# Board Meeting

## Comprehensive Agenda

December 12, 2019 8:45 PM to 12:30 PM

Chateau Louis Conference Centre, Grand Ballroom
11727 Kingsway NW, Edmonton, AB

## 1. Opening

1.1 **Call to Order**  
*Action: Declaration*  
*Lead: Chair Abbott*

1.2 **Chair’s Opening Remarks**  
*Action: Information*  
*Lead: Chair Abbott*

## 2. Approval of Meeting Agenda

*Action: Approval*  
*Lead: Chair Abbott*

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Meeting Agenda of December 12, 2019.

## 3. Approval of Consent Agenda

*Action: Approval*  
*Lead: Chair Abbott*

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Consent Agenda of December 12, 2019.

<p>| i) Approval of October 10, 2019 and November 22, 2019 Board Minutes |
| ii) Audit &amp; Finance Committee – November 29, 2019 Minutes/Preliminary Draft Budget |
| iii) Executive Committee – November 14, 2019 Minutes/Integrated Communications and Engagement Strategy and Framework |
| iv) Edmonton Metropolitan Region Broadband Situation Analysis Update |
| v) Q3 Review of Strategic Priorities – 2018-2023 Strategic Plan |
| vi) CEO Update |
| vii) Next Meeting – February 13, 2020, 8:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m., Chateau Louis Conference Centre, Grand Ballroom |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. <strong>In Camera</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead:</strong> Vice Chair Choy/CEO Wichuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Motion:</strong> That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board move In Camera, in accordance with the provisions of Section 17, of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP), R.S.A. 2000, c.F-25.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1 <strong>Board Chair Appointment – Section 17 – Disclosure Harmful to Personal Privacy</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead:</strong> Vice Chair Choy/CEO Wichuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Motion:</strong> That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board move out of camera.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. <strong>Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.1 <strong>Chair Update</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead:</strong> Chair Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 46 of 282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.2 <strong>Strategic Guidance for Shared Investment for Shared Benefit</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead:</strong> Chair Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Motion:</strong> That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Strategic Guidance document to inform the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit strategic initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 50 of 282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. <strong>Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.1 <strong>Confirmation of Chair and Vice Chair</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead:</strong> Chair Abbott/CEO Wichuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Motion:</strong> That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board confirm Mayor Gale Katchur as Chair of the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force as of October 24, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Motion:</strong> That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board confirm Mayor John Stewart as Vice Chair of the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force as of October 24, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 56 of 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6.2 | Chair Update  
*Action: Information*  
*Lead: Chair Katchur* |
| 7. | Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force |
| 7.1 | Chair Update  
*Action: Information*  
*Lead: Chair Ralph* |
| 7.2 | Final Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan  
*Action: Approval*  
*Lead: Chair Ralph*  
**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan. |
| 7.3 | MRSP Implementation - Standing Committee  
*Action: Approval*  
*Lead: Chair Ralph*  
**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board resolve to create an MRSP Standing Committee by February 2020. |
| 8. | Resolution of Member Motion – June 14, 2018 – REF Amendment Evaluation Criteria  
*Action: Approval*  
*Lead: Chair Abbott/CEO Wichuk*  
**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board affirm the June 14, 2018 member motion REF Amendment Evaluation Criteria has been achieved. |
| 9. | Board Governance and Strategy Update  
*Action: Information*  
*Lead: Chair Abbott/CEO Wichuk* |
| 10. | Audit & Finance Committee |
| 10.1 | Corporate Risk Profile and Policy Framework Update  
*Action: Information*  
*Lead: Chair Doblanko* |
| 11. | Member Updates |
| 11.1 | City of St. Albert – Waste to Energy Pilot Project  
*Action: Information*  
*Lead: Mayor Heron* |
12. Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12.1 Chair Update</th>
<th>Action: Information</th>
<th>Lead: Chair Shaigec</th>
<th>Page 193 of 282</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.2 RAMP Project Update</td>
<td>Action: Information</td>
<td>Lead: Chair Shaigec</td>
<td>Page 199 of 282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. In Camera

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Approval</th>
<th>Lead: Chair Abbott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board move In Camera, in accordance with the provisions of Section 21 and 24, of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP), R.S.A 2000, c.F-25.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13.1 In Camera – Discussion of Engagement Strategy – Section 21 – Disclosure Harmful to Intergovernmental Relations – Section 24 – Advice from Officials</th>
<th>Action: Approval</th>
<th>Lead: Mayor Shaigec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.2 In Camera – City of St. Albert and City of Edmonton – Regional Transit Services Commission Project – Section 24 – Advice from Officials</td>
<td>Action: Approval</td>
<td>Lead: Mayor Heron/Mayor Iveson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board move out of camera.

14. Adjournment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Approval</th>
<th>Lead: Chair Abbott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board meeting of December 12, 2019 be adjourned.
Minutes of the meeting of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board held at Chateau Louis, Grand Ballroom on Thursday, October 10, 2019.

Delegates in Attendance:

Dr. Jodi L. Abbott – Board Chair
Mayor John Stewart – Beaumont
Mayor Ray Ralph – Devon
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Mayor Bob Young – Leduc
Mayor Tanni Doiblanko – Leduc County
Mayor Barry Turner – Morinville
Councillor Stephen Dafoe – Morinville (Alternate)

Mayor Rod Shaigec – Parkland County
Mayor Cathy Heron – St. Albert
Mayor Stuart Houston – Spruce Grove
Councillor Chantal McKenzie – Spruce Grove
Mayor William Choy – Stony Plain
Mayor Rod Frank – Strathcona County
Mayor Alanna Hnatiw – Sturgeon County
Dale Beesley – Government of Alberta

EMRB Administration:

Karen Wichuk, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Director, Regional Growth Planning
Bryan Haggarty, Director, Strategic Initiatives & Operations
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Debra Irving, Senior Project Manager
Alex Bonokoski, Project Manager
Taylor Varro, Project Manager
Ron Cook, Manager, GIS and Business Intelligence
Dan Rose, Senior Communications Advisor
Carol Moreno, Project Coordinator
Agata Lewandowski, Executive Assistant
Raquel Chauvette, Administrative Assistant

Attendance in Gallery: 51
1. Opening

1.1 Call to Order

Chair Abbott calls the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

1.2 Chair’s Opening Remarks

Chair Abbott calls the meeting to order and welcomes the Board Members, the Gallery, and acknowledges the meeting is held on traditional Treaty 6 lands. Chair Abbott reminds those gathered the meeting will be recorded to help with production of minutes and archival purposes. Chair Abbott acknowledges the work being done by the Board since our last Board meeting in June. Chair Abbott touches on the outcomes of the Board sessions that have taken place thus far and the commitment to continuation of these sessions going forward.

Chair Abbott mentions items that were deferred from the last Board meeting, 4.4 Amended Policy F007 Reserves, 5.7 Engagement Strategy, and 8.1 Truth and Reconciliation. Chair Abbott shares that the Amended Policy F007 Reserves has been held back pending the work being done on the Corporate Risk Assessment which may have an impact on this policy. The policy will come forward after the completion of the Corporate Risk Assessment and be included in the larger policy review. Chair Abbott states that given the full agenda, the Engagement Strategy is covered in the CEO Update. Chair Abbott concludes that given the work being done with Indigenous Engagement will be included in the upcoming strategic planning processes.

2. Approval of Agenda

Chair Abbott recommends Item 9 Member Motions be moved to follow Item 6 Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force. Chair Abbott mentions the potential deferral of Items 7, 8, 10 and 11, dependent on time.

Moved by Mayor Doblanko. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Agenda of October 10, 2019, as amended.

Motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes

Moved by Mayor Ralph. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Minutes of June 13, 2019.

Motion carried unanimously.

4. Executive Committee
4.1 Chair Update

Chair Abbott updates members that she was unable to attend and chair the September 20, 2019 Executive Committee meeting, therefore Mayor Young chaired the meeting. Chair Abbott mentions she had joined the meeting by telephone following the discussions of the Board Chair Appointment Process. Chair Abbott mentions that as the Board Chair Selection Process is on this agenda, she will hand over the Chair to CEO Wichuk to lead, and withdraw from the table until discussions and any related motions are concluded.

Mayor Young provides a brief overview of the September 20, 2019 Executive Committee meeting. Mayor Young shares that CEO Wichuk requested Mayor Choy, as Board Vice Chair, fulfill the role of voluntary interim Chair of the Executive Committee in order to lead the Committee through the Board Chair Selection Process discussion and recommendation.

4.2 Board Chair Selection Process

Mayor Choy provides background on the three options presented to the Executive Committee regarding the Board Chair Selection Process, concluding that proceeding with a non-elected Board Chair was the outcome. Mayor Choy confirms that given Chair Abbott’s new appointment at the University Hospital Foundation there has been no perceived conflict between her new position and that of a Board Member who also works for the University Hospital Foundation. Mayor Choy advises that confirmation has been received via letter from both the University Hospital Foundation and the Board’s legal counsel.

**Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board appoint a non-elected Board Chair.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

4.3 In Camera

Chair Abbott explains that when the Board moves to item 4.5 Board Chair Selection Process, she will leave the room and CEO Wichuk will serve as interim Chair of this item.

**Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board move In Camera, in accordance with the provisions of Section 17, of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP), R.S.A. 2000, c.F-25.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

4.4 CEO Performance Contribution Agreement – Section 17 – Disclosure Harmful to Personal Privacy
In Camera Participants:

Dr. Jodi L. Abbott – Board Chair
Mayor John Stewart – Beaumont
Mayor Ray Ralph – Devon
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Ft. Saskatchewan
Mayor Bob Young – Leduc
Mayor Tanni Doblanco – Leduc County
Mayor Barry Turner – Morinville
Mayor Rod Shaigec – Parkland County
Mayor Stuart Houston – Spruce Grove
Mayor Cathy Heron – St. Albert
Mayor William Choy – Stony Plain
Mayor Rod Frank – Strathcona County
Mayor Alanna Hnatiw – Sturgeon County
Karen Wichuk – EMRB CEO

Daina J. Young – Reynolds Mirth Richards & Farmer LLP

Chair Abbott left In Camera at 9:38 a.m.
Mayor Turner left In Camera at 9:38 a.m., replaced by Councillor Stephen Dafoe.

4.5 Board Chair Selection Process – Section 17 – Disclosure Harmful to Personal Privacy

In Camera Participants:

Mayor John Stewart – Beaumont
Mayor Ray Ralph – Devon
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Ft. Saskatchewan
Mayor Bob Young – Leduc
Mayor Tanni Doblanco – Leduc County
Councillor Stephen Dafoe – Morinville
Mayor Rod Shaigec – Parkland County
Mayor Stuart Houston – Spruce Grove
Mayor Cathy Heron – St. Albert
Mayor William Choy – Stony Plain

Daina J. Young – Reynolds Mirth Richards & Farmer LLP
Mayor Rod Frank – Strathcona County
Mayor Alanna Hnatiw – Sturgeon County
Karen Wichuk – EMRB CEO

Moved by Mayor Iveson. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board move out of camera.

Motion carried unanimously.

(4.4) CEO Performance Contribution Agreement – Section 17 – Disclosure Harmful to Personal Privacy

Moved by Mayor Frank. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board accept the CEO Performance Contribution Agreement.

Motion carried unanimously.

(4.5) Board Chair Selection Process – Section 17 – Disclosure Harmful to Personal Privacy

Moved by Mayor Young. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board extend the Board Chair contract until December 31, 2019.

Motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Mayor Heron. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve that Mayor Young, Mayor Choy and Mayor Frank form a Negotiating Committee for the Board Chair contract.

Motion carried unanimously.

5. Audit & Finance Committee

5.1 Chair Update

Chair Doblanko provides a brief update on the September 12, 2019 meeting. Chair Doblanko informs the Board that the 2018-2019 EMRB Annual Report, which included the Audited Financial Statements, was well received by the department and by the Minister. Chair Doblanko concludes that it was tabled in the Legislature in July.
5.2 Quarterly Financial Report

CEO Wichuk walks through the Q1 and Q2 Financial Reports with Board Members. CEO Wichuk highlights key pieces of the Quarterly Financial Reports.

Chair Doblanko shares a reminder to have a timelier submission of invoices to help provide more accurate Quarterly updates to the Board.

5.3 Revised 2019-2020 Budget

CEO Wichuk explains the carryover in the Budget going forward, and confirms a letter was sent to the Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs formally requesting approval to carryover the funding on July 22, 2019. CEO Wichuk explains and provides clarification on the amending conditional grant agreement that was signed and returned on August 30, 2019. CEO Wichuk walks through the Revised 2019-2020 in depth with Board Members. CEO Wichuk touches on accessing grant funding going forward, and the importance of this going forward, as well as spending the grant money first.

**Moved by** Mayor Doblanko. **Accepted by** Chair.

**Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Revised 2019-2020 Budget.

Motion carried unanimously.

6. Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force

6.1 Chair Update

Chair Ralph provides an update on progress that has taken place at the MRSP Task Force.

6.2 Extension Request to Government of Alberta

Chair Ralph shares that as the Task Force has not had a chance to review the MRSP Draft, the Task Force is looking for an extension of 6 months. Chair Ralph informs members that this will allow the Task Force an opportunity to review and make recommendations to come back to the Board for approval.

**Moved by** Mayor Ralph. **Accepted by** Chair.

**Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board seek a 6-month extension from the Government of Alberta to bring the final MRSP Report to the Task Force, Board, and consult member municipalities in the completion of the inaugural MRSP.

Mayor Doblanko makes a friendly amendment to change the word “consult” to “inform”, because consulting implies that there will be information that is taken back that may change it, and if it is already endorsed by the Board then it is an information session.

**Moved by** Mayor Doblanko. **Accepted by** Chair.
Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board seek a 6-month extension from the Government of Alberta to bring the final MRSP Report to the Task Force, Board, and inform member municipalities in the completion of the inaugural MRSP.

Motion carried unanimously.

9. Member Motions

9.1 Submitted by Parkland County – Motion #1

Chair Abbott reaffirms the importance of the mandate and shares how the Board has evolved over the last few years, currently being at a pivot point.

Mayor Shaigec addresses motion and provides additional background and context.

Moved by Mayor Shaigec. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Board (EMRB) conduct a strategic review of the EMRB activities related to their mandate and impact on municipal operations.

Mayor Heron makes an amendment to the motion That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) conduct a strategic review of activities as part of its annual Strategic Planning Process with an increased emphasis on good governance, process improvements and red-tape reduction, to ensure continued alignment with regional and Provincial outcomes. And that the EMRB reaffirm their commitment to the mandate, the work of the board and to advancing the regions prosperity.

Accepted by Chair.

Mayor Katchur asks if Mayor Heron would consider adding the words “impact on municipal operations” to the amended motion.

Accepted by Mayor Heron.

Mayor Doblanko asks for clarification on the “annual Strategic Planning Process”.

Mayor Heron asks to add in “2019” to replace the word “annual” in the amended motion.

Mayor Iveson suggests splitting the motion, to vote separately on the first portion and second portion based on the debate.

Accepted by Mayor Heron.

Moved by Mayor Heron. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board conduct a strategic review of activities as part of its 2019 Strategic Planning Process with an increased emphasis on good governance, process improvements, impact on municipal operations, and red-tape reduction, to ensure continues alignment with regional and Provincial outcomes.
11 in favour. 2 opposed. Supported by 2/3 of the representatives from participating municipalities representing more than 2/3 the population. **Motion carried.**

**Moved by** Mayor Heron. **Accepted by** Chair.

**Motion:** And that the EMRB reaffirm their commitment to the mandate, the work of the board and to advancing the Region’s prosperity.

12 in favour. 1 opposed. Supported by 2/3 of the representatives from participating municipalities representing more than 2/3 the population. **Motion carried.**

**Moved by** Mayor Shaigec. **Accepted by** Chair.

**Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Board (EMRB) conduct a strategic review of the EMRB activities related to their mandate and impact on municipal operations, as amended.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**9.2 Submitted by Parkland County – Motion #2**

**Moved by** Mayor Shaigec. **Accepted by** Chair.

**Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Board (EMRB) suspend all new EMRB work until the strategic review is completed and all detailed activities, defined outcomes, and resource allocations are determined.

Chair Abbott shares her interpretation of the motion, that the Board has already approved the work through the Business Plan and Budget, so it would be any work additional to that. Chair Abbott requests Daina Young, the legal counsel, to comment on the motion being brought forward.

Daina Young shares the potential issue with respect to the current wording of the motion due to lack of clarity with respect to what would constitute new work, other than that which has already been approved by the Board. Daina Young shares that any additional work would authorize Board approval. Daina Young shares more clarity would be recommended if the Board is not to move forward with work in the future, at the policy level or operational level, that there is a full understanding on the meaning of the motion.

Mayor Shaigec clarifies the motion was in regard to projects where the terms of reference have not been established or there is no project charter defined or approved, and no budget approved. Mayor Shaigec concludes that given the conversation and complexity around the motion that he withdraws the motion on the floor.

**Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Board (EMRB) suspend all new EMRB work until the strategic review is completed and all detailed activities, defined outcomes, and resource allocations are determined.
Motion withdrawn.

Chair Abbott states that the items 7 – RAMP Chair Update, 8 – RECAs Update, 10 – Member Updates, and 11 – CEO Update will be picked up at a future meeting.

12. Next Meeting

- December 12, 2019, 9:00 a.m. – Noon, Chateau Louis Conference Centre, Grand Ballroom

13. In Camera

No additional items for In Camera.

14. Adjournment

Moved by Mayor Iveson. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board meeting of October 10, 2019 be adjourned.

Motion carried unanimously.

EMRB Chair, Dr. Jodi L. Abbott  EMRB CEO, Karen Wichuk
Minutes of the meeting of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board held at the Polish Hall, Kingsway Room on Friday, November 22, 2019.

Delegates in Attendance:
Dr. Jodi L. Abbott – Board Chair
Mayor John Stewart – Beaumont
Mayor Ray Ralph – Devon
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Mayor Bob Young – Leduc
Mayor Tanni Doblanko – Leduc County
Mayor Barry Turner – Morinville
Mayor Rod Shaigec – Parkland County
Mayor Cathy Heron – St. Albert
Councillor Chantal McKenzie – Spruce Grove
Mayor William Choy – Stony Plain
Mayor Rod Frank – Strathcona County
Mayor Alanna Hnatiw – Sturgeon County
Thomas Djurfors – Government of Alberta

Guests in Attendance:
Eleanor Mohammed – Beaumont
Tony Kulbisky – Devon
Linda Cochrane – Edmonton
Troy Fleming – Fort Saskatchewan
Michelle Hay – Leduc
Duane Coleman – Leduc County
Stephane Labonne – Morinville
Laura Swain – Parkland County
Simon Farbrother – Spruce Grove
Tom Goulden – Stony Plain
Kevin Glebe – Strathcona County
Reegan McCullough – Sturgeon County

Regrets:
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan

EMRB Administration and Consultants:
Karen Wichuk, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Director, Regional Growth Planning
Bryan Haggarty, Director, Strategic Initiatives & Operations
Agata Lewandowski, Executive Assistant
Raquel Chauvette, Administrative Assistant
Jason Randhawa, Randhawa Consulting
Cathy Kiss, Crown Strategic Consulting
Sheila Witwicky, National Growth Partners
1. Call to Order

Chair Abbott calls the meeting to order at 4:35 p.m.

2. Letter to Minister

Moved by Mayor Ralph. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board direct the Chair and the CEO to send a letter to the Minister of Municipal Affairs outlining Motion B2019-51 passed at the October 10, 2019 Board meeting and include the Message from the Board from the 2018-2019 EMRB Annual Report.

Motion carried unanimously.

3. Adjournment

Moved by Mayor Ralph. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board meeting of November 22, 2019 be adjourned at 4:39 p.m.

Motion carried unanimously.

EMRB Chair, Dr. Jodi L. Abbott  EMRB CEO, Karen Wichuk
Audit & Finance Committee

Friday, November 29, 2019
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board Office
Capital Region Boardroom

Members:
Mayor Tanni Doblanko, Leduc County (Chair)
Mayor John Stewart, City of Beaumont
Mayor Ray Ralph, Town of Devon
Councillor Michael Walters, City of Edmonton
Councillor Natalie Joly, City of St. Albert (Alternate)

Guests:
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Trevor Duley, City of St. Albert
Larissa Lindmark, Parkland County
Avril McCalla, City of Edmonton
Emily Sangster, City of Beaumont
Robert Stephenson, Strathcona County
Julie Vizbar, Leduc County

EMRB Staff and Consultants:
Karen Wichuk, CEO
Bryan Haggarty, Director, Strategic Initiatives and Operations
Sharon Shuya, Director, Regional Growth Planning
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Dan Rose, Senior Communications Advisor
Agata Lewandowski, Executive Assistant
Raquel Chauvette, Administrative Assistant
Jason Randhawa, Randhawa Consulting
1. Opening

1.1 Quorum

Quorum achieved; five of five voting members present.

1.2 Call to Order

Chair Doblanko calls the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

1.3 Chair Opening Remarks

Chair Doblanko informs members there are two key items on the agenda to be discussed. Chair Doblanko introduces Jason Randhawa and shares that he will be providing an update on work underway with the Corporate Risk Profile.

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Audit & Finance Committee approve the November 29, 2019 meeting agenda.
Moved by: Mayor Ralph
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion: That the Audit & Finance Committee approve the September 12, 2019 meeting minutes.
Moved by: Councillor Walters
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

4. Finance

4.1 Preliminary Budget 2020-21 thru 2022-23

CEO Wichuk provides an overview of the preliminary plans for the Budget going forward and shares known impacts to the organization in relation to the provincial budget.

5. Governance
5.1 Corporate Risk Profile and Policy Framework – Update on Work Underway

CEO Wichuk provides a recap on the work completed in relation to the policy framework. CEO Wichuk informs members the work undertaken by Jason Randhawa will serve to identify strategic and operational risks that may also require a policy response. These two projects will continue to proceed in tandem.

Mr. Randhawa provides an overview presentation to the Audit & Finance Committee regarding Corporate Risk Profile methodology and interim observations. Mr. Randhawa shares the next steps for the Corporate Risk Profile. Mr. Randhawa informs member this is just an interim overview as outstanding meetings with elected officials and CAOs still remain.

6. CEO Update

CEO Wichuk provides an update on meetings attended since the last Audit & Finance Committee meeting. CEO Wichuk confirms the response letter from the EMRB Board Chair to the Minister, arising from the November 22, 2019 motion, was hand-delivered to the offices of the Minister and the Deputy Minister. CEO Wichuk shares her current focus, as well as meetings and activities that will continue to take place moving forward.

7. Next Meeting

- January 9, 2020, 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m., EMRB Office

8. Adjournment

Motion: That the Audit & Finance Committee meeting of November 29, 2019 be adjourned at 3:09 p.m.
Moved by: Mayor Ralph
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

Committee Chair, Tanni Doblanko
Provincial Budget 2019-2020 - EMRB Considerations

Background


Direct Funding Impact - EMRB

The operating budget of the Ministry of Municipal Affairs was reduced 9% from $263 million in 2018-19 to $240 million in 2019-20 and a further reduction to $222 million is planned by 2022-23.

Municipal Affairs provides grant funding to the EMRB through a Conditional Gant Agreement under the Alberta Community Partnership (ACP) program. As information, the Fiscal Plan document contained an apparent contradictory statement. An excerpt from the document page 109 notes, “Funding will be reduced for the Alberta Community Partnership, saving $1.5 million per year for four years.” However, there is an additional reference on page 110 that states “…Alberta Community Partnership programs are maintained at current levels.”

Given the above discrepancy, EMRB Administration contacted Municipal Affairs on October 24, 2019, for clarification and were advised ACP grant funding will be reduced by $250,000.00 in 2020-21, with a further reduction of $500,000.00 in 2021-22. Chair Abbott and CEO Wichuk participated in a subsequent conference call with Municipal Affairs on October 25, 2019, which included departmental representation from Assistant Deputy Minister (ADM)/Board Liaison Dale Beesley, as well as ADM Gary Sandberg.

On the conference call Municipal Affairs confirmed that EMRB will receive $1.5 million in 2020-21, rather than the previously anticipated $1.75 million. The department further confirmed ACP grant funding thereafter would be maintained at $1 million each year.

The department advised the reduction to the $1 million core funding was executed on an incremental basis to allow the EMRB a brief transition period in order to explore and secure alternative sources of funding and financial support.

The department also confirmed that while the direct ACP funding to the EMRB was reduced, the ACP grant funding stream remains available to member municipalities to support initiatives which meet ACP program criteria; this may include ongoing or new strategic initiatives of the EMRB.

While the department cautioned that the ACP program is generally oversubscribed, the reduction in EMRB yearly ACP grant funding does not preclude the ability of member municipalities to compete for additional ACP grant funding on behalf of EMRB initiatives.
Direct Budget Impact – EMRB Considerations

The reduction in ACP funding has required EMRB Administration to complete the necessary analysis and due diligence to ascertain and examine impacts to the current Board approved in-year budget and subsequent budget forecast and expenditure plans.

EMRB Administration has therefore developed a revised preliminary 3-year budget scenario considerate of the ACP grant funding reduction and resulting changes to expenditure plans and forecasts.

The following provides an overview of budget items that have been reconsidered as a result of the ACP grant funding decrease (please refer to Attachment 1 for expenditure details)

Note: EMRB Administration has forecast budget adjustments which are considerate of potential changes that may occur as a result of the Board governance and committee structure discussions underway with the Board.

REVENUE

Revenue budget items were reconsidered, and the following action proposed:

- No increase in the level of membership contributions in 2020/21
- Increase member contributions by $11,580 in 2021/22 to cover the costs for notional 5 additional Board meetings.

EXPENDITURES – ADMINISTRATION

Expenditure budget items were reconsidered, and the following action proposed:

- Increase Honoraria/Meeting/Travel – cost for notional 5 additional board meetings per year. (see revenue above)
- No increase in EMRB Administration salaries - to remain fixed at 2019/20 levels.
- Decrease in Travel and Professional Development.
- Decrease in Annual Reports/Audit.

EMRB Strategic Initiatives were also reviewed to determine if budget adjustments were required. At this time, no changes to the budget forecast have been proposed; however, EMRB Administration is recommending the deferral of some projects until such time as additional guidance and direction regarding project prioritization is received from the Board.

The following provides the proposed timeline for completion of strategic initiatives and those projects recommended for deferral* subject to the Board’s strategic planning exercise discussion and decision.
As previously noted, it will be necessary to consider any budgetary adjustments within the context of the Board strategic planning and priority setting exercise currently underway. It is anticipated the discussions may have budgetary impacts.

**EXPENDITURES – STRATEGIC INITIATIVES – COMPLETED/UNDERWAY**

**Completed 2019/20**
- KPI Dashboard

**Anticipate complete 2020/21**
- RAMP/LESA
- Regional Energy Corridors Approach
- Regional Energy Corridors Approach
- Shared Investment Shared Benefit
- Regional Broadband
- IRTMP Update

**EXPENDITURES – STRATEGIC INITIATIVES – DEFERRED***

**Defer to 2021/22**
- Integrated Regional Open Space Master Plan
- KPI Targets for GP

**Defer to 2022/23**
- Regional Infrastructure Master Plan
- Regional Symposium

**Next Steps**

- Continue to refine the preliminary EMRB Budget 2020/21 thru 2022/23 in relation to the strategic priorities and outcomes identified by the Board during strategic planning discussions.

- Present any revisions to the preliminary EMRB Budget for consideration by the Audit & Finance Committee.

- Explore opportunities to collaborate with and support member municipalities in the identification of potential funding opportunities under the ACP grant funding stream.

- Provide the draft EMRB Budget to the Board for information in February 2020, and a finalized budget for Board consideration in April 2020.

- Assess and identify alternative funding sources including provincial and federal ministries aligned with the Board mandate and growth plan outcomes.

**Attachment:** Preliminary EMRB Budget 2020/21 thru 2022/23
## Preliminary EMRB Budget 2020/21 thru 2022/23

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2019/20 Budget</th>
<th>2020/21 Budget</th>
<th>2021/22 Budget</th>
<th>2022/23 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOA Operating Grant</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA Planning Intern Grant</td>
<td>$21,500.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Member Contribution</td>
<td>$1,468,000.00</td>
<td>$1,898,451.11</td>
<td>$1,872,017.89</td>
<td>$2,570,861.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>$2,135,247.00</td>
<td>$1,948,603.36</td>
<td>$782,191.83</td>
<td>$122,995.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry Over</td>
<td>$1,031,083.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$6,655,830.00</td>
<td>$5,347,057.47</td>
<td>$3,654,209.72</td>
<td>$3,693,856.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

#### Board & Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2019/20 Budget</th>
<th>2020/21 Budget</th>
<th>2021/22 Budget</th>
<th>2022/23 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board &amp; Committees Collaboration Events</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>$32,400.00</td>
<td>$45,400.00</td>
<td>$45,400.00</td>
<td>$45,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$42,000.00</td>
<td>$42,000.00</td>
<td>$42,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
<td>$14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Retainer</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Board &amp; Committees</strong></td>
<td>$169,400.00</td>
<td>$201,400.00</td>
<td>$201,400.00</td>
<td>$201,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2019/20 Budget</th>
<th>2020/21 Budget</th>
<th>2021/22 Budget</th>
<th>2022/23 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>$1,953,386.64</td>
<td>$1,953,386.64</td>
<td>$1,953,386.64</td>
<td>$1,953,386.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Lease</td>
<td>$95,000.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees - Legal/Advisory</td>
<td>$56,500.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel/Professional Development</td>
<td>$77,500.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Management</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Communications</td>
<td>$31,295.00</td>
<td>$31,295.00</td>
<td>$31,295.00</td>
<td>$31,295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$6,000.00</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
<td>$6,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings - Non Board/Committee</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges &amp; Interest</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Administration</strong></td>
<td>$2,662,681.64</td>
<td>$2,539,181.64</td>
<td>$2,539,181.64</td>
<td>$2,539,481.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Capital & Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2019/20 Budget</th>
<th>2020/21 Budget</th>
<th>2021/22 Budget</th>
<th>2022/23 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Intern</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Furniture/Equipment</td>
<td>$27,500.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
<td>$7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital &amp; Other</strong></td>
<td>$77,500.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Regional Projects & Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2019/20 Budget</th>
<th>2020/21 Budget</th>
<th>2021/22 Budget</th>
<th>2022/23 Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRSP</td>
<td>$404,200.00</td>
<td>$239,358.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report/ Auditors</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF</th>
<th>125,000.00</th>
<th>125,000.00</th>
<th>150,000.00</th>
<th>125,000.00</th>
<th>125,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>567,700.00</td>
<td>314,842.00</td>
<td>419,358.00</td>
<td>155,000.00</td>
<td>155,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Growth Plan Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9 RAMP &amp; LESA</th>
<th>472,930.00</th>
<th>294,774.00</th>
<th>179,821.00</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Integrated Regional Open Space Master Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>145,475.00</td>
<td>145,475.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Regional Infrastructure Master Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 IRTMP Update</td>
<td>350,000.00</td>
<td>268,018.00</td>
<td>167,700.00</td>
<td>137,658.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Regional Energy Corridors Approach Study</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>133,267.00</td>
<td>35,253.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>972,930.00</td>
<td>716,059.00</td>
<td>382,774.00</td>
<td>283,133.00</td>
<td>345,475.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Growth Plan Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14 KPI Dashboard</th>
<th>125,000.00</th>
<th>43,500.00</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Reporting</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>205,000.00</td>
<td>123,500.00</td>
<td>80,000.00</td>
<td>80,000.00</td>
<td>80,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Plan Initiatives

| 15 Shared Investment Shared Benefit | 250,000.00 | 217,654.00 | 607,022.00 | -          | -          |
| 16 Broadband | 208,520.00 | 95,590.00 | 112,930.00 | -          | -          |
| 17 KPI Targets for GP | 50,000.00 | - | - | 50,000.00 | 50,000.00 |
| 18 Regional Symposium | 70,000.00 | 70,000.00 | 50,000.00 | 50,000.00 | -          |
| Board Collaboration & Education | 40,000.00 | 40,000.00 | 20,000.00 | 30,000.00 | -          |
| Advocacy | - | - | - | - | 100,000.00 |
| Total       | 618,520.00 | 423,244.00 | 789,952.00 | 130,000.00 | 230,000.00 |

### Operations

| Board Stabilization Fund | 100,000.00 | 100,000.00 | 100,000.00 | 100,000.00 | 100,000.00 |
| Engagement & Communications | 120,000.00 | 120,000.00 | 35,000.00 | 35,000.00 | 35,000.00 |
| Total               | 220,000.00 | 220,000.00 | 135,000.00 | 135,000.00 | 135,000.00 |

### Total Regional Projects & Programs

| 2,584,150.00 | 1,797,645.00 | 1,807,084.00 | 783,133.00 | 945,475.00 |

### Total Expenditures

| 5,493,731.64 | 4,707,226.64 | 4,564,865.64 | 3,531,214.64 | 3,693,856.64 |

### Unallocated Funds

| Surplus (Deficit) | 1,162,098.36 | 1,948,603.36 | 782,191.83 | 122,995.08 | 0.00 |

*Office Lease - Term: 10 Years, Expiry Date: January 31, 2024*

1- Maintain membership contributions in 2020/21 and 2021/22 as approved.
2- Honoraria increase of $13,000 as a result of 5 additional board meetings per year.
3- Meetings increase of $17,000 as a result of 5 additional board meetings per year.
4- Travel increase of $2,000 as a result of 5 additional board meetings per year.
5- Salaries to remain at 2019/20 level, no increases.
6- Travel and Professional Development reduction of $8,000.
7- MRSP anticipate spending of $164,842 in 2019/20, to be completed in 2020/21 in the amount of $239,358.
8- Annual Reports/Audit reduction of $8,500.
9- RAMP/LESA anticipate spending of $294,774 in 2019/20, to be completed in 2020/21 in the amount of $179,821.
10- Integrated Regional Open Space Master Plan deferred start to 2021/22.
11- Regional Infrastructure Master Plan deferred start to 2022/23.
13- Regional Energy Corridors Approach Study to be completed in 2020/21 in the amount of $35,253.
14- KPI Dashboard project complete. Budget was $125,000, project savings of $81,500.
15- Shared Investment Shared Benefit anticipate spending of $217,654 in 2019/20, to be completed in 2020/21 in the amount of $607,022.
16- Broadband anticipate spending of $95,590 in 2019/20, to be completed in 2020/21 in the amount of $112,930.
17- KPI Targets for GP deferred start to 2021/22.
18- Regional Symposium deferred start to 2022/23.
Executive Committee

Thursday, November 14, 2019
7:30 a.m. – 8:45 a.m.
Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board
Capital Region Boardroom

**Members:**
- Dr. Jodi L. Abbott, *Board Chair*
- Mayor Bob Young, *City of Leduc (Vice Chair)*
- Mayor Barry Turner, *Town of Morinville*
- Mayor Don Iveson, *City of Edmonton*

**Regrets:**
- Mayor Tanni Doblanko, *Leduc County*
- Mayor Rod Shaigec, *Parkland County*

**EMRB Staff & Consultants:**
- Karen Wichuk, *CEO*
- Bryan Haggarty, *Director, Strategic Initiatives and Operations*
- Dan Rose, *Senior Communications Advisor*
- Raquel Chauvette, *Administrative Assistant*

**Guests:**
- Gibby Davis, *City of Edmonton*
- Trevor Duley, *City of St. Albert*
- Larissa Lindmark, *Parkland County*
- Avril McCalla, *City of Edmonton*
- Julie Vizbar, *Leduc County*
- Robert Stephenson, *Strathcona County*
1. Opening

1.1 Quorum

Quorum achieved; three of five voting members present.

1.2 Call to Order

Chair Abbott calls the meeting to order at 7:46 a.m.

1.3 Chair’s Opening Remarks

Chair Abbott touches on the items that will be discussed in the meeting, and shares that she will be excused from the room when it comes to Item 8.1 – Board Chair Appointment.

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Executive Committee approve the November 14, 2019 meeting agenda.
Moved by: Mayor Iveson
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion: That the Executive Committee approve the September 20, 2019 meeting minutes.
Moved by: Mayor Young
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

4. Finance

4.1 Provincial Budget 2019-2020 – EMRB Impacts – Update on Internal Work

CEO Wichuk explains the background of the EMRB Budget, and potential impacts going forward given the changes in the provincial budget.

5. Governance

5.1 Corporate Risk Profile and Policy Framework – Update on Work Underway

CEO Wichuk shares an update on the work that is currently underway. CEO Wichuk informs there is a policy review required every four years and the policy review and framework will be brought forward as a whole once the Corporate Risk Profile is complete.
6. Stakeholder Engagement & Communications

6.1 Integrated Communications and Engagement Strategy and Framework – Update on Work Underway

CEO Wichuk shares that communications is a key piece priority for the organization and shares the progress being made going forward.

7. CEO Update

CEO Wichuk does not provide update given the time remaining in the meeting.

8. In Camera

8.1 Board Chair Appointment – Section 17 – Disclosure Harmful to Personal Privacy

Chair Abbott left In Camera at 8:40 a.m.

Motion: That the Executive Committee meeting move In Camera, in accordance with the provisions of Section 17, of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP), R.S.A. 2000, c.F-25.

Moved by: Mayor Young
Accepted by: Vice Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

Motion: That the Executive Committee move out of camera.

Moved by: Mayor Young
Accepted by: Vice Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

9 Next Meeting

• January 9, 2020, 9:00 a.m. – Noon, EMRB Office

10 Adjournment

Motion: That the Executive Committee meeting of November 14, 2019 be adjourned at 9:01 a.m.

Moved by: Mayor Iveson
Accepted by: Vice Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously
Integrated Communications and Engagement Strategy and Framework

Background

The development of an assertive, comprehensive and inclusive communications and stakeholder engagement strategy and framework remains a critically important initiative for the organization. EMRB Administration has commenced development of an Integrated Communication and Engagement Strategy and Framework to continue to advance EMRB organizational plans and priorities.

Effective communications and meaningful stakeholder engagement are essential for the EMRB to retain relevance as an organization and also presents a tremendous opportunity to enhance the established EMRB leadership role and utilize the informed regional perspective and experience to engage, message, and leverage influence with stakeholders, all levels of government and decision-makers, and clearly demonstrate the EMRB value proposition and advantage.

Communications and engagement activity have remained an important consideration and ongoing endeavour for EMRB Administration; ongoing communications products, key messaging, published corporate documents and extensive engagement opportunities on the part of the CEO continue to be developed and implemented on demand, and as specific organizational needs, obligations and opportunities arise (See attached example – *IRTMP Update Bulletin*).

However, establishing an overarching strategy and framework to inform, guide and manage these demands in a more holistic, inter-linked, mutually reinforcing and supportive, and harmonized manner will better serve the organization in meeting the extensive communications support needs and associated engagement opportunities of the Board, EMRB Strategic Initiatives, and other EMRB corporate endeavors.

Progress Update

A number of key communications documents have been developed by EMRB Administration including the 2018-2019 Annual Report, Strategic Initiative Key Messaging and Meeting Summaries, the creation of dedicated webpages for each strategic initiative, RAMP/IRTMP Information Update/Fact Sheets, and other ongoing communications products and tactics including an enhanced EMRB Twitter profile and presence and reinforcing Board member and municipal postings.

Given the substantial capacity and expertise required to develop the strategy and framework, and as identified in EMRB Budget 2018-2019 approved by the Board, additional resources were allocated to support enhanced communications related work in this fiscal year.
In this regard, a new approach in communications support was initiated through the placement of a dedicated communications resource at the commencement of the IRTMP initiative. The practice of embedding a communications resource within a strategic initiative will be further evaluated for effectiveness and may potentially serve to establish an organizational best practice for other strategic initiatives.

In addition, EMRB has recently engaged Torque Communications, a small and agile consulting firm comprised of executive management professionals who have experience serving Alberta Premiers, provincial cabinet ministers, municipal officials and senior administration, as well as key business leaders in identifying and meeting the strategic communications needs of complex organizations.

Torque Communications has undertaken a review of EMRB priorities and existing communications tools and practices to develop a baseline inventory of communications assets.

**Next Steps**

- Through ongoing consultation with the CEO and EMRB Administration, Torque Communications is presently developing the strategy and framework.

- Work is underway to populate the framework through the development of compelling narratives, key messages and other communications tactics and tools.

- The strategy and framework will be presented to the Board in February 2020, in anticipation of a planned implementation and rollout following Board approval.

**Attachments**

1. *IRTMP Update Bulletin*
PROGRESS TO DATE

- EMRB has contracted HDR, Urban Strategies, and Watt Consulting Group to provide technical and project management expertise to the renewal of the IRTMP over the course of the project.

- On Thursday, October 24, 2019, the EMRB hosted the inaugural Task Force meeting for the IRTMP initiative.

- The Task Force elected Mayor Gale Katchur to serve as Chair of the Task Force, and Mayor John Stewart to serve as Vice Chair.

- The IRTMP Task Force has endorsed the Terms of Reference for the IRTMP Working Group. The first Working Group meeting was held Friday, September 27, 2019.

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

- EMRB will proceed with Working Group meetings (for a schedule of meetings to date, please see calendar, above.)

- The IRTMP consultant team is preparing the Environmental Scan to assess the transportation system and examine the implications of evolving technology and growth pressures on the regional transportation system.

- EMRB Administration and the IRTMP consultant team will advance work on updating the Regional Transportation Network and the Regional Travel Model.

- EMRB Administration will continue to refine communications and engagement plans to support the IRTMP work.

You can find Task Force meeting minutes, reports and more information about this project at emrb.ca/irtmp.

HOW WE’RE GOING TO GET THERE

- DEC 2019
  - Environmental Scan

- DEC 2019
  - Scenario Modelling

- JUNE 2020
  - Interim Regional Transportation Priorities Report

- DEC 2020
  - Updated Integrated Regional Transportation Plan

- APR 2021
  - Regional Transportation Priorities Evaluation Process

- JUNE 2021
  - Regional Transportation Priorities Report

COMPLETE

PLAN WITHOUT BOUNDARIES

EMRB Board Meeting
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What is the IRTMP?
The Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP) is a future-ready plan for effective regional mobility.

It lays the groundwork for creating a regional network that aligns transportation systems and land use planning with the overall 2017 EMRB Growth Plan. This bold regional plan recognizes the link between efficient movement of people and goods and regional prosperity. It commits that the Region will work together towards a multi-modal and integrated regional transportation system for our growing population.

The IRTMP helps municipalities integrate transportation systems, coordinate transportation planning documents and come together with a single voice to advocate for policies, prioritization, and investment from higher levels of government to ensure our Region is connected as a community and to markets.

Why do we need an updated IRTMP?
The members of the IRTMP Working Group and Task Force are collaborating to update the current IRTMP to align with the 2017 EMRB Growth Plan. This will ensure that by 2044 the Region has the necessary transportation infrastructure and mobility options to move 2.2 million people, accommodate 475,000 new jobs and connect our economy to Canada and beyond.

Delivering Value to the Region
Through municipal collaboration, IRTMP will reduce duplication in planning, realize efficiencies in overall land use, and cost-savings in transportation infrastructure. IRTMP will allow municipalities to go further with tax-payer dollars while getting regional citizens from A to B safely and efficiently.

Our Regional Context

- 1.2 million regional residents spread over 12,000 square kilometres and 24 municipalities
- 8.2 million passengers through the Edmonton International Airport in 2018 making it the 5th busiest airport in Canada
- 10 intermunicipal bus routes, covering 155 kilometres

Message from the Chair
“Transportation infrastructure is the backbone of this Region; connecting communities, businesses and industry across 9,400 sq. km. Through the IRTMP, we’re planning without boundaries for a transportation system that will guarantee our Region is connected, competitive, and positioned for growth.”

Mayor Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Briefing Note to the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board
December 12, 2019

Edmonton Metropolitan Region Broadband Situation Analysis Update

Background

• At the June 13, 2019, EMRB meeting, the Board approved the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Broadband Situation Analysis Project Charter.

• The Regional Broadband Initiative was first identified in the 2018-2023 Strategic Plan. Strategic Priority 2 Responsible and Sustainable Growth states, “Understanding the value created in the Region by enhancing communication tools like broadband that will contribute to the prosperity and quality of life in the Region.”

• In the 2018-2022 Business Plan, the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) approved the implementation of a Broadband Environmental Scan. The environmental scan will provide a regional overview of the gaps and opportunities to inform the development of a strategy to inform and enable several policy areas of the Growth Plan to include Economic Competitiveness & Employment, Agriculture, Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure, Transportation Systems and Communities and Housing.

• The Situation Analysis aims to:
  
  o Provide a comprehensive perspective of the current state of broadband in the Region and identify issues related to connectivity in the Region and the outcomes of the Growth Plan;
  o Explore strategic synergistic relationships the Board may wish to pursue to address gaps including external partnerships;
  o Provide the Board with the evidence-based data and intelligence necessary to make informed decisions regarding next steps in addressing the regional issues and opportunities identified.

• To ensure the Situation Analysis provides a complete picture of broadband for the Region, the project includes a comprehensive Stakeholder Engagement as part of the initial discovery phase. This will involve input from member municipalities, former CRB member municipalities and input from a broader regional ecosystem to include School Boards, AUMA, CRTC, Edmonton Global, RMA, and Service Alberta. Several of these organizations have been identified based on being engaged or having completed similar work directed an identifying gap, needs and opportunities for a targeted group. This list of organizations included in the regional ecosystem may be expanded, as a result of key learnings from interviews.
Through a competitive RFP process, the contract was awarded to RSM Canada and Taylor Warwick Consulting. The successful proponents possess a unique balanced approach, integrating strategic level planning with technical analysis. Additionally, the project team has unrivaled experience in their work within the broadband industry, exemplified by an extensive list of applicable projects completed, many within the Edmonton Metropolitan Region or in partnership with the Province.

The scope of the work in the development of the Broadband Situation Analysis will include:

- **Current State Analysis** – To describe the current state of connectivity and capacity in the Region, across the different identified regional stakeholders;
- **Regional Broadband Gaps and Opportunities** – To identify the impediments, challenges, and opportunities facing the Region in enhancing global economic competitiveness and quality of life for residents, based on current service levels;
- **Status Quo / Opportunity Analysis** – To describe the consequences of not addressing Regional gaps and opportunities, and will include a socio-economic impact assessment;
- **Desired Future Regional State** – To provide conceptual understanding of future broadband needs (considering next generation technology) and how broadband services are connected to and will aid in achieving EMRB Growth Plan objectives and outcomes; and
- **Recommendations and Next Steps** – To outline possible options for consideration by the Region for addressing the broadband gaps and opportunities. This will include recommendations for strategic partnerships, high level funding requirements to address the identified gaps, and implementation considerations.

**Next Steps**

- The initial phase of the project is underway and includes a comprehensive engagement plan to build the understanding of the current state and future needs for Broadband services in the Region.

- As there is no Task Force, EMRB Administration anticipates three check-ins and project updates over the course of this project.
  - **April 2020**: Presentation of the Current State Analysis and Jurisdictional Scan.
  - **August 2020**: Final presentation of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Broadband Situation Analysis for approval by the EMRB.
Q3 Review of Strategic Priorities - 2018-2023 Strategic Plan

Background

- On June 14, 2018, the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approved its 2018-2023 Strategic Plan (the Plan).
- The Plan includes three Strategic Priorities
  o Shared Investment for Shared Benefit
  o Responsible and Sustainable Growth
  o Maintaining Momentum
- Under each Strategic Priorities, Outcomes are identified as well as specific initiatives directed towards achievement of the specific outcomes.
- Appendix B of the Strategic Plan includes the Key Performance measurement mechanism for the Strategic Priorities and informs the annual reporting of Key Performance Indicators to assess progress and the results for the Strategic Plan.
- Attached is the update and progress report for the initiatives approved by the Board for each of the Strategic Priorities.

Next Steps

- EMRB Administration will continue to monitor the progress of each project in accordance with the Board Approved Project Charters and supporting work plans.
- The next update is planned for mid-year 2020.

Attachments:

1. Mid-Year Review of Strategic Priorities of the 2018-2023 Strategic Plan
## Q3 Review of Strategic Priorities of the 2018-2023 Strategic Plan

December 12, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priorities</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Key Results</th>
<th>Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Shared Investment for Shared Benefit       | The shared and equitable contributions, investments, and efforts by the EMRB result in measurable benefits for the Region as a whole. | 1A. Develop and implement a benefits realization model that reflects shared regional interests.  
1B. Measure the contributions and investments by the member municipalities.  
1C. Identify and assess investments by public and private partners for the shared benefit of the Region.  
1D. Evaluate the benefits realized by the contributions and other investments in the Region.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 1A. Task Force participated in six workshops to define and align on the Strategic Intent, Guiding Principles, and Important Considerations to inform the SISB framework and model. Deloitte has been hired as the Project consultant was hired in October 2019. Task Force meetings were held in October and December. The Task Force finalized the Strategic Guidance document and participated in presentations highlighting current municipal realities to aid the Task Force in gaining a shared understanding of the challenges and opportunities facing the Region and provide context for further work on SISB framework and model. At the December meeting, the Project consultant presented the project workplan and provided information on shared investment for shared benefit models as background for further discussions by the Task Force.  
1B. Process and Framework are being developed as part of the project work plan and implementation plan.  
1C. Process and Framework are being developed as part of the project workplan and implementation plan.  
1D. Process and Framework to be developed as part of the project work plan and implementation plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1E. Provide reporting on the shared contributions, investments, and benefits to the Region, key stakeholders, and partners.</th>
<th>1E. Process and Framework to be developed as part of the project workplan and implementation plan.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Responsible and Sustainable Growth</th>
<th>The EMRB develops and implements sustainable growth to enable future generations to meet their needs, including responsible planning, decision-making, and monitoring of growth in accordance with the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan and the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan.</th>
<th>2A. Develop and implement the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan (MRSP).</th>
<th>2A. On November 21, 2019, the Task Force unanimously recommended the MRSP Final Report go to the Board for approval on December 12, 2019. A draft Terms of Reference for an MRSP Standing Committee will be reviewed by the Task Force in January 2020. The proposed Standing Committee would oversee the establishment of the anticipated Regional Collaboratives in 2020.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2B. Develop and implement the Regional Agriculture Master Plan (RAMP).</td>
<td>2B. RAMP Task Force has approved four Agriculture Policy Areas to inform policy development (includes vision, intent, policy directions) and a draft map. The refinement of specific policy directions was unanimously approved by the Task Force on October 28th, 2019 and will inform further work on drafting policies. Work continues into 2020 on defining the economic imperative for agriculture, identification and evaluation of implementation, tools, and finalizing the stakeholder engagement strategy and plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2C. Establish key performance indicator targets and monitor the implementation of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan.</td>
<td>2C. EMRB continues advancing KPI activities with the assistance of KPMG this will include data compilation and management transition and stakeholder engagement will occur into 2020. Further work is required to understand where establishing a target would be appropriate for a specific indicator.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2D. Provide leadership for a regional symposium for education and stakeholder collaboration.</td>
<td>2D. A regional symposium is being planned for the 2022/2023 budget year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Review of Strategic Priorities of the 2018-2023 Strategic Plan</td>
<td>December 12, 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Maintaining Momentum</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2E. Embed an energy, climate, and economic opportunity lens on regional initiatives.</strong></td>
<td><strong>2E. All projects include these lenses.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3A. Maintain and enhance collaboration amongst Board members to foster healthy relationships.</strong></td>
<td><strong>3A. Board Governance Sessions underway with multiple sessions run concurrent with Strategic Planning and Priority setting exercises. Draft Board Charter and renewed committee structure are being developed for further consideration by the Board. Additional follow-up sessions scheduled for Jan-Mar 2020.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3B. Maintain and evolve the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).</strong></td>
<td><strong>3B. There have been 24 REF applications received to date in 2019: 22 approved; two under review; zero rejected. Implementation of REF 2.0 is ongoing, and a municipal working group has been contributing to improvements to the EMRB Planning Toolkit, most recently completing sections related to suggestions from the Growth Plan and REF Workshops held over the summer. EMRB is continuing to engage municipal stakeholders and the development community in identifying and problem-solving issues as they arise and once resolved with be added into the EMRB Planning Toolkit.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3C. Maintain and improve the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Geographic Information Services (EMRGIS).</strong></td>
<td><strong>3C. EMRGIS continues to support all on-going EMRB projects through data management, analysis and visualization to assist in decision-making. EMRGIS continues to evolve in terms of regional GIS capabilities, maps and open data. Future work will consider how to expand our regional services and Geospatial community</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D. Maintain and improve advocacy (e.g., Provincial, Federal, Public Engagement Policies, Indigenous Stakeholders, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D. Integrated Communications and Engagement Strategy and Framework in development to ensure outreach and engagement and communications activities and messaging are aligned and mutually supportive – planned early 2020 implementation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Chair and CEO outreach and engagement with provincial and municipal elected officials, municipal administration, and senior provincial departmental officials, including: Minister, Deputy Minister and ADM’s from Municipal Affairs; Minister of Service Alberta; Agriculture and Forestry; and the Chair of Capital Region Caucus.

Attendance at multiple mayoral events and addresses, and inclusive bi-lateral meetings held or planned with each Regional Mayor; bilateral and ongoing meetings with municipal CAOs.

Additional CEO outreach and engagement includes ongoing engagement with home builders, land developers and industry associations including Qualico, Rohit; guest speaker at UDI.

Attendance at multiple hosted functions and events including ACC, ECC, RMA, UDI, AIHA, AUMA, CHBA, EIA, BILD Alberta, and continued engagement with academic institutions including presentation in support of the UofA Urban and Regional Planning Endowment.
### Q3 Review of Strategic Priorities of the 2018-2023 Strategic Plan

**December 12, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3E. Maintain and enhance innovation to inform decisions.</th>
<th>3E. EMRB Administration continues to support the implementing new agenda software (iCompass) to improve internal efficiency. Framework and content now developed. Preliminary training overview provided to EMRB Administration. Live pilot testing schedule to commence in January 2020. EMRB Administration, as a team have participated in Fundamentals of Project Management Training delivered by Grant MacEwan University.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3F. Complete annual regional transportation priorities to inform Alberta Transportation.</td>
<td>3F. The 2019 Regional Transportation Priorities report reiterated support for the 2018 rankings and highlighted the importance of the 12 funding announcements for listed projects to the Region. The report was submitted to Alberta Transportation in July 2019. A new report will be developed in 2020 as part of the IRTMP initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3G. Update the Integrated Regional Master Plan (IRTMP).</td>
<td>3G. The EMRB kicked-off the IRTMP Working Group in September, followed by the Task Force in October 2019. Work to date has largely been technical in nature, including updating the transportation network and regional land use base ahead of upcoming scenario development and forecasting. The EMRB is working with the regional modeling team to resource updates to the Regional Travel Model and develop roles for upcoming work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- Colours – Green = significant progress; Yellow = work in progress; Red = yet to be initiated or just started
- Arrows – Up = progressing according to plan; Sideways = no progress
CEO Update

The last quarter of this year has been a very busy one for both the Board and EMRB Administration and positions us well for maintaining our momentum in the new year. Notable progress has been made to advance each of the strategic initiatives currently underway as well as a number of important corporate commitments. The Board has concentrated significant efforts to review our governance and committee structures to ensure going forward, these essential organizational structures not only support the ongoing work of the Board but effectively serve in delivering on our mandate and are reflective of the values and guiding principles of the EMRB.

There are also a number of notable accomplishments related to the strategic initiatives. In October, the RAMP Task Force unanimously endorsed a draft agricultural policy area framework, and made significant advancements in further refining the policy areas objectives and directions.

The inaugural MRSP reached a significant developmental milestone in November, with the unanimous Task Force approval of the *Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Report*. Following review and approval by the Board, this report to government provides the Region with an essential plan to support the ongoing implementation of the Growth Plan and represents the commitment of the Region to growing collaboratively.

The IRTMP initiative continues to move forward with the second Task Force meeting held on November 28th. During the inaugural meeting on October 24th, the Chair and the Vice Chair were selected. Congratulations to Mayor Katchur who was selected to Chair the Task Force and to Mayor Stewart as the Vice Chair.

As a result of ongoing dialogue and engagement with partners, EMRB has recently introduced several changes to the REF, and has revised the REF Planning Toolkit to established greater efficiency, consistency and transparency in aligning municipal development with the Growth Plan. EMRB continued our active engagement and involvement with municipal staff, and the developer community to streamline the REF process over last eight months resulting in a revised and flexible Planning Toolkit and introduction of the Substantive Amendment to REF. The Toolkit and Substantive Amendment have provided additional process clarity to municipalities. I wish to highlight the achievement of the REF Working Group and our partners in substantially reducing the number of REFs that are triggered by almost a half.

Work in support of Regional Broadband continues with significant outreach to stakeholders to support and inform the development of the Broadband Situational Analysis. Last week, I sent invitations for stakeholder participation in key interviews and also included a request for information. I wish to ensure that in our work we are not duplicating past good efforts and
instead are serving to build on all available data and intelligence. The situational analysis will serve to identify gaps in our knowledge and to help inform a strategic and targeted approach to broadband, and in addressing availability and connectivity challenges as well as the opportunities for Regional solutions.

The SISB Task Force convened on October 4th and served to finalize and endorse the SISB Strategic Guidance Document for approval by the Board. The Task Force meeting also provided the opportunity for member municipalities to each present and share the defining characteristics of their respective communities, highlight their strategic priorities, and in doing so, acknowledge the many similar issues and challenges their communities face. The second SISB Task Force meeting held on December 6th served to further advance the initiative through focus on development of the SISB workplan, approaches to stakeholder engagement, and examining potential SISB models.

Work in relation to ongoing EMRB corporate initiatives continue to progress as planned. A preliminary review of the EMRB policy suite and development of a Policy Framework has been completed. Proceeding in tandem is work underway in relation to the development of the Corporate Risk Profile (CRP). My sincere thanks to Board Members, municipal councillors, CAOs, and EMRB Administration staff for your participation in CRP key stakeholder interviews and in supporting the organization with your diverse perspectives and informed insights. EMRB Administration will present the finalized CRP, Policy Framework, and revised policy suite, to the appropriate Board Committees for endorsement and recommendation to the Board for approval before the end of the fiscal year.

Of our many corporate priorities, the development and implementation of our Integrated Communications and Engagement Strategy and Framework remains a critically important initiative for the organization. In our 2018-2019 Budget, the Board approved additional resources to enhance our communications and engagement capacity and to build the foundational strategy and framework. We are presently working with our communications consultants in finalizing the strategy and framework and anticipate this deliverable to the Board in the first quarter of the new year. In the meantime, EMRB administration has made significant strides in developing communications products to support each strategic initiative in the form of Updates and Bulletins, the creation of dedicated webpages, Task Force Meeting Summaries, and other ongoing communications products and tactics.

I have been very busy over the last two months with outreach and engagement and in meeting with provincial and municipal elected officials, municipal administrations, and senior provincial departmental officials. I have also had a number of meetings with members from the development community, Edmonton Global, post-secondary institutions and other key stakeholders.
I was again very pleased to attend many Mayoral events and addresses and have continued to engage in bi-lateral meetings with Mayors and with municipal CAOs. I have also been fortunate to present about EMRB and the Regional Mindset at a recent UDI Luncheon and similarly present to the U of A Urban and Regional Planning Endowment.

In keeping with my commitment to keep you informed as to the status and performance of the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) within the CEO Update, attached please find the 2019 Quarter 4 REF Report. You will note one REF approved, one under review and one currently in appeal period.

I wish to express my thanks for the dedicated efforts of the Board, the invaluable contributions of municipal administrations and our subject matter expert consultants, and the hard work of my EMRB Administration team for all the progress made in the last quarter.

Best regards and my best wishes to all for the upcoming holiday season,

Karen Wichuk, CEO
Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board

**Attachment:** 2019 Quarter 4 REF Report
2019 Quarter 4 Total REFs*

3

1 approved
1 under review
1 in appeal period

REF Application Types

3 Area Structure Plan Amendments

Length of EMRB Review

The average length of an EMRB REF review was 15 working days
(Does not include 28-day appeal period.)

*Note: Quarter 4 stats are current as of December 4, 2019.
2019 Year to Date Total REFs**

24

22 approved
1 under review
1 in appeal period

REF Application Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Intermunicipal Development Plans/Municipal Development Plans</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Development Plan Amendment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Area Structure Plans/Area Redevelopment Plans</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Structure Plan/Area Redevelopment Plan Amendments</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of EMRB Review

The average length of an EMRB REF review was 15 working days (Does not include 28-day appeal period.)

**Note: Year to Date stats current as of December 4, 2019
Shared Investment for Shared Benefit (SISB) Task Force

Friday, October 4, 2019
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
La Cité Francophone, Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
8627 Rue Marie-Anne Gaboury NW, Edmonton, AB

Task Force Members:
Rod Frank, Strathcona County (Chair)
Cathy Heron, City of St. Albert (Vice Chair)
John Stewart, City of Beaumont
Ray Ralph, Town of Devon
Don Iveson, City of Edmonton
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Bob Young, City of Leduc
Tanni Doblanko, Leduc County
Barry Turner, Town of Morinville
Rod Shaigec, Parkland County
Stuart Houston, City of Spruce Grove
Justin Laurie, Town of Stony Plain (Alternate)
Alanna Hnatiw, Sturgeon County

Guests:
Teaka Broughm, City of Beaumont
Stephen Dafoe, Town of Morinville
Trevor Duley, City of St. Albert
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Simon Farbrother, City of Spruce Grove
Troy Fleming, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Ian Gallagher, City of Edmonton
Bill Hamilton, City of Leduc
Gordon Harris, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Michelle Hay, City of Leduc
Brandy Kelly, City of Leduc
Larissa Lindmark, Parkland County
Nancy Lyzaniwski, Strathcona County
Ken MacKay, City of St. Albert
Avril McCalla, City of Edmonton
Travis Peter, Sturgeon County
Jackie Porayko, Strathcona County
Stephen Prendeville, EY
Kendra Raymond, City of Beaumont
Paul Ross, City of Edmonton
Kevin Scoble, City of St. Albert
Erin Stevenson, City of Spruce Grove
Martin Stout, City of Beaumont
Alan Thom, EY
Ray Watkins, City of St. Albert

EMRB Staff:
Karen Wichuk, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Director of Regional Growth Planning
Bryan Haggarty, Director of Strategic Initiatives and Operations
Alex Bonokoski, Project Manager
Taylor Varro, Project Manager
Ron Cook, Manager of GIS and Business Intelligence
Dan Rose, Senior Communications Advisor
Carol Moreno, Project Coordinator
1. Opening

1.1 Quorum

Quorum achieved; 13 of 13 voting members present.

1.2 Call to Order

Chair Frank called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

1.3 Chair’s Opening Remarks

Chair Frank welcomed members of the Task Force and regional stakeholders. Opening remarks included celebrating the progress of EMRB’s Shared Investment for Shared Benefit initiative and outlined the main meeting outcomes.

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force approve the October 4, 2019 meeting agenda.
Moved by: Mayor Hnatiw
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

3. Shared Investment for Shared Benefit

3.1. Strategic Guidance

Chair Frank and Mr. Bonokoski recognized the Task Force for the valuable work conducted as part of the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Workshops in developing the presented Strategic Guidance document. Mr. Bonokoski emphasized that the most recent version reflects the core intent and was edited to strengthen the forward-thinking language and emphasize the EMRB’s history of success.

The Task Force debated whether the Strategic Guidance should utilize stronger language around participation. An amendment was brought forward to change “should” to “shall” within the Important Considerations section’s reference to Participation. Mayor Frank turned the Chair over to Vice Chair Heron to provide comment on the proposed amendment. Mayor Katchur requested a recorded vote on this item.

Motion: That the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force amend the Strategic Guidance for Shared Investment for Shared Benefit to indicate that participation shall be mandatory for initiatives determined to be regionally significant.
Moved by: Mayor Doblanko
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: 11 in favour, 2 opposed - Carried
Voted in favour: City of Beaumont, Town of Devon, City of Edmonton, City of Leduc, Leduc County, Town of Morinville, Parkland County, City of Spruce Grove, City of St. Albert, Town of Stony Plain, Sturgeon County
Voted not in favour: City of Fort Saskatchewan, Strathcona County

Motion: That the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force endorse and recommend the Strategic Guidance for Shared Investment for Shared Benefit to the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board for approval as amended.
Moved by: Mayor Heron
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: 12 in favour, 1 opposed - Carried

4. Municipal Realities Presentations

Chair Frank invited each member to lead a 10-minute presentation of their municipal realities. All 13 Task Force members shared each community’s defining characteristics, strategic priorities, challenges and risks, and priority interests for the Region. Members were given the opportunity to ask questions and expressed their appreciation for each other’s candour and unique perspectives. Based on themes from these presentations, CEO Wichuk invited the Task Force to propose topics for further discussion. Members suggested possible topics including infrastructure density, borrowing capacity and financial reserves, listing properties that do not generate municipal taxes, and joint venture opportunities for utilities.

5. 2019 – 2020 SISB Task Force Meeting Schedule

Mr. Bonokoski explained that the proposed schedule is tentative and will likely change as the consultant team is brought on board.

Motion: That the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force accept the 2019 – 2020 SISB Task Force Meeting Schedule as information.
Moved by: Mayor Katchur
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously.

6. Next Steps

CEO Wichuk provided an update on the recent SISB Request for Proposal. EMRB plans to conclude its review of proponent submissions and have a contractor ready to present at the next meeting.
7. **Adjournment**

Chair Frank declared the meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m.

Task Force Chair, Rod Frank
Strategic Guidance for Shared Investment for Shared Benefit

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Strategic Guidance document to inform the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit strategic initiative.

**Background**

- The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board identified *Shared Investment for Shared Benefit* as its key strategic priority, in its 2018-2023 Strategic Plan. The stated outcome was “the shared and equitable contributions, investments, and efforts by the EMRB result in measurable benefits for the Region as a whole”.

- On December 13, 2018, the Board approved the Project Charter and the Task Force Terms of Reference, amended to include all 13 members of the Board.

- To establish a common understanding of the regional outcomes for this strategic initiative, the Task Force participated in six facilitated workshops, between March and August 2019.

- The outcome of the workshops was to develop a common understanding and strategic guidance framework to inform the development and implementation of a benefit realization model that reflects the shared regional interests.

- The key deliverable from the SISB Task Force workshops was a draft Strategic Guidance document.

- The Strategic Guidance document provides context for the strategic initiative and describes the strategic intent, foundational principles, and other important considerations for the development of an SISB framework and model for the Edmonton Metropolitan Region.

- At the SISB Task Force initial meeting on October 4, 2019, the Task Force provided additional feedback on the draft Strategic Guidance document and endorsed and recommended the revised Strategic Guidance document be approved by the Board.
Next Steps

- The Strategic Guidance document will be used as a guiding document throughout the project and will provide critical context and direction to the project team and inform future phases of the SISB project.

- The consulting team from Deloitte, will be introduced at the next Task Force meeting on December 6, 2019. The meeting will focus on a discussion of the proposed Stakeholder Engagement Approach, and introduction of SISB Models and Key Concepts.

- Work is underway to identify the Working Group to support the Task Force for this work.

Attachments

1. Strategic Guidance document for Shared Investment for Shared Benefit
CONTEXT

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region is expected to grow by an additional one million residents and nearly half a million new jobs by 2044. The members of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) work collaboratively to position the Region to capitalize on opportunities and address challenges in order to build a more prosperous and sustainable Region.

Collaboration is a guiding principle of the EMRB and reflects the Board’s commitment to shared regional success. Our member municipalities have already made great strides in thinking and acting regionally. That progress is evident in the creation of the EMRB itself, the Growth Plan, the development of a Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan and Regional Agriculture Master Plan, and the formation of Edmonton Global. This regional mindset is further demonstrated by Alberta’s Industrial Heartland, the Airport Accord, and the work of the Regional Transit Commission. The EMRB is unified in our purpose and building on our momentum. Our regional imperative demands new solutions, and the time has come to develop the next set of tools to enable the Region to realize its vision to be the dominant hub in northern Alberta recognized globally for our economic diversity and quality of life.

Shared Investment for Shared Benefit (SISB) was identified by the Metro Mayors Alliance Advisory Panel as an opportunity to realize the long-term economic competitiveness, community sustainability, and success of the Region. SISB was subsequently affirmed by all members of the EMRB, and, with participation from all municipalities, can offer a transformational approach to regional cooperation that creates cost and process efficiencies, leverages economies of scale, and provides value to regional citizens. A shared investment in legacy initiatives will benefit our Region and the entire province today and be sustainable for generations to come.

STRATEGIC INTENT

The intent of Shared Investment for Shared Benefit is to invest in and leverage the collective strengths, capacity, and resources of the Region’s municipalities, and other stakeholders, to eliminate inefficiency, ensure timeliness of action, and deliver infrastructure, programs and services that would otherwise be beyond a municipality’s ability to accomplish individually. In so doing, SISB will create long-term shared benefit that will enhance the Region’s overall quality of life and create the conditions that will contribute to its global competitiveness, attractiveness, and sustainability as we grow.
PRINCIPLES

A common set of principles will help guide the development of an SISB framework and model and will support the accountability and assessment of the model and its elements to ensure implementation is aligned with the strategic intent of SISB. The following principles have been identified to guide the development of an SISB framework and model.

Regional Strength – The Region should work to leverage the distinct strengths of each municipality and ensure that the elements needed to support the Region are provided by those best suited to secure maximum benefit for all. The Region should be experienced as borderless, supporting the flow and exchange of daily life across municipal boundaries. A regional, metropolitan approach will allow the whole to be greater than the sum of its parts.

Accountability – The framework and model should be developed in a manner that demonstrates accountability. Citizens should be aware of who can be held accountable for investments made to regional initiatives and the source of funds used to support those initiatives.

Transparency – Decision-making should be transparent and guided by openness to question, input, and engagement in the process.

Autonomy – Municipalities should have the ability to act freely outside of external control or influence, the ability to identify and set priorities and to choose a manner or method to achieve them.

Efficiency – Resources should be optimized to provide maximum benefit and return on investment and minimize costs for the Region and municipalities. Wherever possible, efforts should be made to leverage economies of scale and avoid duplication.

Equity – Costs and benefits should be shared equitably across the municipalities, considering each municipality’s ability to contribute and the benefits they may receive.

IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS

The following considerations were identified by municipalities for the development and implementation of an SISB framework and model for the Region:

Autonomy – The framework and model must address autonomy and municipal decision-making at the local level. The framework and model must balance the need for local independence and regional significance.
Ability to Contribute – The framework and model must consider the capacity of each municipality to contribute funding and other meaningful resources for SISB initiatives, including financial resources, staff resources, and other types of expertise or contributions.

Balance Local and Regional Needs – The framework and model must strike and maintain a balance between local needs and demands and those of the Region on an ongoing and sustainable basis.

Stakeholder Support – The SISB framework and model must be well communicated, understood, and garner and maintain the support of stakeholders, including elected officials, local taxpayers, and other regional stakeholders.

In informing the development of the SISB framework and model, it is suggested that the following be considered:

Seize the Opportunity – SISB represents an opportunity to positively shape the Region’s future in a way that significantly contributes to the prosperity and quality of life for all of its citizens. Failing to collaboratively develop an SISB framework and model would be a significant opportunity lost.

Timeliness – There is a desire on the part of the municipalities to develop a sustainable, legacy-building SISB framework and model to enable future regional collaboration. Developing the framework and model in a timely manner is imperative.

Strengthening Partnerships – SISB should allow for flexibility in selecting and funding regionally significant initiatives that strengthen or leverage relationships and efficiencies with Provincial and Federal orders of government.

Participation – Participation shall be mandatory for initiatives determined to be regionally significant. The degree of participation for each municipality will be based on an agreed formula included in the SISB model. Municipalities, acting through the EMRB, will be responsible for determining a process to assess whether an initiative is regionally significant and applicable to the SISB framework and model.

IMPORTANT MODEL CHARACTERISTICS

In addition to the identified principles and important considerations, the SISB framework and model must reflect certain characteristics and, to the extent possible, should reflect other characteristics. These characteristics are listed in relative order of priority so that if trade-offs are necessary, the most important characteristics are given precedence in the framework and model.
• The SISB framework and model must:
  
  o be sufficiently flexible and scalable to handle a range of potential initiatives, large and small, and not just those related to infrastructure;
  o be justifiable based on a compelling rationale;
  o be based on agreed definitions for key elements, such as “regionally significant” and what constitutes “benefit”;
  o provide criteria against which initiatives can be evaluated for objective decision-making; and
  o provide criteria against which to measure success and benefit achieved as part of an accountability framework.

• The SISB framework and model should:
  
  o be affordable, recognize the diversity of the municipalities in the Region, and their different abilities to contribute;
  o enable a transparent, robust decision-making process based on the best available information;
  o be sustainable over time, and, ideally, self-sustaining; and
  o be cost-effective and result in cost-savings or efficiencies.

• Other important framework and model characteristics:
  
  o The value proposition must be clear.
  o The framework and model should be forward-looking and apply to new initiatives and, potentially, new assessment.
  o The framework and model should be tied to regional economic growth and competitiveness.
  o There should be a role for the private sector and other public sector entities.
Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force Chair and Vice Chair

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board confirm Mayor Gale Katchur as Chair of the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force as of October 24, 2019.

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board confirm Mayor John Stewart as Vice Chair of the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force as of October 24, 2019.

**Background**

- On October 24, 2019, the inaugural Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force meeting was held with the first order of business being the selection of Chair and Vice Chair.

- Task Force members nominated members for the position of Chair and through a voting process, Mayor Gale Katchur was selected as the Chair.

- Mayor Stewart was nominated for Vice Chair and was selected as the Vice Chair.

- As per the IRTMP Terms of Reference, the Board must appoint the Chair and Vice Chair of the Task Force.
Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP) Task Force

Thursday, October 24, 2019
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
La Cité Francophone, Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
8627 Rue Marie-Anne Gaboury NW, Edmonton, AB

Task Force Members:
Kathy Barnhart, City of Beaumont (Alternate)
Tim Cartmell, City of Edmonton
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton (Alternate)
Gordon Harris, City of Fort Saskatchewan (Alternate)
Nicole Boutestein, Town of Morinville
William Choy, Town of Stony Plain
Bill Tonita, Strathcona County
Wayne Bokenfohr, Sturgeon County (Alternate)
Barry Chan, Alberta Transportation (Alternate)

Regrets:
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan (Chair)
John Stewart, City of Beaumont (Vice Chair)
Alanna Hnatiw, Sturgeon County
Michael Botros, Alberta Transportation

Guests:
Teaka Broughm, City of Beaumont
Kevin Cole, Strathcona County
Trevor Duley, City of St. Albert
Ahmed Essayed, Town of Stony Plain
David Hales, City of Edmonton
Justin Laurie, Town of Stony Plain
Larissa Lindmark, Parkland County
Nancy Lyzaniowski, Strathcona County
Avril McCalla, City of Edmonton
Ted Nestor, Sturgeon County
Shawn Olson, City of Leduc
Jackie Porayko, Strathcona County
Grant Schaffer, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Dean Schick, City of St. Albert
Peter Reeson, UDI – Edmonton Region

EMRB Staff:
Sharon Shuya, Director of Regional Growth Planning
Debra Irving, Senior Project Manager
Dan Rose, Senior Communications Advisor
Carol Moreno, Project Coordinator

Consultants:
Stephen Power, HDR
Charlene Wilcock, HDR
Melanie Hare, Urban Strategies
Karen Gilchrist, Karen Gilchrist & Associates
1. Opening

1.1 Quorum

Quorum achieved; 7 of 7 voting members present.

1.2 Call to Order

Ms. Shuya called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

1.3 Opening Remarks

Ms. Shuya welcomed members of the Task Force and outlined the focus of the meeting. Highlighting the value of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan, she emphasized the need for flexibility and adaptability to enable the future success of the Region.

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force approve the October 24, 2019 meeting agenda.
Moved by: Councillor Barnhart
Accepted by: Ms. Shuya
Decision: Carried unanimously

3. Governance

3.1. Selection of Chair

Ms. Shuya described the process for selecting the Task Force Chair and Vice Chair. As per the Terms of Reference, the Chair and Vice Chair must be members of the Board and appointed for the duration of the project.

Nominations were received for Mayors Katchur and Stewart. Councillors Harris and Barnhart offered statements on behalf of their respective mayors.

A vote was conducted by secret ballot and Ms. Shuya declared the result in favour of Mayor Katchur.

Motion: That the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force direct EMRB Administration to destroy the ballots.
Moved by: Councillor Bokenfohr
Accepted by: Ms. Shuya
Motion: That the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force appoint Mayor Gale Katchur to the Chair position and recommend that the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board endorse and reaffirm that appointment as effective October 24, 2019.
Moved by: Councillor Harris
Accepted by: Ms. Shuya
Decision: Carried unanimously

3.2. Selection of Vice Chair

Ms. Shuya opened the floor for nominations for the position of Vice Chair. Mayor Stewart’s name was put forward for nomination.

Motion: That the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force appoint Mayor John Stewart to the Vice Chair position and recommend that the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board endorse and reaffirm that appointment as effective October 24, 2019.
Moved by: Councillor Barnhart
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

3.3. Working Group Terms of Reference

Ms. Shuya introduced the IRTMP’s Senior Project Manager, Debra Irving. Ms. Irving led the Task Force in an overview of the Working Group Terms of Reference. The Task Force was given the opportunity to share any comments or questions and none were expressed.

Motion: That the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force accept the IRTMP Working Group Terms of Reference as information.
Moved by: Councillor Gordon Harris
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

4. IRTMP Consultant Review

Mr. Power, Ms. Hare, and Ms. Wilcock provided a brief self-introduction. Mr. Power presented the overall project approach and a high-level work plan. Ms. Wilcock collected Task Force input on their perceptions of transportation issues in their municipalities and the Region, via a mini questionnaire.

1:49 p.m. Councillor Cartmell left the meeting and was replaced by Councillor Walters.

Ms. Hare offered a review of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan (EMRGP) and each of its interconnected policies and objectives, as they relate to transportation. She
outlined some of the key considerations, opportunities, and challenges in the Region. The Task Force asked about the availability of more current data, beyond 2011, on average commutes from communities in the Region and the Project Team confirmed they will integrate data from the most recent census in future presentations.

Regarding the scenarios, the EMRGGP will form the foundation for the transportation network but other variables, such as different ways to organize transportation, will be run through the model. In each scenario, consideration will be given to tradeoffs and unintended consequences. Using this approach highlight which option(s) work best to fit the overall framework and intent of the EMRGGP. The Environmental Scan will include opportunities to see how other cities and regions have implemented best practices in this respect.

Break 2:23 p.m. – 2:37 p.m.

In their responses to the mini questionnaire, Task Force members highlighted transportation systems from different cities which they felt had attractive features or aspects of their system worthwhile to consider. The places identified were Montreal, Calgary, Toronto, Phoenix, Amsterdam, and Chicago. Mr. Power led the Task Force in an open discussion of those examples and their valuable aspects, highlighting the expectations of users of the different systems, creative approaches to servicing a range of transportation needs, and importance of recognizing shifting attitudes, priorities, and values.

5. Engagement and Communications Plans

Ms. Irving introduced the Task Force to the project’s flexible engagement approach, as many groups are interested in learning about and contributing to the project. The first round of engagement will involve key stakeholders identified in the project charter. More details to be discussed at future meetings.

Ms. Gilchrist outlined the overall approach to communications to ensure the Project Team is effective in receiving and sharing critical information required for project success. She encouraged the Task Force to provide feedback on communication methods and tools throughout the project to ensure information is readily available and achieves its purpose.

6. IRTMP Task Force Meeting Schedule

Ms. Irving presented the proposed meeting schedule and suggested it is possible to shift these dates, if major scheduling conflicts arise. Ms. Shuya indicated that meeting invitations will be extended following the meeting.

Motion: That the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force accept the IRTMP Task Force Meeting Schedule as information.

Moved by: Councillor Harris

Accepted by: Chair

Decision: Carried unanimously
7. **Next Steps**

Ms. Shuya reiterated that the Project Team and Working Group will continue its work through meetings and data collection in preparation for the next Task Force meeting.

Next Meeting:

IRTMP Task Force  
November 28, 2019, 1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.  
La Cité Francophone, Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger  
8627 Rue Marie-Anne Gaboury NW, Edmonton, AB

8. **Adjournment**

Ms. Shuya declared the meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.
Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP) Task Force

Thursday, November 28, 2019
1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
La Cité Francophone, Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
8627 Rue Marie-Anne Gaboury NW, Edmonton, AB

Task Force Members:
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan (Chair)
John Stewart, City of Beaumont (Vice Chair)
Tim Cartmell, City of Edmonton
Justin Laurie, Town of Stony Plain
Bill Tonita, Strathcona County
Alanna Hnatiw, Sturgeon County
Dean Litke, Alberta Transportation (Alternate)

Regrets:
Nicole Boutestein, Town of Morinville
Michael Botros, Alberta Transportation

EMRB Staff:
Karen Wichuk, Chief Executive Officer
Sharon Shuya, Director of Regional Growth Planning
Bryan Haggarty, Director of Strategic Initiatives and Operations
Debra Irving, Senior Project Manager
Dan Rose, Senior Communications Advisor
Carol Moreno, Project Coordinator

Guests:
Teaka Broughm, City of Beaumont
Barry Chan, Alberta Transportation
Kevin Cole, Strathcona County
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Madison Dube, City of Edmonton
David Hales, City of Edmonton
Gordon Harris, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Mark Hussey, City of Spruce Grove
Larissa Lindmark, Parkland County
Avril McCalla, City of Edmonton
Des Mryglod, Leduc County
Ted Nestor, Sturgeon County
Brett Newstead, Town of Stony Plain
Shawn Olson, City of Leduc
Robert Parks, Strathcona County
Jackie Porayko, Strathcona County
Grant Schaffer, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Stephen Raitz, City of Beaumont

Consultants:
Stephen Power, HDR
Charlene Wilcock, HDR
Karen Gilchrist, Karen Gilchrist & Associates
1. Opening

1.1 Quorum

Quorum achieved; 5 of 7 voting members present.

1.2 Call to Order

Chair Katchur called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m.

1.3 Opening Remarks

Chair Katchur welcomed Task Force members and regional stakeholders. Opening remarks included a reminder of the Growth Plan as the IRTMP’s foundation, the importance of building a resilient and innovative region, and a recognition of the IRTMP Working Group members, who will offer guidance throughout the project.

2. Approval of Agenda

IRTMP19-07

Motion: That the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force approve the November 28, 2019 meeting agenda.

Moved by: Councillor Tonita

Accepted by: Chair

Decision: Carried unanimously

3. Approval of Minutes

IRTMP19-08

Motion: That the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Task Force approve the October 24, 2019 meeting minutes.

Moved by: Councillor Laurie

Accepted by: Chair

Decision: Carried unanimously

Mayor Hnatiw joined the meeting at 1:13 p.m.

4. Task Force Workshop

Mr. Power provided a brief introduction and an update on the Project Team’s work plan and scope of the Environmental Scan phase. Ms. Wilcock summarized the linkages of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan to the current IRTMP development process. Mr. Power reviewed the results of the previous Task Force workshop on examples of good regional transportation systems and included the Working Group’s perspective from the same exercise. Themes from that exercise included: mode choice, efficiency and intuitiveness, responsiveness to context, and ease of use. He outlined commuting trends in the Region, based on census data, and some of the rationale that inform key observations.
Mr. Power invited members of the Task Force to identify success criteria that they expect to achieve at the time the Plan is ready for approval and at a point 10 years from implementation.

Comments on the near-term goals included: addressing commute times, taking bold action, supporting the Growth Plan, enthusiastic reception and consensus, and building on the value of previous work.

Comments on the long-term goals included: seeing a modal shift, ease of commodity movement, regional investment, completing prioritized projects, using key performance metrics, opportunities for improving the quality of commutes, reduction in the impact of congestion, and reliability of commute times. Mr. Power encouraged the Task Force to manage their expectations around reducing commute times and eliminating congestion.

The Task Force brainstormed some barriers or risks that may prevent achieving these criteria for success. Comments included: coordination with other orders of government, managing local vs. regional interests, the focus and breadth of the priorities list, inability to anticipate and adapt to innovation and technology, implications of federal restrictions on commodity movement, struggles to think from a metropolitan mindset as opposed to a “traditional” approach, failure to learn lessons from other jurisdictions, inability to capitalize on game-changing opportunities, selection of appropriate partnerships, challenges with timeliness from planning to implementation, lack of communication, and land acquisition.

Break from 2:34 p.m. to 2:47 p.m.

Mr. Power led the Task Force in listing some strategies for mitigating the previously identified risks. Comments included: aligning with provincial priorities, maintaining consensus, understanding each other’s realities and perspectives, prioritizing an adaptability in system development, clarifying the concept of “regionally significant”, relying on regional data and evidence for decision making, ensuring EMRB has a strong voice, and developing clear assignment of responsibilities.

5. Next Steps

Mr. Power shared that the next Task Force meeting will also employ a workshop format to start building scenarios. The Working Group will meet in December to prepare and discuss meeting materials. Task Force members discussed expectations around their level of expertise and the supporting role of the Working Group and Project Team. Chair Katchur indicated that representatives from the Working Group will be invited to sit at the Task Force table as part of future meetings.

Next Meeting:

IRTMP Task Force
January 10, 2019, 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
La Cité Francophone, Theatre
8627 Rue Marie-Anne Gaboury NW, Edmonton, AB
6. Adjournment

Chair Katchur declared the meeting adjourned at 3:37 p.m.

Task Force Chair, Gale Katchur
Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force

Thursday, November 21, 2019
8:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
La Cité Francophone, Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
8627 Rue Marie-Anne Gaboury NW, Edmonton, AB

Task Force Members:
Ray Ralph, Town of Devon (Chair)
Dave Anderson, Strathcona County (Vice Chair)
Gordon Harris, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Don Iveson, City of Edmonton
Tanni Doblanko, Leduc County
Ray Watkins, City of St. Albert
William Choy, Town of Stony Plain

Advisory Group Members:
Paresh Dhariya, Town of Devon
Richard Gagnon, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Shawn Olson, City of Leduc
Grant Bain, Leduc County
Brad White, Town of Morinville
Corey Levasseur, City of Spruce Grove
Kevin Cole, Strathcona County
Travis Peter, Sturgeon County

Technical Working Group Members:
Leo Girard, Parkland County

EMRB Staff:
Karen Wichuk, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Director, Regional Growth Planning
Bryan Haggarty, Director, Strategic Initiatives and Operations
Barry Huybens, MRSP Senior Project Manager
Dan Rose, Senior Communications Advisor
Carol Moreno, Project Coordinator
Joseana Lara, Municipal Planning Intern

Guests:
John Stewart, City of Beaumont
Joannes Wong, City of Beaumont
David Hales, City of Edmonton
Avril Mccalla, City of Edmonton
Matthew Wispinski, City of Edmonton
Brandy Kelly, City of Leduc
Kelly Vandenberghe, Leduc County
Linda Matties, Town of Stony Plain
Brett Newstead, Town of Stony Plain
Robert Stephenson, Strathcona County
Jennifer Lavallée, Sturgeon County
Brandi Thorne, CSU 52
Jeannie Bertrand, Dillon Consulting Ltd.
Kevin Ma, Media
1. Opening

1.1 Quorum

Quorum achieved; 6 of 7 voting members present.

1.2 Call to Order

Chair Ralph called the meeting to order at 8:06 a.m.

1.3 Chair Opening Remarks

Chair Ralph welcomed members of the Task Force and regional stakeholders. He reviewed the progress accomplished to date towards the inaugural Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan. Chair Ralph outlined the key questions and next steps to be addressed.

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force approve the November 21, 2019 meeting agenda.

Moved by: Mayor Iveson
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion: That the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force approve the September 6, 2019 meeting minutes.

Moved by: Mayor Doblanko
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

4. Review Work Completed since September 6, 2019

Mr. Huybens described the efforts to complete the final draft of the MRSP Report and acknowledged that the Advisory Group input from an earlier draft had been included in the final draft. That said, the Project Team welcomes additional feedback prior to the report’s submission to the Board.

Since the last Task Force meeting, the Emergency Management Technical Working Group prepared its Environmental Scan to supplement the overall MRSP Environmental Scan and has created a vision statement and identified next steps for the Emergency Management section of the Report. Mr. Huybens expressed thanks to the representatives from municipal administrations for their contributions of data and information in a timely fashion to allow for this service area to be included in the final Report.
Ms. Shuya outlined the meeting outcomes to include a review and endorsement of the inaugural MRSP Report, further discussion on the Engagement Plan, and a discussion of the Implementation Plan.

5. **Government of Alberta Request for Extension Update**

CEO Wichuk advised the Task Force that, as of Monday, November 18th the Government of Alberta had granted the extension request to the end of March 2020.

6. **Inaugural Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan**

Ms. Shuya outlined the approach and process for the review of the inaugural MRSP Report by the Task Force. Ms. Shuya suggested the focus of the review should be limited to the identification of substantive contents changes or concerns by the Task Force.

Key focus areas included the Task Force’s initial thoughts on the Report, anything missed in the final draft, and anything that requires more emphasis or explanation. Other non-substantive changes or suggestions should be communicated to the EMRB Administration in writing to the attention of Ms. Moreno, by end of day Monday, November 25, 2019.

Mr. Huybens provided the Task Force with an overview of each section of the Report and described the process used to arrive at the current iteration. He emphasized the sense of urgency for each service area, the vision and opportunities for the Collaboratives, the prioritization of EMRB’s efforts, and the value of regional data and information through Edmonton Metropolitan Region Geographic Information Services (EMRGIS).

On behalf of the Project Team, Mr. Huybens recognized the expertise provided by the Advisory Group and Technical Working Groups as well as the leadership and strategic guidance of the Task Force members over the past two years.

8:32 a.m. Councillor Anderson joined the meeting.

Ms. Shuya indicated the areas of the Plan where additions would be made in the final Report going to the Board, including: the addition of a section on the Implementation Plan to be added to the Executive Summary, and the addition of a message from the Task Force Chair.

Comments from the Task Force focused on clarification of implementation considerations, the process for identifying future opportunities for more regional planning and efficiencies that may arise for the water, wastewater, transportation – roads, and transportation – transit service areas as well as the role of the proposed MRSP Standing Committee.

**Motion:** That the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force endorse and recommend the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan to the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board for approval.

**Moved by:** Mayor Choy

**Accepted by:** Chair

**Decision:** Carried unanimously
Break from 8:54 a.m. to 9:14 a.m.

7. Engagement Plan & Implementation Plan

Ms. Shuya led the Task Force in a discussion of the Engagement Plan and posed the question as to the best time to submit the Report to the Province: following Board approval or following engagement with Municipal Councils. Members of the Task Force shared their support for submitting the Report once approved by the Board and channeling feedback from Municipal Councils into implementation considerations.

Task Force members are invited to accompany the Chair and EMRB Administration in presentations to Councils around the Region. EMRB Administration will provide Task Force members with the meeting schedule once it is finalized.

Ms. Shuya facilitated an open discussion around the formation of the proposed MRSP Standing Committee. Task Force members were advised development of a draft Terms of Reference is underway and it would be available for review and discussion by the Task Force in late January prior to being tabled at the Board.

After some discussion, the Task Force agreed the Standing Committee would be responsible to oversee the development and implementation of a work plan to include all four collaboratives as its first priority in order to ensure the good work to date in the inaugural MRSP does not lose momentum.

Motion: That the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force recommend the Board resolve to create an MRSP Standing Committee by February 2020.

Moved by: Mayor Choy
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

8. Next Steps

Ms. Shuya outlined the next steps to include: finalize input and design of MRSP Report, seek Board Approval, submit the approved MRSP to the Government of Alberta, finalize the Engagement Plan for Municipal Councils, prepare a draft Terms of Reference for the MRSP Standing Committee, and schedule a Task Force meeting to review the Standing Committee Terms of Reference before the end of January 2020.

The Task Force discussed how municipal initiatives could be identified and considered with the Regional Collaboratives at this time or in the future. CEO Karen Wichuk advised the Task Force no mechanism currently exists to bring these opportunities to the table other than conversations between members, but that these opportunities and a process be identified as part of the evolution of EMRB. In the meantime, municipalities are encouraged to bring forward regional opportunities to work together as part of Board Member Updates.
9. **Next Meeting**

   To be confirmed for early 2020.

10. **Adjournment**

    Chair Ralph offered a farewell to Mr. Huybens with gratitude for his direction and expertise in managing the MRSP project. He also noted the valuable contributions of EMRB Administration, in particular Ms. Shuya and Ms. Moreno, and the integral role of the Task Force members.

    CEO Wichuk, on behalf of the Project Team and others, expressed sincere thanks to the Chair for his dedicated service and leadership in guiding the completion of the inaugural MRSP for the Edmonton Metropolitan Region.

    Chair Ralph declared the meeting adjourned at 10:17 a.m.

---

Task Force Chair, Ray Ralph
Final Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan

Recommended Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan.

Background

- In October 2017, the Government of Alberta passed the Modernization Municipal Government Act which resulted in a new regulation of the Board reducing its membership from 24 to 13 members and expanding its mandate to include the development of a metropolitan region servicing plan (MRSP) and to submit it to the Province in two years from the Regulation coming into force.

- On February 8, 2019, The Board approved the Project Charter, Task Force Terms of Reference and the appointment of a seven-member Task Force. The work of the MRSP Task Force was further supported by an MRSP Advisory Group comprised of senior municipal administration, and by four MRSP Technical Working Groups consisting of subject matter experts from four service areas.

- The first major deliverable was the development of a MRSP Environmental Scan of seven service areas identified in the regulation including transportation roads, transportation - transit, water, wastewater, stormwater, solid waste, and emergency services. The MRSP Environmental Scan provides a concise, region-wide understanding of the current state of these municipal service areas at a point in time to inform the focus and future work of the MRSP.

- On February 14, 2019, the Board received the MRSP Environmental Scan for information.

- The MRSP Environmental Scan identified three service areas – stormwater, solid waste, and emergency services as having the greatest potential for achieving greater efficiency and optimization of resources through a collaborative regional approach. Through subsequent collaboration and discussion, emergency services was further divided into two service areas; fire/EMS and emergency management based on unique stakeholders and legislation.

- For the four remaining four service areas water, wastewater, roads and transit the Task Force recognized current mechanisms, existing entities and regional partnerships already exist to effectively plan for future growth, and therefore do not require a regional level servicing plan at this time.
• The implementation of the inaugural MRSP through the work of the Collaboratives, will leverage the unique and collective strengths and experiences of municipalities to realize efficiencies in planning for regionally significant services, identifying and prioritizing regional infrastructure investments and identifying opportunities to coordinate delivery of services.

• Through continued regional collaboration, the MRSP will help the Region make evidence-based decisions that support efficient and cost-effective investments to reduce duplication and redundancy, optimize services between municipalities, and maximize the value and benefits of those investments.

• The inaugural MRSP is now complete and assembled in the attached report. The inaugural MRSP provides a go-forward strategy in alignment to the regional Growth Plan, in effect.

• The report outlines a proposed strategic and operational direction, and the enabling structures necessary to achieve enhanced municipal collaboration and service coordination in four regionally significant municipal service areas.

• The major recommendation from this work is to stand up Regional Collaboratives for each of the four service areas – stormwater, solid waste, fire/EMS, and emergency management to advance regional level collaboration with strategic oversight being provided through a governance structure reporting thru to the Board.

• The remaining municipal service areas (i.e., water, wastewater, and roads and transit) will continue to be planned and services delivered based on current mechanisms and entities, at this time.

• All eight service areas will continue to be reviewed and monitored against the Growth Plan, to ensure the municipalities and stakeholders in the Region are working together to optimize planning and service delivery to meet the needs and expectation of all regional citizens, in the most cost-effective manner.

• In order to have the required time to bring the report to the Board for approval, at the October 10 Board Meeting, the MRSP Task Force requested the Board seek a six-month extension for completing the MRSP from the Government of Alberta.

• On November 15, 2019, the request for an extension was granted with the servicing plan to be completed by March 31, 2020.
Next Steps

- Upon approval of the inaugural MRSP Report, the Task Force recommends the report be submitted to the Province for approval.

- EMRB Administration will provide a project briefing note to accompany a copy of the Final Report to member Councils for information as part of the Task Force’s commitment to Stakeholder Engagement and will attend a Council Meeting to respond to questions. Comments received will be considered in the implementation of the Regional Collaboratives.

Attachments

1. Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan, Final Report
Part 4
Preparation of Edmonton Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan

Servicing Plan

14(1) The Board shall, within 2 years from the coming into force of this Regulation, prepare a Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan for the Edmonton Metropolitan Region and file a copy with the Minister.

(2) The Board shall review the Servicing Plan every 5 years.

Objectives of Servicing Plan
15 The objectives of the Servicing Plan are as follows:

(a) to identify the services required to support the goals of, and to implement, the Growth Plan;
(b) to support the optimization of shared services to enhance use of ratepayer dollars;
(c) to facilitate orderly, economical and environmentally responsible growth in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region;
(d) to coordinate planning and decisions regarding services among member municipalities to ensure the optimization of ratepayer dollars.

Contents of Servicing Plan
16 The Servicing Plan must

(a) list the servicing required to support the development outlined in the Growth Plan, which may include

(i) transportation including, regional transit,
(ii) water, waste water and storm water,
(iii) solid waste,
(iv) emergency services, and
(v) any other services, identified by the board which benefit residents in more than one of the municipalities that are parties to the Servicing Plan,
(b) for services to be provided on an intermunicipal basis, outline how each service will be

(i) intermunicipally delivered, including which municipality will lead delivery of the service, and
(ii) intermunicipally funded,
(c) set the timeframe for implementing services to be provided on an intermunicipal basis,
(d) contain other matters necessary to support the Growth Plan, and
(e) contain any other matter the Minister considers appropriate.
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95 GLOSSARY OF TERMS, ABBREVIATIONS, AND ACRONYMS
The Chair and Members of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) are pleased to present the inaugural Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan (MRSP).

The MRSP represents the ongoing work of the Board toward fulfilment of our mandate as a growth management board under the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board Regulation; but moreover, is representative of our commitment to working together with a focus on planning regionally to achieve responsible growth.

The MRSP is an essential plan to support the implementation of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan and supports a key component of the Region’s 50 Year Vision in that “the Region is committed to growing collaboratively through the efficient use of infrastructure, building compact communities, and fostering economic opportunities and healthy lifestyles”.

To achieve this vision, we understand the many challenges our future growth will bring. We are the second youngest, second fastest growing Region in Canada, and represent one-third of the province’s population and economic activity. We are planning for an additional one million residents and nearly half a million new jobs in the Region by 2044.

As a Region, we have had nearly a century to plan for the municipal service needs of our first million regional citizens, and we will have just 25 years to plan and build for the next million. The municipal services and infrastructure needed to keep pace with our future growth are significant. There are complex challenges associated with the doubling of our regional population; however, the core principle by which we plan for growth is to work together as one interconnected Region.

Working together in the development of our inaugural MRSP provides the opportunity to coordinate and optimize our municipal services, reduce duplication and inefficiency, leverage the tremendous economies of scale and strengths inherent in our Region, learn from each other and adopt best practices to maximize the value and benefits residents receive from municipal services thereby contributing to a high quality of life and an attractive, competitive Region.
A MESSAGE FROM THE TASK FORCE CHAIR

The inaugural MRSP Report is the product of two years of future-oriented regional collaboration. I am proud to have served as Chair of the MRSP Task Force, and I would like extend my congratulations and gratitude to all my Task Force colleagues from across the Region, the Advisory Group, Technical Working Groups, and subject matter experts representing a number of service areas, and the dedicated EMRB Administration; all of whom have committed their time, expertise, and perspectives to creating a plan for a more efficient and collaborative regional future.

The MRSP is a core deliverable of the Board under the mandate established by the Government of Alberta. It also represents our commitment to thinking and acting with a regional mindset, and to working smarter to reduce duplication and improve value to citizens of the Region.

The MRSP Report provides a clear path forward to a more efficient and cost-effective regional future and provides direction for the next phase of regional collaboration in priority service areas.

We know there are opportunities to work more efficiently today in services like stormwater management, waste management, Fire/EMS, and emergency planning. As individual municipalities, we can no longer afford to go it alone. We’re planning for an anticipated one million additional regional residents and nearly half a million new jobs in our regional economy by 2044. With this “made in the region” approach to growth planning, we know there is so much more we can do together to guarantee the Region has the municipal services and infrastructure needed to be competitive for business and investment, and to attract and retain talented people and families for generations to come.

I am optimistic for the future of the Region and the solutions-oriented innovation we can unlock as one Region. I look forward to advancing the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan with the same level of regional trust and commitment that defines our work to create a region for every ambition.

The success of the Region will be defined by the quality of life we can provide to our residents. By working collaboratively as one Region we can leverage expertise and economies of scale to ensure we can provide exceptional services at the best value for the citizens of the Region.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
INTRODUCTION

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) is a diverse group of four rural and nine urban municipalities with one common goal — to make the best decisions in the interest of the Region by creating the conditions for all municipalities to thrive and prosper for current and future generations.

The EMRB mandate is to provide collaborative regional leadership in the development and implementation of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan (Growth Plan) and a Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan (MRSP) to meet the future population and employment needs of the Region.
THE GROWTH PLAN – GUIDING TRANSFORMATIVE CHANGE IN THE REGION

On October 26, 2017, the Government of Alberta approved the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan – Reimagine, Plan, Build. The Growth Plan establishes the direction for planning as one interconnected Region committed to growing more responsibly. The Growth Plan provides an integrated policy framework and establishes specific outcomes that represent a commitment to responsible growth.

The Growth Plan calls for a reduction in the urban development footprint through higher densities, increased transportation choices, protection of the environment, mitigation of impacts of climate change, wisely managing prime agricultural resources, coordinated regional land use and infrastructure decisions, to create the conditions for a diversified, globally economically competitive region and to create complete communities.

The outcomes of the Growth Plan acknowledge and reinforce the interconnectivity of the Region and the importance of leading with a regional mindset in planning for growth. The MRSP is an essential plan to support the implementation of the Growth Plan and is focused on regional opportunities to coordinate, harmonize and streamline municipal services, in alignment with the outcomes of the Growth Plan.
FROM PLANNING TO REGIONAL ACTION

This inaugural MRSP Report provides a forward strategy and a comprehensive overview of the significant progress to date in developing the first MRSP. This report outlines a proposed strategic and operational direction, and the enabling structures necessary to achieve enhanced municipal collaboration and service coordination in regionally significant municipal service areas. Our inaugural MRSP is based on four Regional Collaboratives to advance four regionally significant service areas.

The MRSP will leverage the unique strengths and experiences of municipalities to realize efficiencies in planning for regionally significant services, identifying and prioritizing regional infrastructure investments and identifying opportunities to coordinate delivery of services. Through continued regional collaboration, the MRSP will help municipalities make evidence-based decisions that support efficient and cost-effective investments to reduce duplication and redundancy, optimize services between municipalities, and ensure citizens have the full range of services they require.

As capacity and resourcing is a major consideration of both planning and implementation, the EMRB will provide ongoing oversight to ensure the Regional Collaborative action plans and related projects are effectively and efficiently prioritized, approved, and managed relative to the capacity of member municipalities to participate.

The MRSP recognizes that as we grow – and grow closer together – the costs associated with providing infrastructure and efficient services for another one million regional residents will be greater than one individual municipality can manage alone.

The work of the EMRB and the introduction of the MRSP demonstrate the spirit of trust, collaboration, and problem-solving that defines our Region. The EMRB continues to plan without boundaries to create the conditions for a resilient and sustainable and prosperous Region, based on providing efficient municipal supports and services necessary for healthy individuals and a healthy environment, a thriving business and industrial community, and livable municipalities.

...the costs associated with providing infrastructure and efficient services for another one million regional residents will be greater than one individual municipality can manage alone.
THE MRSP – WORKING TOGETHER

The development of the MRSP was led by a seven-member MRSP Task Force of Mayors and Councillors from across the Region. Representation on the MRSP Task Force is considerate of the distinct contexts, capacities, and experiences of member municipalities.

The work of the MRSP Task Force was further supported by an MRSP Advisory Group comprised of senior municipal administration, and by four MRSP Technical Working Groups consisting of subject matter experts from the four service areas.

The first project deliverable was the development of a MRSP Environmental Scan of seven service areas including transportation (roads), regional transit, water, wastewater, stormwater, solid waste, and emergency services. The MRSP Environmental Scan provides a concise, region-wide understanding of the current state of these municipal service areas at a point in time to inform the focus and future work of the MRSP.

The MRSP Environmental Scan identified three service areas – stormwater, solid waste, and emergency services as having the greatest potential for achieving greater efficiency and optimization of resources through a collaborative regional approach. Through subsequent collaboration and discussion, emergency services was further divided into two service areas; fire/EMS and emergency management based on unique stakeholders and legislation.

For the remaining four service areas, water, wastewater, transportation – roads and transit, the Task Force recognized current mechanisms, existing entities and regional partnerships already exist to effectively plan for future growth, and therefore do not require a regional level servicing plan at this time. In the event there is a regionally significant change to any of these service areas, the Board reserves the right to consider the implications with respect to the MRSP.

In particular, the Task Force acknowledged work is underway to establish a Regional Transit Services Commission which will provide leadership for the planning of regional transit services, and therefore will not be addressed as part of the inaugural MRSP.

In addition, the update to the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP) is currently underway within the EMRB and will ensure the Region’s transportation infrastructure to include roads and transit service needs are reviewed and aligned in support of the continued implementation of the Growth Plan.
OUR APPROACH – MRSP REGIONAL COLLABORATIVES

Acknowledging the findings of the MRSP Environmental Scan and through collaborative engagement with member municipalities, the MRSP Task Force unanimously agreed to recommend focusing on advancing work in the four regionally significant service areas.

The MRSP Task Force further acknowledged that identifying the four service areas for consideration and inclusion in the MRSP was simply a first step in the substantial work to be undertaken.

The MRSP Task Force explored a number of enabling structures to support the development of regional approaches for the four service areas. The goal of such a structure would be to leverage regional efforts and expertise, provide a supportive forum to foster research, share best practices, to build a common base of data and terminology necessary for evidence-based decisions and actions. The Task Force endorsed establishing Regional Collaboratives for each of the four service areas as an effective approach to advance the MRSP to include all 13 member municipalities and identified stakeholders.

The Regional Collaboratives will focus on a specific mandate, scope and set of stakeholders.

Each Regional Collaborative will have varying goals and objectives including specific plans of action to be approved by the EMRB. The expected outcomes, in time, include regional level planning and/or service delivery, prioritization of regional investments, as well as engagement and ongoing collaboration with key stakeholders towards the implementation of the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan.

...establish Regional Collaboratives for each of the four service areas; solid waste, stormwater, fire/EMS and emergency management.
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

With final accountability and approvals required by the Board, and to ensure alignment to the Growth Plan, it is recommended the Regional Collaboratives report to an MRSP Standing Committee; comprised of elected officials from member municipalities. The MRSP Standing Committee will provide ongoing guidance and direction to the four Regional Collaboratives (i.e., solid waste, stormwater, fire/EMS, and emergency management) and monitor development, opportunities and challenges for all services areas (i.e., roads, transit, water, and wastewater) to ensure alignment with the Growth Plan.

Given the investment in time and resources and the learnings from the process of building the inaugural MRSP Report, the Task Force is committed to advancing the work of all four Regional Collaboratives in 2020, in a staged manner. The MRSP Task Force believes it is essential to maintain momentum behind this work and is recommending the Board proceed with implementing the MRSP Standing Committee once the Plan is approved by the Board and submitted to the Province.
MONITORING AND REPORTING

The development of the inaugural MRSP Report serves to confirm the MRSP strategic objectives and direction, the planning framework, and the enabling structures necessary to develop an implementable and operational shared municipal services model; however, the MRSP Report makes no attempt to detail the specific municipal coordinative service arrangements nor the actual execution of the shared services model – such is the critical, complex and multifaceted work to be undertaken by the Regional Collaboratives.

Therefore, monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on MRSP progress, including the work of the Regional Collaboratives action plans and/or projects, is essential to ensure continued and ongoing incremental progress towards an implementable MRSP while ensuring continued support and alignment to the Growth Plan.

Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) will be developed by each respective Regional Collaborative based on approved action plans and projects. Critical to the measurement of results are the adoption and incorporation of the MRSP Guiding Principles into our actions and decisions as a Region. The action plans and/or projects of the Regional Collaboratives will propose measurable timelines and identify significant milestones to ensure continued progress towards development of an implementable plan for each service area.

Once the priority service area has been fully implemented, the EMRB is committed to “evergreening” the MRSP through a review every two to three years and to undertake an update every five years. A comprehensive review of the MRSP will be completed in association with any major updates to the Growth Plan.

...the inaugural MRSP Report serves to confirm the MRSP strategic objectives and direction, the planning framework, and the enabling structures necessary to develop an implementable and operational shared municipal services model.

FIGURE 1: MRSP Evolution

Inagural MRSP
Direction set through an initial Environmental Scan, Vision and Principles

Enhanced MRSP
Built on consistent regional level knowledge and decision-making about metropolitan servicing

Robust MRSP
Built on evidence-based regional experience and implementation of metropolitan servicing
BACKGROUND
THE EDMONTON METROPOLITAN REGION

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region is 9,879 km² of land in the heart of Alberta. As of 2016, the Region is home to approximately 1.3 million people and approximately 725,000 jobs, representing 30% of Alberta’s total population and economic activity. The Region is expected to reach approximately 2.2 million people and approximately 1.2 million jobs in the next 25 years.

To date, municipalities have largely planned, built and delivered the municipal services and infrastructure needed for their residents independently, but our growing pains will be shared, and our success as one metropolitan region will depend on a collaborative approach to planning for the future growth of the Region.

Our regional challenge is therefore two-fold: we must chart a path to sustainability while maintaining existing assets in an environment where shared regional use is increasing, and we must develop an effective model to plan as one interconnected Region, invest and build for our collective future needs to accommodate future growth.

FIGURE 2: Edmonton Metropolitan Region Map
The development of the inaugural MRSP is our commitment to delivering on our mandate as a growth management board and to ensure the future sustainability, prosperity and livability of the Region.

The MRSP will provide, where appropriate, for regional planning to support the delivery of efficient, cost-effective services and prioritized infrastructure vital to the needs of the current and future residents of the Region and will be a critical plan to support the implementation of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan.

MRSP will leverage the unique strengths and experiences of municipalities to realize efficiencies in planning for regionally significant services, identifying and prioritizing regional infrastructure investments and identifying opportunities to coordinate delivery of services. Through continued regional collaboration, the MRSP will help municipalities make evidence-based decisions that support efficient and cost-effective investments to reduce duplication and redundancy, optimize services between municipalities, and ensure citizens have the full range of services they require.
WHY ACT NOW?

The addition of an MRSP as part of the mandate of the EMRB is an acknowledgement of the need and opportunity to collaborate among member municipalities on the planning and/or service delivery of regionally significant services and to create a more efficient and sustainable future for the Region. As the Region grows, municipalities and other service providers will be challenged to maintain existing infrastructure and service levels without considering the opportunity to plan at a regional level and to explore opportunities to better coordinate service planning and/or delivery in the future to the benefit of all regional citizens.

Municipal services form the backbone of vibrant, safe communities and a competitive regional economy. Some of these services are omnipresent in your day to day; they are the recreation centres where you stay active and connected to your neighbours, the streetlights that guide you home, the bus that gets you to work, or the clean water that comes from your taps.

While such municipal services are vital, some are less visible than others such as stormwater management to prevent flooding, solid waste management to decrease greenhouse gas emissions and reduce waste, emergency management to enable recovery from major incidents, or fire/EMS services to save lives and property. They are vital services that keep our communities safe and healthy.

It is recognized that...

- together we are stronger, more efficient and effective ensuring the highest quality of life and prosperity for citizens of the Region.
- citizens of the Region are already acting regionally, and as the communities within the Region grow - and grow closer together - the lines separating them continue to blur.
- our regional growth challenges - like traffic congestion, accumulation of waste, water demand or major emergencies and disasters - won’t respect municipal boundaries.
- the services and infrastructure in municipalities today, will not be able to support an additional million regional citizens without a collective approach.

Above all, the inaugural MRSP recognizes that our thinking and decisions must embrace a regional mindset; MRSP is focused on those regionally significant services to ensure responsible growth as one interconnected region and will continue to provide value to citizens of the Region for current and future generations.
REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT SERVICE AREAS FOR THE INAUGURAL MRSP

In 2018, the EMRB established an MRSP Task Force to lead the development of the MRSP. An MRSP Environmental Scan was completed in 2018. That Environmental Scan considered the following service areas important to the implementation of the Growth Plan:

- Transportation - Roads
- Transportation - Transit
- Water
- Wastewater
- Stormwater
- Solid Waste
- Emergency Services (Fire)

The Environmental Scan Final Report and the Environmental Scan Summary, approved by the Board in February 2019, provided an understanding and context for each service area for EMRB member municipalities. This baseline assessment considered the following for the above service areas:

- existing agreements and collaborative service delivery structures;
- current infrastructure and service capacity;
- service levels; and
- service costs, where known.

A key challenge in the baseline assessment was the variation in information availability and interpretation of data for the service areas from member municipalities. This challenge represents a significant opportunity for the Region to work together to achieve a consistent baseline of data and information to inform future planning and opportunities for efficient service delivery and has been identified in the next steps for regional collaboration as the MRSP advances.

Subsequent to the MRSP Environmental Scan, the Task Force prioritized three service areas for further collaboration and consideration within an inaugural MRSP. Three service areas were deemed to have the greatest near-term potential for regional coordination of planning
and service delivery and greatest opportunity to support the implementation of the Growth Plan. These included:

- Stormwater;
- Solid Waste; and
- Emergency Services (Fire).

While the four service areas of water, wastewater, roads, and transit are critical to the Region, the MRSP Task Force determined the existing services, planning structures, and service delivery mechanisms as provided through various entities (e.g., Commissions, Authorities, Groups, Alliances, and municipalities) do not require a metropolitan regional-level servicing plan at this point in time. (See Appendix D)

Through further advice from the Advisory Group and technical advisors, the Task Force subsequently recommended the Emergency Services service area be split into two distinct service areas based on unique stakeholders, service needs, and legislation:

- Fire/EMS
- Emergency Management
REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT SERVICE AREA RATIONALE

Within the four regionally significant service areas in the inaugural MRSP, the Task Force identified specific areas of concern supporting a regional imperative for collaborative action for metropolitan region servicing. While growth pressures from within will challenge municipal servicing, external pressures will also have an impact on the future of the Region which will require that we plan without boundaries for a responsible and sustainable regional future.

Some of the growth pressures identified as part of this work include:

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT:

- landfilling of organic material generates greenhouse gases which accelerate climate change;
- solid waste is currently managed at a local level, and costs and efforts are duplicated across geographies to achieve similar outcomes;
- trends towards densification in urban centres will require updates and improvements to solid waste service delivery for multi-family buildings and industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) waste generators;
- major solid waste infrastructure development is planned by member municipalities for the near future, making this an ideal time to forecast and address regional solid waste processing needs and consider opportunities for collaboration;
- increased uptake of circular economy models globally is resulting in changing social and environmental attitudes and changed expectations towards solid waste management from local stakeholders;
- changes to overseas recycling markets have left Canada with a very limited market for its current stream of recyclable materials, resulting in opportunities for an expanded recycling industry in the Region; and
- more effective waste management, including waste reduction and diversion, can reduce the energy and raw material required to manufacture goods.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:

- impacts of climate destabilization and increasing unpredictability of weather;
- effects of densification and urban growth increasing pressure on stormwater management infrastructure;
- impacts to community safety and public and private property; and
- impacts of stormwater drainage on natural water systems and the environment.
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT:

- increased occurrence of weather incidents and an evolving risk profile;
- increased demand for coordination and communication across a larger service area and relative to a larger regional population;
- public costs and impacts of disasters and major incidents;
- costs of not being resilient; and
- costs of recovery and reconstruction.

FIRE/EMS:

- increasing call volumes relative to population growth and density;
- increasing resource challenges to accommodate population growth;
- provision of services across a larger service area;
- citizen expectation for response and services; and
- costs of maintenance, new services, and infrastructure.
OUR OPTIONS FOR PROCEEDING

A major consideration for the inaugural MRSP is how to continue to advance and work towards an integrated MRSP. The Task Force examined three possible scenarios for the future of the MRSP. Those scenarios include:

- continuing “as-is” based current service levels and models;
- proceeding with four priority service area Regional Collaboratives; and
- establishing a new legal entity to plan and provide municipal services.

Many current mechanisms and entities for service planning and delivery are working well. In fact, this is the case for water, wastewater, roads, and transit, each having existing strategies that are reasonable and appropriate at this time.

For transit, EMRB member municipalities are pursuing a new legal entity, a Regional Transit Services Commission, to position this service area going forward.

For other service areas, emerging and future challenges and opportunities indicate new models and an enhanced regional approach should be considered.

**FIGURE 3: Go-Forward Options**

- **As-Is**: Municipalities and their related planning and service delivery entities and initiatives continue as-is.
- **Collaborative**: Through the EMRB, establish and mandate a 13-member collaborative that focuses on regional-level planning and/or service delivery, prioritization of regional investments, and engagement with key stakeholders.
- **New Legal Entity**: Municipalities (with consideration of existing planning and service delivery entities) form a regional commission, authority, corporation, or similar.

...emerging and future challenges and opportunities indicate new models and an enhanced regional approach should be considered.
OUR APPROACH – MRSP REGIONAL COLLABORATIVES

The MRSP is built around eight distinct service areas, each presenting challenges and opportunities for collaboration now and into the future. Based on considerable collaborative study and engagement across the Advisory Group, Technical Working Groups, and the MRSP Task Force, the inaugural MRSP will focus initially on four regionally significant service areas: solid waste, stormwater, fire/EMS, and emergency management.

The remaining service areas (i.e., water, wastewater, roads and transit) will continue to be planned for and delivered based on current mechanisms and entities. All eight services areas will continue to be reviewed against the Growth Plan, future MRSP updates, and future Growth Plan updates.

The MRSP Task Force further acknowledged that proceeding with the four service areas is simply a first step in the substantial work to be undertaken. The MRSP Task Force determined that an enabling structure was also required to concentrate and focus regional efforts and expertise, provide a supportive forum to foster research and to build and share regionally relevant intelligence, and to provide the data necessary for evidence-based decisions and actions in relation to municipal services.

The Task Force endorsed establishing Regional Collaboratives for each of the four service areas as an effective approach to advance the MRSP to include all 13 member municipalities and identified stakeholders. The Collaboratives will focus on a specific mandate, scope and set of stakeholders.

Each Regional Collaborative will have varying goals and objectives including specific plans of action to be approved by the EMRB. The expected outcomes, in time, include regional level planning and/or service delivery, prioritization of regional investments, and engagement and ongoing collaboration with key stakeholders towards the development of a Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan.

Regional Collaboratives are the enabling structure required to concentrate and focus regional efforts and expertise, provide a supportive forum to foster research and to build and share regionally relevant intelligence and to provide the data necessary for evidenced-based decisions and actions.
MRSP GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Creating common understanding of the shared servicing challenges is vital to creating an environment where municipalities can think and act in the best interest of the Region. The MRSP Principles reflect the regional imperative for working together and will provide critical guidance for the planning, investment and coordination of the delivery of metropolitan services. The MRSP Principles are aligned with the guiding principles of the Growth Plan.

The MRSP Principles are:

- Lead with a metropolitan mindset for the greater good.
- Pursue leading and innovative research, technology, and best practices.
- Build, collect, and share regionally relevant data, information and knowledge.
- Prioritize regionally scaled service investments informed by evidence.
- Leverage sub-regional service initiatives to benefit the Region.
- Recognize the unique municipal service contexts.
- Guarantee the safety and wellness of citizens.
- Act in a regional manner with a unified voice.
EMRB OBJECTIVES FOR THE INAUGURAL MRSP

The MRSP Objectives are:

- identify existing services, including current capacity and service provision, and their ability to support current growth;
- identify existing municipal and intermunicipal services and existing shared servicing agreements;
- identify the services required to support future growth through the implementation of the Growth Plan;
- identify opportunities for increased efficiency and collaboration in the sharing of services;
- identify the benefits of enhanced efficiency and optimized services shared amongst municipalities in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region; and
- prepare implementation recommendations for consideration by the Board.
REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT SERVICING

Common across all service areas is a desired future state for metropolitan servicing. This desired future state is intended to support and complement the outcomes of the Growth Plan.

The intended MRSP outcomes are:

• harmonized data and information collection and sharing to support regional evidence-based decision making for service planning, investment and delivery;
• pro-active regional planning for future growth, where appropriate;
• seamless and optimized service delivery ensuring appropriate service levels, where needed;
• efficient and cost-effective regional investments supported by all levels of government;
• globally recognized metropolitan servicing leveraging best-practices and innovative service delivery technology and processes;
• effective engagement of stakeholders and communication to citizens;
• enhanced community safety, livability and sustainability; and
• an investment-ready region for business growth and investment attraction.

Achieving a regional future for metropolitan servicing will require the following:

• a unified voice in the Region;
• a structured, mandated, and supported regional approach;
• regional-level servicing information and data;
• common terminology, indicators, and measures;
• greater collaboration and knowledge sharing about metropolitan servicing;
• clear, well-defined, and evidence-based regional priorities; and
• regional leadership and change management.
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN
The implementation of the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan requires continued commitment and collaboration among EMRB member municipalities, the Government of Alberta, and other regional stakeholders.

As the mandate and authority of the EMRB are derived from the *Municipal Government Act* and the EMRB Regulation, the MRSP will come into force once approved by the Government of Alberta.

This section provides guidance and direction to implement the inaugural MRSP. It describes the intended approach and governance by the EMRB for the MRSP. It also lists the intended actions to support the go-forward strategies for each of the four regionally significant service areas.
GOVERNANCE

The EMRB will use existing governance mechanisms for the leadership and oversight of the MRSP. As the MRSP will represent several service areas over time, each with distinct legislation, stakeholders and subject matter expertise, the EMRB will use the following organizational structure for the MRSP:

![MRSP Governance Diagram]

FIGURE 4: MRSP Governance

The above governance structure is essentially what is in place today by the EMRB for its many strategic initiatives (e.g., Regional Agriculture Master Plan, Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan, and Shared Investment for Shared Benefit).

The following defines some of the key roles within the governance structure:

- **Board** – role as per the Regulation; comprised of elected officials from the 13 member municipalities.

- **MRSP Standing Committee** – role to oversee and lead the implementation and oversight of the MRSP including alignment of the MRSP and go-forward strategies and actions with the Growth Plan; make recommendations to the Board; comprised of elected officials from 3-7 member municipalities, similar to the MRSP Task Force structure. The MRSP Standing Committee will provide ongoing guidance and direction to the four Regional Collaboratives (i.e., solid waste, stormwater, fire/EMS, and emergency management) and monitor development, opportunities and challenges for all services areas (i.e., roads, transit, water, and wastewater) to ensure alignment with the Growth Plan.
• **Regional Collaboratives** – role to lead in the regional collaboration discussions for each service area centered around the defined action plan; develop a framework to identify additional areas deemed to be of regional significance and where the Region may undertake further collaborative municipal service initiatives, further advance coordinated planning and investment, and realize cost efficiency; report to and provide guidance to the MRSP Standing Committee; comprised of non-elected officials and may include senior subject matter experts for the service area from the 13 member municipalities.

• **Project Teams** – role to develop and implement projects, as needed, and approved by the Board; report to a specific Collaborative; comprised of Collaborative members, advisors, and regional stakeholders, as agreed.

• **Regional Stakeholders** – role to be engaged where and when needed for the broader interests of the Region.
REGIONAL COLLABORATIVES

For the inaugural MRSP, the EMRB will establish four Regional Collaboratives – one for solid waste, stormwater, fire/EMS, and emergency management. Where and when approved by the Board, Regional Collaboratives for other service areas may be established or replaced by an alternate governance mechanism.

Each Regional Collaborative will have a common framework for the Terms of Reference; however, each Regional Collaborative will have a specific mandate, scope, and set of stakeholders. The following summarizes the key elements of the Terms of Reference:

- Report to the MRSP Standing Committee.
- Mandatory representation from all 13 member municipalities; however, optional participation in projects, where approved by the Board.
- Chair representation from a member municipality.
- Meet 4-6 times per year, or as needed and approved.
- Optimize regionally relevant data and information gathering, sharing, and consensus.
- Advance the service areas regionally, where appropriate, while engaging with regional stakeholders.
- Determine the need for and scope of projects relevant for advancement of the service areas regionally.
- Contribute to the support and implementation of the Growth Plan.
ACTION PLANS FOR REGIONAL COLLABORATIVES

Each Regional Collaborative will have distinct goals and objectives including specific action plans. These action plans must be supported by the MRSP Standing Committee and approved by the Board.

EMRB capacity and resourcing is a major implementation consideration. As such, EMRB will be responsible for ensuring the Regional Collaborative action plans and related projects are effectively and efficiently prioritized, approved, resourced, and managed within the inaugural MRSP.

While not yet resourced nor approved by the Board, the following provides the intended direction for action plans for the four municipal service area Regional Collaboratives.

SOLID WASTE

- Develop a common set of solid waste terminology, measures, indicators, criteria for prioritization of investments.
- Discuss regional solid waste efforts with the Edmonton Region Waste Advisory Committee (ERWAC) and determine best strategy for the future of ERWAC.
- Gather a foundation of regional level solid waste data and information for residential solid waste management.
- Advance regional discussion and advocacy of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) focused on enacting legislation.
- Conduct an enhanced Environmental Scan of processing capacity and waste generation rates including organics, construction and demolition waste, and industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) waste.
- Consider disaster debris management.
- Identify and assess opportunities for innovation in solid waste management.
- Review success of landfill bans on successful waste diversion.
- Develop policy recommendations on single use items.
- Advance a regionally relevant and common toolkit for communications related to solid waste management.
- Identify and assess opportunities for regionally scaled investments (e.g., organics processing, material recovery facilities, waste processing).
- Develop a common full cost accounting and life cost analysis including carbon footprint and the impact of greenhouse gases in the Region.
- Conduct a detailed service delivery analysis and best practices review for service delivery models; and make recommendations to EMRB.
STORMWATER

- Develop a common set of stormwater terminology, measures, indicators, criteria for prioritization of investments.
- Gather a foundation of regional level stormwater data and information – a library and repository.
- Conduct an enhanced Environmental Scan of creeks, trunks, etc. – measures and monitoring.
- Determine risks (e.g., impacts, liability) of current practices.
- Advance and facilitate good practices and lessons learned.
- Consider projects for design standards, sedimentation, and erosion.
- Advance/evolve regional discussion and advocacy of water quality and design standards.
- Determine opportunities for regionally scaled investments.

FIRE/EMS

- Develop a common set of fire/EMS terminology, measures, indicators, criteria for prioritization of investments.
- Discuss Regional Fire Chiefs Committee (including Sub-Committees) and determine its best strategy for the future.
- Gather a foundation of regional level fire/EMS data and information.
- Advance regional discussion and advocacy of interoperability and emergency communications.
- Advance regional discussion of “Auto-Aid” for priority calls.
- Inventory local and sub-regional initiatives and agreements – in detail.
- Inventory specialty services and equipment – incorporate into Edmonton Metropolitan Region Geographic Information Services (EMRGIS).
- Conduct an enhanced Environmental Scan of servicing levels, ranges of services – descriptive in nature, not prescriptive.
- Determine opportunities for regionally scaled investments.
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

- Develop a common set of emergency management terminology, measures, and indicators;
- Prepare a region-wide hazard and threat assessment to inform decisions and actions;
- Discuss regional Emergency Management efforts with Capital Region Emergency Preparedness Partnership (CREPP) and determine best strategy for the future;
- Gather a foundation of regional level emergency management data and information in an integrated and accessible repository or clearinghouse;
- Engage with public, not-for-profit, business, and industrial partners on advancing emergency management challenges and opportunities;
- Develop criteria for prioritization of investments; and
- Determine opportunities for regionally scaled investments.

A more detailed summary of each Collaborative which includes a definition of the service area, a future vision, rationale, a description of current state, future state, a list of regionally significant topics for further discussion, next steps and measures of success under Appendix A.
MONITORING AND REPORTING

Monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on the MRSP including the work of the Regional Collaboratives and/or their projects are critical to ensuring support and alignment to the Growth Plan. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) will be used to determine the effect of the Collaborative plans of action in achieving the desired outcomes of the MRSP and the Growth Plan. The KPIs will be developed by the Collaboratives based on any approved plans of action and/or projects.

EMRGIS

Central to the success of the MRSP is the quality and availability of current data and information. The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Geographic Information Services (EMRGIS) will be used as one of the principal tools to capture and share regionally relevant information and analysis. The success of the MRSP and its alignment to the Growth Plan will enable regional maps, regional data, and regional KPIs to inform decision making and the advancement of regional collaboration. The regional maps may be static (see Appendix F) or dynamic and will promote the sharing and leveraging of regional information for member municipalities – both for EMRB purposes and for use sub-regionally (e.g., sub-regional service planning) or locally (e.g., local service delivery).

UPDATES TO THE MRSP

To ensure the MRSP continues to support and be aligned to the Growth Plan, the EMRB is committed to “evergreening” the MRSP through a review every two to three years and an update every five years. A comprehensive review of the MRSP will be completed with major updates to the Growth Plan.
APPENDIX A

SERVICE AREA PROFILES

A1 SOLID WASTE
A2 STORMWATER
A3 FIRE/EMS
A4 EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
A1 SOLID WASTE

DEFINITION
Solid waste management refers to the collection, transfer and disposal of all solid waste material, including garbage, recyclables, hazardous waste, and organic material.

VISION FOR A REGIONAL FUTURE
The vision for solid waste management in the Region is:

Leading the way to a zero waste Edmonton Metropolitan Region.

THE CASE FOR REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT
Identified by the MRSP Task Force as the service area with a high priority, the case for a long-term regional plan for solid waste management is simple. The MRSP Environmental Scan identified a number of growth pressures already facing existing solid waste management facilities, as well as increasing costs of collection and processing as the Region grows.

The work of the solid waste service area Regional Collaborative will be to address the challenge of how to best manage the waste created by an additional one million regional residents, and nearly half a million new jobs in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region by 2044.

In advancing a regional approach to solid waste management, municipalities have the opportunity to share valuable information related to service delivery and data on current and projected service levels. By working collaboratively to plan service delivery, municipalities could make more informed, efficient and cost-effective decisions about investment and service delivery that stretches ratepayer dollars further without compromising service levels.

A shared regional approach to solid waste management also has the potential to create opportunities for shared investment and service delivery models, to meet the needs of growing, communities and increased demands on waste management services and infrastructure.

In addition to developing a sustainable cost-effective plan to service Solid Waste management needs as a Region, we are also challenged to identify and advance strategies to reduce the overall volume of solid waste generated as part of a goal of increased regional sustainability and environmental stewardship.
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT IN THE REGION TODAY

Solid waste services include all stages of the solid waste lifecycle, including generation, collection, transfer, and end of life management, including possible re-introduction into the material stream. Solid waste management services also include relevant public education and communication efforts.

Solid waste management is required for all communities, and requires service be delivered to all sectors including residential, construction and demolition, as well as industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) generators. Solid waste management services are primarily delivered locally. There is no single entity responsible for delivering solid waste management services in the Region.

There are numerous sub-regional and local initiatives for solid waste servicing and management. Solid waste management services are primarily delivered to single family homes through their local municipalities; however, the majority of the services are operated by private contractors. Many of the private companies provide services to more than one municipality and operate privately on a sub-regional or regional scale. Businesses and multi-family residential buildings are often required to contract solid waste management services independently and are not serviced through their local municipality.

The opportunity exists to provide an array of solid waste services on a regional scale to all generators of waste within the Region and address waste management from generation through to end-of-life disposal, or re-introduction into the material market stream.

FUTURE STATE

In the next 10 and 25 years, solid waste management services will meet new challenges and opportunities. Some of these challenges and opportunities will be of regional relevance including:

- significant growth in population and employment – the increases in population and employment will increase the amount of waste generated, which will require additional resources and infrastructure to manage;
- densification and intensification of population will require that improved solid waste management service delivery be developed for multi-family homes, as well as for the industrial, commercial, and institutional (ICI) sector;
• changes to the character of the solid waste streams being generated within the Region, and a result of changing consumer habits or changes in industry;
• developments in solid waste processing technology;
• ongoing changes and evolution of global markets for recyclables;
• increased demand for sustainable disposal and processing options for construction and demolition waste, and hazardous waste;
• opportunities to develop local recycling processing capacity, which would generate locally available raw material for processing into goods; and
• potential changes to provincial and federal guidelines applicable to solid waste management.

Solid waste management has seen a number of leading practices being embraced locally and regionally across Europe, North America and Canada more specifically. These have included:

• development and implementation of Circular Economy frameworks for municipalities and businesses;
• implementation of Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) programs, specifically for paper and packaging materials in Canada;
• bans on single use items and other items of specific concern;
• diversion of organic waste from landfills, and processing at industrial scale composting or anaerobic digestion facilities; and
• development of robust climate change adaptation plans, which include detailed disaster debris management strategies.

Future Solid Waste topics of interest in the Region may include:

• developing a single voice for solid waste management advocacy;
• hazardous waste management processing capacity and best practices;
• landfill closures and site remediation;
• development of Circular Economy frameworks for implementation;
• long-term strategy related to facility access and processing capacity;
• increased focus on waste reduction and strategies for improvement;
• landfill bans;
• expanded Extended Producer Responsibility (EPR) programs;
• staging and long-term servicing for major infrastructure; and
• continued engagement with the Government of Alberta and the Federal Government.
MEASURING OUR SUCCESS

As we proceed toward our shared vision for regional solid waste management, our success will reflect our progress in:

- planning collaboratively on regional topics and priorities;
  - we view solid waste management within the context of a regional circular economy;
  - we understand and recognize the full lifecycle of a product or material, from raw material extraction through production, use, and end-of-life management;
  - we have developed solid waste management initiatives and innovation to address each phase throughout the material lifecycle, and prioritize waste management options based on the Waste Management Hierarchy;
  - we recognize materials as resources to be maintained at their highest value within the economy for as long as possible;
  - we are reducing negative impacts to the environment in which we live, including protection of groundwater and air quality;
- collecting and leveraging quality information and knowledge to support regional decision making and investments;
- advancing cost-efficient and cost-effective investments for regional benefits; and
- optimizing regional collaboration and intermunicipal framework for solid waste management.
A2 STORMWATER

DEFINITION

Stormwater management means the collection, conveyance, storage and discharge of stormwater runoff (e.g., rainfall, snow melt).

VISION FOR A REGIONAL FUTURE

The vision for solid waste management in the Region is:

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region will have protected natural assets while achieving resilience from stormwater impacts.

THE CASE FOR REGIONAL SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

Rainfall does not respect municipal boundaries, and moreover, while rain may fall in one municipality, it typically flows downstream. The summer of 2019 provided ample context for this challenge as record levels of consistent precipitation caused overland flooding in multiple regional municipalities. The costs of such flood damage and responding to flood incidents are borne by municipalities and property owners, diverting tax dollars from other needed investment in public services and infrastructure.

As the effects of climate change continue to increase the unpredictability of weather events and natural disasters, and as communities across the Region continue to grow, municipalities will be challenged to ensure stormwater management assets are planned and built to balance the impacts of urban growth, protect communities and investment, and manage natural water systems.

In planning for stormwater management regionally, planning without boundaries, and sharing information about existing capacity and regional needs, the Region will be positioned to prioritize investment in growth areas and make regional-based decisions to protect regional neighbours from the impacts of flooding. In doing so, the Region will protect communities and natural water systems, realize efficiencies in planning and investment, and reduce the costs associated with emergency response and recovery from flooding.
STORMWATER MANAGEMENT IN THE REGION TODAY

Stormwater servicing typically consists of collection and conveyance systems (e.g., swales, ditches, roadway gutters, storm sewers, major stormwater trunks), storage and control or management facilities (e.g., dry ponds, wet ponds, wetlands, control structures), water quality treatment and Low Impact Development (LID) facilities (e.g., wet ponds, wetlands, oil/grit separators, rain gardens, bioswales, green roofs), and discharge facilities (e.g., outfall trunk, outlet structures, erosion control).

Stormwater is unique in that stormwater runoff will occur naturally even if stormwater servicing is not provided. Stormwater servicing is required to manage and convey stormwater runoff from various types of development to the receiving water body. Without stormwater servicing, naturally occurring stormwater runoff will result in adverse impacts such as flooding, erosion and sedimentation, and deterioration in the water quality of receiving water bodies.

Stormwater servicing is required for all new urban and rural development, including residential, commercial, institutional, industrial, transportation and recreational. Stormwater servicing is primarily delivered locally and sub-regionally within watersheds.

Stormwater servicing is a municipal responsibility in the Region under the governance of Alberta Environment and Parks (AEP). The Government of Alberta plays an important role in this service area through AEP as the stormwater regulator. Municipalities are generally allowed to discharge stormwater to downstream municipalities through creeks and rivers, with discharge controlled to approved unit discharge rates (e.g., Litres/second/hectare or L/s/ha).

Stormwater is typically managed by local municipalities, using local collection systems and stormwater management facilities to discharge stormwater runoff to natural waterbodies. EMRB member municipalities are responsible for delivering their own stormwater servicing. Stormwater infrastructure is typically constructed as part of the land development process, including local storm sewers and/or ditches, stormwater management facilities, and outfalls to natural watercourses.

Stormwater planning is conducted by individual municipalities and/or through various planning entities and processes. Municipalities or municipal utilities are responsible for the planning, approvals, asset management and operation and maintenance of the stormwater drainage system. Municipalities typically carry out Stormwater Master Drainage Plans for their entire municipality, which may define the overall drainage basin boundaries and the allowable discharge rates to the various receiving watercourses or existing stormwater infrastructure. These plans are then refined at the Area Structure Plan level, with increased level of detail in the location of stormwater management facilities, the basin and sub-basin boundaries, and the type of conveyance system (e.g., storm sewers and ditches). The plans are further refined at the development permit stage when developers obtain approval to construct specific Stormwater infrastructure.

…the Region will protect communities and natural water systems, realize efficiencies in planning and investment, and reduce the costs associated with emergency response and recovery from flooding.
Where necessary, municipalities collaborate to plan the stormwater drainage system at the local watershed level (e.g., Whitemud/Blackmud Creek). This may include studying the existing hydrologic conditions and existing constraints to develop mutually agreed design criteria, such as the allowable discharge rate in L/s/ha. These municipalities then approach AEP with their recommendations.

There are various watershed groups whom plan for, manage, and report on Stormwater at a sub-regional basis, either bilaterally or multilaterally. The Edmonton Metropolitan Region is part of the North Saskatchewan River watershed, with several sub-watersheds located within the Region’s boundaries. The watershed alliances are advocacy groups, promoting environmental protection with orderly development, and generally have limited authority provided to them by AEP. EMRB municipalities have organized watershed working groups on a sub-regional basis under the authority of the partner municipalities. These municipalities then approach AEP with key recommendations (e.g., allowable discharge rates in L/s/ha), applicable to that sub-watershed, for approval.

**FUTURE STATE**

In the next 10 and 25 years, stormwater servicing will see continuing and new challenges and opportunities; some of which, will be of an evolving regional interest and significance.

- changes to provincial legislation and standards, potentially including greater emphasis on water quality and/or erosion in natural watercourses;
- significant growth in population and employment, with the resulting land development, which will result in:
  - likely increase in annual runoff volume to receiving watercourses;
  - potential increases in erosion rates in watercourses;
- densification and intensification, which could impact flood risk, annual runoff volume and/or water quality;
- encroachment, infilling, and other urban development;
- climate change, with increase in extreme weather events, which can impact flood risk;
- flooding and drainage constraints;
- bed and bank erosion;
- sedimentation and silt accumulations;
- municipal servicing strategies and management criteria;
- on-site stormwater storage, treatment and reuse - interior (e.g., toilet flushing);
- pre-development run-off rates;
- funding constraints especially for major facilities; and
- stakeholder perspectives.
Future stormwater topics of interest in the Region may include:

- ensuring a single voice regarding stormwater;
- staging and long-term servicing for major infrastructure; and
- continued engagement with the Government of Alberta.

**MEASURING OUR SUCCESS**

As we proceed toward our vision, our success will be measured by the following:

- we will plan on regional topics and priorities of significance and relevance;
- we will have quality information and knowledge to support regional investments;
- we will have cost-efficient and cost-effective investments for regional benefits; and
- we will have optimal regional collaboration and a metropolitan framework for stormwater management.

**COLLABORATIVE**

EMRB member municipalities will establish a Regional Collaborative to advance regional collaboration for stormwater management.
DEFINITION

Fire/EMS means all fire services (e.g., suppression, alarms, and rescue) and emergency medical services (e.g., medical first response).

VISION FOR A REGIONAL FUTURE

The vision for solid waste management in the Region is:

An integrated citizen-centric approach to fire/EMS with a holistic level of excellence in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region.

THE CASE FOR REGIONAL FIRE/EMS

As we look to add another one million residents to the Region by 2044, our communities will grow, and so will the demands placed on first responders who keep our communities safe. Not only will service providers face increased demands from a larger population, but they will be challenged to ensure services can be provided across a larger service area; all while working to maintain the expectations of response time and service that residents currently receive at the costs that municipalities can afford.

Municipalities receive excellent fire and emergency medical services, but challenges persist in service delivery from the maintenance of existing assets, to the duplication of service provision between municipalities, and in allocating resources appropriately and strategically. Beyond the costs borne by individual budgets of municipalities, however, there are greater costs. Those costs are related to the safety and security of communities within the Region and the peace of mind of regional citizens that fire and ambulance services will be there when and where they are needed.

Good neighbours look after each other. Regional planning and decision making will benefit from consistent, timely information collection and sharing as well as further support the identification of system gaps and opportunities for shared investment in new technology and infrastructure to the benefit of the Region.

By planning collaboratively as one Region for fire and emergency medical services, municipalities will be able to make stronger evidence-based decisions in planning, investment, and service delivery that ensure cost-effective use of public dollars in resource allocation and support public safety across the Region. The MRSP Regional Collaborative for fire/EMS will help provide a pro-active plan to maintain services we have today, reduce duplication, and ensure future generations will be protected.
FIRE/EMS IN THE REGION TODAY

Fire/EMS servicing is primarily delivered locally. There is no single entity responsible for delivering fire services in the Region.

It is critical to understand that fire, medical aid, and other emergency situations do not know borders and that each incident or event requires a practical and affordable plan to service - whether that is in a metropolitan, urban, suburban, rural, or wilderness area. The plans to service may be local, between municipalities, and/or with other levels of government and partners.

EMRB member municipalities are responsible for delivering their own fire services and basic emergency medical services. In addition, each member municipality is accountable for emergency management, within their jurisdictions. Funding of fire services is diverse, and municipalities use a variety of mechanisms including a tax levy for operating and capital, reserves, grants, and revenue generation.

Some municipalities in the Region have service and/or mutual aid agreements for the provision or support of emergency management and fire services. There are in addition, several industrial and commercial sites with emergency services capability. Alberta Health Services is responsible for delivering ambulance services, which for most of the population outside of the City of Edmonton is delivered through integrated service models.

By planning collaboratively as one Region for fire and emergency medical services, municipalities will be able to make stronger evidence-based decisions in planning, investment, and service delivery that ensure cost-effective use of public dollars in resource allocation and support public safety across the Region.

The current processes or entities for planning are essentially those defined by each member municipality. In most cases, member municipalities have developed a fire services bylaw enabling and describing the services. In some cases, municipalities have bylaws or policies for Standards of Cover, Standard Operating Procedures, and Standard Operating Guidelines that describe the levels of service.

The current plans to service are typically local and include a wide variety of local Fire Master Plans, Fire Strategic Plans, and various Operating and Capital Plans supporting Fire Services or Departmental Business Plans. Services, service levels or targets, service capacity, and service staffing for Emergency Services vary broadly across the Region and amongst member municipalities.

The Region has a wide variance in service delivery, service capacity and service standards for emergency services. However, each EMRB member municipality has unique cultures, assets, strengths, and needs.
FUTURE STATE

In the next 10 and 25 years, each municipal service will meet new challenges and opportunities. Some of these challenges and opportunities will be of regional relevance including:

- significant growth in population and employment;
- overall influence of risk and risk management;
- funding constraints for infrastructure (e.g., facilities, apparatus, and specialty equipment);
- coordinated response to major incidents and disasters;
- changing demographics; and
- changing technology.

Regional growth will have a broad set of influences and impacts beyond increases in population and employment. While not linear to population and employment changes, Emergency Services can reasonably be anticipated to change in the following ways:

- increased fire calls;
- increased fire stations;
- increased and diversified fire equipment and apparatus;
- increased firefighters (not including management); and
- increased need for public awareness and education.

Future Fire/EMS topics of interest in the Region may include:

- ensuring a single voice regarding Fire/EMS;
- risk identification and management;
- training, education and standards;
- recruitment and human resource support;
- specialty services response (e.g., hazardous materials);
- major facilities, apparatus, and equipment;
- service agreements;
- staging and long-term servicing for major infrastructure and technology; and
- continued engagement with the Government of Alberta.

COLLABORATIVE

EMRB member municipalities will establish a Regional Collaborative to advance regional collaboration for Fire/EMS.
MEASURING OUR SUCCESS

As we proceed toward our vision, our success will be measured by the following:

- we will plan on regional topics and priorities of significance and relevance;
- we will have quality information and knowledge to support regional investments;
- we will have cost-efficient and cost-effective investments for regional benefits; and
- we will have optimal regional collaboration and a metropolitan framework for fire/EMS.
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT IN THE REGION TODAY

In Alberta, the Emergency Management Act, RSA 2000, c E-6-8 defines that municipalities are responsible for the direction and control of emergency responses, and the preparation and approval of emergency plans and programs. Municipalities must also appoint an Emergency Advisory Committee (members of Council) and an Emergency Management Agency (responsible to Council) to exercise responsibilities under the Emergency Management Act, updated in November 2018.

In addition, the Municipal Government Act, RSA 2000, c M-26 provides for Councils to establish bylaws. One other item of legislation is the Local Authorities Emergency Management Regulation which defines expectations of municipalities in the areas of regional collaboration, training, emergency management plans and emergency management exercises. This regulation comes into effect January 1, 2020.

Emergency management in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region is characterized by the following:

- servicing is primarily planned for and delivered locally;
- some support is provided through the Alberta Emergency Management Agency (AEMA);

VISION FOR A REGIONAL FUTURE

The vision for solid waste management in the Region is:

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region will collectively mitigate against all-hazards by preparing for, responding to, and recovering from major incidents and disasters that optimize the interests of the Region and Albertans.

DEFINITION

Emergency management means services in preparation and mitigation, prevention, response, and recovery to major incidents and disasters.
• all member municipalities, with many other municipalities in the Region, are members of the Capital Region Emergency Preparedness Partnership (CREPP), an ad hoc entity representing local municipalities;

• most member municipalities do not have full-time positions supporting this service area;

• much of emergency management has evolved out of emergency services and now engages a cross-municipal set of representatives;

• the Edmonton Metropolitan Region plays a major role in supporting the consequences of disasters in this province;

• there are acknowledged gaps in the regional approach to emergency management, especially in business continuity, emergency social services, and crisis communications;

• local capacity is a major issue including the ability to support Incident Management Teams for response and recovery of municipalities; and

• emergency management is now a political and economic risk for municipal executive and elected officials.

FUTURE STATE

The future state of emergency management will be characterized by the following:

• there is a rapidly changing landscape of risks and a risk profile in the Region;

• major incidents and disasters do not respect borders nor jurisdictions;

• emergency management is increasingly multi-sectoral issue (e.g., public, business, industry);

• collaboration will lead to innovation and resulting region-wide and collective strategies; and

• the requirements for education, training and exercises are evident and will increase in time.

THE CASE FOR AN EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT COLLABORATIVE

The case for a Regional Collaborative for emergency management includes the following:

• there is a clear willingness and desire by front-line municipal emergency management professionals to work together;

• a collaborative approach can optimize investment decisions and the sharing of resources and capacity;

...the Local Authorities Emergency Management Regulation which defines expectations of municipalities in the areas of regional collaboration, training, emergency management plans and emergency management exercises.
• the occurrence and cost implications of major incidents and disasters are increasing; and
• regional emergency management is a strategy in optimization of investments for collective benefits – not a cost saving strategy.

**MEASURING OUR SUCCESS**

As we proceed toward our vision, our success will be measured by the following:

• we will plan on regional topics and priorities of significance and relevance;
• we will have quality information and knowledge to support regional investments;
• we will have cost-efficient and cost-effective investments for regional benefits; and
• we will have optimal regional collaboration and a metropolitan framework for emergency management.

**NEXT STEPS**

EMRB member municipalities will establish a Regional Collaborative to advance regional collaboration for emergency management.
APPENDIX B

ADDITIONAL SERVICE AREAS

B1 WATER
B2 WASTEWATER
B3 TRANSPORTATION – ROADS
B4 TRANSPORTATION – TRANSIT
B1 WATER

DEFINITION
Water means potable water.

WATER SERVICES IN THE REGION TODAY
Water servicing includes the supply, treatment, transmission, storage and distribution of potable water. Water servicing is delivered through a combination of regional, sub-regional, and local means. Almost all of the supply and treatment is delivered by EPCOR including all EMRB member municipalities (except Devon, which has its own water treatment plant). Regional water servicing focuses on water treatment and major water pumping and transmission systems.

EPCOR provides water treatment plus transmission within the City of Edmonton boundary. Treated water is then transferred to adjacent municipalities and/or the three connecting water commissions (Capital Region Parkland Water Services Commission, Capital Region Northeast Water Services Commission and Capital Region Southwest Water Services Commission). Water is then transferred to other EMRB member municipalities and to other water commissions and municipalities beyond the Region’s boundaries.

Storage and local distribution are provided locally within each municipality. There are no known locations where one municipality’s distribution system connects directly to the distribution system of another municipality (Enoch and Canadian Forces Base Edmonton may be exceptions).

EPCOR Water undergoes a Transmission Master Planning Exercise every five years focusing on the upcoming 10-year capital requirements. They are currently in the process of updating the Transmission Master Plan, which will include a greater focus on potential transmission upgrades to accommodate regional growth in the long term (up to 2060).

Most municipalities also prepare master plans on a regular basis and use the results to budget for major water transmission and storage facilities. Master plans are typically updated every 10 years with a 20 to 30-year planning horizon.

FUTURE STATE
To ensure that EPCOR Water can meet water treatment and transmission needs and accommodate regional growth in the near term, they undertake the following process:

- Annually, each regional customer provides EPCOR a written forecast of the quantity of water the customer reasonably expects to purchase during each of the next five calendar years (procedure is outlined in each regional water commission’s Water Supply Agreement with EPCOR).
• EPCOR approves this quantity of water, or suggests a reduced amount based on a bona
fide reason including economic, legal, regulatory, technical or engineering aspects. As
stated in each Water Supply Agreement, it is not reasonable for EPCOR to refuse to
agree to a quantity of water primarily for the purpose of
limiting the growth of residential, commercial or industrial
development within the customer's boundaries.

EPCOR anticipates regional customer growth. To meet
increased regional demands EPCOR can either:

1) construct capital upgrades to the Edmonton municipal
water supply system, or

2) potentially operate the system in an alternate manner.

Future infrastructure/upgrades will be designed and constructed to accommodate both
internal and regional growth, ensuring servicing standards are achieved.

In the next 10 and 25 years, water services will meet new challenges and opportunities. Some
of these challenges and opportunities will be of regional relevance including:

• significant growth in population and employment - water conservation has generally
mitigated the impact of regional growth on withdrawals from the North Saskatchewan
River, however it is not clear to the degree that this will continue to be the case in the
future;

• increases in population and employment may lead to increased water demands on the
North Saskatchewan River at a time when the long-term supply available may be impacted
by climate change; and

• densification and intensification - upgrades in the water storage, transmission and
distribution systems will allow infill development without impacting available fire flows.

Water has seen a number of leading practices being embraced locally and regionally across
North America and Canada more specifically. These have included:

• regionalization of treatment and transmission services, primarily when the water
commissions were set up;

• water conservation has resulted in the total demands for treated water to stay fairly
constant for several years as the Region’s population and employment has increased; and

• water treatment technologies continue to evolve. The current challenges include removal of
pharmaceuticals from raw water.

Future Water topics of interest in the Region may include:

• ensuring a single voice regarding the North Saskatchewan River water withdrawals;

• water conservation;
• staging and long-term servicing for major infrastructure;
• servicing of major growth areas; and
• continued engagement with the Government of Alberta.

**NEXT STEPS**

**AS-IS**

The current “as-is” approach by EPCOR, various Water Commissions, the Town of Devon, and EMRB member municipalities will continue to lead and manage all aspects of this service area.

This service area will be monitored by EMRB for implications to the Growth Plan. The EMRB may consider specific go-forward strategies in the coming years including the collection and awareness of sub-regional and local plans including Master Plans, Engineering Studies so as to better position knowledge and information about the Region for future updates to the MRSP and the Growth Plan.
B2 WASTEWATER

DEFINITION

Wastewater means wastewater generated from residential, industrial, commercial and institutional developments.

WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT IN THE REGION TODAY

Wastewater servicing is primarily regional and focuses on major wastewater transmission and treatment facilities. Wastewater services are delivered through a combination of regional, sub-regional and local means. Almost all of the transmission and treatment is delivered by either EPCOR or the Alberta Capital Region Wastewater Commission (ACRWC) and the Town of Devon. Collection is delivered locally, with some larger municipalities providing their own transmission systems. There are almost no locations where one municipality’s collection system connects directly to the distribution system of another municipality (34 St Trunk in Edmonton and Strathcona County are exceptions).

The ACRWC and EPCOR Drainage Services (formerly City of Edmonton Drainage Services) regularly carry out joint wastewater system planning studies. They also developed a Master Regional Servicing Agreement that dictates how wastewater transmission and treatment services are shared between the two organizations. In addition, the ACRWC and EPCOR meet quarterly to conduct joint planning of wastewater transmission and treatment facilities. EPCOR and the ACRWC’s current long-term plan include wastewater transmission and treatment servicing to 2059.

In addition to the above joint planning initiatives, EPCOR Drainage Services regularly undertakes wastewater system planning studies for each of the main wastewater trunk systems servicing the City of Edmonton and the ACRWC south system. These studies typically review historic and projected growth, estimate peak wastewater flows using hydraulic models, and plan for staged construction of the wastewater transmission system.

The ACRWC regularly undertakes planning studies to assess the capacity of the transmission and treatment facilities. Recent planning studies indicate that upgrading to their Parkland Sanitary Trunk Sewer (PSTS) and St. Albert Regional Trunk Sewer (START) is required to convey peak wet weather flows. Portions of these trunks have been upgraded and plans are in place to continue upgrading over the next 10 years. The upgrading is generally to address growth to approximately 2045.

The ACRWC site was designed to facilitate significant expansion. The ACRWC adds plant capacity as needed to meet both growth requirements and changing environmental regulations.
for discharges to the North Saskatchewan River. Most municipalities also prepare wastewater master plans on a regular basis and use the results to budget for expanding their wastewater collection and transmission systems. Master plans are typically updated every 10 years with a 20 to 30-year planning horizon.

**FUTURE STATE**

In the next 10 and 25 years, wastewater services will meet new challenges and opportunities. Some of these challenges and opportunities will be of regional relevance including:

- **Significant growth in population and employment** – the latest regional planning studies document how wastewater servicing will be provided to the Region (excludes Devon) to the year 2059. This will require expansion of the major wastewater transmission systems including new trunks within Edmonton and upgrading of ACRWC systems. Expansion of the two major wastewater treatment plans will eventually be required but is currently being offset by reduced water use across the Region.

- **Densification and intensification causing increases in wastewater flows can adversely impact downstream sewer systems and upgrading is often needed.**

- **Funding constraints, especially for major facilities such as major trunk systems and wastewater treatment plants, is currently managed through construction staging and long-term interim servicing.** The wastewater utilities and commissions generally have predictable long-term funding through utility rates.

Wastewater has seen a number of leading practices being embraced locally and regionally across North America and Canada more specifically. These have included:

- regionalization of transmission and treatment services, primarily when the ACRWC was set up in the mid-1980s;

- water conservation has resulted in the total wastewater flows to the Region’s wastewater treatment plants increase at well below the rate of population/employment increases;

- wastewater treatment technologies continue to evolve, with removal of nutrients (e.g., nitrogen, phosphorus) and bacteria now being standard practice. The current challenges include removal of pharmaceuticals and the treatment of wastewater within a smaller plant footprint; and

- detailed wastewater planning studies are now standard practice for both servicing new greenfield areas and redevelopment/intensification of existing development areas.

Future wastewater topics of interest in the Region may include:

- ensuring a single voice regarding the North Saskatchewan River assimilative capacity and allowable effluent discharge parameters;

- management of inflow and infiltration to the wastewater system;
- staging and long-term servicing for major infrastructure; and
- continued engagement with the Government of Alberta.

**NEXT STEPS**

### AS-IS

The current “as-is” approach by EPCOR, ACRWC, the Town of Devon and EMRB member municipalities will continue to lead and manage all aspects of this service area.

This service area will be monitored by EMRB for implications to the Growth Plan. The EMRB may consider specific go-forward strategies in the coming years including the collection and awareness of sub-regional and local plans including Master Plans, Engineering Studies so as to better position knowledge and information about the Region for future updates to the MRSP and the Growth Plan.
B3 TRANSPORTATION - ROADS

DEFINITION

Transportation - Roads means the transportation system of roadways, air, and rail as well as active transportation.

Regionally significant roadways are identified in the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP) as linking municipalities, major destination centres, and employment centres as well as providing access to air and rail.

ROADWAYS IN THE REGION TODAY

The primary mechanism for Transportation Planning is the IRTMP.

- Roads

This service area is provided locally through regional, sub-regional and provincial collaboration. Examples of these include the IRTMP (Regional), Transportation Master Plans (Local), Alberta Transportation (Provincial) and Intermunicipal Development Plans (IDP) and Intermunicipal Collaboration Frameworks (ICF), both sub-regionally. Transportation (roads) networks in the Region comprise of several regionally significant roads classified as either arterial, expressway or freeway, and are identified in the IRTMP. The regional roadway classifications system serves to respect the correlation between moving people and reflecting the nature and character of the surrounding land uses and development pattern. The Government of Alberta owns and operates the majority of regionally significant roadways in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region, but often works with EMRB member municipalities in completing planning studies for future roadways.

- Goods Movement

Goods movement networks are provided provincially and locally through high and heavy load corridors, dangerous goods routes and truck routes. All provincial highways, which form part of the regional network, are designated as truck routes and dangerous goods routes. The Province also designates specific corridors as high/heavy load routes. Local goods movement networks provide connectivity to the provincial goods movement network.

- Air

Air services are operated regionally by the Edmonton Regional Airport Authority (ERAA) and regulated federally. ERAA currently operates two airports in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region, Edmonton International Airport (EIA) and Villeneuve Airport in the best interests of the Region.
Rail services are provided federally and regulated by Transport Canada. An extensive network of railway facilities serve passenger and cargo needs in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region. Rail based cargo transportation in the Region is provided by the Canadian National and Canadian Pacific railways.

An EMRB Working Group, including representation from member municipalities, reviews regional transportation priorities annually. Priority transportation projects are identifying by inventorying regional projects, scoring each project against policy areas weightings based on the Growth Plan and adjusting for priority. Each transportation project in the Region is given a score using the policy area weightings, which is multiplied by a priority score of one, two or three, depending on the priority, with three being the highest priority.

**FUTURE STATE**

The future state of transportation — roads includes how demand for transportation services changes and how transportation services are delivered.

Factors affecting the demand for transportation services are as follows:

- increased population and employment growth result in increasing demands on the transportation system;
- changes in development patterns affecting the transportation services in demand;
- changes in demographics affecting the transportation services in demand; and
- economic factors, including changes in goods movement needs, affecting the transportation services in demand.

Factors affecting how transportation services are delivered are as follows:

- new technologies changing how transportation systems are provided;
- changes to how existing transportation networks are used;
- changes in public policy, funding mechanisms, and priorities affecting the types of transportation services provided;
- maintenances costs for existing (and future) infrastructure affecting funding decisions; and
- balancing the need to accommodate future changes while maintaining or limiting impacts on current services.

Regionally significant roadways are identified in the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP) as linking municipalities, major destination centres, and employment centres as well as providing access to air and rail.
Future Transportation - Roads topics of interest in the Region may include:

- ensuring a single voice regarding roads;
- staging and long-term servicing for major infrastructure; and
- continued engagement with the Government of Alberta.

**NEXT STEPS**

The current “as-is” approach by EMRB member municipalities will continue to lead and manage all aspects of this service area. This service area will be monitored by EMRB for implications to the Growth Plan.

The IRTMP 2.0 project will address the longer-term servicing needs of this service area consistent with the Growth Plan. The EMRB may consider specific go-forward strategies in the coming years including the collection and awareness of sub-regional and local plans including Master Plans and Engineering Studies so as to better position knowledge and information about the Region for future updates to the MRSP and the Growth Plan.
TRANSIT IN THE REGION TODAY

The transportation - transit service area will focus on intermunicipal transit services offered between EMRB member municipalities, as such, local routes are not considered, although intermunicipal routes with connections to local routes are noted as needed. Intermunicipal transit services focus on intermunicipal transit routes, park and ride facilities, and accessible transit.

Public transit is expected to play a significant role in servicing Priority Growth Areas and reducing the regional footprint. The MRSP Environmental Scan was completed in November 2018. This is an important input to understanding the transportation - transit service area including the reports detailed information on the current state.

The components of the transit system include routes, vehicles, stations and facilities. In addition, the major influencers to the transit system include – legislation, governance, funding/maintenance, policies, enforcement, and design standards and criteria.

Intermunicipal Transit Routes

• Seven of the 13 EMRB member municipalities operate intermunicipal transit routes.

• All members offering transit connect to at least one City of Edmonton Transit Centre. Spruce Grove is the only member providing a transit connection to an area outside of Edmonton (Acheson).

• Currently, Beaumont, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Leduc, Spruce Grove, Strathcona County, St. Albert, and Morinville offer intermunicipal transit services with Edmonton transit stations as the primary destinations. The most common destinations of the intermunicipal services are the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (NAIT), Century Park Transit Centre, MacEwan University, Downtown Edmonton, University of Alberta (U of A), Government Centre, West Edmonton Mall, and Edmonton International Airport (EIA).

Park and Ride Facilities

• Park and ride facilities are an essential part of an integrated multi-modal transportation system as they offer commuters in low-occupancy automobiles a convenient connection to local and intermunicipal transit thus increasing the transit mode share.
• Park and ride utilization varies greatly within the Region. The majority of Edmonton’s park and ride facilities are approaching capacity. Strathcona County’s and St. Albert’s park and ride facilities are at or above capacity.

Accessible Transit

• The following EMRB member municipalities offer accessible transit, including trips to local and regional destinations: Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Leduc, Spruce Grove, St. Albert, Stony Plain, and Strathcona County.

• Booking process for an accessible transit ride varies by municipality and is either by phone, email and/or online. Accessible transit service providers apply different age thresholds for providing their service, ranging from 16 years old and up to 65 years old and up.

• Edmonton Transit Service (ETS) Disabled Adult Transit Service (DATS) provides all trip administration services for both St. Albert and Leduc (registration, bookings, complaints, scheduling, and dispatch).

The EMRB Transportation Priorities working group reviews regional transportation priorities annually. Priority transportation projects are identified by inventorying regional projects, scoring each project against policy area weightings based on the Growth Plan and adjusting for priority. Each transportation project in the EMRB is given a score using the policy area weightings, which is multiplied by a priority score of one, two or three, depending on the priority, with three being the highest priority.

FUTURE STATE

In the next 10 and 25 years, transit services will meet new challenges and opportunities. Some of these challenges and opportunities will be of regional relevance including:

• Funding requirements for future build out of the LRT system, including connections that penetrate the Anthony Henday, especially to support where intensification, densification and complete communities are planned. This includes expansion of intermunicipal bus transit routes, connecting to more areas in the Region and providing more opportunities for park and ride facilities connecting to the LRT system.

• Integrating land use and transit services, including build out of existing and future transit-oriented developments (TOD), improving access for more people to use transit as a primary mode of transportation.

• Integrating non-vehicular transportation infrastructure with transit services, including enhancement of active transportation infrastructure, reducing the demand for vehicle only modes connecting to a transit service and improving access for more people to use transit as a primary mode of transportation.

• Developing and adopting intermunicipal and accessible transit service standards, including frequency, scheduling, fares, ride quality, utilization, park and ride, route performance and others, developed in collaboration with EMRB members and the Regional Transit Services Commission, to plan and improve future intermunicipal transit services.
• Obtaining provincial regulation for the creation of the Regional Transit Services Commission and further development and future implementation of the objectives of the Commission, which could include the following aspects: improving service efficiencies, reducing costs for all, coordinating planning efforts, creating a better customer experiences, supporting long-term regional developments and others, as needed.

• Accounting for the impacts of new transportation technologies that could be leveraged to improve transit services or potentially impact the utilization of transit services, including ride sharing technologies allowing more people to connect and share non-transit transportation and autonomous vehicles.

• Continual maintenance requirements, including replacement to the aging bus fleet (if applicable at the regional level, depending on the Commission’s role) and/or improvements/replacement of bus fleets and facilities appurtenances accounting for environment initiatives, including change over to electric vehicles to reduce emissions.

Future Transportation - Transit topics of interest in the Region may include:

• ensuring a single voice (e.g., Regional Transit Services Commission) regarding Transit;
• staging and long-term servicing for major infrastructure; and
• continued engagement with the Government of Alberta.

**AS-IS**

The current “as-is” approach by EMRB member municipalities will continue to lead and manage all aspects of this service area.

This service area will be monitored by EMRB for implications to the Growth Plan. The EMRB may consider improving the collection and awareness of sub-regional and local plans including Master Plans and Engineering Studies so as to better position knowledge and information about the Region for future updates to the MRSP and the Growth Plan.

The Regional Transit Services Commission project will address the longer-term servicing needs of this service area. The EMRB may consider specific go-forward strategies in the coming years.
APPENDIX C

MRSP ALIGNMENT TO THE GROWTH PLAN

EDMONTON METROPOLITAN REGION GROWTH PLAN (EMRGP)

ALIGNMENT OF THE METROPOLITAN REGION SERVICING PLAN TO THE GROWTH PLAN
The EMRB completed the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan in 2016. The Government of Alberta approved the Growth Plan on October 26, 2017 in conjunction with the EMRB Regulation. The EMRGP provides an integrated policy framework to plan for and manage the challenges and opportunities of growth through a holistic approach to land use planning, infrastructure and servicing, and investment.

The Growth Plan is a 50-year vision for the Region, including Guiding Principles, a framework for responsible growth, an Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Structure, and an implementation plan, all working together to achieve the following outcomes:

- a diversified, globally competitive economic region;
- a smaller more compact urban footprint;
- coordinated regional land use and infrastructure decisions;
- resilient, adaptable and complete communities;
- an interconnected multi-modal transportation system;
- the growth and sustainability of the agriculture sector; and
- environmental stewardship.
ALIGNMENT OF THE METROPOLITAN REGION SERVICING PLAN TO THE GROWTH PLAN

The MRSP is an integral component contributing toward the effective management of growth in the Region. The MRSP can be seen as well-aligned to the EMRGP as illustrated by some of the many interrelationships between the MRSP service areas and the six policy areas defined within the EMRGP:

The following sections will summarize the strategies to advance the MRSP for each of eight service areas. In the future, the EMRB may add other service areas (e.g., recreation) and may establish new strategies to address the growth and change in regional servicing needs.

The following tables illustrate more of the alignment of MRSP service areas to policy objectives along with examples of touchpoints or initiatives reflecting current and future planning and service delivery of metropolitan services.

**TABLE 1: WATER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic Competitiveness and Employment</th>
<th>Natural Living Systems</th>
<th>Communities and Housing</th>
<th>Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure</th>
<th>Transportation Systems</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Objective</td>
<td>1.2.4 Regional infrastructure investment, including municipal services, and utilities, will support commercial and industrial development</td>
<td>2.2 Protect regional watershed health, water quality and quantity.</td>
<td>3.2.2 Within the built-up urban area and centres, infill development...will be encouraged.</td>
<td>4.1 Establish a compact and contiguous development pattern to accommodate employment and population growth.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Plan development to promote clean air, land and water and address climate change impacts.</td>
<td>3.2.3 The greatest density...will be directed to centres and areas with planned regional infrastructure</td>
<td>4.2 Enable growth within built-up urban areas to optimize existing infrastructure and minimize the expansion of the development footprint.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Minimize and mitigate the impacts of regional growth on natural living systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Plan and develop greenfield areas in an order and phased manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6 Prioritize investment and funding of regional infrastructure to support planned growth.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchpoints</td>
<td>Regional wastewater planning studies, wastewater master plans</td>
<td>Advances in wastewater treatment will mitigate impact of growth on the North Saskatchewan River ecosystem</td>
<td>Upgrades in the wastewater collection and transmission systems will allow infill development without impacting flooding risk or impacts on the environment</td>
<td>Regional wastewater planning studies, wastewater master plans, wastewater servicing plans to support Area Structure Plans</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2: WASTEWATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic Competitiveness and Employment</th>
<th>Natural Living Systems</th>
<th>Communities and Housing</th>
<th>Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure</th>
<th>Transportation Systems</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4 Regional infrastructure investment, including municipal services, and utilities, will support commercial and industrial development</td>
<td>2.2 Protect regional watershed health, water quality and quantity.</td>
<td>3.2.2 Within the built-up urban area and centres, infill development...will be encouraged.</td>
<td>4.1 Establish a compact and contiguous development pattern to accommodate employment and population growth.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Plan development to promote clean air, land and water and address climate change impacts.</td>
<td>2.4 Minimize and mitigate the impacts of regional growth on natural living systems.</td>
<td>3.2.3 The greatest density...will be directed to centres and areas with existing or planned regional infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchpoints</td>
<td>Regional wastewater planning studies, wastewater master plans</td>
<td>Advances in wastewater treatment will mitigate impact of growth on the North Saskatchewan River ecosystem</td>
<td>Upgrades in the wastewater collection and transmission systems will allow infill development without impacting flooding risk or impacts on the environment</td>
<td>Regional wastewater planning studies, wastewater master plans, wastewater servicing plans to support Area Structure Plans</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLE 3: ROADS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic Competitiveness and Employment</th>
<th>Natural Living Systems</th>
<th>Communities and Housing</th>
<th>Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure</th>
<th>Transportation Systems</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Objective</td>
<td>1.1.1.e Coordinating sustained investment in infrastructure and planning for the efficient movements of goods, services, and people.</td>
<td>2.3.1 Planning, design, and construction of new development and infrastructure in greenfield areas and build-up urban areas will incorporate...green building practices.</td>
<td>4.2.4 Intensification will optimize existing and planned infrastructure. Infrastructure investments to support intensification will be identified and planned appropriately.</td>
<td>4.6.1 Regional infrastructure priorities will be identified to target and focus public investments to support employment and population in the Region and the policies of this Plan.</td>
<td>5.1.1 The regional transportation system... will...ensure that regional transportation corridors provide connections to major employment areas and link the Region with local and extra-regional markets in Canada and abroad... provide an efficient system of regional truck routes and over dimensional corridors to ensure the effective and efficient movement of goods...ensure that access, intersection and interchange practices recognize and support the economic activities and provide a reasonable balance between access, efficiency and safety.</td>
<td>4.7.5 Future multi-use corridors will minimize the fragmentation of greenfield areas, prime agricultural lands and natural living systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchpoints</td>
<td>Annual updating of the transportation priorities</td>
<td>Land development</td>
<td>Access of communities</td>
<td>Land development</td>
<td>Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP)</td>
<td>Regional Agriculture Master Plan (RAMP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 4: TRANSIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic Competitiveness and Employment</th>
<th>Natural Living Systems</th>
<th>Communities and Housing</th>
<th>Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure</th>
<th>Transportation Systems</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Objective</td>
<td>Coordinating sustained investment in infrastructure and planning for the efficient movements of goods, services, and people.</td>
<td>Planning, design, and construction of new development and infrastructure in greenfield areas and build-up urban areas will incorporate green building practices.</td>
<td>Areas will be planned and developed as complete communities and support active transportation</td>
<td>Intensification will optimize existing and planned infrastructure.</td>
<td>The regional transportation system will be planned to deliver viable multi-modal transportation choices.</td>
<td>Future multi-use corridors will minimize the fragmentation of greenfield areas, prime agricultural lands and natural living systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Touchpoints

| Regional Transit Services Commission | Land development | TODs | Implementing or improving transit systems to make existing infrastructure more efficient | IRTMP | RAMP |

---

**Notes:**
- Table 4: Transit
- Policy Area:
  - 1.1.1.e: Coordinating sustained investment in infrastructure and planning for the efficient movements of goods, services, and people.
  - 1.2.3.b: Planning for and promoting increasing employee density in areas with multi-modal transportation access in the metropolitan core and metropolitan area.
  - 1.4.2: Downtown Edmonton, urban centres, TOD centres,... will be planned with multi-modal transportation access.
  - 3.3.3: Priorities will be established for location of housing 800 meters of a major transit station.
  - 4.7.5: Future multi-use corridors will minimize the fragmentation of greenfield areas, prime agricultural lands and natural living systems.
### TABLE 5: STORMWATER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic Competitiveness and Employment</th>
<th>Natural Living Systems</th>
<th>Communities and Housing</th>
<th>Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure</th>
<th>Transportation Systems</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Objective</td>
<td>1.2.4 Regional infrastructure investment, including municipal services, and utilities, will support commercial and industrial development</td>
<td>2.1 Conserve and restore natural living systems.</td>
<td>2.2 Protect regional watershed health, water quality and quantity.</td>
<td>3.2.2 Within the built-up urban area and centres, infill development...will be encouraged.</td>
<td>4.1 Establish a compact and contiguous development pattern to accommodate employment and population growth.</td>
<td>5.3 Coordinate and integrate land use and transportation facilities and services...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Plan development to promote clean air, land and water and address climate change impacts.</td>
<td>2.4 Minimize and mitigate the impacts of regional growth on natural living systems.</td>
<td>3.2.3 The greatest density...will be directed to centres and areas with existing or planned regional infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 ...the diversification and value-added agriculture sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchpoints</td>
<td>Sub-regional watershed studies, stormwater master plans</td>
<td>Stormwater Management Facilities for water quality and quantity control; Low Impact Development; integrate wetlands into development</td>
<td>Low Impact Development</td>
<td>Watershed studies, stormwater master plans, stormwater plans to support Area Structure Plans</td>
<td>Integrated land use planning and transportation planning stormwater studies</td>
<td>Stormwater quality control, Low Impact Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6: SOLID WASTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic Competitiveness and Employment</th>
<th>Natural Living Systems</th>
<th>Communities and Housing</th>
<th>Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure</th>
<th>Transportation Systems</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Objective</strong></td>
<td>1.1 ...Promote global economic competitiveness and diversification of the regional economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 ...Plan development to promote clean air, land, water and address climate change impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 ...the planning and development of complete communities, to accommodate people’s daily needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4 ...Plan for and accommodate rural growth in appropriate locations with sustainable levels of servicing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6 ...Prioritize investment and funding of regional infrastructure to support planned growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Touchpoints</strong></td>
<td>Solid waste diversion can create opportunity for recyclers and waste processors to build local presence</td>
<td>Solid waste reduction will decrease environmental impacts, and proper waste management practices will decrease GHG emissions and impacts to groundwater</td>
<td>Solid waste services will need to evolve to provide collection for areas of increased densification, while continuing to provide service to rural areas</td>
<td>Costs associated with providing solid waste management services to rural communities tend to be high, and may benefit from regionalizing services deliver to rural areas</td>
<td>Solid waste infrastructure could be built with a regional funding and operations approach to decrease cost to rate payers</td>
<td>Regional appetite for developing new landfills on agricultural land is decreasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Market Opportunities</td>
<td>International recognition for Solid waste management sustainability goals</td>
<td>Collection Service Capacity</td>
<td>Regional waste disposal facilities</td>
<td>Efficiencies from regional service delivery</td>
<td>Opportunities exist for diverting biosolids and compost material and applying to agricultural land for increased yields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Delivery Innovation</td>
<td>Organics Diversion Solid Waste Management Regulations and Policy (AEP)</td>
<td>Efficiency of service delivery</td>
<td>Organics Processing, Biosolids Land Application, Recycling Initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7: FIRE/EMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic Competitiveness and Employment</th>
<th>Natural Living Systems</th>
<th>Communities and Housing</th>
<th>Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure</th>
<th>Transportation Systems</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Objective</strong></td>
<td>1.4 ...the livability and prosperity of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 ...the minimization and mitigation of the impacts of regional growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 ...the planning and development of complete communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.7 ...the investment into infrastructure and the compatible land use patterns and risks to public safety and health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 ...the efficient and safe movement of people, goods and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 ...the diversification and value-added agriculture sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Touchpoints</strong></th>
<th>Master Plans, Strategic Plans</th>
<th>Mutual Aid and Service Agreements</th>
<th>Fire Planning</th>
<th>Fire Stations, Fire Apparatus</th>
<th>Fire Services</th>
<th>Fire Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SOLID WASTE CONTRIBUTES TO...

FIRE/EMS CONTRIBUTES TO...
## TABLE 8: EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Economic Competitiveness and Employment</th>
<th>Natural Living Systems</th>
<th>Communities and Housing</th>
<th>Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure</th>
<th>Transportation Systems</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy Objective</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 ...the livability and prosperity of the Region and plan for the needs of a changing population and workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 ...the minimization and mitigation of the impacts of regional growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 ...the planning and development of complete communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 ...the investment into infrastructure and the compatible land use patterns and risks to public safety and health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 ...the efficient and safe movement of people, goods and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 ...the diversification and value-added agriculture sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Touchpoints</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mutual Aid and Service Agreements</td>
<td>Community Resilience, Community Partnerships</td>
<td>Emergency Operations Centres, Risk Assessments</td>
<td>Emergency Evacuations</td>
<td>Disaster Recovery and Relief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF CURRENT STATE GOVERNANCE / PLANNING / SERVICE DELIVERY / FUNDING MODEL BY SERVICE AREA
### TABLE 8: SUMMARY OF CURRENT STATE BY SERVICE AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Service Delivery</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Local (e.g., Utility), Commissions</td>
<td>Local, Sub-Regional</td>
<td>Local, Sub-Regional</td>
<td>Various local, utility, user-based, provincial, etc. sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>Local, Commission</td>
<td>Local, Sub-Regional</td>
<td>Local, Sub-Regional</td>
<td>Various local, utility, user-based, provincial, etc. sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Local, Provincial</td>
<td>Local, Regional (IRTMP), Provincial</td>
<td>Local, Provincial</td>
<td>Various local, utility, user-based, provincial, etc. sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>Local, Regional (Transit Commission)</td>
<td>Local, Regional (Transit Commission)</td>
<td>Local, Regional (Transit Commission)</td>
<td>Various local, utility, user-based, provincial, etc. sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services (i.e., Fire/EMS, Emergency Management)</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Various local, utility, user-based, provincial, etc. sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>Local, Commission, Authority</td>
<td>Local, Sub-Regional</td>
<td>Local, Sub-Regional</td>
<td>Various local, utility, user-based, provincial, etc. sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>Local, Alliances, Groups, Provincial</td>
<td>Local, Sub-Regional</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Various local, utility, user-based, provincial, etc. sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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REGIONAL MAPS
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ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN
The full document of the MRSP Environmental Scan - Final Report (February 2019) can be downloaded from the MRSP section of the emrb.ca website.
## Glossary of Terms, Abbreviations, and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AEP</td>
<td>Alberta Environment and Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEMA</td>
<td>Alberta Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto-Aid</td>
<td>Assistance that is dispatched automatically by a contractual agreement between two or more municipalities or other entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO Committee</td>
<td>an EMRB Standing Committee comprised of Chief Administrative Officers from all 13 member municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circular Economy</td>
<td>An economic system aimed at eliminating waste and the continual use of resources emphasizing reuse, sharing, repair, refurbishment, remanufacturing and recycling to create a close-loop system, minimising the use of resource inputs and the creation of waste, pollution and carbon emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB</td>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREPP</td>
<td>Capital Region Emergency Preparedness Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATS</td>
<td>Disabled Adult Transit Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Edmonton International Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>Services in preparation and mitigation, prevention, response, and recovery to major incidents and disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services (EMS)</td>
<td>Providing patient services that might include provision of assessment, treatment (e.g., first aid, basic and advanced life support) and other pre-hospital procedures, including ambulance transportation of patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>Police, protective services, fire, medical (i.e., EMS and ambulance) and emergency management services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMRB</td>
<td>Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMRGP</td>
<td>Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMRGIS</td>
<td>Edmonton Metropolitan Region Geographic Information Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPR</td>
<td>Extended Producer Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERAA</td>
<td>Edmonton Regional Airport Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERWAC</td>
<td>Edmonton Region Waste Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS</td>
<td>Edmonton Transit Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Fire/EMS</strong> | all fire services (e.g., suppression, alarms, and rescue) and emergency medical services (e.g., medical first response) |
| <strong>Fire Services</strong> | career, paid on call or volunteer fire prevention, public safety education, emergency incident response (i.e., fire and EMS) and mitigation, and other related activities, in support of the communities served |
| <strong>ICI</strong> | Industrial, Commercial, and Institutional |
| <strong>IRTMP</strong> | Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan |
| <strong>KPI</strong> | Key Performance Indicator |
| <strong>Local</strong> | a single municipality |
| <strong>LID</strong> | Low Impact Development |
| <strong>LRT</strong> | Light Rail Transit |
| <strong>MRSP</strong> | Metropolitan Region Serving Plan |
| <strong>Regional</strong> | all of the 13 member municipalities of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board |
| <strong>Regional Collaborative</strong> | organized by service area, a group of representatives from all 13 member municipalities tasked to concentrate and focus regional efforts and expertise, provide a supportive forum to foster research and to build and share regionally relevant intelligence, and provide the data necessary for evidence-based decisions and actions in relation to municipal services |
| <strong>RTSC</strong> | Regional Transit Services Commission |
| <strong>Solid Waste</strong> | any garbage, refuse, sludge, and other discarded material, including solid, liquid, semisolid, or contained gaseous material, resulting from residential habitation and industrial, commercial, mining, and agricultural operations |
| <strong>Solid Waste Management</strong> | the collection, transfer and disposal of all solid waste material, including garbage, recyclables, hazardous waste, and organic material |
| <strong>Stormwater</strong> | stormwater runoff from rainfall and snowmelt to a receiving water body |
| <strong>Stormwater Management</strong> | the collection, conveyance, storage, and discharge of stormwater runoff (e.g., rainfall, snow melt). |
| <strong>Sub-Regional</strong> | a group of two or more municipalities, not necessarily on the same border(s) |
| <strong>TOD</strong> | Transit-oriented Development |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Transportation – Roads</strong></th>
<th>the transportation system of roadways, air, and rail as well as active transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation – Transit</strong></td>
<td>the transportation system of transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong></td>
<td>potable water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wastewater</strong></td>
<td>wastewater generated from residential, industrial, commercial and institutional developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste Management Hierarchy</strong></td>
<td>The waste management hierarchy indicates an order of preference for action to reduce and manage waste with the aim to extract maximum practical benefits from products and to generate the minimum amount of waste</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MRSP Implementation - Standing Committee

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board resolve to create an MRSP Standing Committee by February 2020.

**Background**

- After a review of the final draft MRSP Report on November 8, 2019, the Task Force engaged in a discussion of the timing of the implementation plan for the inaugural MRSP. The implementation plan has two key components – a MRSP Standing Committee (Standing Committee) and four Regional Collaboratives.

- The MRSP Task Force further acknowledged that identifying the four service areas for consideration and inclusion in the MRSP was simply a first step in the substantial work to be undertaken.

- With final accountability of Regional Collaboratives required by the Board, and to ensure alignment to the Growth Plan, it is recommended the Regional Collaboratives report to a Standing Committee; comprised of elected officials from the 13 member municipalities.

- The MRSP Task Force believes it is essential to maintain the momentum behind this work and is recommending the Board proceed with implementing the Standing Committee once the MRSP is approved by the Board and submitted to the Government of Alberta.

- The Standing Committee will provide ongoing guidance and direction and oversee the development and implementation of work plans based on the plans of actions for each of the four Regional Collaboratives (i.e., solid waste, stormwater, fire/EMS, and emergency management). In addition to monitoring development, opportunities and challenges for all services areas (i.e., roads, transit, water, and wastewater) to ensure alignment with the Growth Plan.

- The Standing Committee would also be responsible recommend to the Board any action plans or projects that evolve.

- Each Regional Collaborative will have tailored goals and objectives including specific plans of action to be approved by the Board.
• As capacity and resourcing is a major consideration of both planning and implementation, the Board will provide ongoing oversight to ensure the work of the Regional Collaborative are effectively and efficiently prioritized, approved, and managed relative to the capacity of member municipalities to participate.

• The MRSP Task Force acknowledges that the Board is currently in discussions around a renewed Governance Structure and is in the process of drafting a Board Charter document which will include the identification of Committee Structures and Terms of Reference.

Next Steps

• Under the direction of the MRSP Task Force EMRB Administration is in the process of drafting the Terms of Reference for the Standing Committee for review and consideration by the Task Force for the end of January 2020 and approval by the Board in February 2020.
Resolution of Member Motion – June 14, 2018 – REF Amendment Evaluation Criteria

Recommended Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board affirm the June 14, 2018 member motion REF Amendment Evaluation Criteria has been achieved.

Background

- On June 14, 2018, the City of Edmonton brought forward the following member motion to the Board:

  *That Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board Administration develop criteria for evaluation of Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) applications that consist of amendments to statutory plans as outlined in Section 5.7.1 (e) of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan in order to provide clarity on expectations of density targets, beyond or in addition to what is included in the existing planning toolkit.*

- Upon a review by EMRB Administration of the supporting documentation to the motion, the Administration summarized the components of the motion to be addressed were to:

  1. Develop criteria for evaluation of REF applications that consist of amendments to statutory plans as outlined in Section 5.7.1 (e) specifically relating to grandfathering and density;
  2. Define ‘substantive amendment’; and
  3. Provide for a common understanding and certainty for Growth Plan implementation.

- To address the components of the Motion, EMRB Administration formed a Growth Plan and REF Implementation Working Group with all member municipalities in the summer of 2018 to work collaboratively.

- Over the course of 11 meetings, the Working Group concluded that, from an administrative perspective, the identified components in the member motion are resolved.

The following table is a summary of the actions and outcomes of the discussions for each of the three components listed above.
The following table highlights the identified objectives in the background report to the member motion, the actions the Working Group took to address the motion, and the resulting intended outcomes for the Region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion Objectives</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Develop criteria for evaluation of REF applications that consist of amendments to statutory plans as outlined in Section 5.7.1 (e) specifically relating to grandfathering and density | Developed evaluation criteria and workflow outlining EMRB considerations for evaluating grandfathered plans and density changes  
Added the provision for additional rationale to be provided in the form of technical justification and/or planning rationale to be submitted in support of density changes for statutory plan amendments | Consistent understanding of expectations for REF applications consisting of grandfathered statutory plans and density changes across the Region and incorporated into EMRB Municipal Planning Toolkit |
| 2. Define ‘substantive amendment’                                                | Developed Planning Toolkit guide and defined the term ‘substantive amendment’ in the EMRB Planning Toolkit  
Created focused REF submission exemptions for those amendments deemed ‘non-substantive’ | Consensus on what is deemed a substantive amendment, enabling municipalities to use professional judgement in applying the REF to municipal statutory plans  
Clarified non-substantive amendments, as defined, which do not need to be submitted, resulting in a more efficient process when development applications are local in nature  
Focusing on substantive amendments in the REF process restores the original intent of the REF as envisioned in the Growth Plan |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motion Objectives</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Achieve a common understanding and certainty for Growth Plan implementation</td>
<td>EMRB completed six Regional Growth Plan and <strong>REF Workshops</strong> with over 150 municipal participants</td>
<td>Consistent understanding of Growth Plan and REF implementation across the Region and industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EMRB completed a Growth Plan and REF Workshop with seven members of UDI</td>
<td>Municipalities and UDI provided valuable feedback on the REF process that was incorporated in the Planning Toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed Planning Toolkit guide for calculating density</td>
<td>Clarified the methodology for calculating density consistently across the Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed Planning Toolkit guide for sub-area structure plans and created <strong>REF submission exemptions for conforming plans</strong></td>
<td>Clarified <strong>REF applications which do not need to be submitted</strong>, restoring the original intent of the REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed Planning Toolkit guide and created <strong>REF submission exemptions for beneficial increases in density adjacent to Planned LRT lines</strong></td>
<td>Clarified <strong>REF applications which do not need to be submitted</strong> consisting of beneficial increases in density near LRT, achieving main outcomes of the Growth Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed Planning Toolkit guide and created <strong>REF submission exemptions for IDPs with non-members</strong></td>
<td>Clarified <strong>REF applications which do not need to be submitted</strong> where an IDP with a non-member proposes no change, restoring the original intent of the Growth Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Process Efficiencies from this Analysis:**

- EMRB Administration reviewed all applications received to date under REF 2.0 in order to assess how REF application activity has been affected by changes to the interpretation of the Growth Plan and REF process.

- At the time this report was written, the EMRB had received 35 REF applications since REF 2.0 came into force, comprised of 15 new statutory plans and 20 statutory plan amendments. Applying the new EMRB Planning Toolkit interpretations to the same applications, EMRB Administration estimates that ten out of 15 new statutory plans would need to be submitted, resulting in 33% fewer applications.
Even greater efficiencies will be realized with statutory plan amendments, where **an estimated eight out of 20 applications would need to be submitted to the REF, resulting in 60% fewer applications.** This reduction is mainly due to clarity added to the Toolkit around what constitutes a ‘substantive amendment’ as well as the exemption of certain beneficial increases in density near future LRT lines.

Next Steps

- **Continuation of the Working Group** – while components of the member motions are resolve, it is recognized that the Working Group provides a regional forum for members to discuss emerging issues, request guidance on interpretation from planning peers, and to continue to develop Toolkit language to ensure the REF process continues to fulfill the objectives of Growth Plan implementation policies. In response to a request by UDI, the Working Group is exploring options for the development community to share their perspectives and potentially discuss their applications in conjunction with municipalities and the EMRB Administration.

- **EMRB Planning Toolkit Review** (improve the user experience) - with the addition of the new interpretive sections of the EMRB Planning Toolkit, EMRB Administration is now undertaking a comprehensive review and update to the Planning Toolkit to better integrate the new material into the document and ensure the information is easy to understand and work with. It will be important for the EMRB Planning Toolkit to remain evergreen and nimble in response to unforeseen legislative changes or other circumstances, similar to how the Working Group addressed the unintended consequences of the Modernized Municipal Government Act requirements for developing IDPs.

- **Consultation with the Municipal Affairs** - EMRB Administration has been engaging with Alberta Municipal Affairs throughout this process to ensure the intent of the REF and outcomes of the Planning Toolkit remain aligned. As a key partner in the REF process, communication with the Province is ongoing and will continue, informing future discussions with the Working Group and, if needed, follow-up implementation direction from the Board.
Board Governance and Strategy Update

Background

Beginning in the late spring the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board initiated work on Board Development. In July 2019, the Board began engaging in facilitated working sessions to review the current EMRB governance framework and committee structures, and to reaffirm and/or adjust the Board’s current strategic priorities.

The objectives of the Governance Sessions seek to ensure the necessary and appropriate internal mechanisms are in place to:

- support the ongoing stability and functionality of the Board;
- advance the Board mandate under regulation;
- inform and guide the strategic direction of the organization;
- fulfil the requisite duty of care and fiduciary obligations;
- clarify roles and responsibilities;
- delegate executive and operational authorities;
- provide for enabling committee structures; and
- define an equitable and representative decision-making process.

The objectives of the Strategic Planning Sessions seek to undertake a critical review the 2018-2023 EMRB Strategic Plan, and to validate, revise or replace existing Regional Outcomes and Strategic Priorities through informed consideration of the situational and operation context of the organization, and in response to new or emergent opportunities and challenges.

Further, the Strategic Planning Sessions will serve to inform the EMRB business and operational planning process to ensure EMRB Strategic Initiatives are assessed for continued relevance and remain aligned and supportive of any newly established Regional Outcomes and Strategic Priorities.

Given the interdependencies of the work undertaken in relation to governance and strategic planning, the working sessions are being held concurrently. In addition, this work is further responsive to Board approved motion B2019-50 regarding a strategic review of EMRB activities (see Attachment - Response to October 10, 2019 Board Motion B2019-50).
Progress Update

On July 11, the first Governance Session was held and focused on:

1. Thinking about a framework for governance and team effectiveness;
2. How to optimize our current model of governance and create a common understanding of how boards add value;
3. Defining our assumptions for a high-performing governance system; and
4. Developing an action plan for going forward.

On September 4th, a further generative discussion of governance was held and there was consensus among Board Members in acknowledging the value in the focus of the Board in setting the strategic direction, identifying the priorities and establishing the outcomes for the Region. Following a future oriented presentation to the Board, a preliminary discussion of Regional Outcomes and Strategic Priorities was also initiated; however, it was acknowledged subsequent focussed discussions in this regard would be required.

Based on the sessions a supportive and enabling governance framework was presented to the Board in the form of a Draft Charter at the November 8th Governance Session. While the session provided a good introduction to the Draft Charter and renewed committee structure, and there was general agreement on the direction in proceeding, it was understood the Board required an opportunity to further consider the information presented.

In addition, the November 8th Governance Session served to further clarify the roles and responsibilities of the Board under regulation and the fiduciary obligation of Board Members as functionaries of government and legislated mandate. The presentation and discussion also served to highlight the permissive and enabling intent of the regulation, and the scope of agency and authorities the regulation confers to Board members.

On November 22nd, a further Strategic Planning Session was held and served to build upon prior discussions of the mandate of the Board under Regulation and to introduce the concept of managing complex adaptive systems and wicked problems. The Board was also presented with information to achieve a shared understanding of:

- What EMRB is responsible for;
- Why EMRB’s current vision/mission/purpose matters in the current operating context;
- What this means for EMRB in terms of core objectives over the short/mid/long-term;
- How ERMB can develop better strategy to support clear objectives that can be successfully executed, measured and communicated.
The Board did not get through the full agenda and will continue to move forward with its strategic planning early in the new year.

During this session the Board also took the opportunity to discuss the recent RMA resolution regarding the dissolution of mandatory growth management boards.

Pursuant to EMRB Policy G005* - Board Meeting Procedures, a Special Board Meeting was called by the Chair at that time. For a record of the meeting, please refer to the Minutes of the Meeting of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board of November 22, 2019.

**Next Steps**

Work to further develop and refine the Draft Charter and renewed committee structure continues; a subsequent version of the Charter will be presented to the Board for review and consideration in advance of planned Governance Sessions.

The draft Regional Outcomes and draft Strategic Priorities will continue to be informed by ongoing Board Governance and Strategic Planning Sessions with the intent to support the development of the EMRB 2020-2025 Strategic Plan in the new fiscal year.

Additional Governance and Strategic Planning Session have been scheduled throughout the first couple of months of 2020.

Attachments:

1. *Response to October 10, 2019 Board Motion B2019-50*

*EMRB Governance Manual
Policy G005 Board Meeting Procedures
3. Regular and Special Meetings
(a) Date and time for meetings of the Board will be determined by the Chair, Appointed Chair, or Interim Chair and the Chief Executive Officer.*
That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board conduct a strategic review of activities as part of its 2019 Strategic Planning Process with an increased emphasis on good governance, process improvements, impact on municipal operations, and red tape reduction, to ensure continued alignment with regional and provincial outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>INITIATIVE</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Good Governance | Board Governance and committee structure review  
Enhanced strategic planning and priority setting | In progress  
In progress |
| Process Improvements | Administrative & operational review  
Corporate risk profile  
Enhanced communications and support  
Enhanced full cost accounting and financial variance reporting  
Enhanced operational planning and reporting  
Policy framework  
Policy review | In progress  
In progress  
In progress  
In progress  
In progress  
In progress  
In progress |
| Impact on Municipal Operations | Municipal Impact Assessment | In development |
| Red Tape Reduction | REF process efficiency improvements  
Shared Investment for Shared Benefit | Ongoing  
In progress |
Corporate Risk Profile and Policy Framework Update

Background

In 2010, the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) established Policy G001, which provides an approach for the development and approval of policies in relation to administration, finance, governance and human resources. In accordance with Policy G001, approved policies are to be reviewed every four years, with the last review having occurred in 2014/2015.

As such, EMRB Administration commenced a review of the current policy suite and also initiated the development of a Policy Framework. The objective of the framework is to further prescribe the manner of development, review, category of instrument, approvals, document format, publication and communication of EMRB policy documents to ensure a uniform, objective and transparent policy standard.

Concurrent to the policy review, and as identified in the EMRB 2018-2022 Business Plan, EMRB Administration commenced the development of a Corporate Risk Profile (CRP) to identify and assess potential organizational risks and to develop and recommend organizational risk responses. This includes implementable risk mitigation strategies to minimize potential impacts to the Board, EMRB Strategic Initiatives, EMRB Administration, and collateral impacts to stakeholders and others, in achieving organizational objectives.

As the work undertaken to develop the CRP will also serve to identify organizational risks that may require a policy response, and to inform further refinement of the Policy Framework and policy suite, these two projects are proceeding in tandem.

Progress Update

A preliminary review of the EMRB policy suite has been completed with tentative recommendations for policy amendment currently pending in anticipation of review against the recommendations of the CRP and the aligning with the work being done by the Board on governance. The draft Policy Framework has also been completed subject to similar assessment against the findings and recommendations of the CRP.

An independent and impartial consultant, Jason Randhawa, President of Randhawa Consulting, has been engaged to develop the CRP. Preliminary work undertaken has included an environmental scan and document review, and completion of key stakeholder interviews with Board Members, CAOs and EMRB Administration staff.

On November 29th, Mr. Randhawa presented to the Audit & Finance Committee, and provided an overview of the framework and methodology employed in development of the CRP.
Next Steps

- Key stakeholder interviews with the remaining participants will be concluded shortly.

- Completion and presentation of the completed CRP Risk Profile to EMRB Administration is anticipated early in the new year.

- EMRB Administration will review the CRP recommendations in relation to the Policy Framework to further refine the framework as may be required, and to identify potential gaps in the policy suite requiring a policy response.

- EMRB Administration will present the finalized CRP, Policy Framework, and revised policy suite, to the appropriate Board Committee for endorsement and recommendation to the Board for approval before the end of the fiscal year.
Purpose
The City of St. Albert intends to move forward with a Waste to Energy pilot project and will be seeking funding partnerships with interested Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board member municipalities.

The purpose of this report is to provide an update to Board members; no action or decision is being requested of the Board or its member municipalities at this time.

Alignment to Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board
While this initiative is being led by the City of St. Albert, it is aligned with several aspects of the EMRB.

Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board Guiding Principles:
- Collaboration: Working Together—we are committed to working together to achieve our vision.
- Innovation: Creative and Nimble—we are leaders that embrace better ways to achieve long-term prosperity.

Board Strategic Priorities:
- 2) Responsible and Sustainable Growth: The EMRB develops and implements sustainable growth to enable future generations to meet their needs, including responsible planning, decision-making, and monitoring of growth in accordance with the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth plan and Edmonton Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan.
  - 2A) Develop and implement the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan.
  - 2E) Embed an energy, climate, and economic opportunity lens on regional initiatives.

Final Draft of Servicing Plan (Presented to MRSP Task Force on Nov. 21, 2019):
- The inaugural MRSP notes that:
  - “In advancing a regional approach to Solid Waste management, municipalities have the opportunity to share valuable information on service delivery and data on current and project service levels. By working collaboratively to plan services, municipalities could make more informed, efficient and cost-effective decisions about investment and service delivery that stretches taxpayer dollars without compromising service levels.”
- The MRSP notes that future Solid Waste topics may include:
  - Waste as a resource;
  - Facility access and processing
Background and Discussion
At the City of St. Albert’s November 18, 2019 Council Meeting, Council approved a motion allocating $1 Million for the City to proceed with a Waste to Energy Pilot Project. Council’s condition on the funding was that 75% of total project funding needs to come from third party sources. Total costs for the project are estimated to be $4,000,000.

The City is initiating a Waste to Energy Pilot Project to understand how the technology can work within the context of a mid-sized municipality, within an Edmonton Metropolitan Region context, and what the output will provide as value. We want to study how this technology could help us manage our solid waste over the long-term, with the intent of turning our collected waste into a revenue stream that bring value to our residents and rate-payers.

This pilot-scale project will provide participating partners with valuable information about utilizing such technologies within an Edmonton Metro context. While this type of technology is generally new to Alberta, it has been used in other parts of the world (a larger-scale version of this technology is being used at the Enerkem Facility in the City of Edmonton). Its use could help to alleviate some of the waste issues that have emerged over the past year. The technology being considered is relatively simple and it contemplates the transition of solid waste into a heat and/or electricity stream. This maintains the relative simplicity of the process, thereby reducing the impacts of the operational personnel.

The value partners receive from participating in the project is that they will receive the raw data from the pilot and the framework would encourage and support the testing of variable wastes that are of value to each community, so this technology could potentially be scaled within your own municipalities. The pilot plant could also take your waste products—which can include organics, agricultural plastics, tires and more. The more partners that sign-on to the project, the cheaper the cost for the region and the likelihood of leveraging FCM grants successfully is improved.
Next Steps

St. Albert has secured a location and a technology for this pilot, and subject to funding, the technology should be commissioned in Spring 2020.

The City of St. Albert would like to gauge member interest in participating in this project, and/or if the EMRB has a preference if the City pursues cost-sharing partnerships for this initiative on an intermunicipal basis, or through the process identified within Board Policy G008—Regional Capital Projects. This valuable feedback will be used to help determine next steps as to how the City requests funding partners.

Once more funding partners are secured, the intent is to jointly apply for an FCM grant; roughly, a funding breakdown could look like:

- City of St. Albert: $1 Million
- Partnering Municipalities: $1 Million
- FCM Grant: $2 Million

Interested parties can follow-up with City of St. Albert Administration for more information, by contacting Kevin Scoble, CAO, at kscoble@stalbert.ca
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1. Opening

1.1 Quorum

Quorum achieved; 7 of 7 voting members present.

1.2 Call to Order

Chair Shaigec called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

1.3 Chair Opening Remarks

Chair Shaigec welcomed the members of the Task Force including Mr. Malcolm Bruce, CEO of Edmonton Global, as the newest member. Although the Task Force has not met since August, the progress of RAMP has continued by the Working Group, as evidenced by the thorough agenda package. He thanked the County of Leduc for hosting this meeting.

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force approve the October 28, 2019 meeting agenda.
Moved by: Mayor Turner
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion: That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force approve the August 16, 2019 meeting minutes.
Moved by: Mayor Doblanko
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

4. Task Force Outcomes from August 16, 2019

Mr. Burden reviewed the results of the last Task Force meeting including the unanimous support of the draft policy areas and progress on the Engagement Plan.

5. Outcomes for October 28, 2019

Mr. Burden communicated the goals of this meeting include a review of the Economic Imperative for Agriculture, endorsement of the draft policy area objectives and mapping, and endorsement of the Engagement Plan implementation update and direction.
6. Agriculture and The Economic Imperative

Mr. Bouma presented the Task Force with examples of successful integration of agri-food systems and economic development highlighting the Netherlands, Portland, Austin, Minneapolis, and Lisbon. Many of these locations share some similar characteristics with the Edmonton Metropolitan Region but each were able to capitalize on their unique features and competitive advantages. Their successes were not by default, but by design due to the intentional effort and ensure the appropriate conditions were in place for success.

Mr. Bruce commented that Edmonton Global recently conducted a successful trip to the Netherlands and have strengthened partnerships there. He encouraged the Task Force to refer to edmontonglobal.ca/downloads for a two-page summary of the Food and Agriculture priorities for the Region. Ms. Sundquist renewed her offer to coordinate a presentation by members of the Business Development and Program Delivery Branch. Mr. Bruce shared some of the opportunities and strategies employed by Edmonton Global to encourage investment and enhancement of the Region’s agri-food system.

Task Force members discussed the pivotal role of the Government of Alberta in ensuring these intentional policy directions are implemented and supported. CEO Wichuk reiterated the need to fully develop and communicate the exponential return on investment in this industry to all key stakeholders. Mr. Bruce echoed the need for and continued effort towards alignment of municipal, provincial and federal levels of government.

Mr. Bouma shared some impactful statistics and trends, extracted from the August 2018 Situation Analysis, to support the need for a deliberate strategy to elevate the importance of the food and agriculture sector.

Break 10:24 a.m. – 10:42 a.m.

Mr. Burden invited the Task Force to participate in a Regional Alignment breakout exercise. Members were asked to indicate the level of support and perceived value of RAMP from three perspectives: themselves as Task Force members, their perception of their Council’s position, and their perception of other stakeholders’ position.

Mr. Burden reviewed the results of Breakout Session #1 with the Task Force to discuss potential reasons for positioning and opportunities to move towards the high value/strong support quadrant. Task Force members noted that consistent communication a strong business case to key stakeholders would encourage greater support and recognition of RAMP’s value.

7. Agriculture Policy Area Framework

Mr. Burden outlined the working assumptions for RAMP policy development: using a 2044 planning horizon, building on existing policies from the Growth Plan, and updating the RAMP as part of the 2027 Growth Plan review.
Mr. Davis then led the Task Force through the process of developing the draft Agriculture Policy Area map, as presented. He explained the intent was to approach the drafting of an initial policy area map using an evidence-based approach to achieve as much certainty for agriculture and, at the same time, ensure room for growth to 2044.

Mr. Davis presented the map in layers of policy area starting with Policy Area 4 – Urban Agriculture, followed by Policy Area 3 – Transition Lands within the Metropolitan Area. Policy Area 2 was introduced as lands within the Rural Area policy tier where Agriculture was secondary to other land uses, followed by Policy Area 1, as the remaining lands within the Rural Area of the Growth Plan, where Agriculture would be a priority. Both Policy Area 1 and 2 recognize specific land uses such as Confined Feeding Operations, Country Residential, Rural Employment Areas, and Environmentally Sensitive areas, which would be subject to specific policy directions, as an example.

Mr. Bouma then reviewed the policy objectives and refined policy directions for each of the four Policy Areas in detail. The Task Force enquired about engagement with non-EMRB municipalities, plans for future reclaimed mining lands, and the use of the term “transition” for lands within Area 3.

Lunch 12:00 p.m. – 12:43 p.m.

Mr. Burden invited the Task Force to participate in Breakout Session #2 and visit each of the policy area stations to provide their input and ask questions. Members of the Working Group captured their feedback providing background and context in support of the draft refined policy area refined policy directions. A representative from each station then provided the Task Force with a high-level summary of the feedback, which will be addressed by the Working Group.

Comments related to the use of the term “required” for some policy directions in Area 4, a potential economic assessment of a quarter section of agricultural land versus urban development land, staging and prioritization of using lower capability land balanced with contiguous growth, depictions of built-up employment areas perceived as residential on the draft map, growth potential for hamlets, possible mechanisms for redrawing policy area lines, and the impact of climate change on water and ground water.

**Motion:** That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force endorse the draft Policy Area Mapping, and refined Policy Area Directions to inform further work on Policy Development.

**Moved by:** Mayor Hnatiw

**Accepted by:** Chair

**Decision:** Carried unanimously
8. RAMP Engagement Plan – Implementation Update

Ms. Shuya outlined the current plans for Stakeholder Engagement – Phase 1, including presentations to all thirteen councils and five regional stakeholder roundtable sessions. The presentations will include progress on RAMP up to and including October 28, 2019.

Members of the Task Force shared concerns that brief presentations to councils would not provide sufficient opportunity to learn the material and encourage meaningful feedback. It was also suggested that bringing all regional stakeholders to the same forum may not be ideal and could result in unintended consequences. Consideration for a narrated video presentation was proposed as an effort to save time and ensure consistent messaging across stakeholder groups.

The Task Force members affirmed their intention to be involved in engagement opportunities hosted by their municipality and to receive open invitations to attend other sessions in the Region. The Project Team was encouraged to contact the Government of Alberta’s resource prior to embarking on Indigenous engagement.

Motion: That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force accept the RAMP Engagement Plan update for information.

Moved by: Mayor Doblanko
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

9. Meeting Summary and Next Steps

Mr. Burden summarized the record of key decisions:
1. Different stakeholders were identified as holding different positions within the Alignment Exercise matrix
2. Engagement and communication are critical to ensure others understand its value and move towards support
3. Endorsement of refined policy directions and mapping
4. Messaging should be as precise and efficient as possible
5. Difference between communication and engagement

Mr. Burden suggested that the December 5 Task Force meeting will be rescheduled as the updated work on policy development would not be completed in time. The Project Team will evaluate the options and propose a new date for early 2020.

Motion: That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force endorse the Meeting Summary and Next Steps.

Moved by: Councillor Barnhart
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously
Chair Shaigec thanked the Leduc County and the catering staff for hosting as well as the Working Group for their contributions to the success of this meeting.

12. Adjournment

Chair Shaigec declared the Task Force meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Task Force Chair, Rod Shaigec
RAMP Project Update

Background

- As part of the Growth Plan update in 2013 - 2016, the Growth Plan Update Task Force began a review of the key issues affecting growth in the rural areas. Two policy areas where preliminary issues were examined included the supply and demand of Country Residential Areas, and Rural Fragmentation and Conversion. However, the Task Force was unable to conclude its review and analysis during the time frame for completing the Growth Plan.

- As a result, the Task Force at the time agreed it was important the Board address the rural growth issues and identified objectives, policies, and tools in the Growth Plan with a commitment to addressing rural growth to the same extent the Growth Plan had addressed future urban growth, in the development of a Regional Agriculture Master Plan (RAMP).

- At the time of approving the Growth Plan in 2016, the CRB agreed developing a Regional Agriculture Master Plan should be the Board’s first implementation priority following the approval of the Growth Plan by the Province.

- The updated EMRB Growth Plan - Reimage, Plan, Build- was approved in October 2017 and includes a policy area for Agriculture, including specific objectives as well as an initial set of policies.

Objectives:

- 6.1 Identify and conserve an adequate supply of prime agricultural lands to provide a secure local (and global) food source for generations.
- 6.2 Minimize the fragmentation and conversion of prime agricultural lands for non-agricultural uses.
- 6.3 Promote diversification and value-added agriculture production and plan infrastructure to support the agricultural sector and regional food system.

- In February 2018, the current Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approved the Project Charter and established a Task Force to oversee the development of the RAMP.

- In August 2018, the Board accepted the RAMP Situation Analysis as information which provides a comprehensive overview of the global trends affecting agriculture, a historical context for agriculture in the Region, a current state and gap analysis for the sector, and identified future challenges and recommendations for enabling a sustainable agriculture sector in the Region.
For the past 14 months, the RAMP Task Force has been providing leadership in the development of a framework and policy approach for EMRB members to address the Growth Plan objectives and future opportunities for primary and value-added agriculture.

On October 28, 2019, the Task Force unanimously endorsed a draft agriculture policy area framework including - objectives for four defined policy areas, refined policy area directions for each and a map to inform further work on drafting RAMP policies for consideration by the Task Force.

The Task Force has identified that the success of the RAMP relies on a focused commitment by the Region to a long-term vision and an appreciation for the economic imperative for supporting and maintaining the primary and value-added agriculture sectors.

RAMP provides primary decision makers across the Region with a plan focused on creating the conditions for seizing the larger economic opportunity and potential for the sector for the next 25-50 years.

Agriculture is our Region’s second largest contributor to GDP and capitalizing on the continued growth and potential of the sector requires the buy-in and support from a broad set of stakeholders.

RAMP identifies specific areas where agriculture lands should remain a priority and aligns policies throughout the Region to encourage all types of agriculture to continue for as long as possible.

The proposed policy area framework for RAMP does not create an Agriculture Boundary. Instead, it proposes defining specific agriculture policy areas differentiated by existing conditions, current land uses and accounts for future urban growth plans for the next 25-50 years based on approved statutory plans.

The proposed RAMP policy framework is adaptable and responsive to future growth demands and does not limit or interfere with existing approval processes or the long-term planning needs of urban municipalities. This approach provides certainty for agriculture and land development for the next 25-50 years.
• While there is an economic imperative for implementing RAMP, the Task Force is also sensitive to the timing and need to socialize the direction for RAMP. The Task Force is monitoring and considering the global market forces and policies affecting the sector, the current federal and provincial priorities- opportunities for job creation, enabling investment in economic development and area for improved efficiencies and collaborating with regional stakeholders, and current local issues affecting rural areas - rural crime, top of mind concerns for rural property rights, changing legislation and another difficult year for producers.

• The Task Force knows this is a complex area for public policy and that there is a need for a strong, well-timed and executed engagement plan that will ensure an understanding of the RAMP, and the opportunities and certainty it offers.

• In discussions about an Engagement Plan for RAMP, the Task Force identified the following groups of stakeholders. The list is in no specific order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMRB Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Caucus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producers – Commodity, Value Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• To ensure an effective Engagement Plan, EMRB Administration has retained additional support to assist with the design and implementation of the public engagement plan.

Next Steps

• The Task Force is continuing with the development of the policies for each of the identified Policy Areas and is beginning work on exploring Implementation tools like the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Tool (LESA) identified in the Policy 6.1.1b.c.

• Further work is underway on a comprehensive Engagement Strategy and Plan.

Attachments:

1. Regional Agriculture Master Plan – Situation Analysis Report, Board Approved – August 9, 2018
2. Agriculture Policy Area Framework, as presented to the Task Force – October 28, 2019

---

i Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan – Reimagine, Plan, Build - Policy 6.1.1a
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Executive Summary

Introduction:

The agriculture and food industry is a major economic driver in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region (EMR) and it is by far the single largest land user (approximately 1.7 million acres). Within the province, it is the second largest processing industry surpassed only by the energy sector; agriculture production and food processing together generate over $4.5 billion in direct annual revenues. The industry is a reliable and stable source of employment – it generates over 10,500 jobs and produces a sustainable source of locally produced food. Overall, the agriculture and food industry provides the EMR considerable economic activity as well as food security.

The sector is also a major contributor to the environmental well-being of the region with its inherent ability to sequester carbon, contribute to the local water table and foster biodiversity. What’s more, the growing global demand for agriculture and food products suggests that significant potential growth is possible. For example, should the EMR achieve growth targets set by the Province of Alberta, it would double its food and value added processing in terms of economic outputs and employment. Underlying all of these activities is land as the foundation - an irreplaceable resource and essential for the future growth of the region’s agriculture and food system.

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) identified the agriculture and food sector in 2017 as a key economic growth sector. To this end, the recently approved Growth Plan Re-Imagine. Plan. Build clearly articulates that agricultural land is an essential resource and needs to be conserved. From 2002 to 2012, a total of 38,250 hectares of farmland in the EMR have been converted to non-agricultural uses, with over 60% of that loss being prime agricultural lands.

Additionally, Edmonton Global, the newly formed regional economic development agency has targeted agriculture and food as a priority for growth. Both the EMRB and Edmonton Global recognize the significant diversity and growth potential in the EMR but to ensure the long-term sustainability of the sector, a clear definition of success and a plan is required.

This situation analysis is the first step towards the development of the Regional Agriculture Master Plan (RAMP). The primary purpose of this analysis is to clarify the definition of success by: providing a common base of information; summarizing the opportunities and issues facing the EMR agriculture and food community; and formulating a preliminary set of directions from which to build the RAMP. Indeed, the RAMP development process must address several fundamental questions including:

- What is the future of agriculture both globally and regionally?
- What are the resource and policy requirements for the EMR both at the municipal and regional levels?
- What agricultural land should be preserved and how?
- What decisions need to be made across the EMR to support the agriculture and food sector as a vibrant and growing industry into the future?

Objectives:

The objectives from the Growth Plan for the RAMP are stated as follows:

1. Identify and conserve an adequate supply of prime agricultural lands to provide a secure local food source for future generations;
2. Minimize the fragmentation and conversion of prime agricultural lands for non-agricultural uses; and
3. Promote diversification and value-added agricultural production and plan infrastructure to support the agricultural sector and regional food system.

Global Trends

The agriculture and food industry in Alberta (including the EMR) does not operate in isolation. Rather it is impacted by trends and dynamics that continuously change in terms of issues, structure and direction. What’s important is to understand how these larger trends will shape the future of the sector. The major trends include:

1. Growing Global Food Demand – driven by increasing global populations and incomes. Few countries have the long-term ability to supply the food necessary to support this growth. In fact, numerous indicators suggest that Canada is one of six countries worldwide projected to be a net food exporter into the future. Within Canada, most of the supply response potential lies in the West and in regions like the EMR;
2. Industry and sector consolidation - the phenomena of fewer but larger farms in the crop and livestock sectors, as well as fewer but more capital-intensive processors is dramatically altering the size and scale of businesses including farming operations. Today, it is not unusual for individual farm businesses to encompass anywhere from 4,000 to 20,000 hectares (there are several such farms based in the EMR). Additionally, major consolidation is taking place in the processing, farm input, wholesale and retail sectors putting pressure on small scale processors or startups who face overcome enormous challenges to becoming larger regional or national suppliers;
3. Technology and Automation – game-changing technologies such as sensors, robotics, machine learning and artificial intelligence are having dramatic impacts on operations and efficiencies across all businesses big and small. These dynamics couple with supporting regional research institutions provide EMR stakeholders with the potential advantages that could lead to the region being a food and feed centre of excellence;
4. Changing Food Economy –comprising a host of disruptive factors that present both opportunities and challenges for current players as well as for new entrants. For example, the rapid demand for direct delivery and the technologies that enable such services are changing the nature of relationships between consumers and suppliers. One such example developing rapidly in the EMR is the burgeoning hemp and cannabis sector which has the potential to offer an array of edible and fibre products;
5. Climate Change – greater extremes such as heat, drought, flooding leaving the entire food system more vulnerable thus requiring new management practices and mitigation strategies. However, given the region’s location, it is expected to have a comparative advantage over traditional production areas with shortages of water and higher average temperatures; and
6. Land Use and the Conservation of Agricultural Lands – the result of rapid urbanization worldwide, and a trend seen in the EMR, which is turn reducing the supply of a productive land base for food production. Protecting the agriculture land base is becoming a foremost public issue in Canada - Ontario and British Columbia being notable examples where specific action has been taken to ensure the sustainability of the sector. The EMR has a highly productive land base and if protected, can be the foundation of long term economic growth and prosperity.

Importance of Agriculture in the EMR

The Situation Analysis identifies several key attributes, characteristics and advantages that strongly position the EMR as a highly competitive agriculture and food region listed as follows:

- **EMR has productive soils:** The EMR is in fact the most productive agricultural region in Alberta. It is home to high quality black soils – 35% of the top producing soils in Alberta are found in the Region. Furthermore
69% of the region is comprised of prime agricultural soils (LSRS 2, 3, 4), and a favourable climate – some areas in the region have never experienced a crop failure in 100 yearsⁱ.

- **EMR has a vibrant food processing sector:** An estimated 25% of the province’s food and beverage processing industry is situated in the EMR. The sector is comprised of two major poultry processors, several dairy processing plants, and a large oil seed crusher, a feed milling sector as well as numerous speciality food and beverage processing businesses which have grown to become major national and international players. This sector generates an estimated $3.7⁳ B in annual revenues and employs over 6,000 people.

- **EMR has the skilled people:** The region is replete with innovative, experienced, progressive and talented individuals including: farmers who are rapidly expanding their operations; food processors who have developed successful businesses supplying customers both nationally and internationally; and an emerging class of entrepreneurs who are developing new food businesses and events.

- **EMR has world leading research and development infrastructure:** The EMR is home to several world leading institutions and special purpose facilities established to support the agriculture and food industry. These include: the University of Alberta with the Faculty of Agriculture, Life and Environmental Sciences including several research stations such as the Edmonton Research Farm; the St. Albert Research Farm; the Botanical Garden and Agri-Food Discovery Place; Alberta Agriculture & Forestry with the Food Processing Development Centre in Leduc and the Crop Development Centre in northeast Edmonton; NAIT and the Culinary Program; and the Pioneer DuPont Seed Research Farm in Strathcona County. In addition, the region is replete with high quality supporting infrastructure including a superior set of roadways, rail-lines and the Edmonton International Airport equipped with the necessary facilities and logistics to ship fresh or frozen food products to destinations both nationally and internationally. It will be important to ensure that the provision of high quality infrastructure continues to be a priority.

- **EMR boasts a productive agricultural sector:** EMR farms are highly productive and on average, generate 40% more revenue per acre than their Alberta counterparts ($499 vs. $352 per acre). Over the 15-year period (2001-2016) farm size in terms of acres farmed has grown by 30%. Farms in the EMR while smaller in size compared to the provincial average (523 acres vs. 1,237 acres), have rates of invested capital per acre that is almost twice the Alberta average ($5,581 vs. $2,863 per acre). Since 2001, the biggest changes have occurred in two financial indicators: (a) **Average Capital per Farm** ($811,000 in 2001 and increasing to $2,919,000 in 2016) – an increase of 250% and (b) **Total Gross Sales** ($476.6 M in 2001 versus $838.2M³ in 2016) – up 75%. In total, the EMR farm community has 4,655 operators.

Perhaps the most notable feature is the resilience and the adaptive nature of the sector. In this region, agriculture has historical, cultural, economic and environmental significance, and is often taken for granted. For an important food producing region with over 100 years of history, the time has come to develop a plan that will ensure it continues to be such for the next 100 years.

---

¹ Land Suitability Rating System (LSRS) Classes 2, 3 and 4 is highly correlated to Canada Land Inventory (CLI) 1, 2 and 3. These land classes, often referred to as prime, provide farmers the greatest flexibility with respect to the choices of crops to be grown and resilience with respect to variable weather conditions.

² Comments received from individual farmers during the consultation process.

³ The economic multiplier (Alberta Treasury Board and Finance) for food and beverages – direct, indirect and induced is 2.308.

⁴ Thus this revenue multiplies to $8.5 billion in total economic impact.

---

Situation Analysis: July 2018
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Critical Success Factors:

**Agriculture as a Priority** - To date, much of the success of EMR’s agriculture and food industry has taken place in the absence of it being a regional priority. Arguably the success and resilience of the agriculture and food sector has occurred largely by default and generally functions without supportive policies. Given the regional assets, the strength of the sector and the opportunities that it now faces, it is time to make agriculture and food a priority and identify the necessary support requirements if the region is serious about the long term sustainability and prosperity of the sector for future generations.

**Supportive Land Use Policies** - Currently, land use policies across the EMR appear to operate at cross purposes with the diversity of development opportunities across the region. More specifically, land use policies which allow for the conversion of prime agricultural land as well as fragmentation and encroachment in rural areas, contribute to an undertone of uncertainty among farmers – which in turn results in increased conflicts between rural and urban interests. These uncertainties undermine long term investment plans by farmers to continue farming in the region.

**Conservation of Agricultural Land** – The EMRB Growth Plan calls for regional growth that includes a healthy and expanding agricultural sector which depends upon conserving a supply of prime agricultural land. However, the issues and concerns raised by farmers in the EMR regarding the long-term availability of land, the ability to assemble land parcels and the rising cost of land strongly suggests that current land use policies at the regional and municipal levels are not sufficiently strong or definitive enough to arrest this undertone of uncertainty.

In summary, these three core issues need to be addressed in order for the EMR to realize its full potential as a thriving, robust agriculture and food centre.

**The focus of the RAMP:**

The analysis of trends, issues and comparatives to other jurisdictions in this Situation Analysis confirms that an effective RAMP capable of shaping a new future for the agriculture and food sector must address four core issues:

1. **An assured long-term agricultural land base with a clear vision for agriculture and food in the EMR.** The question to be addressed is straightforward: *How can agriculture and food play an increased role in the economic, cultural and environmental future of the region?* To be clear, the long term assurance of land is critical and cannot be half-hearted or in doubt. When addressing this fundamental issue, it will be important to recognize that not all agriculture land requirements are the same – it differs by production sector. For example, the large commodity sector requires large areas of contiguous farmland; the specialty sector requires smaller plots that are typically high-quality soils in relative proximity to urban markets, transportation and water infrastructure. Most importantly, any vision for agriculture and food must provide the assurance of a productive land base and allow for flexibility to respond to changing dynamics of the agriculture and food sector or it will not be successfully realized.

2. **Agricultural zoning and effective land use policies.** Effective zoning and land use policies will be critical to the realization of the EMR as a thriving and robust agriculture and food region. These will differ by area or sub-area across the region and reflect the requirements of clearly defined production sectors and intended uses. Furthermore, urban or non-farm encroachment and land fragmentation must be addressed – the greater the level of fragmentation allowed to occur in rural areas, the greater the conflicts. Finally, the permanence of agricultural area boundaries and correspondingly, urban growth boundaries are exceedingly important to support the long term management of agricultural land and cannot be understated. Clearly, the more enduring and definitive urban growth boundaries can be established, the greater the degree of stability provided for adjacent or nearby agriculture lands.
3. **Mitigation measures.** To address current expectations with respect to land values and expectations implicit to current land use policies. Many farmers and land owners expect the ability to monetize the value of lands which are now implicit to rural property values as result of the ability to sub-divide. In this regard, the application of such planning tools as the transfer of development credits and the purchase of conservation easements may serve to address these expectations.

4. **Supportive and targeted economic development programs.** To recognizes the unique market, access and infrastructure requirements of the differing agriculture and food sectors operating within the EMR. This will require clear targeting and the selection of key infrastructure investments (hard and soft) to support identified growth opportunities.

**Moving Forward:**

This Situation Analysis provides the start from which to continue the RAMP planning process. Agriculture is a critical economic driver for the region; it can be an even greater contributor to the region’s economic prosperity but only if it is treated as a priority area.

A targeted approach to prioritizing agriculture and recognizing the critical importance of land preservation is foundational for the long-term sustainability of the industry. With an effective policy framework that responds to and supports the current and future needs of the agriculture and food sector, it can be the catalyst for significant additional economic growth - including all the benefits associated with employment, trade, food security, environmental stewardship economic prosperity and social well-being.

“The key to a robust agricultural industry is the same everywhere: the protection of the land base on which to farm and to carry out farm related activities.” ... A fresh perspective is needed of farmland ... one that sees agriculture as a permanent feature of the regional landscape and farming as an essential component of our economy and cultural heritage.”

---

5 Farmland at Risk: Why land-use planning needs improvement for a healthy agricultural future in the Greater Golden Horseshoe, November 2015. Ontario Federation of Agriculture and Environmental Defense
1.0 Purpose of the Situation Analysis

The purpose of the Situation Analysis is to: (a) present an overview of the major global trends and dynamics impacting the agriculture and food industry; (b) provide a common ‘fact base’ from the statistical review of the changes that have taken place in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region (EMR) from 2001 to 2016; (c) summarize an overview of the opportunities, issues, facing the EMR agriculture and food community including the food processing and value-added sector; (d) review the varying municipal plan and policy framework within which the EMR operates; and (e) formulate a preliminary set of directions from which to continue the process of building the Regional Agriculture Master Plan (RAMP) which is due to be completed by April, 2020. The development of a RAMP was identified as the first implementation priority of the Growth Plan by the EMRB.

2.0 Background and Objectives

2.1 Background to the RAMP

The EMRB’s Growth Plan, “Reimagine. Plan. Build,” approved by the Province on October 26, 2017, articulated the key challenge for the RAMP, namely to “clarify the role of agriculture in the EMR and in particular to define what and where the disposition and protection of agricultural lands is appropriate.” The Growth Plan presents a central guiding principle specific to this broad challenge:

Ensure the wise management of prime agricultural resources.

The Request for Proposal (RFP) for the RAMP states: “The conversion of prime agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses is a significant issue for the region and a fundamental challenge to a thriving agricultural sector.” The Growth Plan goes on to say:

“Agriculture is the largest single land use in the Region, a key economic sector and an irreplaceable resource for local food security. During the region’s recent period of rapid uncoordinated growth, neither the Province nor municipalities considered ways to conserve prime agricultural lands for farmland. Existing and planned urban development is encroaching on high quality agricultural soils and placing pressure on the region’s agricultural land base. From 2002 to 2012, a total of 38,250 hectares of farmland have been converted to non-agricultural uses, with over 60% of the loss being prime agricultural lands. The agricultural sector is experiencing significant change—with a decrease in the overall number of farms and operators, but an increase in farm productivity and profits. Although region-wide, agriculture represented only 1% of all jobs in 2014, it provides 10 to 20% of employment in many regional municipalities. This Plan recognizes the importance of a viable agricultural sector as a key asset, economic sector and strategy for enhancing local food security.”

Agriculture and food is a major industry in the EMR. In its entirety (including farm production and food processing), it is Alberta’s second largest industry, surpassed only by the energy sector. Furthermore, it is by far the largest user of land in most rural municipalities in Alberta including the EMR. In the context of growing global food demand, it is apparent that Alberta has a healthy future as a major food/agricultural commodity supplier. It is also important to point out that the EMR contains approximately 35% of Alberta’s Class 1 soils.

The challenge of managing growth for rural municipalities adjacent to urban or industrial development results

---

7 FAO estimates that the global population increases 85 million each year, the size of Germany.
in stress on the agriculture sector and on agricultural land. This is an issue for the EMR given the high percentage of agricultural land, including both highly-productive and some more marginal areas. This presents both opportunities and challenges that require careful consideration in the EMRB’s planning process. The task will not be easy - it takes place within the context of issues that are exceedingly difficult and fundamental to address including such questions as:

- What is the future of agriculture?
- What does this mean for resource and policy requirements at the municipal and regional level?
- What agricultural land should be preserved?; and
- What decisions need to be made across the EMR to sustain the agriculture food sector as a vibrant and growing industry?

2.2 The RAMP Objectives

The Growth Plan Re-Imagine. Plan. Build. provides more agriculture-based policy than the previous plan Growing Forward. To this end, the RAMP must address three key objectives:

1. Identify and conserve an adequate supply of prime agricultural lands to provide a secure local food source for future generations;
2. Minimize the fragmentation and conversion of prime agricultural lands for non-agricultural uses; and
3. Promote diversification and value-added agricultural production and plan infrastructure to support the agricultural sector and regional food system.

And to assist with the implementation of the RAMP a land evaluation and site assessment tool (LESA) will be developed. The LESA tool is described as a “critical and objective method to assess, qualify and quantify the prime agriculture lands in the Region.” Until the RAMP is approved incorporating LESA, the EMRB will continue to apply the policies and use Schedule 11 in the Growth Plan to identify prime agricultural lands.

Current policies state that, in the rural area, identified prime agricultural lands will be conserved, including encouraging opportunities to conserve areas currently defined by municipalities for non-agricultural uses. In the metropolitan area, the intent is that agricultural lands will be used for agriculture for as long as possible but will ultimately be converted when required to accommodate urban growth.
3.0 Global Trends and Industry Dynamics

3.1 Introduction

The agriculture and food industry in Alberta including the EMR does not operate in isolation. Rather it is impacted by trends and dynamics that continuously change in terms of structure and direction.Forecasting the future is always a tenuous exercise. Nevertheless, what’s important is to understand the larger trends to provide both context to inform the development of the RAMP.

3.2 Global Trends and Developments

Several major trends are identified and listed as follows:

1. **Growing global food demand** - multiple sources forecast the world population to exceed 9.5 billion by 2050 and accordingly project an increased demand for food. Not only will there be more ‘mouths’ to feed, income levels as evidenced by a rapidly expanding middle class (notably India and China) is driving demand for higher quality foods such as meat proteins and prepared foods. Much of this growth will take place in the world’s major urban centres which are also the location of the best agricultural production areas.

   Significantly, food demand will grow as the production capacity to produce food is on the decline. On the surface, this bodes well for Alberta as a major source of agricultural commodities, foods and ingredients. Canada has been identified as one of only six countries who will be net food exporters by 2025\(^8\) - Alberta and the EMR are well positioned to respond to this growing demand.

2. **Industry and sector consolidation** - the phenomena of fewer but larger farms in the crop and livestock sectors, as well as fewer but more capital intensive processors is dramatically altering the size and scale of farming operations. Today, it is not unusual for individual farming operations to cover anywhere from 10,000 to 50,000 acres (there are several such farms based in the EMR).

   Additionally, major consolidation is also taking place in the processing, farm input, wholesale and retail sectors. In the case of the latter, large-scale retailers with national sourcing and distribution requirements make it extremely difficult for small scale food processors or start ups to overcome the enormous ‘gap’ from operating as a niche player to becoming a regional or a national supplier. This trend contributes to the phenomenon termed as the ‘vanishing middle’ leaving two types of operations: a) large scale enterprises that compete on the basis of volume and competitive pricing; and b) highly specialized smaller scale enterprises that compete on the basis of differentiation (product and/or service) with premium pricing.

3. **Technology and automation** – the availability and adoption of technology is profoundly impacting how businesses operate as well as the very structure of the industry itself. Today’s equipment is bigger, faster and easier to operate as machine automation becomes more dominant; livestock operating systems are also increasingly more automated with such innovations as robotic milkers; feeding and housing systems that require little or no labour. In both the crop and livestock production sectors there is a clear substitution of capital for labour.

   According to Successful Farming\(^9\), the top technologies impacting agriculture include:
   
   (a) Robots as ‘fieldworkers of the future’ driven by machine learning algorithms;

   (b) Drones that can monitor and respond to a wide range of production scenarios including the ability to seek out and spray individual weeds;

---

\(^8\) CIA Handbook, 2012

\(^9\) A major US based farm publication.
(c) Superior sensors able to monitor a host of production conditions including moisture and nutrient levels;
(d) Big data that can be used to power digital services leading to improved management decisions;
(e) Data control systems for precision (or smart) farming;
(f) 3-D printing that will enable the on-site production of machine parts or even foods; and
(g) Artificial intelligence that will drive decision making and optimization to new levels of efficiency.

Furthermore, farm operators are becoming sophisticated business managers (referred to in some circles as CEO farmers). These farmers typically lease large areas of land, employ a range of services such as agronomists, custom applicators, satellite tracking services and can manage their farms remotely using cellular technologies.

Technology advancements also benefit smaller-scale operations. For example, greenhouse and/or warehouse productions systems can be completely automated. Small-scale orchards (apple trees growing much like grapes), can be operated by employing automated systems including harvesting – this vastly reduces the amounts of pesticides and labour required. With the deployment of such enabling technologies, the emergence of smaller enterprises in response to local food demand and specialized markets becomes much more feasible.

4. **The changing food economy** – the food economy and the food system are in state of rapid change. Several dynamics are at play including:

a) **The rise of new market channels** – with changing lifestyles, new technologies (employed by the likes of Uber Eats, Skip the Dishes, etc.), new players such as SPUD, The Organic Box and Amazon, as well as mainline retailers, all provide delivery and on-line services. Consequently, more and more prepared foods, specialty products and/or meals are now being delivered direct to the consumer. Some estimates suggest that nearly 50% of all meals within certain demographic groups such as the ‘millenials’ are being served this way. These developments pose a major challenge for traditional marketers. However, at the same time, they represent new opportunities for entrepreneurs and offer the potential to disrupt established distribution channels as well as mainline retailers.

b) **Alternative proteins** – there is a growing interest and potentially, a significant shift to food products made from alternative proteins driven by the desire to improve or manage health outcomes and growing concerns with animal welfare. Most of these new proteins are coming from plants (pulses) but there is also activity with such novel sources as insects (crickets) and ‘meat’ being produced through the propagation of synthetic proteins. Just recently, Maple Leaf Foods re-positioned itself as a ‘protein’ company, moving away from its historical roots as a meat company – this is a harbinger of the scale and significance of this movement.

Within the food industry, a newly formed organization called The Good Food Institute has emerged – many of its members are mainstream food companies. This rapidly growing sector is working to change the current food system to reduce impacts on climate and the use of resources such as water and grains for livestock feeding. Some of these members are committed to seeing the complete transformation of protein sourcing away from livestock within the next 30 years.

c) **Local food and food experiences** – on the cultural front, there is an increased interest in growing, sourcing and supplying local foods and related services - a trend which is also very evident in the EMR with the growth of new niche food processing companies, new restaurants and events (such as the What the Truck Food Festival). Edmonton is replete with start-ups and interested persons who are bringing new ideas to the market including a commercial food hub that will be offering shared facilities, equipment and marketing services to several compatible companies.
5. **Climate Change** – there is no industry that is more ‘weather’ dependent than agriculture and food production. Without question, climate change is a growing concern – the phenomenon has both positive and negative impacts.

On the positive side, warmer temperatures lengthen the growing season and increase the choice of crops a farmer can consider. As a result, crops such as corn and soybeans are more commonly grown in Alberta including the EMR. Also, on the positive side, the emphasis on carbon capture affords farmers the opportunity to earn carbon credits through improved (reduced) tillage practices, the growing of ‘green’ crops such as pulses and alfalfa crops capable of fixing nitrogen directly into the soil. It should be noted that this market which was initially established in 2006 continues to emerge. An estimated 15% of producers in Alberta are engaged in carbon capture programs.

On the negative side the impacts range from: increased weather volatility including drought, hail, excessive rains, and soil micro biome, etc. All these factors increase the risk associated with production. In response, mitigation strategies become increasingly important including: the choice of crop and varieties better able to withstand stress; land management (for example, minimum or no-till practices have become standard practice); variable rate inputs (the right amounts of seed/fertilizer at the right place at the right time); crop and risk insurance programs, etc. In this regard, the advent of ‘smart’ agriculture is a major enabling factor in responding to the impacts of climate change.

6. **Land use and the issue of conserving agricultural lands** - by 2030, the FAO estimates that urban and industrial areas throughout the world (Asia and Africa in particular) will grow dramatically, expanding onto cropland and undermining the productivity of agricultural systems that are already stressed by rising populations and climate change.

Approximately 60% of the world’s irrigated cropland lies in relative proximity to major cities which is a major concern, since this peripheral habitat is on average, twice as productive as land elsewhere on the globe. “We would expect peri-urban land to be more fertile than average land, as mankind tends to settle where crops can be produced,” says Felix Creutzig from the Mercator Research Institute on Global Commons and Climate Change in Berlin, and principal author of the paper; “However, we were ignorant about the magnitude of this effect.” The agricultural losses they calculated in the study, published in the proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, translates to a 3 to 4% dip in global agricultural production.

At first glance this loss may not appear to be a huge figure but on the regional scale the picture changes. Across countries and different crops, the effects of these losses vary and become more intense. In Africa and Asia especially—which together bear 80% of the projected loss due to rising urbanization in these regions—urban expansion will consign farmers to an even tougher agricultural reality. A major worry surrounding the disappearance of this productive land is the impact it will have on staple crops such as maize, rice, soya beans, and wheat, which are cornerstones of global food security.

Closer to home, the movement to address agricultural land conservation has been slowly growing and intensifying. Significant provincial initiatives in British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec reflect the recognition that a relatively small proportion of their respective land base is suitable for agriculture. This realization for example, led to establishment of the BC’s Agricultural Land Reserve in the 1970s. More recently, the protection of agricultural land has been front and centre in Ontario with the implementation

---

10 Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), United Nations
11 Future Urban Expansion & Implications for Global Croplands, December 2016; Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA

The issues of land use and the preservation of agricultural land continue to grow as a public concern. Within Canada several recent developments bear noting including:

- **A recent Standing Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (March 2018)** - the report entitled “GROWING CONCERN, How to Keep Farmland in the Hands of Canadian Farmers” is in response to growing concerns about the future of farmland, its availability and tenure. Among its several recommendations, two are particularly relevant to the EMR: a) to establish a national research project on farmland protection; and b) work with federal and provincial governments to protect and promote the use of land for agricultural purposes.

- **British Columbia** – the B.C. government is in the midst of revitalizing the Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR). Two objectives have relevance for the EMR: a) preserve the productive capacity of land in the ALR; and b) encourage farming of land in the ALR for uses related to agriculture and food production. In the case of the latter, there is a strong push to limit (prohibit) the use of agricultural properties as building sites for large residences while little or no agriculture activity is taking place – a current loophole that is being addressed.

- **Ontario and Greater Golden Horseshoe** – while strong measures to preserve agricultural land in the ‘Greenbelt’ (or the inner ring surrounding the Greater Toronto Area as it is referred to) have been taken, there are major concerns about the area referred to as the ‘outer ring’ and located in the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH).

A recent study led by the Ontario Federation of Agriculture states unequivocally that the key to a robust agricultural industry is the same everywhere: the protection of the land base on which to farm and to carry out farm related activities. While the Greenbelt Plan has taken steps to provide permanent protection to the agricultural land base (an area of 2.3 million acres), the next ring (another 5.2 million acres) is subject to a “weaker planning framework that leaves farmland vulnerable to urbanization.” The report pulls no punches and advocates for stronger land preservation measures to be taken in this outer ring and makes this statement: “A fresh perspective is needed on farmland in the GGH, one that sees agriculture as a permanent feature of the regional landscape and farming as an essential component of our economy and cultural heritage.”

---

12 Farmland At Risk: Why land-use planning needs improvement for a healthy agricultural future in the Greater Golden Horseshoe, November 2015. Ontario Federation of Agriculture and Environmental Defence.
4.0 Agriculture in the EMR

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a detailed analysis of trends and changes that have taken place across the EMR during the period 2001-16. More than 70 variables, encompassing a wide range of farm business indicators, the cropping mix, livestock populations and speciality enterprises (greenhouses, fruits, vegetables and nursery products), were reviewed. Specifically, the analysis focused on identifying and understanding three dynamics when comparing the EMR to the Province of Alberta:

- Changes similar to the broader trends taking place across the province;
- Positive changes occurring at a greater rate than in the province; and
- Negative changes occurring at a greater rate than in the province.

4.2 EMR Compared to Alberta

4.2.1 EMR Trends Similar to the Provincial Trends

Changes in the structure of farming within the EMR are very similar to the broader trends taking place in Alberta. To summarize: there is a prevailing trend to fewer but larger farms (see Table 4.1), which illustrates that the number of farms has declined by approximately 25% over the 15-year period; at the same time, farm size in terms of average acres farmed has grown by 30%. The biggest changes have occurred in the two financial indicators: (a) Average Capital per Farm – up approximately 250% (invested capital per acre is almost twice the Alberta average at $5,581 vs. $2,863 per acre); and (b) Total Gross Sales – up 75%. The crop mix has also changed, namely a significant increase in canola acres – a reflection of this crop’s relative profitability to other crops. Provincial canola acreage grew by 132% while it grew by 92% in the EMR.

One major difference between EMR farms and the average Alberta farm is size (523 acres vs. 1,237 acres in 2016). This disparity can be explained by major differences in soils and climate. EMR lays in the black soils zone – the most productive soil zone on the Prairies allowing farmers to consider a wide range of crops. By comparison, many Alberta farms and ranches are located in dry land, brown and light brown soil zone areas which are much less productive requiring farms to be larger in order to generate similar incomes.

Table 4.1 Business Indicators Where Changes for EMR and Alberta are Similar: 2001-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Farms</td>
<td>4,736</td>
<td>3,209</td>
<td>-22.2%</td>
<td>53,652</td>
<td>40,638</td>
<td>-24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Farm Size (acres)</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>+32.7%</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>+27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Capital per Farm</td>
<td>$811,000</td>
<td>$2,919,000</td>
<td>+260.1%</td>
<td>$1,030,000</td>
<td>$3,542,000</td>
<td>+243.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Sales</td>
<td>$476.6 M</td>
<td>$838.2 M</td>
<td>+75.8%</td>
<td>$9.9 B</td>
<td>$17.73 B</td>
<td>+78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canola acres</td>
<td>160,164</td>
<td>307,690</td>
<td>+92.1%</td>
<td>2,660,509</td>
<td>6,165,746</td>
<td>+131.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Positive Changes

Areas where the EMR is ‘outpacing’ the rest of Alberta in terms of agriculture include:

- **Number of farms over 1,120 acres** – the EMR saw an increase in this category (up 10%), where the provincial number is down 11.8%. Simply, EMR farms on average are smaller than their provincial counterparts, thus the jump in size in this particular category is more pronounced.

- **Potatoes acres** – in relative terms, potato acreage in the EMR increased by 1.5% compared to a provincial decrease of 7.6%. Arguably this increase can be attributed to unique soil characteristics and micro-climates suitable for this type of crop.

- **Number of vegetable farms** – the number increased by 60% in the EMR vs. the Province where it increased by 24%. It should be noted however, while numbers increased, acreages did not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Farms over 1,120 acres</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>+10.0%</td>
<td>12,552</td>
<td>11,073</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potato Acres</td>
<td>4,004</td>
<td>4,064</td>
<td>+1.5%</td>
<td>58,341</td>
<td>53,912</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Vegetable Farms</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>+60.0%</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>+24.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Negative Changes

The most significant negative changes within the EMR compared to Alberta are taking place in two areas:

- **Livestock populations** (see Table 4.3) – in all major livestock areas, the reduction rate of EMR’s livestock numbers exceed that of the province. Most notable is the poultry category: overall provincial numbers are up 16% while the EMR saw a 28% decline. Cattle, dairy cow and pig numbers are in decline across the province. This trend is accentuated in the EMR– particularly in dairy cows and pigs where the rate of decline is substantially higher that in the province.

- **Specialty enterprises** (see Table 4.4) – five categories are listed: nursery products; greenhouse area; fruits, nuts & berries; vegetables and bees. Three enterprises – nursery products, greenhouse areas and bees have shown increases in Alberta (up 11.7%, 14.7% and 45.7% respectively). However, all these enterprises including fruits, nuts & berries, vegetables and bees have been on the decline in the EMR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pigs (hd)</td>
<td>81,659</td>
<td>19,887</td>
<td>-75.4%</td>
<td>2,027,533</td>
<td>1,462,247</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry (hd)</td>
<td>2,350,845</td>
<td>1,685,508</td>
<td>-27.9%</td>
<td>12,175,246</td>
<td>14,125,401</td>
<td>+16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cattle</td>
<td>265,323</td>
<td>155,129</td>
<td>-41.5%</td>
<td>6,615,201</td>
<td>5,206,999</td>
<td>-21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Cows</td>
<td>12,514</td>
<td>6,888</td>
<td>-45%</td>
<td>84,044</td>
<td>80,014</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 Nursery products typically include shrubs, ornamental plants, trees, hedges. Greenhouses tend to supply either vegetables or bedding plants.
Table 4.4  EMR Specialty Enterprises Decreasing at Faster Rates than Alberta: 2001-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursery (ac)</td>
<td>1,838</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>-21.1%</td>
<td>6,642</td>
<td>7,420</td>
<td>+11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouse area (sq. ft)</td>
<td>1,559,772</td>
<td>1,340,397</td>
<td>-14.1</td>
<td>11,029,753</td>
<td>12,647,517</td>
<td>+14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit, Nuts, Berries (ac)</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>-36.9</td>
<td>2,515</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>-14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables (ac)</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>-56.9</td>
<td>14,194</td>
<td>10,108</td>
<td>-28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bees (colonies)</td>
<td>30,329</td>
<td>24,917</td>
<td>-17.8</td>
<td>209,821</td>
<td>304,846</td>
<td>+45.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.4  Regional Assets and Infrastructure

The EMR is home to a host of world leading institutions and facilities specifically established to support the agriculture and food industry. These include: the University of Alberta with the Faculty of Agriculture, Life and Environmental Sciences (ALES) as well as several research stations including the Edmonton Research Farm, the St. Albert Research Farm, the Botanical Garden and Agri-Food Discovery Place; Alberta Agriculture & Forestry with the Food Processing Development Centre in Leduc and the Crop Development Centre in northeast Edmonton; the NAIT Culinary Program; and the Pioneer DuPont Seed Research Farm in Strathcona County. In addition, the region has a superior set of roadways, rail-lines plus the Edmonton International Airport equipped with the necessary facilities and logistics to ship fresh or frozen food products to destinations around the globe.

---

14  The areas listed reported here do not include the rapidly emerging cannabis sector. In 2017 and 2018, an 800,000 square foot facility is being built in Leduc County at the airport. Parkland County will also be the base for 2 million square feet of new cannabis production.
4.3 Trends within the EMR

Table 4.5 provides a comparative analysis of the EMR to the Province (2001-2016). Using “Total Land in Crops” as a base for comparison (line 4,) any relative percentage that is higher (above 4.4% in 2016) illustrates relative strength for the EMR while percentages below 4.4% illustrates below average for the EMR compared to the rest of Alberta. The most significant trends include:

- The number of farms in the EMR, as a percentage of all farms in the province is down to 7.9% from 8.8% in 2001; or a decline of 32.2% in the region itself.
- The total area farmed as a percentage of all farm area is down to 3.3% compared to 3.6% in 2001;
- Total gross sales are down to 4.6% compared to 4.7% in 2001. Actual gross sales increased by 75.8%;
- The total number of cattle and calves is down to 3.0% vs. 4.0% in 2001 – an actual decline of 41.5%

A series of graphs and charts highlighting the changes within the agricultural sector from 2001 – 2016 within the
EMR are found in Attachment 1. A summary of these graphs and charts are presented below:

- **Farm Business Indicators (Figures 1.1 to 1.3)** – illustrates the clear trend to fewer but larger farms across the EMR, while gross sales for the region have increased by 75% from 2001 to 2016.

- **Area Farmed and Selected Crops (Figures 1.4 to 1.7)** – the total area in crops within the region has declined by 28,000 acres over the 15-year period. Canola has grown to be the major field crop (over 307,000 acres in total) followed by barley (160,000 acres). Peas have also become a major field crop (51,000 acres in 2016 vs. 18,000 acres in 2001). Potatoes grown mostly in Parkland and Sturgeon Counties (just over 4,000 acres in 2016), now represent 7.5% of the overall Alberta potato acreage – a slight increase but indicative of the favourable soils and climate required by this crop and found within the EMR.

- **Livestock Enterprises (Figures 1.8; also see Table 4.5)** – overall livestock numbers are on the decline led by major decreases in inventory from 265,000 head to 155,000 head in 2016 – a decline of 41.5% vs. 21.3% decline for the province. Much of this decline can be attributed to the 2003 BSE crisis in the beef industry and an extended period of poor returns that persisted for almost 10 years.

- **Specialty Enterprises (Figures 1.9 and 1.10)** - the 15-year trend for specialty enterprises illustrate that both vegetable acres and greenhouse area have decreased. For example, greenhouse area has dropped from 1.56 million square feet to 1.34 million square feet – a decline of 14% as of 2016. Note: these statistics do not capture the new greenhouse areas currently being constructed for the emerging cannabis sector.

- **Food Processing and Employment (Table 1.1)** - employment trends in the agriculture production and manufacturing (agriculture and food processing sectors) are illustrated in Table 1.1 (see Attachment 1). Of note are the employment estimates for the food and beverage processing in the EMR – highlighting the increase in the number of employees from 4,000 to 6,000 during the 2001-2016 period. It is estimated that 25% of the provincial food and beverage processing takes place in the EMR – comprised of two major poultry processors, a large oil seed crushing plant, a feed milling sector as well as numerous specialty food processing businesses that have grown to become major national and international players. Total annual revenues (or shipments) are in the order of $3.75 billion to $4 billion annually. By comparison, total food and beverage processing shipments for Alberta in 2016 were $14.6 billion, up from $9.3 billion in 2001 – an increase of 57 percent over the period.

- **Urban Agriculture** - both the City of Edmonton and Strathcona County have committed to the development and implementation of urban agriculture plans. In both cases, interests and activity levels are high. For example, the Edmonton bee keeping program is fully subscribed with 130 applicants; in addition, 50 licenses for backyard hens have been issued. Our interview findings affirm that a new generation of new small-scale food processors, food service providers and food centred events is emerging. As well, the number of Farmers Markets in the region continues to grow: Edmonton has 18 such markets (up from 12 just 6 years ago); there are another 10 or more markets in other communities including Stony Plain, Spruce Grove, St. Albert, Ft. Saskatchewan, Leduc, Devon and Morinville.

15 We advise caution with this statistic in view of how Statistics Canada collects crop acreages and assigns these to the address of the originating producer. Thus, anyone who farms in municipalities out of the region will have that acreage attributed to his or her home municipality. For example, both Strathcona and Sturgeon show actual increases in crop acreage – both municipalities are also home to several large crop producers who farm in other municipalities both in Alberta and Saskatchewan.

16 Specialty enterprises include fruits, nuts & berries, vegetables, greenhouses, nursery products, bee keeping/honey as well as new emerging crops such as hemp and cannabis.
4.4 EMR Profile – An Overview

An overview of the five major municipalities in terms of relative strengths and differences is summarized in Table 4.6 and the accompanying Schematic Profile (see Figure 4.1).

Table 4.6 Profile of the EMR by the Five Major Municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Unique Features/Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strathcona     | • Smallest county in terms of area farmed, number of farms  
• Has lost nearly 32,000 acres in area farmed since 2001.  
• Smallest cattle population (15,000 head); few dairy cows; no pigs)  
• Second largest poultry population (488,705 birds)  
• Third largest horse population (2,100 head)  
• Largest greenhouse area in the EMR (443,000 square feet)  
• Home of the Pioneer-DuPont seed research site  
• Urban agriculture strategy has been adopted and in early stage |
| Leduc          | • The largest county in terms of area farmed; number of farms; the number of farmers under 35.  
• Second largest canola producer (81,000 acres); largest barley producer (60,000 acres)  
• Largest cattle population (58,000 head); largest dairy herd – 4,600 head  
• Largest horse population (2,800 head)  
• Largest area growing nursery products (585 acres)  
• Home of the Food Development Processing Centre (City of Leduc) |
| Parkland       | • Smallest county in terms of total gross sales.  
• Has lost the largest area (100,000 acres) since 2001.  
• Largest potato producer (2,700 acres)  
• Second largest cattle population (47,000 head); 1,000 dairy cows; very few pigs; largest sheep population (8,300 head)  
• Second largest horse population (2,600 head)  
• Largest number of vegetable producers (14)  
• Home of the Devonian Garden – U of A Research Facility |
| Sturgeon       | • Similar to Leduc in terms of area, but largest in terms of overall gross sales, average capital per farm and land in crops  
• Largest canola producer (129,000 acres)  
• Second largest barley producer (48,000 acres)  
• Largest poultry population (969,000 birds)  
• Only county with a hog operation (20,000 head)  
• Largest area growing fruit, nuts and berries (149 acres)  
• Second largest area growing nursery products (447 acres)  
• Home of the U of Alberta Research Farm |
| City of Edmonton| • Base of a large food and agriculture processing sector (estimated product sales of $3.75 billion to $4 billion annually)  
• Estimated 6,000 employees working in the sector  
• Adopted the Edmonton’s Food & Urban Strategy in 2013 (fresh)  
• Urban agriculture plan is gaining momentum – focus on community gardens (75 sites), access to vacant lots, bee keeping (150 participants), backyard chickens (50 licenses issued) |
Figure 4.1: Schematic Profile of the EMR
4.5 Regional Issues

Over the past three years and in the course of preparing agriculture plans or strategies, numerous consultations and individual interviews have been conducted across all the EMR Counties (Strathcona in 2015; Parkland in 2016; Leduc in 2016; and Sturgeon in 2018). Significantly, the concerns raised were strikingly similar. The issues that are most prevalent and common across the Region\(^7\) are summarized as follows:

1. **Agriculture as a low or non-priority** – there is a strong and overriding sense among the farming community that agriculture as an industry has had little to no priority for municipal governments and for the Provincial Government, and accordingly is not valued or even appreciated in terms of its contribution to the economy, to the community or to the environment. This sentiment varies – the view is stronger in some municipalities and less so in others. This concern was raised repeatedly during the course of discussions in every county. According to the farm community, the prevailing focus on the part of counties has been to attract industry, commercial interests and/or more residents. This focus has left the farmers and those involved in the agriculture industry feeling that their sector is a very low priority if it is a priority at all.

2. **Uncertain long-term future for agriculture in the region** – agriculture as a low priority coupled with the steady and the seemingly inevitable expansion of urban development throughout the EMR, is leaving many producers questioning the future of agriculture and indeed their own farm businesses. In other words: “The writing is on the wall!” Livestock producers exhibit the greatest concern – in many cases, expansion is either exceedingly difficult or impossible due to minimum distance requirements and the emergence of non-farm rural residents that has taken place in recent years. Some crop producers have already begun the process of transition by purchasing and/or leasing farmland in more distant municipalities. Many are of the view that it is only a matter of time before the land being farmed in the EMR will be bought and sub-divided for development purposes.

3. **Ongoing rural-urban frictions** – the growing number of non-farm rural residents juxtaposed to fewer but larger farm operations is leading to increased tension between farmers and non-farm residents. The major complaint heard is the lack of appreciation for and understanding of agriculture. Thus, the range and intensity of complaints is on the rise and include issues pertaining to dust, noise, odours, operating hours and dangerous traffic conditions when farmers are transporting large pieces of equipment on local roads as they move from site to site or haul input supplies or harvested grain.

4. **The ‘Right to Farm’** – a growing sense of vulnerability is rising within the farming community specific to their ability to farm and perform a range of necessary operations. The concerns are especially evident during such intense seasonal periods as seeding and harvesting. Simply put, the agriculture community feels outnumbered and undervalued. A major concern is their declining political influence in a changing community. Some are openly questioning: “Are we going to face a movement (or an anti-farm Council) that may actually restrict our ability to farm?”

5. **The need to conserve agricultural land** - no issue is more contentious than or as potentially divisive as the subject of preserving agricultural land. Two major questions prevail: (a) should agricultural land be preserved? And (b) if yes, how should this be done?

There are two very distinct points of view with respect to the land preservation issue.

---

\(^7\) Well over 500 people contributed to these consultations over the course of the various planning projects undertaken across the EMR.
a) On the one hand, farmers who plan to farm for the long term, support the principle of preserving good agricultural land – which means the need to limit fragmentation and small land parcels amid farming areas as well as the encroachment of non-farm rural residents.; and

b) On the other hand, there is considerable support to maintain the current subdivision policies and not restrict land owners from realizing the financial benefits from their ability to sub-divide. This ability remains a potential source of revenue – strongly supported by farmers who are approaching retirement.

6. **Land Use and Zoning** – the issue of zoning is inextricably related to the land preservation issue. Generally, there is agreement that agriculture requires areas or zones that are designated as priority areas for the long term. Some municipalities have already begun to move in this direction.

Two major questions underlie this issue however:

a) How to reduce and/or mitigate land fragmentation? and

b) How to manage expectations now that the ability to subdivide properties is seen as a ‘right’ and in many cases may already have been capitalized into the value of the land?

7. **Top soil removal and reclamation** – the continued expansion of urban development on agricultural land ultimately results in the removal of top soil from the source lands. Top soil is a non-renewable resource and should not be wasted - a sentiment expressed by numerous rural stakeholders during the course of recent consultations and area meetings. Given this reality and in view of continued development in the EMR, there is both the opportunity and the need to develop a pro-active top soil removal and reclamation best practices plan for the region. Such a plan would address the manner in which top soil is removed, stored, and ultimately placed on lower productivity areas or sites. To be clear, this is a highly technical process – it requires carefully stripping practices to ensure that soil layers are removed and stored separately; soils must also be stored in such a manner that organic and micro-organism loss is minimized; and finally receiving sites need to prioritized and prepared in advance to ensure maximum advantage that can be gained by top soil reclamation.

8. **Opportunities and challenges with value added/diversification** – there is considerable interest and good intentions to develop opportunities in the areas of local food, food experiences, value-added food and agriculture processing opportunities. Nevertheless, the pathways for success remain unclear. While there are several examples of successful ventures that have developed over the past twenty years, overall progress in value added development has been limited. The barriers are considerable:

a) The challenges associated with start-ups;

b) Business management – particularly sales and marketing experience;

c) Accessing existing market channels; and

d) Creating new market opportunities either domestic or export.

Furthermore, attracting and/or training the required business and management skills are identified as a significant challenge. There is a growing interest among a new generation of local food advocates to produce food locally. However, the cost of land in the EMR for most of these proponents is prohibitive. (Note: we conducted 23 interviews with individuals either working in or very familiar with food processing/value added sector. More detailed comments are found in Attachment 3).

9. **Complex Regulatory Environment** – the regulatory requirements for agriculture and agri-food/business are viewed as complex and, in many cases, onerous. There were numerous concerns about the multiple
and different levels of regulation (municipal, provincial and federal). As well as, questions about basic definitions: What is defined as agriculture? What is considered agri-business? What is agri-tourism? What is permitted? And what is not permitted and why? The regulatory challenge is complicated by several factors:

a) the changing face of agriculture resulting in new people wanting to do new things that have not been traditionally viewed as ‘agriculture’ and certainly not traditional farm production;

b) well-meaning proponents who are generally unfamiliar with the nature and degree of the regulations that must be addressed - particularly the case with food processing or preparation requiring a host of health, sanitation and facility standards which are either provincial and/or federal (CFIA) depending on the marketing objectives of the proponent; and

c) the general ethos and style of regulatory bodies or planning departments – typically proponents deal with staff that are neither particularly helpful nor able to provide the full or ‘one stop’ solution that is being sought. Thus, the levels of frustration in dealing with regulations can be very high.

This is a complex area requiring a lot of special attention to address. The key point to be made at this stage of the RAMP development process is: the need for a more ‘customer service’ orientated regulatory environment to enable the emergence and growth of new value added and diversification agri-food/businesses. Furthermore, the need for a ‘one-stop’ regulatory shop imbued with a service culture and willing to pro-actively deal with proponents would go a long way to deal with this general barrier.

10. The lack of a ‘Voice’ for the Agriculture and Food Industry – a key concern to advance any strategies or initiatives for food and agriculture in the EMR is the need for advocacy and support. The lack of a voice for agriculture or for the food industry has been consistently identified. The comments repeatedly stressed, how fragmented and disconnected the sector really is. The reasons are many. For example, the actual numbers of farmers are few; most are aligned with commodity groups or marketing boards which typically have provincial mandates and generally are not integrated. Food processors meanwhile are running flat out just to stay on top of their businesses. Thus, few farmers or food industry personnel have the time or energy to devote to broader industry concerns. Overall, no organization exists to provide this leadership.

11. Other issues – several additional issues raised by individuals or small groups emerged over the course of the consultation process. These include such concerns as:

- **Water** - the availability and timing of water for agriculture production is expected to grow into the future. These concerns are being driven by climate change and the increased incidence of weather extremes (drought and heat). In those areas of Sturgeon, Parkland and Leduc Counties where potatoes and other specialty crops are being grown, the need for irrigation systems and the associated infrastructure is frequently mentioned.

- **Annexation** - currently, several annexation processes are underway in the EMR. We are not in a position to comment on the need or rationale for these applications. Based on input received from rural stakeholders, these annexations send a clear message to the agriculture and food community – any agricultural lands near to urban development regardless of quality, can be consumed by urban municipalities at any time.

- **Ecological Goods & Services** – as the major steward of the land, farmers are major carbon sequesters, managers of soil quality, and the guardians of large forested areas, wetlands, the water table, and biodiversity in general. Yet they receive little or no reward for their
contributions for these efforts in what is commonly referred to as “ecological goods & services.”

Indeed, farmers can be major contributors and mitigators on climate change through tillage practices, planting ‘green’ crops, maintaining wetlands as well as other conservation or preservation activities. Note: Alternative Land Use Services (ALUS) and Ducks Unlimited are examples of such initiatives. ALUS remains in the early stage and modest in terms of the financial incentives that are being provided.

- **Property rights** – the issue of property rights is complex and deeply embedded in the rural zeitgeist. There are strong views among farmers who feel that they have the ‘right’ to do with their property as they please and the ‘right’ to sell to the highest bidder for whatever purpose when they are ready to sell. In actuality, this is not the case. While many industrialized countries including the USA have guaranteed property rights within their constitutions, Canada has not done so. Further while common law tradition recognizes outright expropriation (or the change in zoning or bylaws within an existing zone) should never occur without compensation, Canadian governments have given themselves the power, through the passage of laws and regulations, to expropriate private property without consultation or compensation.

This differs markedly from the USA whereby The Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, passed in 1791, provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation. The courts in the United States have interpreted "property" within the meaning of this constitutional provision to include the traditional types of property, such as tangible assets like real property or land. Thus, compensation in the event of expropriation or a change in land use zoning is standard practice. Compensation may also occur on rare occasions for a change in land use zoning.

That being said, the prevailing view of property rights in rural Canada along with expectations regarding what can be done with farm property is a complicating and contentious factor with rural land use planning. This issue will need to be addressed as the RAMP planning process moves forward.
5.0 Municipal Policies and Planning Context

5.1 Introduction

The current planning framework in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region and how agriculture fits in requires an understanding of the provincial, regional, and municipal policies which influenced its evolution over time to the present. A detailed review beginning with the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission (established in 1950) to the recently approved Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Board growth plan is presented in Attachment 2. This review includes the provincial land use framework and the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan.

5.2 Comparison of Regional and Municipal Policies

As part of the Situation Analysis, a matrix has been completed which compares the municipal agriculture related policies of the four counties (Leduc, Parkland, Strathcona, and Sturgeon) and the City of Edmonton (see Attachment 2.) The urban municipalities within the counties were not included.

The plans were compared across 22 factors to identify similarities and differences for the purpose of developing a comprehensive view of the sector is supported across the EMR. Below are some of the key points of comparison across the municipalities.

Vision

The respective ‘visions’ for each of the major agricultural municipalities and the City of Edmonton are presented below:

Visions for Agriculture Across the EMR

**Strathcona County** as ‘Canada’s most livable community’ is distinguished by its agricultural heritage that builds on history and responds to opportunities as a leader in the Capital Region in the provision of a broad range of agricultural and food opportunities as well as services to one of Canada’s fastest growing metropolitan regions.

**Leduc County:** A vibrant and resilient agri-food future built on a proud agriculture history.

**Parkland County:** A vibrant agriculture and food community characterized by its diversity, creativity and entrepreneurship, focused on sustainability as well as new opportunities.

**Sturgeon County:** The ‘Heart’ of Agriculture for the Region

**COE Fresh:** Edmonton has a resilient food and agriculture system that contributes to the local economy and the overall cultural, financial, social and environmental sustainability of the city.
Guiding Principles

Overall, the guiding principles for agriculture across the municipalities are generally quite similar both in terms of intentions and tone. There are subtle differences between the major thrusts of each of the various plans. In some cases, the difference is more one of emphasis (focusing more narrowly on managing land vs. a broader view of community) or from perspective (urban vs. rural), or different historical perspectives. Differences are mostly by omission, not by opposing viewpoints.

Overall, at this high level of policy, there is acknowledgement that there are important "agricultural resources" in the region and efforts should be made to ensure and enhance its diversity and vibrancy, resiliency and sustainability, creativity and entrepreneurship.

There are several key principles that should comprehensively drive the regional agricultural master plan:

- The diversity of agriculture can make an important economic contribution in the local to global marketplace.
- The historical and cultural/social aspects are important in maintaining a high quality rural lifestyle and community character.
- Environmental sustainability of the rural landscape is important.
- The food system is an important perspective to consider.

Implications for the RAMP: Developing a ‘shared vision’ for agriculture and the future role, look and ‘feel’ of agriculture and food within the region is the critical starting point. Once this is in place and agreed to, the planning process becomes much easier.

Prime Land

There is acknowledgment of the differing qualities of soil throughout the region although different rating concepts are used: Land Suitability Rating System (LSRS), Canada Land Inventory (CLI), and Farmland Assessment Rating (FAR). Regardless of the relative merits of each system, the planning policies focus attention on the higher capability lands (sometimes referred to as 'prime'). However, it should be noted that attention should be given to 'unique farmlands' that have usefulness to produce specific high-value food and fiber crops because of characteristics.

Implications for the RAMP: The EMRB will need to provide clear direction on which rating system(s) will be used and for what purposes and the role of different land areas within the overall agricultural and food sector.

Land Use Zones

There are a variety of agricultural zones defined across the EMR. Generally, there is one all-purpose agricultural zone that has been used to support traditional agriculture–sometimes different zones for larger and smaller agricultural holdings. The multiple-purpose zones are sometimes supplemented by a 'holding' zone generally designed to limit subdivision and uses that would interfere with future urban development. These zones tend to have a very broad range of uses (either permitted or discretionary), including residential uses or others that aren't really soil based, which tend to have inherent differences with agriculture and, perhaps, are not consistent with long term priority agricultural areas. In addition, there is a question about the range of agricultural-related uses (support, service, agri-tourism, etc.) that should be provided for.

Implications for the RAMP: The implications are like the previous two sub-sections. There may be a case to agree to a common set of agricultural zones across the Region. However, there may be a need for special zones (or overlays) that might apply to unique or special locational circumstances.
Conversion of Agricultural Lands

There are several approaches:

1. A recognized intent to permanently designate large contiguous agricultural areas so agriculture can thrive on both large and small holdings;
2. Development of better lands should only be where there are no reasonable alternatives (as a last resort) and the impact on agriculture is minimized;
3. Pressure can be taken off these areas by requiring higher densities, directing development to other suitable locations (lower capability lands, existing urban centres) where possible, transferring development rights and clustering;
4. Development of agricultural areas should be phased so that agriculture remains as long as possible; and
5. Some lands that are currently designated for non-agricultural uses (such as large areas of country residential) could be re-designated to agriculture.

Implications for the RAMP: The protection and preservation of agricultural lands requires a broader range of tools than what has been employed in other jurisdictions to date. The most decisive of these would be a policy to ‘freeze’ lands like approaches taken in British Columbia’s Agricultural Land Reserve (ALR) and Ontario (Greenbelt). Such measures are politically challenging. Other more nuanced tools include transfer of development credits; conservation easements; establishing farmland trusts; and clustering development in areas of lower land quality. There is legislation in Alberta, such as the Land Stewardship Act (ALSA) to facilitate this. Specific to a policy enabling the transfer of development rights, a major issue to consider will be the ability and/or the desirability to allow transfers from municipality to municipality.

Lots and Sizes

Traditional zoning practice throughout the region is that 80 acres is an acceptable minimum size for most agriculture, although some municipalities propose or allow smaller agricultural holdings. Approaches range from Strathcona where a quarter section can be split into halves or a smaller residential parcel can be subdivided out; other Counties allow the creation of up to four parcels per quarter section, in a variety of formats (Parkland for example allows 4-40-acre parcels or 4 smaller residential parcels).

Implications for the RAMP: The impact on agriculture and farming operations of differing lot sizes will need to be addressed. Lot sizes should be addressed in accordance to associated land use (i.e. Ag Acreages). For example, if a lot is being used as a residence only, then a maximum size may be prescribed. However, if the lot is being used for agricultural or food production purposes, a larger size may be allowed.

Economic Development

There is widespread support for increasing the economic development potential of the agricultural sector. Most plans are supportive of “value-added agriculture” and the “diversification of agriculture” as major goals. The suggested opportunities are extensive—from agri-tourism and to energy creation to specialized livestock and local food initiatives. However, there are little in the way of concrete initiatives and implementation strategies for this economic development goal.

Implications for the RAMP: A major challenge facing the EMRB will be to adopt and implement an economic development plan that can stimulate and enable the growth of the regional food and agriculture industry.

Three distinct strategies will be required:

1. Ensuring the ability of traditional forms of production to continue (grains, oilseeds, dairy, beef, pork, poultry etc.);
2. Stimulating and/or supporting new ventures that are emerging in response to local food demand; and
3. Building the core of regional and nationally focused agri-food enterprises that have successfully emerged over the past 20 years.
Current State of Plans and Policies

A comparison of the current zoning, any changes (or proposed changes) to the MDP, and the sub-division policies for each of the Counties is presented in Table 5.1. This summary provides important background and context as the RAMP planning process moves forward to ascertain common zones or sub-areas across the region.

In addition, Table 5.2 outlines policy directions and plans for each of the counties. It can be seen that several counties are currently in the process of completing plans, reviewing zones or sub-areas or in some cases reviewing their MDPs.

Two municipalities, namely the City of Edmonton and Strathcona County have developed and implemented urban agriculture strategies. In both cases, the strategy remains early stage and focuses on community gardens, bees and chickens (Note: Strathcona County has made the decision not to allow backyard chickens in view of the disease risk these may pose to the County's poultry sector). An overview of the urban agriculture plans are presented in Table 5.3.

The remaining urban centres have not yet taken any specific strategies or plans specific to urban agriculture or are in the very early stages. Many of these centres however, host very active Farmers' Markets. Further input and discussion will be received from the urban stakeholders during the next stage of the RAMP development process.
Table 5.1  Comparison of Agriculture Land Use Policies by County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Leduc</th>
<th>Parkland</th>
<th>Strathcona</th>
<th>Sturgeon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Agriculture Zoning or Sub-Areas</td>
<td>As per existing MDP, two designated areas:</td>
<td>Three Prime Agriculture Areas:</td>
<td>The MDP identifies two areas:</td>
<td>Agriculture – General encompasses 80% of the County’s lands. Overall the County is divided into 10 neighbourhoods primarily defined by soil classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Area A: generally east of Beaumont, Nisku and Leduc</td>
<td>· South East for large parcels</td>
<td>· Agriculture Small Holdings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Area B: the remainder of the County.</td>
<td>· West for large parcels</td>
<td>· Agriculture Large Holdings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture areas are rated based on FAR scores: 41% and over and under 41%</td>
<td>· Small Holdings (10 to 40 acres).</td>
<td>As well, the Beaver Hills Policy Area also provides opportunities for agriculture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Changes to MDPs (planned or in progress)</td>
<td>Proposing four agricultural areas:</td>
<td>In the process of exploring implementation tools for these areas:</td>
<td>The MDP adopted in September of 2017 has numerous agriculture related policies (both rural and urban), including expansion of agriculture definitions.</td>
<td>MDP review is in progress further to the completion of the Agriculture Engagement Strategy. Currently no formal planned/in progress changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Area A - broad range of ag. (crop &amp; grazing)</td>
<td>· Large parcels for grazing</td>
<td>Implementation are now being worked on, a number of which relate to agriculture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Area B - extensive field crops</td>
<td>· Large parcels for crops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Area C - focus on CFOs (dairy) but also includes crops and grazing</td>
<td>· Agriculture areas that are sensitive to environment areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Area D – small holdings (16 ha [40 acre] parcels) for agricultural use.</td>
<td>· Small holdings areas for specialty and horticulture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision policy (general overview)</td>
<td>As per existing MDP: Limited to one lot on high capability land (over 41% FAR).</td>
<td>Each 160 acre parcel can be subdivided into 4 titled areas in a variety of formats.</td>
<td>In the Agriculture Large Holdings and Beaver Hills Policy Areas – a first parcel out of an unsubdivided quarter section can be considered, consisting of: an equal split; a residential parcel; or a split along a natural or man-made severance. In the Agriculture Small Holdings Policy Area, the minimum parcel size is 8.0 ha (20 acres) with a 200 m minimum width.</td>
<td>Maximum density for 160 acres is 4 parcels. Policy shall ensure that subdivision layout contains 2 Agricultural Parcels and 2 acreage lots (usually 2 x 80 acres and 2 residential lots).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As per draft MDP: One parcel per quarter – 32 ha (80 acre) split; farmstead (size limited to 1 ha or buildings and shelterbelt assoc. with residence); or residential (bare land 1 ha in size) depending on Agricultural Area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2  Policy Directions and Programs by County
### Situation Analysis: July 2018
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leduc</th>
<th>Parkland</th>
<th>Strathcona</th>
<th>Sturgeon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri-business encouraged county-wide in agricultural hubs (concentrated nodes) AIA generally required for non-ag development proposals.</td>
<td>County offers ALUS (Alternative Land User Services) – an incentive program for farmers to provide ecological goods &amp; services.</td>
<td>Planning and Development Services and Agricultural Services work closely together on policy updates such as the MDP and on the implementation of AMP items.</td>
<td>Agricultural Support Strategy report scheduled to be completed in Q4 2018. Also currently assessing ALUS program and applicability to Sturgeon County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced number of dwellings per quarter.</td>
<td>Agriculture Services is referred on all planning related applications for input.</td>
<td>All proposed subdivision applications within the municipality are reviewed by Agriculture Services for input.</td>
<td>Established Agricultural Services Board Serves as an advisory body to Council on agriculture-related matters with a goal to promote, enhance and protect the viability of the agricultural industry in Sturgeon County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize conversion and/or fragmentation of ag through site design.</td>
<td>There is an increased role of Agriculture Services as technical experts when developing agriculture related planning policies.</td>
<td>Established Agricultural Services Board Serves as an advisory body to Council on agriculture-related matters with a goal to promote, enhance and protect the viability of the agricultural industry in Sturgeon County.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County also offering ALUS (Alternative Land User Services) – an incentive program for farmers to provide ecological goods &amp; services.</td>
<td>Urban Agriculture Strategy developed and accepted in 2016 is now being implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.3  Urban Agriculture Policies and Strategies: City of Edmonton and Strathcona County

|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **Strategic Directions/Strategy Areas** | 1. Establish the Edmonton Food Council  
2. Provide Food Skill Education and Information  
3. Expand Urban Agriculture  
4. Develop Local Food Infrastructure Capacity  
5. Grow Local Food Supply and Demand  
6. Enliven the Public Realm Through a Diversity of Food Activities  
7. Treat Food Waste as Resource  
8. Support Urban Farms and Ecological Approaches to Farming  
9. Integrate Land for Agriculture | 1. Community Gardens  
2. Public Agriculture and Edible Landscaping  
3. Urban Farming  
4. School Agriculture Program  
5. Urban Livestock  
6. Home Gardens  
7. Education and Coordination |
| **Progress to Date**       | Edmonton Food Council was established in 2013. The focus to date has been largely on developing by-laws to enable urban agriculture – particularly bees and backyard chickens. The Council is working to support more local markets as well as assisting new entrants to obtain licenses and permits. It is also working to support urban farmers and ecological approaches to farming.  
Significantly, the City of Edmonton has made “Food and Urban Agriculture” one of the 9 strategic goals in the MDP. The stated goal is to develop “A Resilient Food and Urban Agriculture System.” The MDP outlines several requirements:  
- Prevent premature fragmentation of agricultural lands in the urban growth areas prior to expansion.  
- Preparation of Area Structure Plans in the Northeast, Southeast and Southwest Urban Growth Areas that adhere to the Citywide Food and Agriculture Strategy. These plans are to include a peri-urban agricultural section. | Agriculture Strategy was adopted by Council in 2016. Implementation has begun. A Community Garden Policy was accepted in 2017 and 10 new gardens have been established since. Other projects underway include school agriculture and edible landscaping. |
6.0 Suite of Principles

The analysis of regional and municipal plans and policies reveal that a common ‘suite of principles’ to build the RAMP are in place albeit with differing emphasis or priorities across the region.

First, addressing the opportunity to grow the agriculture and food industry including the requirement to conserve agricultural land is generally comprised of four elements:

- Exploring opportunities to grow the economic contribution of agriculture and food
- Incorporating historical & cultural aspects for the agricultural community
- Sustaining the environmental quality of the rural landscape
- Emphasizing the agriculture and food system perspective (food security).

The major and consistent thrust of current regional and municipal policy is that a supply of land (with subtle differences about quality, prime, long term, contiguous size, large and small parcels, etc.) should be maintained (or protected, preserved or conserved, used only as a last resort etc.) and not developed for other uses for a period of time (from development, long term, etc.).

Second, the common elements that can be used to build a guiding suite of principles are as follows:

1. Recognize the importance of a long term assured land base on which the agriculture and food sector can operate without undue hindrance or limitations. This in turn requires policy direction in three critical areas:
   a. Identify the actual areas that define the long term secure agricultural land base
   b. Minimize fragmentation of agricultural land in the defined areas
   c. Minimize conversion of agricultural land to other uses

2. To promote the economic development, value-added and diversification of the agriculture and food sector as a major economic driver

3. To accommodate compatible and supportive land use in agricultural areas including wetlands, environmentally sensitive areas and woodlands.

4. To support agriculture with appropriate hard and soft infrastructure—including physical assets, economic development programs, and leadership development

5. To manage and reduce issues between agriculture and other uses

**Implications for the RAMP:** It will be critical to define and subsequently agree on a ‘suite of principles’ that are common across the Region. Again the ‘shared vision’ and the long-term intentions to be achieved by the shared vision serve as the key starting point.
7.0 Observations and Implications

7.1 Observations

1. **The Agriculture & Food Sector is valued within the EMR** - agriculture, food production and the visible presence of farming operations as an integral part of the EMR community fabric appears to be highly valued by all the regional stakeholders. The position is supported by the 'Vision' statements that have been generated by all four major agricultural municipalities and the City of Edmonton. The vision statements reflect an extensive body of input and consultation from a wide range of stakeholders and residents across the Region.

2. **Agriculture and Food in the EMR has strong growth potential** - input received from twenty-three food industry representatives strongly support aspirations that the EMR can become a bigger player in terms of being a 'Food and Agriculture' centre. Many of the interviewees expressed optimism specific to numerous opportunities regarding export demand, interests in local food, examples of companies that serve as 'success' models, and an emerging entrepreneurial class actively developing new ventures in this space.

   In addition, the legalization of cannabis has stimulated major new investments in greenhouse production and the processing of hemp. It should also be noted that many of those interviewed expressed frustration that 'Agriculture and Food' has not received more focus as a strategic industry sector capable of generating economic growth and employment – a foremost objective for the Province of Alberta.

3. **Agriculture and Food Sector is positioned to be an Economic Generator and GDP Growth** - perhaps one of the Region’s biggest strengths is the size of the food and agricultural processing industry. Approximately 25% of the total provincial industry (as measured by the number of employees working in the sector) is located within the Region. The EMR is home to two major poultry processors (Sofina, Maple Leaf Foods) a large feed milling sector, a major oil seed crushing plant, a major terminal elevator well as several specialty food processors including Alyia’s, Capital Packers, Champion Pet Foods, Heritage Foods, Hempco, Kinickkinick, Kitchen Partners, Little Potato Company and Siwin Foods. Several of these companies exceed $100 million in annual revenues.

4. **Resilience and Sustainability of Agriculture Sector** - agricultural production in the EMR is undergoing rapid change. Like the province (and elsewhere) the trend is to fewer but larger farms. Overall, the changes in the region’s crop mix reflect the changes taking place in the province. Two indicators differ (a) livestock populations and the actual number of farms are decreasing more rapidly; and (b) specialty enterprises are also on the decline.

   The reduced levels of livestock (particularly pigs) are not surprising in view of proximity to urban development and the major restructuring that has taken place within the pork sector. However, the relatively small acreages of vegetables, fruits and greenhouse production are indicative of the challenges that local operators are facing with respect to viability, accessing current market channels and/or in developing direct market opportunities.

5. **Need for Certainty** - based on the consultations, many farmers themselves feel less certain about their long-term future in view of the growing development pressures coming both from industry, commercial and residential growth. Not surprisingly, this viewpoint varies by proximity to urban developments. The closer these farms are, the greater the concern. But this concern is not limited to those farmers located near to urban centres or industrial developments. Rural sub-divisions and the encroachment of non-farm
rural residents located in agricultural areas are also a major concern. In response, some of these farmers have already begun transitioning their operations and land base out of the EMR. The steady decline in livestock populations over the past 15 years is further testimony of this transition to the extent that large tracts of land are required for forage/silage production and the spreading of manure free from obstructions and complaints.

6. **Rural – Urban frictions** - a major and growing concern among the farming community is the increase in rural-urban frictions. There are strong feelings that agriculture is not understood and at best is ‘misunderstood.’ As the non-farm rural population increases, so do the issues and concerns. Furthermore, farmers are concerned about being outnumbered. Consequently, there is considerable support for ‘Right to Farm’ policies that assure farmers of their ability to undertake the necessary and timely operations fundamental to their farms.

7. **Increasing Land Values** - the long-term availability and affordability of land and the ability to operate are major concerns to many farmers in the EMR. In many cases, the value of the land exceeds the value of the agricultural operations taking place on it. Availability and affordability are also major barriers for new entrants – both established producers who are seeking to continue conventional farming operations and potential entrants who are interested in establishing new operations to supply the growing demand for local food and food experiences.

8. **Need to Build Consensus among stakeholders** - measures taken to preserve agricultural land will receive mixed support from most farmers and landowners. While many support efforts to preserve good agricultural land, at the same time, there are concerns that overly restrictive policies may impact property values – a concern for those farmers who are planning to retire soon.

9. **Need to remove Barriers to enable growth in Value added Agriculture** - while new agricultural, food and value-added enterprises such as food processing, equine operations, market gardens, horticultural, specialty crops or agri-tourism offer potential within the EMR, the path forward to success remains unclear and replete with risks and barriers.

Overall, value added and new enterprise development in the Region (and the Province) has been modest. Furthermore, despite the strong interest in food and sourcing locally, the statistics illustrate that growth of the local food sector to date has been modest at best. Nevertheless, it remains a future opportunity for the Region.

### 7.2 Implications

1. **Agreed to definition of Agriculture** - the review of the trends combined with a review of the literature, the changes in technology and first-hand input from the food and agriculture sector affirms that agriculture is changing, and it is changing fast. Thus, a first step to be taken in the planning process is to ensure that a broad definition of agriculture is defined, understood and applied. Agriculture is now far more than the traditional family farm – it ranges from large scale family corporations farming thousands of acres to small scale service-based speciality enterprises that may be involved in production and focus on the provision of customer experience.

2. **Ongoing Education and Awareness** - the agriculture and food industry tomorrow will be markedly different from what it has been in the past. Several of the changes have been noted earlier. However, two areas warrant further attention: “Smart Agriculture” and “Smart Food.”
• **Smart Agriculture** can be summarized by one driving imperative: “No Molecule is Wasted”. Driven by economics and enabled by technology, smart agriculture is effectively bringing what has been referred to as “Precision Agriculture” to a new level. Technical and management systems are now available to deal with every farm, every field and indeed every square meter uniquely. All of this is data driven – top down using satellite imagery; yields maps; imagery; drones; the use of sensors, monitoring; as well as bottom up – the continuous flow of data from the soil, topography and local weather. The consequences are significant: improved economic performance; and reduced environmental impacts. Nutrient run-off or pesticide drift will become concerns of the past.

• **Smart Food** involves the development and selection of foods that have been validated to provide desired health effects or performance. This includes: targeted nutrition research that identifies compounds in foods that interact with longevity genetic pathways (smart food compounds); validates the effects of “smart food compounds” and “smart foods” in disease prevention and cure; and develops “smart food compounds” into dietary supplements or pharmaceutical drugs.

3. **Raise the Profile and Instil a higher Value for Agriculture** - the EMR has the opportunity to “establish itself” as a major centre for agriculture and food. In this regard, the Region is replete with numerous assets to actualize this opportunity: excellent soils; a favourable climate; a high performing farming sector; a strong processing sector with several players who have developed unique products and markets; excellent supporting infrastructure including the University of Alberta (Faculty of Agriculture Life and Environmental Sciences with several regional based research facilities such as the Research Farm in Sturgeon County and Devonian Garden in Parkland County and an internationally renowned nutrition research group), NAIT with its culinary program, and Alberta Agriculture & Forestry including the Food Product Development Centre and Crop Development Centre (CDC North). In addition, several initiatives are emerging to build momentum in this area such as the Food and Agri-Business Initiative led by the City of Edmonton, the Local Food Act led by the Province of Alberta and the Supercluster Initiative supporting Protein Industries Canada led by Industry Science and Economic Development (ISED), Government of Canada.

4. **A commitment to Agricultural Land Preservation to meet future needs** - a major limiting factor to the realization of the Food and Agriculture opportunity for the EMR is the long-term availability of agricultural land. However, the specific requirements and issues pertaining to land vary by the differing segments. For example:

• Crop Producers who produce forages, grains, oilseeds and pulse crops require large areas of contiguous agricultural land to operate efficiently. Furthermore, they require that these lands are available in the long term. The shorter (or the more uncertain) the term, the less attention is paid to soil quality and maintaining long term fertility.

• Specialized crop producers such as potato growers require specialized soils and micro-climates. For example, potatoes perform best when grown on sandier soils and with access to water (irrigation).

• Vegetables, fruits and other specialized produce for local food demand require high quality, well drained soils and access to water for irrigation. Much of these can take place on small parcels (1 to 10 acres). Many of these growers (or would be growers) are simply unable to afford the purchase of such lands nor are such parcels readily available on a lease basis close to the City of Edmonton.
5. **An undertone of uncertainty** - at first glance, agriculture in the region appears to be holding its own. However, the consultation process across the EMR while conducting the four municipal agriculture plans clearly indicates that the agriculture and food system is less than stable and may be reaching a tipping point. It is already evident that livestock production is exiting from the EMR. Furthermore, speciality enterprises even in the shadow of a large urban market are not showing signs of growth, rather the reverse. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, crop producers expressed strong concerns about the ability to operate their businesses in view of the increasing encroachment by non-farm rural residents and urban based issues (traffic, theft, complaints regarding dust, noise, sprays, manure etc.). Some have already begun to secure lands for farming outside the EMR. Should encroachment and issues increase and the size and shape of available lands becoming limiting, these operators will choose to farm outside of the region. Thus, the prospect that significant tracts of land not being cropped or underutilized is foreseeable.

6. **Enabling the Growth of Value added Food Sector** - the emergence of new value-added enterprises whether these are production, processing or service based will not come easy. The barriers are substantial. History has shown that successes have been few; the many initiatives applied to this area have yielded modest results. However, it should also be said that food and agriculture has never been a strategic focus for the City of Edmonton or the Edmonton Metropolitan Region. The question remains: what can be accomplished with a vision, focus and the long-term commitment of resources?

7. **Consistent Decision – making** - the process of developing the EMR Land Evaluation and Site Assessment process, one of the key deliverables for the RAMP, remains early stage. However, much can be learned from Lancaster County, Pennsylvania (see Text Box next page). Lancaster County has successfully preserved 110,000 acres (nearly one-third of the arable acreage – much of this is located in close proximity to urban development.

The County takes a comprehensive approach to agricultural land preservation and applies several tools that work together:

1. agricultural zoning and clear urban growth boundaries;
2. prioritization of parcels to be preserved using the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment program that is customized for Lancaster County;
3. the purchase of conservation easements by the Agriculture Preserve Board or the Lancaster Farmland Trust;
4. the trading of development credits from farms to designated urban growth areas (towns, villages and ‘qualified crossroads’).

8. **Establishing Limits on Urban Growth** - Finally, the analysis and recommendations offered by a recent review\(^{18}\) of the Ontario Greater Golden Horseshoe area are very instructive. First it is noted that the growth pressures, issues and industry dynamics which operates outside the Greenbelt are very similar to the EMR. The review makes some very clear statements with respect to agriculture and its importance as a major driver of the Ontario economy. For example:

- The key to a robust agricultural industry is the same everywhere: the protection of the land base on which to farm and to carry out farm related activities.

---

\(^{18}\) Farmland at Risk: Why land-use planning needs improvement for a healthy agricultural future in the Greater Golden Horseshoe, November 2015. Ontario Federation of Agriculture and Environmental Defence.
As urban development encroaches on agricultural land and the urban envelope expands onto farmland without adequate buffers or when non-agricultural uses are permitted in rural areas, normal farm practices are disrupted, and the long-term viability of farming is impacted.

Planners and key decision makers are often “deaf” to the concerns of the farming community. Furthermore, there is little to no understanding of the agricultural systems that are in place and spatially specific and how new developments or infrastructure projects can irreparably damage these systems to the detriment of the farming community.

The current planning framework is weak and leaves farmland vulnerable to urbanization. Currently farmland in this critical agricultural area of Ontario is considered “tarmac in waiting.”

As stated earlier in this document, the report calls for a new approach to planning in this region summed as follow: “A fresh perspective is needed on farmland ….. one that sees agriculture as a permanent feature of the regional landscape and farming as an essential component of our economy and cultural heritage.”

Figure 7.1 Aerial View of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania
Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, Case Study

1. A municipality that generates an estimated $1.5 billion annually in farm gate sales (the most productive agricultural county in the USA east of the Mississippi; similar in size to Lethbridge County, Alberta in terms of sales).

2. Home to 530,000 people – comprising 41 townships; 18 boroughs and one city (Lancaster City). Each of these municipalities has its own council but operates within the framework of the Lancaster Planning Commission and the Comprehensive Plan for Lancaster County.

3. Contains a farm acreage base of 425,000 acres (much like Leduc County which has 375,000 acres in crops).

4. Has achieved a preserved agricultural land base in excess of 110,000 acres since 1988 – all with conservations easements.

5. Significant areas are designated for urban growth delineated by urban growth boundaries and able to accommodate projected growth for 20 year periods. These are reviewed every 10 years and can be expanded or contracted.

Lancaster Country takes a comprehensive approach to agricultural land preservation and involves an interesting application of several tools: 1) agricultural zoning and clear urban growth boundaries; 2) prioritization of parcels to be preserved using the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment program that is customized for Lancaster County; 3) the purchase of conservation easements by the Agriculture Preserve Board or the Lancaster Farmland Trust; and 4) the trading of development credits from farms to designated urban growth areas (towns, villages, qualified crossroads);

The concerted effort to preserve agricultural land began in the 1980’s and was led by a small group of farmers concerned about the future. Now 30 years later, almost one-third of the productive land base has been preserved. Furthermore, the success of the Lancaster County approach has been copied by several neighbouring counties located in the states of Delaware, Maryland and Pennsylvania wherein a total more than 600,000 acres have been preserved.

To be sure, Lancaster is different from Alberta – farms are much smaller (average size is less than 100 acres) and the County is home to a distinct cultural group – the Amish which comprise approximately 35% of the farming population. But the real lesson from Lancaster County is what can be accomplished when a small group of motivated people work together toward a clear objective.
8.0 Creating a New Future for Agriculture and Food in the EMR

The essence of the RAMP is to shape a future for agriculture and food in the EMR. It can be argued that the agriculture and value added food sector has largely functioned in the region without much attention and largely by default.

That is, the sector has not been the focus of a clear set of land or sector specific economic development policies. Nor has agriculture and food been the focus and beneficiary of a concerted public relations or communications strategy. Thus, the vast majority of the population in the region know little about the sector, what it does, what is being produced, the nature of the farm or food processing businesses at play, or even the disproportionate amount of high quality soils that are actually found in region. The real opportunity facing the EMR is this question: what can be achieved by design?

It must also be clearly stated (and perhaps repeated) that the agriculture and food sector is far from a "one size fits all" sector. There are at least three distinct sub-sectors:

   a) **Large scale commodity production sector** that is focused on production for provincial, national or export markets;
   b) **Specialized local food and emerging products** sector that focus on distinct markets which may be local, provincial or beyond; and
   c) **Value added/food and beverage processing** sector which in turn ranges from the very small to the very large. Each must be considered distinctly.

And accordingly three overriding questions prevail:

1. What needs to be done to provide an assured future for farmers who produce grains, oilseeds, forages, pulse crops, potatoes, livestock etc. who are by far the largest land owners and stewards of the land in the region?
2. What can be done to facilitate the growth of and the opportunities for the specialty and food producing producers who typically operate on small land parcels or special purpose facilities?
3. How can the food and agriculture sector become an even larger and growing economic driver for the Region?

To seed the response to these questions, we begin by providing a profile of two agriculture businesses that are currently operating in the EMR. (See the short story lines on the Little Potato Company and Kalco Farms – next two pages). These profiles provide a glimpse of what is happening and most importantly what the future could hold.

The question of the future and what this might look like is predicated on a clear understanding of differing sectors, each with differing needs. We identified three:

1. **Commodity Production Sector** – producing largely for regional, national or export markets;
2. **Specialty Products/Local Food/Emerging Sector** – producing largely for the local and regional markets; and
3. **Value-Added Food and Beverage Sector** – producing for any and all markets. A brief summary of what each of these sectors may look like and what their requirements are presented in Tables 8.1 to 8.3.
### Table 8.1: Commodity Production Sector: Future Picture and Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture of the Future</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>· Few but large operations</td>
<td>· Long term assured land base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Large areas of farming/field – contiguous agriculture land</td>
<td>· Priority areas for commodity agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Minimal encroachment</td>
<td>· ‘Right to Farm’ legislation and regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Extensive use of professional, operational and technical services</td>
<td>· Good infrastructure – roads, rails, air and irrigation (in some areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Technology driven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.2: Local Food/Emerging Sector: Future Picture and Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture of the Future</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>· Small plot production</td>
<td>· Affordable land close to market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Large number of small producers – multiple products</td>
<td>· Land use policy that provides small plots for agriculture (not residences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Soil and facility based production</td>
<td>· New local markets and channels to market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Extensive automation</td>
<td>· Extension and technical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Excellent economics - competitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8.3: Value-Added Diversification: Future Picture and Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture of the Future</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>· Local products are competitive and preferred – significant market share</td>
<td>· Targeted market strategies – dedicated supply chains serving local, regional and export markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· New generation of processors, co-packers, supporting services</td>
<td>· New infrastructure supporting retail, wholesale and processing – incubators, co-packers, logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Robust production of products and ingredients for the multiple markets</td>
<td>· Entrepreneurship and mentoring support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Advanced technical, nutritional and business management services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Little Potato Company

In 1996 Angela Santiago with her father, who missed the delicious little “Creamer” potatoes of his youth in the Netherlands co-founded The Little Potato Company. Their plan: grow a few potatoes in the backyard, wash them in the family’s bathtub, pack two pounds into a paper bag, set up at the Strathcona Farmers Market and hope for the best. It didn’t take long to realize that the ‘test’ was successful. People loved their product. And the idea for a specialty produce company was born.

Twenty years later, the Little Potato Company (LPC) has grown to be one of Alberta’s largest and fastest growing fresh produce companies. Three years ago, it surpassed $100 million in annual sales; this year it will reach $200 million. And it is not stopping here. Development of the US market remains early stage and $1 billion in annual sales is not out of the question.

The company operates out of three facilities: the ‘home’ plant based in Edmonton; a co-packer in Prince Edward Island; and a newly constructed plant which just opened in Deforest, Wisconsin. The Edmonton plant alone has more than 300 employees and the total workforce exceeds 600. More than 25 growers supply over 100 million pounds of potatoes annually from several provinces and states including Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, PEI, Georgia, Florida, Wisconsin, Illinois and California. But the original potato supply began in Parkland County where it continues to this day.

The LPC story is truly inspirational. It is a story of a visionary, a culled product and a passion to supply a tasty nutritious branded product. And a readiness to surround herself with the expertise necessary to manage, operate and grow a company. Today the Little Potato Company stands tall in most major grocery retailers in Canada and the USA. As Angela would say: “We may be ‘little’ but we are getting bigger!”
Kalco Farms – A New Generation

Just 4 years ago, Mike Kalisvaart, who owns and operates Kalco Farms – had 8,000 acres under his watch. This year, he planned to farm 14,000 acres. By the time he finished seeding, he had over 16,000 acres of crops.

Mike Kalisvaart is an example of a new generation of CEO farmers. They are young, business minded, focused on efficiency and ready to employ any technology or expertise to improve their operations. And expanding rapidly.

Mike’s home base is near Gibbons. But his farming operation now covers three municipalities: Sturgeon, Strathcona and Thorhild Counties. The majority of his land is rented - over 14,500 acres. And the opportunity to add another 2,000 acres to his production base this spring came unexpectedly. Word got around that Mike was in the area and before long several farmers turned over their properties to him. Ten years ago, it took a month to seed 2,500 acres. Now he can seed the entire 16,000 acres in 3 weeks.

A second generation farmer, Mike took over from his father who had been a long time hog producer and an active member of the Western Hog Exchange. But the hog business changed - positive margins were more the exception than the rule and it was time to move on. Since then Mike is totally focused on learning and adopting best practices for cropping. For example, he employs over 10 full time employees including a full time agronomist to oversee all the crops in production. During seeding and harvest, this work force doubles with the addition of contractors.

The farm uses a tablet based record keeping system. Employees enter data on the tablet while in the field. It is Cloud based, allowing analysis and the pulling of real-time reports on input supplies and inventory for sale at any time.

How big will Mike’s farm become? His response: “I know farmers who are two or three times larger than me. So I guess there’s still some room to grow yet.”
9.0 Toward the Regional Agriculture Master Plan

9.1 The Core Issues

The preceding analysis of trends, issues and comparatives to other jurisdictions strongly suggest that an effective RAMP capable of shaping a new future for the agriculture sector must address the following core issues:

1. **Provide assurance for an agricultural land base that is long term.** It is important to recognize that land requirements differ by production sector – the large commodity sector requires large areas of contiguous farmland; the specialty sector requires smaller plots and in many cases high quality soils that are in relative proximity to urban markets and infrastructure.

2. **Agricultural zoning** differs by area or sub-area across the EMR and reflects the requirements of defined production sectors and intended use. Furthermore, urban or non-farm encroachment and land fragmentation must be addressed. Finally, the permanence of agriculture zone boundaries and correspondingly, urban growth areas are exceedingly important.

3. **Mitigation measures** to address current expectations with respect to land values and ‘rights’ implicit to current land use policies. In this regard, the application of such planning tools such as the transfer of development credits and the purchase of conservation easements may serve to address these expectations.

4. **Supportive and targeted economic development programs** that recognizes the unique market, access and infrastructure requirements of the differing agriculture and food sectors operating within the EMR.

9.2 The Path Forward

The Situation Analysis provides the starting base for the continuation of the RAMP planning process. The following responses are provided to the fundamental questions posed in the introduction:

- The growing demand for food and agricultural products presents a bright future for agriculture both regionally and globally.
- Land use policies that provide access, affordability and long term assurance to farmers are critical.
- Prime agricultural land is in short supply and diminishing – every effort should be made to protect this valuable resource.
- The EMR needs to declare that agriculture and food is a strategic industry for growth given the rich resource base and the supporting production, processing and research asset base situated.

As next steps in the development of the RAMP, it is recommended that the EMRB consider the following areas of focus and sequencing over the next 18 months:

1. **Developing a Shared Vision for Agriculture and Food in the Region** – in other words, what is the desired state to be achieved? What will the EMR ‘look and feel’ like as a community in 50 years? Can a clear picture be created and articulated? A clear vision with the support of guiding principles is the first and most important step.

Currently the Counties and the City of Edmonton have similar visions and aspirations to the extent that agriculture is explicitly valued. A clear articulation of and commitment to agriculture and food as a
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strategic industry for the Region and capable of increasing it’s economic, cultural and environment contributions a critical starting point. Such a commitment will enable this all important visioning process.

This process which will be led by the EMRB Task Force should be a foremost priority and be completed by the fall of 2018.

2. Land Use Policies – land use policies are critical to the realization of the EMR as a thriving and robust food and agriculture centre. The ‘Vision’ will drive this process and influence the decisions regarding choices specific to agricultural land and the priorities given to agricultural lands.

Several questions will need to be addressed:

- Will some areas for agriculture be zoned as permanent? If so, what policies could enable this?
- Will there be different priority areas to reflect differing types of agriculture?
- How to minimize the impact of urban growth on agricultural lands?
- Where should growth not take place?
- When growth requires the use of good agriculture land, or any agricultural land such as areas for grazing - how can this be done while minimizing disruption to the agriculture and food system?
- What considerations should be given to the value of the environmental goods and services that agricultural is able to provide a community? Where should this be done?
- How to deal with permanent agriculture lands vs. transition lands that are clearly earmarked for future urban development?
- What tools can be used to deal with land speculation?
- How do we take a regional planning approach and not just cater to land owners who want to sell for the highest price?

Many of the above questions specific to priority areas, choices and tradeoffs will be addressed through the process of developing the LESA tool.

The LESA development process began on June 15th, 2018 and will inform the land use policy questions and vice versa. This process will take place over the course of the next year.

The Task Force will be in a position to evaluate and make recommendations regarding a specific set of land use policies by the fall of 2019.

3. Economic Development and Diversification – it is apparent that economic development policies directed to the food and agriculture industry need to be strengthened. The question of how to foster agricultural and food business viability is a difficult one.

- What types of agricultural activities/food related enterprises can thrive?
- How can agriculture and food become an even larger economic driver within the Region in the future? If so, how and what must be done differently or better than past efforts?
- How can economic development strategies enhance the full spectrum of the agri-food system – production, processing, and marketing?
- What needs to be done to address new and emerging initiatives?

The question of how to sustain and support the food and agriculture industry for the next 30 to 50 years is an important one. Simply preserving agriculture lands especially those in close proximity to urban
development without a strong a growing food industry would be sub-optimal.

This process will begin in parallel to the Land Use Policy development. Again, the Task Force will be in a position to consider recommendations in the fall of 2019.

The three components listed above are highly inter-related. The vision will drive a definitive land use policy that is seen to value and support agricultural land and in turn foster the conditions that enhance or lead to economic diversity and viability.

Conversely, a land use policy in the metropolitan context that regards any and all lands (including prime agricultural lands) as merely ‘lands in waiting’ for future development, will create conditions that undermine the economic viability and the vision for a growing and robust agriculture and food sector will not be attained.

In closing, the Situation Analysis remains a working document that will continue to be reviewed, revised and updated as the RAMP process continues.
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## Attachment 1: Charts and Graphs

### Farm Business Indicators

**Figure 1.1: Number of Farms by County, 2001-2016**

![Chart 1.1: Number of Farms by County, 2001-2016](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>1,144</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart 1.1: Schematic Comparisons of Farm Numbers by Municipality: 2001-2016**

![Pie Chart for 2001 and 2016](image)
**Figure 1.2: Average Farm Size (Acres, by County, 2001-2016)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is assumed that the 2011 Edmonton statistic is an anomaly due to the way data was collected.

**Figure 1.3: Total Gross Farm Sales (by County: 2001-2016)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>142,621</td>
<td>138,528</td>
<td>162,680</td>
<td>198,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>82,064</td>
<td>85,070</td>
<td>97,975</td>
<td>119,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon</td>
<td>146,696</td>
<td>154,789</td>
<td>185,794</td>
<td>230,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>87,871</td>
<td>87,606</td>
<td>90,895</td>
<td>122,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>17,433</td>
<td>28,737</td>
<td>35,356</td>
<td>166,655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

It is assumed that the 2011 Edmonton statistic is an anomaly due to the way data was collected.
Area Farmed and Selected Crops

Figure 1.4: Total Area of Farms (by County: 2001-2016)

![Graph of Total Area of Farms (by County: 2001-2016)](chart1.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>564,298</td>
<td>600,825</td>
<td>564,865</td>
<td>531,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>475,926</td>
<td>455,677</td>
<td>401,863</td>
<td>375,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon</td>
<td>499,567</td>
<td>517,537</td>
<td>467,464</td>
<td>479,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>256,270</td>
<td>250,937</td>
<td>220,184</td>
<td>224,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>70,690</td>
<td>66,548</td>
<td>13,011</td>
<td>68,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.5: Total Area of Crops (by County: 2001 – 2016)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>359,027</td>
<td>379,013</td>
<td>373,077</td>
<td>354,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>227,729</td>
<td>206,235</td>
<td>180,512</td>
<td>187,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon</td>
<td>361,288</td>
<td>369,728</td>
<td>362,846</td>
<td>377,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>152,850</td>
<td>159,636</td>
<td>150,138</td>
<td>164,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>46,065</td>
<td>40,761</td>
<td>10,012</td>
<td>36,338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chart 1.2 Schematic Comparison of Crop Mix in the EMR: 2001-2016
Figure 1.6: Canola Acreage (by County, 2001-2016)

Figure 1.7: Potato Acreage (by County, 2001-2016)
Selected Livestock Statistics

Figure 1.8: Number of Cattle and Calves (by County, 2001-2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leduc</th>
<th>Parkland</th>
<th>Sturgeon</th>
<th>Strathcona</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>97,176</td>
<td>79,084</td>
<td>50,988</td>
<td>32,879</td>
<td>5,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>90,850</td>
<td>68,709</td>
<td>47,324</td>
<td>24,125</td>
<td>3,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>60,388</td>
<td>45,353</td>
<td>27,184</td>
<td>14,781</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>57,879</td>
<td>47,134</td>
<td>32,532</td>
<td>14,845</td>
<td>2,829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specialty Enterprises

Figure 1.9: Acres of Vegetables (by County)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leduc</th>
<th>Parkland</th>
<th>Sturgeon</th>
<th>Strathcona</th>
<th>Edmonton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1.10: Greenhouse Area by Square Feet (by County, 2001-2016)
Table: 1.1 Profile of Agriculture/Food Processing Employment in Alberta and the EMR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>INDUSTRY</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>%: 2001-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALBERTA</td>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>1,627.4</td>
<td>2,274.6</td>
<td>2,301.1</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total All Industries</td>
<td>59.50</td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td>62.80</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture Industries</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1100 - Mixed Farming (N.E.C)</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111 - Crop Production</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>28.20</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Support Activities for</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crop and Animal Prod.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1151 Support Activities for Crop Prod.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1152 Support Activities for Animal Prod.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>139.20</td>
<td>144.50</td>
<td>139.90</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312 - Beverage and Tobacco Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311 - Food Manufacturing</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3121 - Beverage Manuf.</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDMONTON REGION</td>
<td>Total All Industries</td>
<td>526.90</td>
<td>765.30</td>
<td>780.10</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture Industries</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.90</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1100 - Mixed Farming (N.E.C)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111 - Crop Production</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112 - Animal Production</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Support Activities for</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crop and Animal Prod.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1151 Support Activities for Crop Prod.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1152 Support Activities for Animal Prod.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>50.10</td>
<td>58.10</td>
<td>53.30</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>312 - Beverage and Tobacco Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>311 - Food Manufacturing</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3121 - Beverage Manuf.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada, Labour force survey, custom tabulation G0108_12_Tab1(ivt)
Note: The statistics for Edmonton Region in 2015 appears suspect. For example, employment in the Animal Production category is reported to 5,200 – a marked increase over the 2014 reported number of 2,000. We have used the 2014 numbers as a more accurate estimate of employment.
Attachment 2: Policies and Planning Context

Introduction

To understand the current planning framework in the Edmonton region and how agriculture fits in, it is important to consider the provincial, regional, and municipal policies which influenced its evolution over time to where we are now.

Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission

The Edmonton Regional District Planning Commission was established in 1950 and first adopted a regional plan for the metropolitan area in 1958, which sought to maintain compact communities and prevent ‘unwarranted’ fragmentation of good agricultural land. The Commission adopted other policies as early as 1975:

- The Commission aims to ensure that agriculture will remain a valuable component of the regional economic base.
- The Commission opposes the unwarranted fragmentation of prime agricultural land for non-agricultural purposes

In 1979, the Commission prepared policies stating that ‘Prime agricultural land… shall not be subdivided for country residential uses except…’ In 1980, the Commission wrote that ‘the competition for the use of the basic land resource of the region has created major problems for the agricultural community…’

A new Metropolitan Regional Plan was approved in 1984—driven by: (1) Provincial policies in favour of the conservation of ‘better’ agricultural land and other policies such as the first parcel out; (2) development patterns based on continued contiguous growth regardless of soil conditions; and (3) soil quality and the dividing line between Classes 1 & 2 and Class 3 in ‘rural areas’ as a major determinate.

Provincial Land Use Policies

In 1996, the Provincial Government adopted Provincial Land Use Policies (PLUPs) pursuant to the Municipal Government Act. With a goal to contribute to the maintenance and diversification of Alberta’s agricultural industry, four policies were adopted. Municipalities were ‘encouraged’ to: (1) identify areas for extensive and intensive agriculture, (2) limit the fragmentation of agriculture lands and their premature conversion, (3) direct non-agricultural development to areas where they will not constrain agriculture, and (4) minimize issues arising from intensive agricultural operations. The policies were only discretionary and non-binding.

Provincial Land Use Framework and ALSA

The Land Use Framework (LUF), released in 2008, outlined a new Provincial approach to managing land and resources. The Alberta Land Stewardship Act (ALSA), proclaimed in 2009, enabled, not only regional planning, but it also provided tools for implementation: conservation directives, conservation easements and transfers of development credits that could be aimed at the protection, conservation, and enhancement of agricultural lands and lands for agricultural purposes. To date, these new tools have not been utilized to any extent.
North Saskatchewan Regional Plan

The Lower Athabasca Regional Plan, the first provincially approved regional plan, merely repeats the PLUPs as its agricultural policies. This regional plan is currently under preparation, but the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the planning process state the plan is to ‘provide advice on maintaining a viable agricultural land base to support growth and diversification of the agricultural industry.’ In its discussion of biodiversity, the TOR notes that the trade-off discussion related to the settled area revolves around the value of the land in terms of its agricultural productivity and the ecosystem services that the private land base provides versus the value of the land if used for other purposes (e.g. residential development). The plan is required to address the use of the various conservation tools.

In summary, the language of these Regional Plans to date have moved from the term ‘encouraged’ to ‘expected’ to limit fragmentation and the premature conversion of agricultural lands. Although there is no requirement per se in the first two regional plans, the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan may be more directive in the conservation of agricultural lands if desired by stakeholders and municipalities.

Capital Region Board Growth Plan

The primary purpose of the Capital Region Land Use Plan was to manage sustainable growth in a manner that protects the region’s environment and resources, minimizes the regional development footprint, strengthens communities, increases transportation choice and supports food and agricultural sector development. The Capital Region Growth Plan: Growing Forward was approved by the Government of Alberta in 2010.

The plan had the following acknowledgement about agricultural land:

Agricultural land is a limited, non-renewable resource which is competing with other forms of development. If the land is not protected in the long-term for food production, the land will be converted to another use and lost forever. Agricultural land has significant value, both at the local and regional levels, beyond its pure economic capacity, including green space, aesthetics, community character, lifestyle, air quality, wildlife habitat, as well as a risk management measure in the event of future food shortages. In order to ensure agriculture lands are complementary with policies to reduce the regional footprint, further collaboration on implementing agricultural land policies is required.

Specific to agriculture, the CRB Plan did little else other than to identify those areas that have been designated for agricultural purposes by municipalities. However, the CRB took the position that it would wait until the Province took further policy decisions relative to agricultural land fragmentation and preservation. Since that time, the Alberta Government wrote the CRB in August 2014, stating that the Province ‘determined that the economic, environmental and social evidence did not currently support the need for a provincial-level policy on agricultural fragmentation and conversion, though we recognize the issue as a growing concern throughout Alberta, particularly within the Edmonton-Calgary corridor.’ The letter goes on to state that ‘municipalities are now expected, rather than encouraged, to follow the direction provided through the PLUP on this important issue.’

Growth Plan Update

The CRB went through an extensive process to update the Growth Plan. In its review, the CRB acknowledged the pressure on agricultural land. It noted that 80% of land within the primary growth areas is classified as best or better agricultural land; 56,000 ha of lands would be consumed within the urban growth shadow; the total number of farms and area of farmland in the region is declining; and there is a need to optimize the potential for value-added agriculture. The CRB noted that currently “there is no policy
direction concerning the encroachment of urban development on high quality agricultural lands in the region.”

The ‘Agriculture Working Paper’ for the plan update identified policy gaps specific to the preservation of agricultural land: (1) A lack of leadership and direction from the Province; (2) No differentiation with respect to which agricultural lands are more suitable for preservation or development; (3) lack of a robust analytical framework; and (4) differing approaches being taken by municipalities.

The ‘Metropolitan Regional Growth Structure Working Paper’ said that protecting land areas for agricultural use can be done in numerous ways and a suite of other policy tools is recommended to protect prime agricultural land, including the introduction of a LESA system. But, one of the principles of the plan update was to “wisely manage prime agricultural resources. In the context of metropolitan growth, we will ensure the wise management of agricultural resources to continue a thriving agricultural sector.” It included the following key strategy:

Growth needs to be carefully managed in the region to ensure the long-term viability of the agricultural sector. The policies of this Plan are designed to address this issue from multiple standpoints including our cultural heritage, future need for food production and for its contribution to the region’s economic prosperity. Maintaining agricultural viability requires managing growth to protect prime agricultural lands from development, preventing fragmentation of the land base, recognizing the important role of agriculture in the global and regional economy and fostering growth and diversification and the potential for value added products within the agricultural sector.

The draft plan stated that ‘a supply of prime agricultural lands will be identified and preserved.’ This was to be accomplished through the future development of a Regional Agriculture Master Plan using a Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) analysis and be informed by municipal agriculture master plans. The CRB’s expectation was that “policies will be included to implement the regional agricultural policy directions at the municipal level and identify priority and prime agricultural lands in municipal statutory plans on a map.” The new Growth Plan prepared by the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board was approved by the Minister of Municipal Affairs in October 2017.

The plan was based on six guiding principles, one of which addressed agriculture—this is a new policy area in the Growth Plan. The guiding principle for agriculture is Ensure the wise management of prime agricultural resources to continue a thriving agricultural sector. Further, in the context of metropolitan growth, we will ensure the wise management of prime agricultural resources to continue a thriving agricultural sector.

Three objectives were identified in the Growth Plan, each with a set of policies:

- Identify and conserve an adequate supply of prime agricultural lands to provide a secure local food source for future generations
- Minimize the fragmentation and conversion of prime agricultural lands for non-agricultural uses
- Promote diversification and value-added agriculture production and plan infrastructure to support the agricultural sector and regional food system

Several of the implementation techniques suggested earlier in the planning process were not carried forward into the approved Growth Plan. These include conservation easements; alternative land use services (ALUS); and a capital region transfer of development credits program.
Comparison of Regional and Municipal Policies

As part of the RAMP process, a matrix that compares the agriculture and agriculture related policies for the EMRB, the four counties (Leduc, Parkland, Strathcona, Sturgeon) and the City of Edmonton (the smaller municipalities have not been included). The plans were compared across numerous attributes starting with their visions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visions for Agriculture Across the EMR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strathcona County</strong> as ‘Canada’s most livable community’ is distinguished by its agricultural heritage that builds on history and responds to opportunities as a leader in the Capital Region in the provision of a broad range of agricultural and food opportunities as well as services to one of Canada’s fastest growing metropolitan regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leduc County</strong>: A vibrant and resilient agri-food future built on a proud agriculture history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parkland County</strong>: A vibrant agriculture and food community characterized by its diversity, creativity and entrepreneurship, focused on sustainability as well as new opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sturgeon County</strong>: The ‘Heart’ of Agriculture for the Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COE Fresh</strong>: Edmonton has a resilient food and agriculture system that contributes to the local economy and the overall cultural, financial, social and environmental sustainability of the city.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guiding Principles for Agriculture

Overall, the guiding principles for agriculture across the municipalities are quite similar both in terms of intentions and tone. There are subtle differences between the major thrusts of each of the various plans. Sometimes this is one of emphasis (focusing more narrowly on managing land vs. a broader view of community) or from perspective (urban vs. rural), or different historical perspectives. Differences are mostly by omission, not by opposing viewpoints. Overall, at this high level of policy, there is acknowledgement that there are important "agricultural resources" in the region and efforts should be made to ensure and enhance its diversity and vibrancy, resiliency and sustainability, creativity and entrepreneurship.

There are several key principles that should comprehensively drive the regional agricultural master plan:

1. The diversity of agriculture can make an important economic contribution in the local to global marketplace.
2. The historical and cultural/social aspects are important in maintaining a high quality rural lifestyle and community character.
3. Environmental sustainability of the rural landscape is important.
4. The food system is an important perspective to consider.

**Implications for the RAMP:** Developing a ‘shared vision’ for agriculture and the future role, look and ‘feel’ of agriculture and food within the region is the critical starting point. Once this is in place and agreed to, the planning process becomes much easier.

**Definition of Agriculture**

Agriculture means many things and different things to different people as traditional agriculture evolves. There are key elements that should be addressed in the regional agricultural master plan:

1. In the broadest sense, agriculture includes the people, the community and the land.
2. Most of agriculture focuses on growing (whether traditional or new specialized crops) and raising (a wide range of animals).
3. Scale is a consideration—extensive farms to intensive operations.
4. Value-added (includes some processing of raw materials, etc.) is part of a new view of agriculture.
5. There are a wide range of commercial activities from export of raw product to farm gate sales and farmers markets.
6. A broader definition of agriculture often includes support services serving the agricultural sector.
7. Location enters in to it—for example, urban agriculture.
8. Another perspective is consideration of a ‘food system,’ ranging from production through to eating and composting.
9. Some definitions address motivation—not just for profit but acknowledging that it can also be motivated by lifestyle preferences.

**Implications for the RAMP:** There is a need to balance two different perspectives. (1) Work toward the broadest definition of agriculture possible recognizing that the sector continues to change and evolve as new enterprises and services emerge; and (2) not make it too broad that ‘anything goes’ and the door is left open to uses that might lead to the conversion of agriculture land. Agreement on a common definition for agriculture across the Region will impact the land use bylaw definition for each municipality. Consistency is inherently desirable, but there must be recognition of the different circumstances throughout the region.

**Sub Areas**

The Regional Growth Plan has three tiers: Metro core with no provisions for agriculture; Metro area which provides for agriculture until required for urban development; and rural which includes large areas of potentially long-term agriculture. These areas all have different policies related to agricultural land. It’s also important to note that there is a ‘commuter shed’ designation that is particularly relevant to policies about the designation and conversion of land for country residential.

While Edmonton currently has significant agricultural lands, it has not designated large areas for permanent agriculture. Outside of their proposed growth areas in the Metro area tier, the Counties are recognizing the need to address soil quality and locational factors.

**Implications for the RAMP:** It will be critical to determine and agree on an overall coherent strategy for priority agriculture areas. Two different priority areas will need to be defined: (1) Long term or permanent priority areas – lands that will be designated for agriculture uses only; and (2) Short or medium term permanent priority areas – land that will be designated as areas that may be transitioned to other uses over time.
Prime Land

There is acknowledgment that there are differing qualities of soil throughout the region although different rating concepts are used: Land Suitability Rating System (LSRS), Canada Land Inventory (CLI), and Farmland Assessment Rating (FAR). Regardless of the relative merits of each system, the planning policies focus attention on the higher capability lands (sometimes referred to as 'prime'). However, it should be noted that attention should be given to 'unique farmlands' that have usefulness to produce specific high-value food and fibre crops because of characteristics.

Implications for the RAMP: The EMRB will need to provide clear direction on which rating system(s) will be used and for what purposes and the role different areas in the overall agricultural and food sector.

Other Values

While the major policy emphasis is on agricultural production and economic values, there is some recognition of the importance of other values in the agricultural setting, such as those relating to culture, history, lifestyle, recreation, community, environment, etc.

Implications for the RAMP: Currently land, regardless of its agricultural value has no acknowledged value or priority relative to urban development. Historically, agricultural land for the most part has been considered ‘land in waiting’ for development when this is needed. Other factors may need to be considered including ascribing value to prime agriculture land in a manner like values associated with clean air and water; food security; aesthetics; environment benefits; etc.

Policies

There are indications that there is a need to use a variety of tools to protect and preserve the better agricultural lands, outside what is 'required' for urban development, on a certain and long-term basis.

Implications for the RAMP: The protection and preservation of agricultural lands requires a broader range of tools than what has been employed to date. The most decisive of these would be a policy to 'freeze' lands like approaches taken in British Columbia (ALR) and Ontario (Greenbelt). Such measures are politically challenging. Other more nuanced tools include transfer of development credits; conservation easements; establishing farmland trusts; and clustering development in areas of lower land quality. There is legislation (ALSA) to facilitate this. Specific to a policy enabling the transfer of development rights, a major issue to consider will be the ability and/or the desirability to allow transfers from municipality to municipality.

Conversion

There are several approaches: (1) a recognized intent to permanently designate large contiguous agricultural areas so agriculture can thrive on both large and small holdings; (2) development of better lands should only be where there are no reasonable alternatives (as a last resort?) and the impact on agriculture is minimized; (3), pressure can be taken off these areas by requiring higher densities, directing development to other suitable locations (lower capability lands, existing urban centres) where possible, transferring development rights and clustering; (4) development of agricultural areas should be phased so that agricultural remain as long as possible; and (5) Some lands that are currently designated for non-agricultural uses (such as large areas of country residential) could be re-designated to agriculture.

Implications for the RAMP: The implications on the issues of conversion are like the ‘Policies’ – see previous sub-section.
Land Use Zones

There are a variety of agricultural zones. Generally, there is one all-purpose agricultural zone that has been used to support traditional agriculture—sometimes different zones for larger and smaller agricultural holdings. The multiple-purpose zones are sometimes supplemented by a 'holding' zone generally designed to limit subdivision and uses that would impact future urban development. These zones tend to have a very broad range of uses (either permitted or discretionary), including residential uses or others that aren't really soil based, which tend to have an impact on agriculture and, perhaps, are not consistent with long term priority agricultural areas. In addition, there is a question about the range of agricultural-related uses (support, service, agri-tourism, etc.) that should be provided for.

Implications for the RAMP: The implications are like the previous two sub-sections. There may be a case to agree to a common set of agricultural zones across the Region. However, there may be a need for special zones (or overlays) that might apply to unique or special locational circumstances.

Fragmentation

The general policy 'understanding' is that fragmentation is not conducive to effective agricultural practice because it reduces the area of agriculture, may introduce inefficient property patterns, or create potentially conflicting (and limiting) land uses. However, policy has been to allow at least limited subdivision in agricultural areas for other uses (residential farmsteads, a new first parcel out, recreation or resource development, etc.)—perhaps with a requirement for some mitigation. Those favouring subdivision raise questions of equity and the need to 'subsidize' the purchase of already expensive agricultural land through the ability to subdivide at least one parcel.

Implications for the RAMP: Given existing rules, there is a tremendous amount of potential future subdivision throughout the agricultural areas of the region. Long term priority agricultural areas may have considerably more restrictions. However, the impact of these restrictions could be mitigated by the ability to transfer development credits to address the equity question.

Lots and Sizes

Traditional zoning practice throughout the region is that 80 acres is an acceptable minimum size for most agriculture, although some municipalities propose or allow smaller agricultural holdings. Approaches range from Strathcona where a quarter section can be split into halves or a smaller residential parcel can be subdivided out; other Counties allow the creation of up to four parcels per quarter section, in a variety of formats (Parkland for example allows 4-40-acre parcels or 4 smaller residential parcels).

Implications for the RAMP: The impact to agriculture and farming operations of differing lot sizes will need to be addressed. Lot sizes should be addressed in accordance to associated land use. For example, if a lot is being used as a residence only, then a maximum size may be prescribed. However, if the lot is being used for agricultural or food production purposes, a larger size may be allowed.

Economic Development

There is widespread support for increasing the economic development potential of the agricultural sector. Most plans are supportive of "value-added agriculture" and the "diversification of agriculture" as major goals. The suggested opportunities are extensive—from agri-tourism and to energy creation to specialized livestock and local food initiatives. However, there are little in the way of concrete initiatives and implementation strategies for this economic development goal.

Implications for the RAMP: A major challenge facing the EMRB will be to adopt and implement an economic development plan that can stimulate the regional food and agriculture industry. Three distinct strategies will be required (1) ensuring the ability of traditional forms of production to continue (grains, oilseeds, dairy, beef, pork, poultry etc.); (2) stimulating and/or supporting new ventures that are
emerging to response to local food demand; and (3) Building the core of regional and nationally focused agri-food enterprises that have successfully emerged over the past 20 years.

**Urban Agriculture**

The Regional Growth Plan promotes urban agriculture in the metropolitan tier. Both Edmonton and Strathcona have urban agriculture strategies and Leduc includes policy in support.

**Implications for the RAMP:** Urban agriculture remains in a nascent stage. Nevertheless, there is a strong and growing interest in urban agriculture as a response to local food demand and food security. To date, limited resources have been committed to this area. However, it fits with the previous initiative particularly the new and emerging enterprise group but does not have major significance on the regional land base.

**Infrastructure**

Most policies are general and in support of physical infrastructure (roads, drainage, irrigation, etc.) needed to support the growth and diversification of agriculture, but implementation rests with the strategic and budget plans of the municipalities. There are also ‘soft’ infrastructure suggestions in other areas (market development, education, etc.).

**Implications for the RAMP:** There may be key infrastructure investments to be considered that can effectively increase the viability and growth of the emerging food and services sector.

**Advocacy**

There is some recognition that one of the requirements in promoting agriculture is that the sector needs a voice and leadership to champion and advocate on its behalf. Suggested efforts include leadership development, marketing, education, an industry institute and/or agricultural forums. The regional agriculture master plan process will have to determine what initiatives might be appropriate at the regional scale to advance food and agriculture.

**Implications for the RAMP:** The lack of a voice or ‘leadership’ coming from the agriculture and food community is a major concern. While many producers and processors are member of organizations, no organization speaks for issues pertaining to the sector in the EMR. This will be an important issue to address.

**Land Use Conflict**

Land use conflict is closely associated with fragmentation. It is accepted that different land uses can impact agricultural areas and are generally undesirable insofar as it may limit efficient agricultural production. Examples include increased country residential development in agricultural areas or CFOs impacting on residential. Leduc’s draft MDP states that ‘agricultural uses shall take precedence within the Agricultural Area.’ Two other Counties refer to the concept of ‘right to farm.’ What is an appropriate regional response and what is appropriate at the municipal level—to be determined through the process?

**Implications for the RAMP:** Perhaps one of the most significant outcomes of the RAMP is a clear articulation of and support for ‘Right to Farm’ legislation. Currently long-established farms are concerned about their long-term future and their ability to operate. The enactment of such legislation would send a very clear message to farmers in the region as well as those residents who make the choice to live in an agricultural area.

**Agricultural Impact Assessments**

The concept of agriculture impact assessments (and what they are) as a contribution to better decision making is certainly gaining ground. The question is where and when they should be applied—on prime
lands, on all agriculture lands, adjacent to these lands, etc.?

**Implications for the RAMP:** To date, the use Agricultural Impact Assessments (AIA) is in the very early stages within the region. A clear vision for agriculture for the region and supporting policies will clarify what the AIA needs to assess.

**Other Strategies**

Preserving agricultural land and promoting the agricultural economy can be enhanced using new and/or innovative strategies in the Edmonton region. These include best practices such as ALUS, transfer of development rights, conservation easements, growth boundaries, permanent agriculture priority areas, etc. They will have to be explored through the planning process.

**Implications for the RAMP:** Perhaps the most significant point to make now is this: an effective RAMP will require the integration of several strategies and policies to be effective. There will be no one policy alone that will lead to a successful outcome. For example, changes in land use policies must be supported with effective communications plans and pro-active economic development strategies all working together to achieve the vision for the region.

**Indicators & Monitoring**

Most agencies are committed to monitoring and developing key indicators to measure changes in the agriculture sector, including addressing a range of planning measures (land conversions, fragmentation etc.), and business measures (market development achievements, agricultural trends, etc.).

**Implications for the RAMP:** The selection of a key set of practical as well as easy to obtain indicators will be key to the RAMP.

**Implementation**

The RAMP and the LESA tool are key to implementing the Growth Plan’s agricultural objectives. The municipalities, of course, will have a key role in implementation.

**Implications for RAMP:** The best plan without the will or the capacity to implement achieves little or nothing. Structure, strategy and accountability will be key to the required implementation plan.
### 3.1 Profile of the People Interviewed

Interviews have been conducted with 23 individuals. These are categorized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background/Sector</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Organization/Association</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment/Venture Capital</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government or Agency (Alberta)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Institution</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 Discussion highlights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Discussion</th>
<th>Summary of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Region as</td>
<td>There is a growing realization that solutions and growth opportunities will be found locally or within the Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Centre for</td>
<td>Agriculture within the region is very misunderstood; very little understanding of economic development and what it will take to grow this sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture &amp; Food-</td>
<td>Currently a lot of buzzwords and good intentions but very little capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is this possible?</td>
<td>Agriculture if very low priority: industrial; commercial and residential have been the priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The demand for more local products from major institutions is there!! But!!! There are significant barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a very real demand for local food – baby boomers who are health conscious and ‘millennials’ who are value based buyers and committed to supporting the local economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We hear of the need for space to incubate businesses. Things are popping up all over – a critical mass of interest is forming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Region has numerous valuable assets: Leduc Food Centre; U of A; NAIT; a core group of successful companies. Very strong institutional capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a real entrepreneurial spirit in Edmonton – a group of like-minded food industry entrepreneurs that have built successful businesses and support each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonton region has some very significant players who have developed very successful businesses! Actually the whole highway 2 corridor (Lethbridge, Calgary, and Edmonton) could be a significant force nationally and internationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leduc has a thriving dairy sector; cropping across the Region is strong. There is lots of opportunity and with the airport we can box or containerize specialty products for export.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alberta should be the Food Province. The opportunities are will young companies developing novel products (see the Barton report to the Competitiveness Council. Plus develop ‘Smart Agriculture’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Discussion</td>
<td>Summary of Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Examples of Businesses or Initiatives within the Region moving in this direction | • Growth of the 104 St. Market; new start-ups such as Honest Dumplings; Moho Jojo Pickles; the 124th Market; ‘What the Truck’ Food Festivals.  
• Establishment of the Community University Partnership (CUP).  
• The Food & Agribusiness Diversification Initiative led by Councillor Paquette.  
• The Alberta Flavour Learning Lab that is working to source/aggregate products for institutional buyers.  
• Emergence of several regional/national food processing companies including: Heritage; Little Potato Company; Crust Craft; Alyia’s; Siwin; Kinnikinnick Foods Kitchen Partners, Ceapro, Capital Packers, Champion Pet Foods etc. show that it can be done! (Note: these were mentioned by several respondents). “It can be done!!”  
• Interest in urban agriculture – bee program is fully subscribed.  
• There are several natural health product companies that are emerging: Bionutra; From the Earth Naturally; Ceapro; Radiant; also the hemp industry – Hempco.  
• Recent Supercluster initiative – although the Alberta proposal (Smart Agri-food Supercluster) was not successful, Protein Innovations Canada (PIC) based in Saskatchewan has potential positive repercussions for Alberta and the Edmonton region. |
| Cities or Regions that Serve as Models for Edmonton Region | • Ottawa region is focusing an “Food First” Strategy – focusing on food quality and more of a life balance  
• Portland as a ‘foodie’ city; other big cities such as San Francisco, New York, Toronto  
• Austin, Texas  
• Netherlands Food Valley (several mentions)  
• Calgary has multi-day Farmers Markets which become destinations  
• The Fraser Valley, Lower Mainland  
• Detroit – a real focus on urban agriculture  
• Look at the Milan Urban Food Policy Pact – this is a framework where food is a drive – something that Edmonton should become part of.  
• Quebec has a strong focus on local food and supporting agri-food industry  
• Lisbon, Portugal  
• Agro-Food Parks in Denmark  
• Denver – there are 13 municipalities that are working together.  
• Food South Australia in the Adelaide area  
• Saskatchewan keeps growing in stature. They had strong support from the provincial government for the Protein Industry Canada Super-Cluster proposal – something that Alberta did not have. |
### Significant Strategy or Initiative that would move the Edmonton Region Forward

- Establish a Farm-Food Institute that supports (trains) new entrants, led by passionate energetic and experienced people.
- A food hub that could connect/aggregate smaller suppliers to match with the larger demand of institutional and larger buyers.
- There has to be a multi-dimensional approach – not just a local food strategy. That would not be sustainable.
- We need a focussed committed long term strategy – we are not good at sustained efforts – we do things half-***ed.
- We need a MECHANISM that can bridge promising ideas and small companies to connect to retail and food service. This gap is great!!
- We need a co-packing facility as part of the eco-system. This is lacking. Take Baby Gourmet – a company founded and formed in Alberta. But all their processing, marketing and distribution is done in Ontario. Why? No facilities!

### Significant Opportunities

- The Region has incredible infrastructure and capacity – the U of A; industrial parks; Aerotropolis; 15 municipalities coming together; Leduc Food Processing Development Centre, the availability of labour ...
- There are a lot of new players (immigrants, young people, entrepreneurs) who are keen to start new things: small farms; businesses; new services; new food opportunities – restaurants, food trucks, pop up etc.
- Older farmers/land owners without succession plans may be prepared to rent land to younger/new/first time individuals.
- In the specialty crop areas, there are processing opportunities – two new plants are being built on the prairies – one in Manitoba; one in Saskatchewan.
- The market for ‘ready to serve’ meals or products is growing fast. 50% of meals are now eaten this way.
- The market is changing fast – look at the growth of Uber Eats or Skip the Dishes.
- China has to be a long term focus – but it needs a very targeted approach led by people who know how to put deals together.
- Smart Agriculture is an opportunity that can be addressed with such players as AMII (Alberta Machine Intelligence Institute at the U of A).

### The Most Significant Barriers

- Convincing the Region to look at agriculture in a strategic way. Now there are so many piecemeal approaches.
- The Government of Alberta does not appreciate how important agriculture is to our economy. I find this so frustrating.
- Alberta has no focus – it is all over the place!
- The Hubris is incredible. But it is based on rhetoric, faint hope and little substance.
- We talk a good game but we are not so good at getting things done.
- Edmonton Food Council has very limited resources – a Board of volunteers and a part time staff person.
- COE has a challenging permitting and licensing process – “an almost hostile environment.”
- We talk about diversifying but we keep doing business in a very traditional some old way.
- There are no clear pathways for the person with an idea or even someone at early state to move a business forward. There are so many barriers: food safety; sufficient volumes; insurance/liability issues; distributors who take too big of a cut to make it profitable for the small processor.
Alberta (and Edmonton) lacks a robust business culture that spins out people with marketing and sales experience! We have lots of oil and gas expertise but these people don’t market. Growing businesses especially in the area of food, agriculture and related technologies requires real marketing and professional sales experience. We see this lacking again, again and again!! There is no real solution until we address this skills or talent gap.

- Transportation system is a limitation.
- Carbon tax puts us at a disadvantage; the government is not business friendly
- The ‘Right to Farm’ is a growing issue
- Alberta has been only ‘Oil and Gas’
- Logistics and distance to market is a real barrier
- For local food, the cost of land is the most significant barrier. Capital is also limiting: land and capital are linked.
- There are few specialty retailers – it is very difficult to move from a small scale to be able to supply mainline retail – the gap is prohibitive.
- Extension on how to grow and how to run a business is a gap – a lot of new Canadians are interested in growing food. They are looking for help.
- There is a real lack of incubator space. Also a lack of cold storage.
- The big gaps for many start-ups is the lack of co-packing space where small companies can work and actually share a lot of equipment since so many processes and requirements are similar. Plus the opportunity for mentor, marketing, co-ordinating logistics etc.
- The regulatory process is a problem – we are no longer a business friendly place. Many municipalities are not very inviting to do business – the first response is “No”. Or “we can’t do that!” Rather, it should be: how can we help?
- Helping entrepreneurs on how to build a business – this is critical
- Do we have entrepreneurs with the energy, the knowhow and the right connections to people? I see people with good ideas but lacking a critical piece to move the idea forward to becoming a business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where does the Leadership Come From?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have assets but no champions!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are so many small groups; everyone doing their own thing – they don’t accomplish much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CEO Club has been an effective group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary has an Agri-Business Committee – there is nothing like that here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is not one voice for the local food industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The industry is so fragmented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who has the time? Everyone is so busy just running their businesses!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one is championing the industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership? I don’t see any.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **The Importance of Land** | • My members see land as important – it will be a long time before you can convince us that agricultural land is not important.  
• Specific to local food, access to land in the peri-urban area is critical.  
• There is a new generation of millennials who are interested in value based buying and value based enterprises – specifically local food.  
• Food production within the region is more and more important as economics becomes more important.  
• Vertical and urban farming will always be limited – they will have a place but not replace mainstream production systems.  
• If you develop the land, it is gone forever.  
• There are other reasons: economic – does it make sense to service ‘lazy sprawl”: food security or resilience is something to consider; environmental reasons.  
• Preserving prime ag land is about preserving the opportunity for agriculture to operate on the most productive land in the future. This ensures that a resource that we know is valuable will be available for future generations.  
• The ancillary benefits of protecting prime ag land in close proximity to Edmonton also stack up such as connecting urbanites to food production (both in understanding and in physical food), aesthetics of open spaces, ecological values of agricultural landscapes, and possible recreation value though including these values in the justification opens up too many fissures in the value proposition. |
| **Role of Technology** | • Automation both in field and internal operations are changing everything.  
• Now there are drones that can seek out and spray individual weeds.  
• Technology will play a key role. But in the case of vertical farms, there are a lot of things that you cannot grow in them – it is also very costly.  
• Food will always have a story – vertical farms will have their place but people are still looking for authentic, wholesome food  
• Technology won’t remove field crops and cattle. |
| **Other Comments** | • Attracting new businesses is important but don’t forget our current ones. Retention is key!!  
• RAMP needs to recognize what agriculture does in terms of its contribution to the economy.  
• It’s not just about local – we must recognize the global nature of this industry  
• If RAMP could come up with a plan and political will, you may attract leaders who might see value in getting involved. |
3.3 Additional Analysis

Growing the value added food and agricultural processing sector has been a foremost objective of the Government of Alberta since 1997. Since that time, numerous initiatives have been implemented and considerable resources have been committed. However, progress as measured by the ratio of food and beverage outputs relative to the farm gate sales has shown little change and remains in the range of 1:1\textsuperscript{20}.

In 2015, Alberta Innovates Bio-Solutions (AIBS) addressed the value added challenge based on the observation that relative to other provinces, the Alberta agri-food sector was slow to adopt innovation and new technologies – a conclusion reached by a 2013 study which stated:

\begin{quote}
“ Alberta’s food businesses motivation to innovate is in many cases much less than motivation in B.C. and Quebec.” \textsuperscript{21}
\end{quote}

In response AIBS commissioned Serecon Inc. to undertake a detailed review of the Alberta food processing sector to determine the reasons why the willingness to innovate, grow current businesses or even start new businesses was low. To address this central issue, Serecon conducted over 50 interviews and review several successful innovation systems in detail. The presented this conclusion:

One key issue mentioned by some, but not universally agreed to, relates to the lack of management capability. It is our opinion that while not a universal problem in a general way - there are many managers that are excellent in ensuring profitable production - that there is a limitation of the capability of those in the sector to focus on innovation and growth. More importantly, there is a lack of understanding of appropriate governance requirements necessary in order to access the capital required for expansion and innovation. Current stakeholders do not know how best to approach/develop these types of relationships so are missing out on the complementary strategic opportunities they would provide.

In summary, the business environment and culture for food processing is not regarded as favourable. As on respondent stated:

\begin{quote}
“ There is no incentive to be in the food industry in Alberta – there is no single vision for agriculture and food in the province; no incentives; no critical mass; no centers or hubs; no appeal to be in that business! And what's more while there are opportunities the sector suffers from a severe “Brain Drain.” The best and the brightest are all attracted to the energy sector.”
\end{quote}

Serecon concluded that that the fundamental barriers leading to low motivation to pursue innovation among Alberta food processing sectors can be explained by two main factors:

- Leadership and related capacity – it is critical to recognize that most (if not all) of the businesses that have shown rapid growth in Alberta, are being led by a single individual or driver that is going ‘flat out.’ Quite simply, these individuals do not have the time or the capacity (a dedicated non-operational staff person) to link to the ‘research community and/or

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{20} Alberta is a major agri-food jurisdiction and is now Canada’s largest primary producer. By comparison, Alberta’s food processing sector remains relatively modest in comparative terms. For example, the revenue ratio of Ontario food processing to farm production is approximately 3:1 while Alberta’s ratio is just over 1:1 – a ratio that has remained unchanged for more than 20 years.
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Alberta Unbound: Research and Innovation Opportunities in Alberta’s Food Sector, Conference Board of Canada, November 2013
\end{itemize}
explore new innovations that might be beneficial. (Note: multi-nationals have capacity elsewhere – not in Alberta).

- **Unwillingness/inability to accept the RISK** – the competitive nature of the food business is such that margins are tight and growing tighter. Thus there is little if any financial capacity to add to the current risk profile which testing a new unproven product or process would represent – even though this is precisely where the benefits from innovation are likely to occur. While part of this is the risk associated with product acceptance by consumers, perhaps the more import element is the financial risk associated with the actual cost of getting the new products onto grocery shelves given the significant listing fees in place in Canada.

Simply put, the business class that typifies the entrepreneurial Alberta food processors in the best position to grow strongly believes that they have neither the TIME nor the MONEY to pro-actively innovate. This creates a significant barrier to the monetization of technology and/or innovation.

A recently released 2017\(^2\) study of the challenges of stimulating value added enterprises within the Agriculture Land Reserve (ALR) in Kelowna mad the following conclusions:

1. The ability to enhance farming (in this case, small plot farms) is key. If the economics of farming in the inner fringe (within or in close proximity to urban development) is suffering, the speculation will continue to rise in response to the adjacent pressures of urbanization. Simply, if lands cannot be farmed economically, they will sit idle.

2. Provincial legislation is protecting the land but not helping farmers with the viability of their farms. . . . . there has been no creation or encouragement of a new generation of farmers. The lack of a comprehensive approach to agriculture is also impacting Kelowna’s fringe areas.

3. Based on quantitative findings and feedback from farmers, there is considerable logic to supporting the concept of small lot farms. Business cases are being made for small lot farms and the arguments support the viability of the local food movement.

4. The link between emerging agriculture practices and urban food security policies is only beginning to materialize.

5. Successful strategies have to be more than just preserving the most fertile lands; it is about advancing a strategy for urban agriculture, green space and livability where urban and peri-urban agriculture practices can coexist.

6. To address the barrier to entry of young and new farmers, alternative land tenure in the urban shadow is an important factor in sustaining or building an agriculture sector. Some of these include incubator farms, land linking, cooperative farming, farmland trusts, life estate leases and community farms. Each of these models have pros and cons that would need to be investigated to determine what is most suitable (or practical) for individual cities.

END OF DOCUMENT
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Agriculture Policy Area Framework
Framework for Policy Area Policy Directions

RAMP Working Assumptions:

1. Inaugural RAMP is a plan to 2044
2. RAMP Policies build on the existing policy framework and will be integrated into the Growth Plan, once approved by the Province
3. Future review and updates to RAMP will occur as part of the next official review of the Growth Plan (By 2027)
Draft Agriculture Policy Areas
For discussion October 28, 2019

Area 1 Rural Agriculture
Area 2 Agriculture Complementary to Other Uses
Area 3 Transitioning Metropolitan Area
Area 4 Urban Agriculture
Municipal Boundary
Urban Service Area
Policy Area 1: Rural Agriculture

Goal: The presence of productive agricultural areas over the long term, encompassing a wide range of agricultural production and agriculture enterprises of varying size and scale. A vibrant agricultural system including input suppliers, services, and community facilities that support the agricultural and rural community.

Objectives:
• Agriculture is recognized and valued
• The primacy of agriculture is evident, assured
• The presence of a stable and accessible land base
• A strong commitment to and evidence of environmental stewardship practices
• A thriving rural community
• The presence of a strong and vibrant agricultural system
Policy Area 2: Agriculture Complementary to Other Land Uses

**Goal:** The presence of productive agricultural areas is a complementary use over the long term on lands that have other identified uses and/or constraints and recognizes opportunities for agriculture to exist in the interim until the land is required for its designated use.

**Objective:**
- Agriculture continues to be present for the foreseeable future
Policy Area 3: Transition Lands within the Metropolitan Area

**Goal:** The agricultural land base near an urban setting continues to be productive and managed under principles of good land and environmental stewardship.

**Objectives:**
- Agriculture coexists in proximity to urban development and will transition according to future growth requirements within the Metropolitan Area of EMR
- Development takes place in a staged and contiguous manner
Policy Area 4: Urban Agriculture

**Goal:** Thriving, engaged urban agriculture expressed in multiple forms and supported by an engaged community. A wide range of activities can exist including residents, businesses, communities, and organizations.

**Objectives:**

- All urban municipalities within the EMR have developed and implemented Urban Agriculture Plans
- Recognition that a vibrant urban agriculture industry could generate large economic benefits
- Building Community Through Food and Agriculture
- A Range of Approaches and Activities
- Major Economic Development and Research Outcomes