebooks with ~ 10 pages filled out each, other staff (3) have at minimum 1 notebook each with a guess of 50 pages filled out	564 pages/one minute to visually scan 12 pages of records for responsiveness 47 minutes
Filing Cabinets	The Village originally indicated the searched involved 17 drawers of filing cabinets. After some discussion, the Village confirmed a search of 9 drawers of filing cabinets.	9 drawers x 5 minutes 45 minutes
Totals		344 minutes 5 hours and 44 minutes

[44] **Emails:** As noted above, local authorities should charge 3 minutes to search one active email account and transfer the results to a separate folder or drive. This standard will also be applied to searching other electronic devices such as cellphones. In addition, local authorities can charge five minutes per file drawer.

[45] There are some problems associated with the email search plan proposed by the Village in this case. For instance, the Village proposed conducting three different searches strategies starting with the Applicant’s name then a search of the Applicant’s address and finally a search of the terms “drones/UAVs”. This type of search would produce every record where the Applicant’s name appears regardless of the topic and every record involving a drone or a UAV. The time required to do this was estimated buy the Village to be 72 minutes.

[46] The Applicant is asking for records responsive to a very specific topic and timeframe. The search should reflect this, so we suggest a search strategy that includes the applicant’s name and address *combined with* keywords that will retrieve relevant records (such as the search

term “drone” and “UAV” since these terms are at the basis of this request and will assist in streamlining the search). We re-calculate this search at 8 email accounts x 3 minutes x 2 search strategies: (1)name, address, drones and (2) name, address, UAV for a total of 48 minutes.

[47] **Electronic Files:** The most serious searching miscalculation is associated to the way the Village searched the electronic files. The Village provided a directory of 13 electronic files and stated that the 13 files would need to be searched three times *each* with the search terms they were using (name, address, drone/UAV).

[48] Microsoft provides a feature that allows for these 13 electronic files to be searched together at the same time. We recommend that the search terms be entered together into the *file explorer search box* which would search the entire 13 files in the file directory all at once. This Microsoft feature alleviates the need to search individual folders/files. Even if the Village had to conduct more than one search, this method of searching is infinitely faster than the ponderous method recommended by the Village. We suggest this type of search would account for a total of 15 minutes which is generous, but with this approach it is clear that the time to be spent in this area of the search can be significantly reduced.

[49] **Cell Phone:** The Village mentioned there were seven cellphones to search. OIPC recommends using the same search strategy as recommended above. We re-calculate this search at 7 cell phones x 3 minutes x 2 search strategies: (1)name, address, drones and (2) name, address, UAV for a total of 42 minutes.

[50] **Notebooks:** In terms of notebooks, OIPC agreed with the time it would take to search all of the notebooks ($564/12 = 47$ minutes) because this is the process the chief administrator uses to take notes and track call records. The Applicant has specifically asked for these types of records.

[51] **Filing Cabinets:** The Village advised that it searched 9 file drawers in this matter. The Village knows its filing system and in this respect we accept their submission that this aspect of the search took 45 minutes.

[52] Before any conclusions can be reached about the reasonableness of the fee estimate, other fees must be considered.

(2) Reasonableness of the Fees for Preparation

[53] As noted earlier, section 5(3) of the *LA FOIP Regulations* allows \$15.00 per half hour of preparation time (or \$30 an hour). Preparing a record for disclosure includes the time anticipated to be spent physically severing exempted information from the records. However, preparation time does not include time spent:²⁶

- Deciding whether to claim an exemption.
- Identifying records requiring severing.
- Identifying and preparing records requiring third party notice.
- Packaging records for shipment.
- Transporting records to the mailroom or arranging for courier service.
- Time spent by a computer compiling and printing information.
- Assembling information and proofing data.
- Photocopying.
- Preparing an index of records.

[54] OIPC has set out the following general standards for calculating time spent preparing records for disclosure:²⁷

- The test related to reasonable time spent is generally that an experienced employee should take two minutes per page to physically sever records.
- If the above test does not reflect the circumstances (e.g., the record is complex), the local authority should test a representative sample and apply that time to the whole record.

²⁶ *Ibid*, at paragraph [29].

²⁷ *Ibid*, at paragraph [30].

[55] On March 5, 2026, the Village emailed OIPC with the following regarding time for preparing the record for disclosure:

...

With the assumption of ~150 pages of information to prepare for the applicant at 2 minutes per page. $150 \times 2 = 300$ minutes of preparation fees.

[56] The Village's claim of 150 pages equaling 300 minutes fits the criteria for the test stating that a reasonable amount of time spent is generally that an experienced employee should take two minutes per page to physically sever records. Before making a finding and recommendation, one more fee must be considered.

(3) Reasonableness of the Fees for Reproduction

[57] Section 5(2) of *LA FOIP Regulations* provides as follows:

5(2) Where access to a record or part of a record is given by providing the applicant with a copy of the record, the following fees are payable at the time when access is given:

(a) for a photocopy, \$0.25 per page;

(b) for a computer printout, \$0.25 per page;

(b.1) for electronic copies, the actual cost of the portable storage device provided to the applicant;

[58] The Village is not charging for reproduction fees because the Applicant will accept electronic disclosure.

Conclusion re: Total Fees

[59] The following is a breakdown of the total fees:

Activity	Village findings	OIPC findings
Time to search	72 minutes (emails) + 117 minutes (electronic files) + 63 minutes (cell phones) + 47 minutes (notebooks) + 45 minutes (filing cabinets) Total: 344 minutes	48 minutes (emails) + 15 minutes (electronic files) + 42 minutes (cell phones) + 47 minutes (notebooks) + 45 minutes (filing cabinets) Total: 197 minutes
Time to prepare	300 minutes	300 minutes
Search + preparation time total	644 minutes	497 minutes
Minus 1 hour free	60 minutes	60 minutes
Total time	584 minutes or 9 hours and 44 minutes At \$15.00 per 30 minutes = \$0.50 per minute 584 minutes x \$0.50 = \$292.00	437 minutes At \$15.00 per 30 minutes = \$0.50 per minute 437 minutes x \$0.50 = \$218.50
+ Reproduction cost	\$0	\$0
Total charge to Applicant	\$285.00²⁸	\$218.50
50% deposit	\$146.00	\$109.25

²⁸ As noted earlier, in the course of this review, the Village amended its calculation for the estimated time for the search and preparation of the records. The Village estimated a total 644 minutes for search and preparation and calculated the overall fee to be \$291.99, which is higher than the overall fee in its original fee estimate. The Village acknowledged it must honour the total fee calculated in its lower original fee estimate in the amount of \$285.00 in accordance with *LA FOIP*.

IV FINDINGS

[60] OIPC has jurisdiction to undertake this review under PART VI of *LA FOIP*.

[61] The Village properly exercised its discretion in refusing a waiver of fees.

[62] The overall fee estimate of \$285.00 issued by the Village was unreasonable.

[63] This office has re-calculated the reasonable fees to be \$218.50.

V RECOMMENDATIONS

[64] I recommend the Village take no further action regarding the Applicant's fee waiver request.

[65] I recommend the Village issue a revised fee estimate in the amount of \$218.50.

[66] I recommend if the Applicant pays the 50% deposit of \$109.25, the Village should continue to process the Applicant's access to information request.

Dated at Regina, in the Province of Saskatchewan, this 1st day of May, 2026.

Grace Hession David
Saskatchewan Information and Privacy Commissioner