Meeting Agenda
March 14, 2013 – 9:00 a.m. – Noon
Chateau Louis, Grand Ballroom
11727 Kingsway, Edmonton

Open to the Public

1. Chair’s Opening Remarks
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes of February 14, 2013
4. Representations from the Public
5. REF Applications
6. Land Use
   a. CRB Administration Capacity to Evaluate Submitted Plans – City of Edmonton
      Motion: That the Land Use Committee evaluate the capacity of CRB Administration to
      evaluate submitted plans.
7. Governance
   a. CRB 2012 Audited Financial Statements – Presentation
      Motion: That the Capital Region Board approves the 2012 calendar year Audited Financial
      Statements as approved by Governance Committee.
   b. CRB 2012 Annual Report (calendar year)
      Motion: That the Capital Region Board approves the CRB’s 2012 Annual Report as
      approved by Governance Committee.
   c. Review Voting Structure – Leduc County
      Motion: That the Capital Region Board hold a planning session of all Board members to
      review the current Voting Structure (Section 5 subsections (2) and (3)), of the Capital
      Region Regulations and bring back recommendations to the Capital Region Board,
      regarding the regulations functionality.
      
      Councillor MacKay has advised that she will be withdrawing the County’s Motion as stated
      above.
   d. Procurement Policy #F002
      Motion: That the Capital Region Board approves the amendments to Policy F002 –
      Procurement.
8. Committee Reports
   a. Land Use Committee
   b. Transit Committee
   c. Governance Committee

9. Administrative Issues
   a. Provincial Budget Implications
   b. CCRA and Non-PGA Policy Clarification

10. Motion: That the CRB move to in camera session

No In-Camera Items

In Camera

11. Motion: That the CRB revert to public session.

Open to the Public

12. Adjournment
Minutes of a meeting of the Capital Region Board held at Chateau Louis, Grand Ballroom on Thursday, February 14, 2013

Delegates in Attendance:
Mayor Nolan Crouse – St. Albert/Chair
Mayor Camille Berube – Beaumont
Mayor Don Rigney - Sturgeon
Mayor Barry Rasch - Thorsby
Mayor Stephen Mandel – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Councillor Doug Horner - Gibbons
Councillor Dwight Ganske – Stony Plain
Mayor Dawson Kohl - Warburg
Mayor Bill Skinner – Town of Lamont
Councillor Jocelyn MacKay – Leduc County
Mayor Lisa Magera - Legal
Mayor Linda Osinchuk – Strathcona County
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord
Alderman Dominic Mishio – City of Leduc
Mayor Don Faulkner - Calmar
Councillor Bill Purdy - Wabamun
Mayor Karl Hauch - Bruderheim
Councillor Lisa Holmes - Morinville
Mayor Anita Fisher - Devon
Mayor Rodney Shaigec - Parkland
Mayor Stuart Houston – Spruce Grove
Mayor Mel Smith - Redwater
Reeve Wayne Woldanski – Lamont County
Ivan Moore – Government of Alberta

Absent:
None.

CRB Administration:
Doug Lagore, Chief Executive Officer
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Kim Wieringa, Project Manager
Brendan Pinches, Associate Project Manager
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Courtney Andrews, Executive Assistant
Allyson Jacques, Administrative Assistant
This meeting was open to the public except for agenda items 10 – 11, which were held in-camera.

Open to Public

1. Call to Order and Chair’s opening remarks
   Called to order at 9:33 a.m.
   
The Chair welcomed the CRB’s new CEO, Doug Lagore, to the meeting. Members were reminded to submit any pictures for the CRB’s 2012 Annual Report to CRB Administration.

9:38 a.m. Mayor Mandel replaced Councillor Gibbons as Edmonton’s representative.

2. Approval of Agenda
   
   Motion: To approve the agenda of February 14, 2013.
   
   Moved by Mayor Boyd.
   Motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes of January 10, 2013
   
   Motion: To accept the minutes of January 10, 2013.
   
   Moved by Mayor Katchur.
   Motion carried unanimously.

4. Representation from the Public

5. REF Applications
   a. REF 2012-019, Parkland County
      Proposed Municipal Development Plan Amendment
      Proposed New Area Structure Plan - Acheson
      
      Mayor Shaigec introduced the item. Mr. Martin Frigo, Senior Planner from Parkland County made a presentation providing an overview of the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) amendment and proposed new Acheson Area Structure Plan (ASP) highlighting the details of the Plan and its compliance with the requirements of the CRB’s Growth Plan and Regional Evaluation Framework (REF). The CAO Subcommittee was convened on January 15, 2013 to review REF 2012-019. The Subcommittee did not reach unanimous consensus. Mr. Frigo provided a summation of the concerns raised at the CAO Subcommittee and the County’s response to each concern raised. Mr. Paul Hanlan, Manager of Planning & Development for Parkland County was also in attendance.
      
      Neal Sarnecki gave an overview of the CRB Administration Recommendation confirming that the proposed MDP amendment and ASP is consistent with the policies and principles of the CRB’s Growth Plan and evaluation criteria in the REF. The third party consultant (Parioplan) also recommended the approval of the application.
      
      Some comments were made respecting the REF application. Mayor Houston put forward a motion.
**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board refer the proposed amendment to the Parkland County Municipal Development Plan and New Acheson Area Structure Plan back for CRB Administration to undertake an assessment of the regional and inter-municipal planning impacts of the proposed plan on bordering municipalities with respect to land use compatibility and the sustainable delivery of infrastructure.

Moved by Mayor Houston.
3 in favour, 21 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion failed.**

It was requested that the vote be recorded.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approves the proposed amendment to the Parkland County Municipal Development Plan and New Acheson Area Structure Plan in accordance with the Regional Evaluation Framework.

Moved by Mayor Shaigec.

In favour: Beaumont, Sturgeon, Thorsby, Gibbons, Stony Plain, Warburg, Town of Lamont, Leduc County, Legal, Strathcona County, Bon Accord, Wabamun, Bruderheim, Morinville, Devon, Parkland County, Spruce Grove, Redwater, Lamont County and St. Albert.

Opposed: Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, City of Leduc and Calmar.

Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion failed.**

11:00 a.m. Councillor Jones replaced Mayor Magera as Legal representative.
11:00 a.m. Councillor Lumsden replaced Mayor Smith as Redwater’s representative.
11:00 a.m. Councillor Gibbons replaced Mayor Mandel as Edmonton’s representative.
11:00 a.m. Councillor Shaw replaced Mayor Rigney as Sturgeon County’s representative.

Mayor Boyd left the table as Bon Accord’s representative. No replacement.

**6. Governance**

a. Request to Change Fiscal Year End

Mayor Berube introduced the item.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approves the request to Alberta Municipal Affairs to change the CRB’s financial year end from December 31 to a financial year end of March 31.

Moved by Mayor Berube.
**Motion carried unanimously.**

b. Committee’s Terms of Reference
Mayor Berube provided an overview of the item. It was noted that the names of the Chair and Vice Chair should be removed in each of the Committee’s Terms of Reference. It was also requested that “municipalities” be added to the wording in each Terms of Reference. Administration will amend each Terms of Reference as noted.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approves the changes to the Committee’s Terms of Reference as approved by the Governance Committee, with the additional amendments.

**Moved by** Mayor Berube.  
**Motion carried unanimously.**

c. 2012 Audited Financial Statements  
Mayor Berube provided an overview of the item.  
**Notice of Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approves the 2012 calendar year Audited Financial Statements as approved by Governance Committee.

**Provided by** Mayor Berube.

11:11 a.m. Mayor Mandel replaced Councillor Gibbons as Edmonton’s representative.

11:15 a.m. Mayor Rigney replaced Councillor Shaw as Sturegon County’s representative

**d. 2012 Annual Report (calendar year)**  
Mayor Berube provided an overview of the item.  
**Notice of Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approves the CRB’s 2012 Annual Report as approved by Governance Committee.

**Provided by** Mayor Berube.

Councillor MacKay put forward a Notice of Motion.

**Notice of Motion:** That the Capital Region Board hold a planning session of all Board members to review the current Voting Structure (Section 5 subsections (2) and (3)), of the Capital Region Regulations and bring back recommendations to the Capital Region Board, regarding the regulations functionality.

**Provided by** Councillor MacKay.

Mayor Rigney put forward a Notice of Motion.

**Notice of Motion:** That the Capital Region Board rewrite the CRB Growth Plan.

**Withdrawn by** Mayor Rigney.

7. Committee Reports
a. Land Use Committee
Mayor Fisher provided an overview of the recent work and future initiatives of the Land Use Committee.

Mayor Mandel put forward a Notice of Motion.

Notice of Motion: That the Land Use Committee evaluate the capacity of CRB Administration to evaluate submitted plans.

Provided by Mayor Mandel.

The Chair along with CRB Administration will review the work and progress of the Growth Plan update.

b. Transit Committee
Councillor Iveson provided an overview of the work of the Transit Committee.

c. Housing Committee
Councillor Gibbons provided an overview of the work of the Housing Committee.

d. Governance Committee
Mayor Berube provided an update on the work of the Governance Committee.

e. Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee
Mayor Houston gave an overview of the work concluded by the Pipeline’s Committee.

8. Administrative Issues

9. Motion: That the CRB move to in camera session.

Moved by Mayor Berube.
Motion carried unanimously.

In Camera

10. Advocacy & Communications Committee Report
Councillor Gibbons, Committee Vice Chair, provided an overview of the work of the Advocacy & Communications Committee.

11. Motion: That the CRB revert to public.

Moved by Mayor Kohl.
Motion carried unanimously.

Open to Public

12. Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.
CRB Administration Capacity to Evaluate Submitted Plans

Motion
That the Land Use Committee evaluate the capacity of CRB Administration to evaluate submitted plans.

Background

- Ministerial Order No. L:270/10, being the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF), was approved November 29, 2010. The effective date of the Regional Evaluation Framework is March 31, 2010. The REF requires that CRB Administration present a report and recommendation to the Board within 25 working days on which the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment referral is found to be complete. The presentation of the report and recommendation (posting to the CRB website) has not exceeded the 25 working days since the implementation of the REF. The average number of working days to post a REF recommendation is 19.


- Pursuant to the Administrative Procedures, following the receipt of a REF application the submitted documents are referred to a Third Party Consultant for evaluation.

- The Third Party Consultant evaluation is reviewed by CRB Staff and an administration recommendation is prepared and reviewed with the Chief Executive Officer. The final recommendation and Third Party evaluation are posted to the CRB website.

- A recommendation to approve is referred to a CAO Subcommittee for review and decision. If a Subcommittee unanimously supports the recommendation, it is deemed to have been approved by the Board. If a Subcommittee does not unanimously support the recommendation, the REF application is referred to the Board for a decision.

- A recommendation to reject is referred directly to the Board for a decision.

- Of the 60 REF applications processed since approval of the Growth Plan, the Board has only deviated from the CRB Administration recommendation 3 times. Two were to approve REF applications that had received reject recommendations from Administration and one was to reject a proposal that was recommended for approval by Administration.

Next Steps

Options
1. Support
2. Non-support
   - Financial implications of supporting the motion: ±$10,000.00

Administration recommendation

- That the Capital Region Board does not support the motion.
CRB 2012 Audited Financial Statements

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves the 2012 calendar year Audited Financial Statements as approved by Governance Committee.

Background

- Section 9 of the CRB Regulation requires the Board to submit an annual report on its activities in the preceding year to the Minister of Municipal Affairs by May 31 each year including audited financial statements. The CRB’s 2012 Audited Financial Statements will be included in the 2012 Annual Report document once approved by the Board.

- A Notice of Motion was provided to the Board at its February 14, 2013 meeting. This Motion is presented to the Board for approval of the CRB’s 2012 Audited Financial Statements.

- The CRB’s 2012 Annual Report will be also be provided, by separate motion, for approval at the March 14, 2013 Board meeting. Once these statements are approved, they will be incorporated into the Annual Report.

Next Steps

- Following approval of the 2012 Audited Financial Statements, CRB administration add these statements into the 2012 Annual Report to finalize the document. A printed version of the complete Annual Report will be provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in April 2013.

Rationale

- Ensure compliance with section 9 of the CRB Regulation to submit an annual activity report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs by May 1 of each year including audited financial statements.
February 25, 2013

Capital Region Board  
Suite 1405, Bell Tower  
10104-103 Avenue  
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H8

Attention: Board of Directors

Dear Board Members:

**RE: 2012 AUDIT FINDINGS LETTER**

The purpose of this communication is to summarize certain matters arising from the audit that we believe would be of interest to the Board. Additionally, during the course of our audit we identified matters that may be of interest to management.

This communication should be read in conjunction with the financial statements and our report thereon, and it is intended solely for the use of the Board and should not be distributed to external parties without our prior consent. Hawkings Epp Dumont LLP accepts no responsibility to a third party who uses this communication.

**AUDIT FINDINGS**

It is important for the Board to understand the responsibilities that rest with Capital Region Board and its management and those that belong to the auditor in relation to the financial statement audit.

Our audit of Capital Region Board’s financial statements was performed in accordance with Canadian Auditing Standards. These standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position, results of operations and fund balances, and cash flows of Capital Region Board in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

Accordingly, we planned and performed our audit to provide reasonable, but not absolute, assurance of detecting fraud and errors that have a material effect on the financial statements taken as a whole, including illegal acts whose consequences have a material effect on the financial statements.
The audit included consideration of internal control relevant to the preparation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control.

Canadian Auditing Standards do not require the auditor to design procedures for the purpose of identifying supplementary matters to communicate to the Board. Accordingly, our audit would not necessarily identify all such matters that may be of interest to the Board and management and it is inappropriate to conclude that no such matters exist.

**MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES**

Management is responsible for the preparation of the financial statements in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

**AUDIT APPROACH**

In gathering our audit evidence, we utilized a substantive approach to the audit of Capital Region Board. This approach allowed us to issue an audit opinion on the financial statements in the most cost-effective manner, while still obtaining the assurance necessary to support our audit opinion. In performing our audit, our work focused on, but was not limited to, areas that we believed had a higher risk of being materially misstated. A substantive approach is more appropriate when an entity processes a relatively low volume of transactions and may not have strong internal controls due to limited segregation of duties. In obtaining the required audit evidence to support our report, we did not place reliance on any internal controls that may exist at Capital Region Board.

**MATERIALITY**

Materiality in an audit is used as a guide for planning the nature and extent of audit procedures and for assessing the sufficiency of audit evidence gathered. It is also used in evaluating the misstatements found and determining the appropriate audit opinion to express.

A misstatement, or the aggregate of all misstatements in financial statements, is considered to be material if, in the light of surrounding circumstances, it is probable that the decision of a person who is relying on the financial statements, and who has a reasonable knowledge of business and economic activities (the user), would be changed or influenced by such misstatement or the aggregate of all misstatements. The materiality decision ultimately is based on the auditors’ professional judgment.

The auditor's determination of materiality is a matter of professional judgment, and is affected by the auditor's perception of the financial information needs of users of the financial statements. In planning our audit, we have concluded that a materiality level of 2% of expenses is appropriate. However, we anticipate that management will record any adjustments that we propose that are of a non-trivial nature.
SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS FROM THE AUDIT

Our objective is to communicate appropriately to the Board and management deficiencies in internal control that we have identified during the audit and that, in our professional judgment, are of sufficient importance to merit being reported to the Board.

The audit findings contained in this letter did not have a material effect on Capital Region Board’s financial statements, and as such, our audit report is without reservation with respect to these matters.

In our Management Letter for 2011 we had brought several issues to the attention of the management. As at December 31, 2012 all those issues have satisfactorily been dealt with except the issue with respect to the server location. We recommend that Capital Region Board’s server be placed in a locked room with proper ventilation and be accessible only to authorized staff members.

Significant Deficiencies in Internal Control

Our audit procedures did not reveal any significant deficiencies in internal control.

Significant Qualitative Aspects of Accounting Practices

Management is responsible for determining the significant accounting policies. The choice of different accounting policy alternatives can have a significant effect on the financial position and results of Capital Region Board. The application of those policies often involves significant estimates and judgments by management.

We are of the opinion that the significant accounting policies, estimates and judgments made by management, and financial disclosures do not materially misstate the financial statements taken as a whole.

Uncorrected Misstatements

Uncorrected misstatements aggregated by our Firm, for the year ended December 31, 2012 amounted to a $4,800 overstatement of expenses.

After considering both quantitative and qualitative factors with respect to the uncorrected misstatements above, we agree with management that the financial statements are not materially misstated.

Significant Difficulties Encountered During the Audit

We encountered no significant difficulties during our audit that should be brought to the attention of the Board.
Management Representations

Management’s representations are integral to the audit evidence we will gather. Prior to the release of our report, we will require management’s representations in writing to support the content of our report.

AUDITOR INDEPENDENCE

We have been engaged to audit the financial statements of Capital Region Board for the year ended December 31, 2012.

We believe it is important to communicate, at least annually, with you regarding all relationships between the Capital Region Board and our Firm that, in our professional judgment, may reasonably be thought to bear on our independence.

In determining which relationships to report, these standards require us to consider relevant rules and related interpretations prescribed by the Institute of Chartered Accountants of Alberta and applicable legislation, covering such matters as:

(a) holding a financial interest, either directly or indirectly, in a client;
(b) holding a position, either directly or indirectly, that gives the right or responsibility to exert significant influence over the financial or accounting policies of a client;
(c) personal or business relationships of immediate family, close relatives, partners or retired partners, either directly or indirectly, with a client;
(d) economic dependence on a client; and
(e) provision of services in addition to the audit engagement.

We have prepared the following comments to facilitate our discussion with you regarding independence matters.

We are not aware of any relationships between Capital Region Board and ourselves that, in our professional judgment, may reasonably be thought to bear on our independence that have occurred from January 1, 2012 to February 25, 2013.

In our proposal of October 27, 2011, we quoted our fees to the Capital Region Board for audit services during the year from January 1, 2012 to December 31, 2012 at $9,800. Non audit fees amounted to $3,800 during 2012.
We wish to thank Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager for her assistance during our audit work. We appreciate the opportunity to provide audit services to Capital Region Board and we extend our best wishes for a successful 2013.

Yours very truly,

HAWKINGS EPP DUMONT LLP

Michael H. Epp, CA, CMA
Partner

MHE/law

cc: Doug Lagore, Chief Executive Officer; Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager;
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

To the Members of Capital Region Board

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the Capital Region Board, which comprise the statement of financial position as at December 31, 2012 and the statements of operations, changes in net financial assets (debt), and cash flows for the year then ended, and a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards, and for such internal control as management determines is necessary to enable the preparation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with Canadian generally accepted auditing standards. Those standards require that we comply with ethical requirements and plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditors' judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement in the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditors considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

Opinion

In our opinion, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Capital Region Board as at December 31, 2012, the results of its operations, change in its net financial assets (debt) and its cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

Edmonton, Alberta
February 25, 2013

HAWKINGS EPP DUMONT LLP
Chartered Accountants
MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSIBILITY FOR FINANCIAL REPORTING

The financial statements have been prepared by management in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards and the integrity and objectivity of these statements are management’s responsibility. Management is also responsible for all of the notes to the financial statements and schedules, and for ensuring that this information is consistent, where appropriate, with the information contained in the financial statements.

Management is also responsible for implementing and maintaining a system of internal controls to provide reasonable assurance that reliable financial information is produced.

The Board is responsible for ensuring that management fulfills its responsibilities for financial reporting and internal control and exercises these responsibilities through the Board. The Board reviews internal financial statements on a monthly basis and external audited financial statements yearly.

The external auditors, Hawking Epp Dumont LLP, conduct an independent examination, in accordance with Canadian auditing standards, and express their opinion on the financial statements. The external auditors have full and free access to financial management of Capital Region Board and meet when required.

On behalf of Capital Region Board:

__________________________
Doug Lagore
Chief Executive Officer

Edmonton, Alberta
February 25, 2013
CAPITAL REGION BOARD

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION

AS AT DECEMBER 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$134,618</td>
<td>$1,162,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax receivable</td>
<td>48,974</td>
<td>39,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>183,592</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,201,729</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>$158,217</td>
<td>$198,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue (Note 3)</td>
<td>8,293</td>
<td>992,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized deferred lease inducement</td>
<td>13,446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>174,513</strong></td>
<td><strong>204,659</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net financial assets (debt)</td>
<td><strong>16,079</strong></td>
<td>(2,930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-financial assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible capital assets (Note 4)</td>
<td>88,990</td>
<td>100,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83,590</td>
<td>102,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated surplus</td>
<td><strong>92,669</strong></td>
<td><strong>100,011</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD:

_________________________ Chair

_________________________ Vice Chair

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
CAPITAL REGION BOARD

STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS AND ACCUMULATED SURPLUS

FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Budget (Note 9)</th>
<th>2012 Actual</th>
<th>2011 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants (Note 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province of Alberta:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Internship</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>34,862</td>
<td>21,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Roadmap</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Collaboration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and other income</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,927</td>
<td>23,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>4,040,220</td>
<td>3,310,009</td>
<td>3,098,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and committee expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>146,600</td>
<td>120,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>89,020</td>
<td>69,865</td>
<td>52,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>44,600</td>
<td>35,809</td>
<td>24,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative expenses:</strong></td>
<td>319,620</td>
<td>252,374</td>
<td>197,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting fees</td>
<td>2,062,400</td>
<td>1,254,481</td>
<td>1,261,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>1,410,000</td>
<td>1,363,848</td>
<td>1,195,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office lease</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>165,569</td>
<td>174,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>55,500</td>
<td>108,872</td>
<td>61,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>18,193</td>
<td>38,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,379</td>
<td>36,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>48,500</td>
<td>40,626</td>
<td>34,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>16,455</td>
<td>20,995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>19,223</td>
<td>16,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,867</td>
<td>4,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,602</td>
<td>3,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program expenses (Note 3):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Internship</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>34,862</td>
<td>20,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Roadmap</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual surplus (deficit)</strong></td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>(7,342)</td>
<td>(18,353)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated surplus at beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100,011</td>
<td>118,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated surplus at end of year</strong></td>
<td>$ 375,000</td>
<td>$ 92,669</td>
<td>$ 100,011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
CAPITAL REGION BOARD

STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET FINANCIAL ASSETS (DEBT)

FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Budget (Note 9)</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual surplus (deficit)</td>
<td>$ 375,000</td>
<td>$ (7,342)</td>
<td>$ (18,353)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(18,958)</td>
<td>(17,953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35,379</td>
<td>36,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,421</td>
<td>18,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of prepaid expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of prepaid expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in net financial assets (debt)</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>12,009</td>
<td>(2,395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net financial assets (debt) at beginning of year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2,930)</td>
<td>(535)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net financial assets (debt) at end of year</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td>$9,079</td>
<td>$ (2,930)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Activities</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual surplus (deficit)</td>
<td>$(7,342)</td>
<td>$(18,353)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>35,379</td>
<td>36,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due from government</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax receivable</td>
<td>(9,910)</td>
<td>30,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>2,930</td>
<td>(2,395)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>(40,686)</td>
<td>(35,696)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue</td>
<td>(984,082)</td>
<td>(23,666)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized deferred lease inducement</td>
<td>(5,379)</td>
<td>(5,379)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,009,089)</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,111</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Activities</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>(18,958)</td>
<td>(17,953)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Cash During the Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>(1,028,047)</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,158</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash, Beginning of Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,162,665</td>
<td>$1,131,507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cash, End of Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$134,618</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,162,665</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Cash Flow Information:

- Interest received during the year: $3,855 | $4,135
1. NATURE OF OPERATIONS

Capital Regional Board (the "Board") was established by the Capital Region Board Regulation 49/2008 (the "Regulation") under the Municipal Government Act of the Province of Alberta on April 15, 2008. On September 16, 2010, the Regulation was updated (145/2010). The updated Regulation is in effect until December 31, 2012. The Board is an other government entity and is exempt from income taxes.

Members of the Board include elected officials of 24 participating municipalities representing 5 cities (Edmonton, St. Albert, Fort Saskatchewan, Spruce Grove and Leduc), 11 towns (Beaumont, Bon Accord, Bruderheim, Calmar, Devon, Gibbons, Lamont, Legal, Morinville, Redwater and Stony Plain), 3 villages (Thorsby, Wabamun and Warburg), and 5 counties (Strathcona, Lamont, Sturgeon, Parkland and Leduc) in the Capital Region.

The Board was established by the Province to prepare a proposed Capital Region Growth Plan (the "Plan"), advise and make recommendations to the Minister of Municipal Affairs (the "Minister") regarding the preparation and implementation of the Plan, facilitate the resolution of issues arising from the preparation and implementation of the Plan, implement policies for the sharing of costs among the participating municipalities for regional projects of the Capital Region and carry out any other functions and duties as the Minister directs. Key elements of the Plan include development of a regional land use plan, a regional intermunicipal transit network plan, a plan to coordinate geographic information services, and a plan regarding non-market and market affordable housing requirements for the Capital Region.

In June 2009, the Minister requested that the Board complete additional work on the Growth Plan including land use, a cost allocation formula for the regional portion of regional transit projects, Geographic Information Services (GIS) and the general location of housing. This work was completed in two separate Addenda to the Growth Plan in October and December 2009. The Province of Alberta approved the Growth Plan in March 2010. Since that time, the Capital Region Board has been working to accomplish the projects set out in the updated 2012-2014 business plan.
2. ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The financial statements have been prepared by management in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards for other government entities established by the Canadian Public Sector Accounting Board. The financial statements have, in management’s opinion, been properly prepared within reasonable limits of materiality and within the framework of the accounting policies summarized below:

(a) Revenues
Revenues are recognized in the period in which the transactions or events occurred that gave rise to the revenues. All revenues are recorded on an accrual basis, except when the accruals cannot be determined with a reasonable degree of certainty or when their estimation is impracticable.

Funds from external parties and earnings thereon received by agreement or legislation are accounted for as deferred revenue until used for the purposes specified.

Interest income is recorded as it is earned.

(b) Expenses
Expenses are reported on an accrual basis. The cost of all goods consumed and services received during the year is expensed.

(c) Tangible Capital Assets
Tangible capital assets are recorded at cost, which includes amounts that are directly related to the acquisition, design, construction, development, improvement or betterment of the assets. Cost includes overhead costs only attributable to construction and development, as well as interest costs that are directly attributable to the acquisition or construction of the asset.

The cost, less residual value of the tangible capital assets, is amortized using the following methods at the following annual rates. The half year rule applies to the tangible capital assets in the year when they are purchased or disposed. Only assets with costs in excess of $2,500 are capitalized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Equipment</td>
<td>Declining balance</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Declining balance</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td>Straight-line</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tangible capital assets are written down when conditions indicate that they no longer contribute to the Board’s ability to provide goods and services, or when the value of future economic benefits associated with the tangible capital assets are less than their net book value. The net write-downs are accounted for as expenses in the statement of operations.

Contributed capital assets are recorded into revenues at their fair market value on the date of donation, except in circumstances where fair value cannot be reasonably determined, which are then recognized at nominal value. Transfers of capital assets from related parties are recorded at carrying value.

(d) Contributed Goods and Services
Contributed goods and services represent goods and services which the organization would normally purchase. The contribution amount is recorded at the fair value of the goods or services received.
CAPITAL REGION BOARD
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (CONT'D)

DECEMBER 31, 2012

2. ACCOUNTING POLICIES (CONT'D)
   (e) Prepaid Expenses
   Prepaid expenses include deposits and insurance and are charged to expense over the periods expected to benefit from it.

   (f) Measurement Uncertainty
   The preparation of financial statements in conformity with Canadian public sector accounting standards, requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities, and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements, and the reported amounts of the revenues and expenses during the period. Items requiring the use of significant estimates include the useful life of tangible capital assets, rates for amortization, and impairment of assets.

   Estimates are based on the best information available at the time of preparation of the financial statements and are reviewed annually to reflect new information as it becomes available. Measurement uncertainty exists in these financial statements. Actual results could differ from these estimates.

   (g) Deferred Revenue
   Certain amounts are earned pursuant to legislation, regulation or agreement and may only be used in the conduct of certain programs or in the delivery of specific services and transactions. These amounts are recognized as revenue in the fiscal year the related expenses are incurred, services are performed or when stipulations are met.

   (h) Deferred Lease Inducement
   Deferred lease inducement represents the unamortized value of an inducement received when the Board entered into a lease arrangement in 2009 for rental of additional office space. Amortization is provided on a straight-line basis over the 5 year term of the related lease as a reduction in operating expenses.

3. DEFERRED REVENUE
   Deferred revenue Amounts received/ Revenue Deferred revenue
   beginning of year receivable recognized end of year

   Province of Alberta:
   Operations $ 992,220 $ 2,250,000 $ 3,242,220 $ -
   Municipal Internship - 43,000 34,862 8,138
   Regional Collaboration - 17,000 17,000 -

   $ 992,220 $ 2,310,000 $ 3,294,082 $ 8,138
CAPITAL REGION BOARD

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (CONT'D)

DECEMBER 31, 2012

3. DEFERRED REVENUE (CONT'D)

Operations:
An updated 2012/2013 conditional operating grant agreement between the Province of Alberta and the Board was signed on April 24, 2012. The agreement provides a conditional contribution in the amount of $3,000,000 (2011 - $3,000,000) to the Board. The contribution, including any income earned thereon, is to be used to fund the Board's operations and to allow it to carry out its mandated responsibilities for the period from April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013 unless an extension is agreed to by the Minister.

There was an amount of $992,220 being carried forward from 2011, which was recorded as revenue for the December 31, 2012 year end.

The 4th quarter installment of the 2012/2013 conditional operating grant agreement, related to the period January 1, 2013 to March 31, 2013, was received on January 8, 2013.

Municipal Internship:
During the year, Alberta Municipal Affairs provided $40,000 in supplemental funding to the Board for the Municipal Internship Program (the "Program"). The Program is intended to strengthen the municipal planning field in Alberta by attracting recent graduates and providing them with a two year training opportunity. To December 31, 2012, eligible expenditures for salaries and benefits of $34,862 have been incurred (2011: $20,574).

Regional Collaboration:
During the year, Alberta Municipal Affairs provided a one time conditional grant of $17,000 to the Board. The grant is intended to support the collaboration of the Board and its member municipalities and to assist with conference costs for the 2012 Housing Symposium.
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4. TANGIBLE CAPITAL ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Furniture and Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>$28,219</td>
<td>$79,076</td>
<td>$87,404</td>
<td>$194,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,958</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>28,219</td>
<td>98,034</td>
<td>87,404</td>
<td>213,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accumulated amortization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Furniture and Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>13,819</td>
<td>42,597</td>
<td>38,272</td>
<td>94,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>13,786</td>
<td>18,711</td>
<td>35,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>16,699</td>
<td>56,383</td>
<td>56,983</td>
<td>130,067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net book value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Furniture and Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$11,520</td>
<td>$45,343</td>
<td>$30,421</td>
<td>$83,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Furniture and Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>$28,219</td>
<td>$78,178</td>
<td>78,178</td>
<td>176,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>8,768</td>
<td>9,226</td>
<td>9,226</td>
<td>17,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>28,219</td>
<td>92,676</td>
<td>87,404</td>
<td>194,699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accumulated amortization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Furniture and Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>10,218</td>
<td>28,833</td>
<td>19,330</td>
<td>58,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>8,601</td>
<td>13,764</td>
<td>18,942</td>
<td>36,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>18,819</td>
<td>42,597</td>
<td>38,272</td>
<td>94,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net book value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Furniture and Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$14,400</td>
<td>$36,479</td>
<td>$49,132</td>
<td>$100,011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

The Board’s financial instruments consist of cash, accounts receivable, accounts payable and accrued liabilities. It is management’s opinion that the Board is not exposed to significant interest, credit, or currency risks arising from these financial instruments.

Unless otherwise noted, the carrying values of the financial instruments approximate their fair values.
6. CAPITAL MANAGEMENT
The Board's objectives when managing capital are to safeguard the Board's ability to continue as a going concern, so that it can continue to provide service to its member municipalities.

7. RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS
Capital Region Board has the following transaction with the Province of Alberta (the "Province"):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants from the Province (Note 3)</td>
<td>$ 3,294,082</td>
<td>$ 3,074,840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. COMMITMENTS
The Board is committed to operating leases for its office premises, both of which expire on May 31, 2014. Under the terms of the lease arrangements, the Board is responsible for annual rent plus its share of operating costs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 170,252</td>
<td>$ 70,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 241,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. BUDGET
Budget figures are presented for information purposes only and are unaudited.
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**Motion**

*That the Capital Region Board approves the CRB’s 2012 Annual Report as approved by Governance Committee.*

**Background**

- Section 9 of the CRB Regulation requires the Board to submit an annual report on its activities in the preceding year to the Minister of Municipal Affairs by May 31 each year including audited financial statements.

- A Notice of Motion was provided to the Board at its February 14, 2013 meeting. This Motion is presented to the Board for approval of the 2012 Annual Report.

- The CRB’s 2012 Audited Financial Statements will be also be provided, by separate motion, for approval at the March 14, 2013 Board meeting. Once approved, these statements will be incorporated into the Annual Report.

**Next Steps**

- The 2012 Audited Financial Statements will be added to the Annual Report upon approval of that separate motion by the Board.

- A printed version of the complete Annual Report will be provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in April 2013.

**Rationale**

- Ensure compliance with section 9 of the CRB Regulation to submit an annual report of the Board to the Minister of Municipal Affairs by May 1 of each year.
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THE ULTIMATE AIM OF THE BOARD IS TO ENSURE THE HEALTH AND VITALITY OF THE CAPITAL REGION FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS, THROUGH A GROWTH PLAN WHICH EMPHASIZES ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY.
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FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
ALBERTA’S CAPITAL REGION IS WELL POSITIONED TO EMERGE AS A SIGNIFICANT REGION ON THE WORLD STAGE, GIVEN ITS ABUNDANT RESOURCES, GROWING POPULATION AND SIGNIFICANT INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTH.
MESSAGE FROM THE BOARD CHAIR AND INTERIM CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

The Government of Alberta created the Capital Region Board (CRB) in 2008 with the ultimate goal to ensure the vitality of the Capital Region for future generations, through a Growth Plan which emphasizes economic, social and environmental sustainability.

The Region will face significant opportunities and challenges in the coming years. New growth is occurring at an unprecedented pace throughout much of the Region, including a boom in the construction of new industrial facilities, retail and office space, as well as housing. New businesses and services will be attracted to the Region as a result of its tremendous growth. This scale of growth requires commitment to a shared vision for the Region and coordinated planning to achieve it.

THE CASE FOR ADOPTING A REGIONAL APPROACH TO BETTER ENBRACE THE TREMENDOUS OPPORTUNITIES IN THE CAPITAL REGION HAS BEEN WELL ESTABLISHED. THIS IS THE WORK OF THE CAPITAL REGION BOARD, AND IT IS CRITICAL TO SUSTAINING ECONOMIC GROWTH WHILE ENSURING STRONG COMMUNITIES AND A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT.

The Capital Region Board Regulation requires that the CRB prepare an Annual Report on its activities and financial statements for submission to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The CRB's Annual Report for the year ending December 31, 2012, was prepared under that direction. Included are the CRB’s financial statements which have been prepared in accordance with the Province’s Financial Accountability Act and Canadian generally accepted accounting principles. All of the Board’s policy decisions with material financial implications, as of December 31, 2012, have been considered in the preparation of this report.
Achieving Our Vision

The Capital Region Growth Plan: *Growing Forward* is a landmark agreement among the Board’s 24 member municipalities to support a new pattern for future development. It represents a shift in approach to integrated land use and transportation planning aimed at reducing the Region’s development footprint. This will include a broader mix of housing types and densities in more compact communities supported by a range of transportation modes—public transit, cycling and walking.

Member municipalities are committed to ensuring a sustainable future for the Region. Preserving the quality of life for present and future generations is essential. To ensure that CRB decisions support that goal and also to track their cumulative effect on the environment, the Board will implement monitoring and performance measures. At the same time, there must be a balance between the effects of growth on land, water and air quality, and the social and economic vitality of the Region.

While the Plan recognizes that more of the Region’s future population and employment expansion will occur in Priority Growth Areas, all municipalities in the Region will benefit. What will serve to guide the Board and member municipalities in achieving the Vision are the comprehensive principles and policies that address the interrelationships between the four strategic priority areas of the Growth Plan:

- Land Use
- Intermunicipal Transit
- Housing
- Geographic Information Services (GIS)
OUR VISION:

THE CAPITAL REGION IS A FAMILY OF DIVERSE, INTERDEPENDENT COMMUNITIES WHOSE ENERGY, TALENT AND RESOURCES ARE COMBINED WITH INSIGHTFUL PLANNING PROCESSES, SOUND FISCAL AND REGULATORY PRACTICES, ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITY AND EMPATHY FOR THE UNDERPRIVILEGED. STRONG EXPRESSIONS OF REGIONAL PURPOSE AND THE ABILITY TO EMBRACE CHANGE ENSURE THAT THE SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL WELL-BEING OF THE REGION'S CURRENT AND FUTURE RESIDENTS AND COMMUNITIES IS RESPECTED AND SUSTAINED.
The Board continues to operate under the Capital Region Board Regulation which was updated by A.R. 38-2012, and came into effect on March 31, 2012. The Board is deemed to be a regional services commission for the purposes of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, and the Alberta Capital Finance Authority Act.

The Regulation identifies the Board's 24 member municipalities and sets out its accountability, voting structure and its powers and duties. It also establishes the CRB's mandate to develop and oversee the implementation of an integrated and strategic Regional Growth Plan for the next 35 years, and to coordinate decisions in the Capital Region to support economic growth and strong communities and a healthy environment.

A recent history of high population and employment growth, and their associated pressures, demonstrated the need for collaboration among the Region's municipalities to improve their long-term sustainability. Relative to the rest of Canada, the Region is predicted to continue to grow at an advanced rate.

The Capital Region Growth Plan is an important step in ensuring that the Region remains globally competitive. Its directives provide a path toward sustainable growth and improved quality of life for the Region's citizens.
In 2012 we reached a level of maturity such that all of us—administrators and elected officials—began to understand the depth and breadth of the Growth Plan. It's a huge undertaking and beyond what any of our local communities could do alone. The issues are complex and the region is diverse; from urban to rural, large centres to small villages, farms and acreages. That is challenging and it requires each of us to set aside our local hat and look at things regionally. To successfully plan for the coming growth, it is critical that we work together. Collectively we will succeed.

— Mayor Nolan Crouse,
Chair of the Capital Region Board
### Capital Region Board Members
(as of 12/31/2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Beaumont</td>
<td>Mayor Camille Berube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Bon Accord</td>
<td>Mayor Randolph Boyd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Bruderheim</td>
<td>Mayor Karl Hauch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Calmar</td>
<td>Mayor Don Faulkner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Devon</td>
<td>Mayor Anita Fisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>Mayor Stephen Mandel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Mayor Gale Katchur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibbons</td>
<td>Mayor William Nimmo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>Reeve Wayne Wolanski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Lamont</td>
<td>Mayor Bill Skinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>Councillor Jocelyn Mackay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Leduc</td>
<td>Mayor Greg Krischke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Legal</td>
<td>Mayor Lisa Magra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Morinville</td>
<td>Mayor Paul Krauskopf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>Mayor Rodney Shaigec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Redwater</td>
<td>Mayor Mel Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spruce Grove</td>
<td>Mayor Stuart Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Albert</td>
<td>Mayor Nolan Crouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Stony Plain</td>
<td>Councillor Dwight Ganske</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>Mayor Linda Osinchuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>Mayor Donald Rigney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Thorsby</td>
<td>Mayor Barry Rasch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Wabamun</td>
<td>Councillor Bill Purdy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Warburg</td>
<td>Mayor Dawson Kohl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Who We Are

The Capital Region Board is a corporation consisting of 24 member municipalities from within the Region. Each member municipality is represented by an elected official appointed by their local council. The CRB members and their respective representatives are listed to the left.

In addition to the elected officials, there is a non-voting Government of Alberta appointee, Mr. Ivan Moore, of Alberta Municipal Affairs. Mr. Moore is also a non-voting member of the Board's Land Use Committee. The Government of Alberta has also appointed representatives to the Regional Transit Committee and Housing Committee.
What We Do

The CRB coordinates long range planning and decision making amongst the region's municipalities. Effective planning and implementation of the four strategic priority areas identified in the regulation will engage the municipalities to:

- Plan and assist in administering regional projects designed to improve the quality of life for Capital Region residents, and to act as a monitoring body for those projects;
- Establish land use practices that benefit the region while respecting and supporting the diversity that exists within the individual municipalities—its people, culture and natural environments;
- Plan and oversee regional intermunicipal transit services that also provide special services for persons with disabilities;
- Plan and support programs and practices which increase the availability of non-market affordable and market affordable housing throughout the Region;
- Expand regional capacity to deliver geographic information services that support regional decisions on sustainable land use, transit, and non-market affordable and market affordable housing;
- Assist in coordinating the efforts and energies of the member municipalities where applicable;
- Share the knowledge and insight gathered by the Board with member municipalities;
- Liaise and advocate with the provincial and federal governments on issues and projects related to the Capital Region;
- Provide the public with a comprehensive single source to access information on regional projects.
How We Operate

The Board organizes its work through committees comprised of elected officials appointed by the 24 member municipalities. Each committee operates within a Terms of Reference approved by the Board. Each year the Board reviews and approves the Committee priorities for the upcoming period. In 2012, the committees' work focused on further implementation of the Growth Plan and building partnerships in the Region. Each committee selects a Chair and Vice-Chair from within its membership; these selections are subsequently approved by the Board. The committee chair and vice-chair appointments are reviewed annually by each committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Governance</th>
<th>Advocacy &amp; Communications</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Pipeline Linkages Strategy (Ad Hoc)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Town of Beaumont</td>
<td>City of Leduc</td>
<td>Town of Devon</td>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>City of Spruce Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair</td>
<td>County of Strathcona</td>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>County of Leduc</td>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>Town of Redwater</td>
<td>City of Fort Saskatchewan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On December 13, 2012, the Board reviewed the committee structure, terms of reference and municipal membership for its standing committees in preparation for the work of 2013. The Board will review the committee structure and municipal membership for the ad hoc Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee in 2013. The responsibility for implementing the Geographic Information Services (GIS) component of the
Growth Plan currently resides under the mandate of the Land Use Committee, continuing a 2010 Board decision on committee organization.

Going forward, each committee will continue to implement the Growth Plan and work on the Plan update, scheduled for completion in 2015.

**Organization**

During 2012, the Board was supported by eight full-time administrative term positions.

In addition to the 8 full-time term positions, Stephanie Chai was hired under the Municipal Affairs Internship Program, a two-year internship for Land Use Planners. In order to provide practical local municipal planning experience that is not available in the Board office, CRB Administration and the Town of Beaumont signed a Memorandum of Understanding, agreeing to the secondment of the planning intern to the Town for eight months in 2013.

In November, the Board completed a competitive recruitment process in which Mr. Doug Lagore, previously City Manager for the City of Spruce Grove, was selected as CRB’s Chief Executive Officer, effective February 2013.
The CRB represents one-third of Albertans and when we speak with one voice we have influence. Our committee is the voice, advocating for CRB goals and priorities to local groups, Chambers of Commerce and other orders of government. A high priority for 2012 was to work with the Province to secure sustainable, long-term funding to advance our current and future projects. We clearly articulated that need to the Minister and other elected members of the legislature.

— Mayor Greg Kniest, Chair, Advocacy and Communications Committee.

Role of The Government of Alberta

Between 2008 and the first quarter of 2012, the Province appointed two successive Interim Chairs to lead the Board, Mr. Christopher Sheard, followed by Mr. Jim S. Edwards. This position was appointed by Ministerial Order with the authority necessary to carry out the Board’s mandate in the early stages of its existence.

In February 2012, the Board elected a Chair from within its own membership for the first time. Effective April 1, 2012, Mr. Nolan Crouse, Mayor of the City of St. Albert, became the first elected official appointed by the Board. Chair Crouse will remain Board Chair until the 2013 municipal election, after which a new nomination and election process will take place.

In June 2012, the Honourable Doug Griffiths, Minister of Municipal Affairs, met with the Board and noted the importance of building strong communities in the Region and congratulated the Board on their accomplishments to date. The Minister expressed his continued commitment to support the CRB with sustainable funding. Since the Board’s inception the Government of Alberta has provided an operating grant of $3 million for each of the Board’s fiscal years. This grant expires in 2013 and is expected to be renewed. Additionally, Alberta Municipal Affairs has provided grant funding for Municipal Planning Intern positions. These internships are two-years in duration and the Board has hired an intern during both the 2010-2011 and 2012-2013...
programs. In 2012, through the Regional Collaboration Program, the province approved a $17,000 grant to the CRB for hosting the Re/Envision Housing Symposium held on October 4, 2012. Member municipalities continued to work with the Province on funding approvals for eligible GreenTRIP Program projects as part of the Board’s 30-year Transit Service Plan for intermunicipal service in the Region. The Province also appointed staff to the Board and key Committees, and provided access to experts in specific areas of planning as the need arose. This continued collaboration and support from the Province has been essential in all facets of the Board’s activities and achievements, support that will continue to be needed as the Growth Plan is updated and implemented.

In November 2011, the CRB submitted three important strategic plans to Minister Griffiths: the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP), the 30-Year Transit Service Plan and the Integrated Regional Transportation System Study (IRTSS) Technical Report. These reports were approved by the Board in mid-2011 and are the result of completing 2011 priority projects by both the Land Use

Committee and the Transit Committee. Once these are approved by the Province, they will become an integral part of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

In 2012, the Board continued to administer the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF), which exists under the authority of Section 21 of the Capital Region Board Regulation and Ministerial Order L270:10 adopted November 29, 2010. Under the REF, the Board reviews and approves municipal statutory plans to ensure that they are consistent with the Capital Region Growth Plan.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs retains the authority to create Ministerial Orders to direct the following: the Board’s management, duties and functions; transitional matters related to the Capital Region Board Regulation; the requisition of operating and capital funds, record keeping and reporting; and any other matters deemed necessary by the Minister under the Board’s Regulation. This may extend to legislative amendments to enable the Board to carry out its mandate, and the facilitation of access to funds and to borrow from the Alberta Capital Finance Authority for regional projects approved by the Board.
Statement of Accountability

The Capital Region Board is responsible to the member municipalities, residents and key stakeholders of the Capital Region, and to the Government of Alberta to ensure that its work is focused on the appropriate priorities to ensure the global competitiveness and sustainability of the Region for future generations.

The Board ensures sound operations through a commitment to transparency, consistent with Alberta’s Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

1. The Board seeks broad input through consultation, either directly or through its member municipalities, on matters that affect the communities and the future of the Capital Region.

2. The Board operates within a corporate governance model that includes:
   a. Preparation of a Business Plan, updated annually, that sets direction, establishes regional priorities, and reports on progress toward Growth Plan objectives;
   b. Adherence to fiscal management and reporting in compliance with Alberta’s Financial Administration Act and Canadian generally accepted accounting standards;
   c. Preparation of an Annual Report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs as required in the Capital Region Board Regulation;
   d. Monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the Growth Plan including activities related to the Board’s operations;
   e. Commitment to an “evergreening” process for updating the Growth Plan every five years;
   f. Ongoing advocacy in support of regional priorities;
   g. Communication with member municipalities, stakeholders and the public that focuses on the Board’s key activities and the implementation of the Growth Plan.
Decision Making Structure

Powers and Duties of The Board

The Capital Region Board Regulation identifies the Board’s membership, the voting structure and its powers and duties. The roles and responsibilities of the Board are to coordinate long range planning and decision making among the municipalities of the Capital Region. All member municipalities must comply with the Growth Plan as approved.

It is important to note that the Board supports member municipalities from a regional perspective to achieve balanced growth. Residents of the Region continue to be served by their elected municipal councils, and decisions without regional implications continue to be made locally.

The following table provides further definition of the Board’s functional responsibilities relative to the four priority mandate areas of the Growth Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPITAL REGION BOARD RESPONSIBILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FUNCTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supported by the Governance and Advocacy and Communications Committees, there are three additional standing committees that focus on specific priority areas: Land Use which includes Geographic Information Services, Intermunicipal Transit, and Housing, each comprised of elected officials. These committees are responsible for implementing the Growth Plan and ensuring continuity and integration across all aspects of the plan. As each committee finalizes their deliverables, they must bring recommendations to the Board for approval. Each committee completes its business plan and mandated responsibilities with the assistance of Board administration, support staff and industry consultants. The Chief Executive Officer has also established working groups and advisory committees to provide advice and technical expertise from member municipalities to support the work of these standing committees.

During late 2011, the Capital Region Board created a new ad-hoc Committee, the Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee. The group provides guidance and advocacy on the need for pipeline infrastructure required to move Alberta’s petroleum products to diverse global markets and for value-added activity in Alberta. This committee was active throughout 2012.

The Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) Sub-Committee exists to support the REF review process with the delegated authority to approve municipal statutory plans submitted under that process. If the Sub-committee rejects an application, or the decision to approve is not unanimous, the delegation order requires that
the application be referred to the Board for a decision. Refer to the Regional Evaluation Framework and Land Use sections for further information about this process.

**Voting Structure**

The Capital Region Board Regulation stipulates that each member of the Board has one vote at a Board meeting. If a decision is made by a vote, it must be supported by not fewer than 17 member municipalities that collectively have at least 75 percent of the population in the Capital Region.

**Delegation**

Only the Board may adopt bylaws, borrow money, adopt budgets and approve financial statements, but may otherwise delegate its authority.

As noted previously, the CAO Sub-committee continues to operate under authority delegated by the Board on April 8, 2010.

**Bylaws and Policies**

The CRB Regulation provides authority to the Board to make bylaws respecting its conduct and affairs, including without limitation, rules and procedures for dealing with matters before the Board. All bylaws require the approval of the Minister of Municipal Affairs before coming into effect.

The Board has not established any bylaws as of December 31, 2012. However, the Board has established and continues to maintain policies associated with human resources management, administrative and financial standards, remuneration, member code of conduct and ethics, and governance direction for its activities.
The Growth Plan is the Capital Region’s roadmap for collaboration and coordination of growth in the Region. It recognizes the need for the efficient use of regional infrastructure, land and other resources. Moreover, the Growth Plan provides the foundation for decisions aimed at reducing the Region’s development footprint, integrating land use and transit/transportation planning and emphasizes building complete communities based on increasing densification of urban areas, particularly in Priority Growth Areas. Successful implementation of this strategy will result in an improved quality of life for residents, more regional cooperation among municipalities and stakeholders, a strong economy and a healthy environment.

Implementing the Growth Plan requires strong collaboration among regional stakeholders, including residents, industry, community groups and agencies and all orders of government. The Plan is consistent with and supports the policy direction provided in the Province’s Land-use Framework and in other Provincial strategies (such as the Capital Region Air Quality Management Framework) and key government priorities.

Throughout 2012 the Board and its committees focused on implementing the Growth Plan with the understanding that this was a large task that requires a horizon of many years. The work was guided by the projects identified in the Board’s 2012-2014 three year rolling Business Plan. Progress toward the implementation of the growth plan is reported below for each committee.
Land Use

The Land Use Committee completed A Review of the Administration of the Regional Evaluation Framework, a major project which undertook a comprehensive review of the implementation of the REF by CRB Administration since its inception in 2010. The CRB approved the Report and directed the Land Use Committee to implement the ten recommendations to improve the REF process. Implementation of the recommendations, which includes preparing a communications protocol for REF applications, documenting the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders involved in REF, and developing an interpretive guide to the REF and the Growth Plan, is expected to be completed by the third quarter of 2013.

The Growth Plan directs that the Land Use Plan be updated every five years. Completing a review of the Land Use Plan for the update will require substantial time and resources based on the experience attained while preparing the original Growth Plan. The Land Use Committee developed a comprehensive process, including projects and tasks that need to be undertaken in 2013 and 2014, to complete an update. The Board approved that process in November 2012.

The Committee got a head start on the Land Use Plan update by approving a Terms of Reference for a Regional Energy Corridors Study that will be carried out in 2013. The Growth Plan currently depicts the location of existing power and pipeline corridors in the Capital Region. The Regional Energy Corridors Study will define a framework for accommodating future corridors within the Capital Region in a manner consistent and compatible with the principles

"The committee made great progress on the Geographical Information Services project which is fundamental to most of what the CRB does. The overlays of data and maps help us understand the interconnections within the region and enable us to see the “big picture”. It is important to integrate the CRB committee work in land use, transit, and housing with provincial government plans.

Mayor Anita Fether
Chair, Land Use Committee

One Region Infinite Opportunity
and policies of the Land Use Plan. Understanding the need for and location of these future corridors is critical to updating the plans for growth within the Region.

In 2010, the Land Use Committee was identified as the most appropriate committee to provide strategic oversight of the Geographic Information Services (GIS) component of the Growth Plan. In 2012, the Committee approved the Capital Region Geographic Information Services Spatial Data Demonstration Project, to further define and understand the costs and resources necessary to deliver geographically-based information and services to support the Board’s regional decision-making. The focus of the demonstration project was the development of a subset of spatial data needed to support the Land Use Plan update.

The Land Use Committee also provided input on the Integrated Housing and Land Use Policy Framework and Implementation Plan that was undertaken by the Housing Committee. The resulting Our Affordable Future Report was approved by the CRB in December 2012.

2012 LAND USE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

- Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan
- Review of REF Administration Report
- Land Use Plan 5 year update process
**Intermunicipal Transit**

In 2012, the Regional Transit Committee's focus was on two foundational projects shaping the future of public transit in the Capital Region - A Regional Fare Strategy and Implementation Plan, and a Regional Transit Governance Model and Implementation Plan. Both projects were started in the fall of 2011 and scheduled to be completed in 2012. The Regional Fare Strategy and Implementation Plan is exploring the feasibility of a single regional fare for public transit to better serve customers. The current system, with multiple operators and fares across the region is inconvenient for users. A common regional policy would simplify fare payment and transfer choices for intermunicipal travel. This project will also explore technology options for fare collection to support whatever policy is proposed. These changes will create opportunities for increased ridership and revenues, and seamless expansion of transit services in the Region.

The Regional Transit Governance Study and Implementation Plan is a multi-phase project to identify a governance model for Intermunicipal Transit Services. The Regional Transit Committee has prepared an Interim Report, approved by the Capital Region Board on December 13th, 2012, which provides an overview of the different governance models and includes a recommendation to prepare a business case in 2013.

The Committee also led the update for the Capital Region's GreenTRIP Project list. The revised list of projects will be held until the Province announces the next round of funding. Throughout the year, the Committee has been an advocate and ambassador for the value of the GreenTRIP Program in achieving the goals of the Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan and specifically, components of the 30 Year Transit Service Plan which supports the expansion of public transit in the Region. The Transit Committee continued to focus on ensuring efficient labor mobility and transportation choice exists in the region to support the growth in jobs and population. The Province is currently reviewing
Our breakthrough in 2012 was reaching consensus on the idea that if we work together we are stronger. We are collaborating to create a regional fare strategy so it’s easier for people to use public transit across the region. We’ve also agreed to pool resources to examine a business case for delivering transit services regionally through a commission model. A metropolitan area requires a transit system that moves people around easily and efficiently. That’s the big picture here and we are working together to achieve that.

"Councilor Don Pundt, Chair, Intermunicipal Transit Committee"

GreenTRIP applications for St. Albert’s South Transit Center and Park and Ride, and the City of Leduc/ Leduc County for Park and Ride locations, buses and related transit infrastructure.

The Transit Advisory Committee which provides technical advice for public transit management and operations continued to meet with Alberta Transportation throughout the year on the interpretation of different sections of the Bus Modernization Regulation announced in 2011, to ensure compliance.

The Committee Chair made presentations about the Intermunicipal Transit Plan and its current projects to the St. Albert Chamber of Commerce and the Greater Edmonton Region Chambers of Commerce.

**2012 INTERMUNICIPAL TRANSIT ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- Regional Services Standards
- 30 year Service Plan
Housing

In 2012, the Housing Committee continued to work with the Province to explore the implementation of a model for the planning of affordable housing on a sub-regional basis across the Capital Region. The Housing Committee worked closely with representatives from the City of Fort Saskatchewan, Strathcona County and the Province as they established the Heartland Housing Foundation. This foundation was formed with a 'one management body' approach to provide and manage the full spectrum of non-market housing in that sub-region. This foundation is expected to be operational by January 1, 2013.

In the same vein, the Housing Committee has initiated an environmental scan of the Capital Region to identify how current non-market and market-affordable housing needs are being met through a range of housing providers and support services delivery organizations in 23 of the Board’s municipalities (excluding Edmonton). The environmental scan is the first step towards understanding housing supply and demand from a regional / sub-regional perspective which will inform the development of a 10-year rolling housing plan to guide future Provincial investment and planning. It is anticipated that the environmental scan will be completed in March 2013.

The Housing Plan, approved by the Province in March 2010, identified a gap in the provision of market affordable housing in the Capital Region. In December of 2010, the Land Use and Housing Committees agreed to co-sponsor an Advisory
Committee comprised of representatives from the land development and home building industries, municipal administrators, and elected officials to suit this issue. The Advisory Committee explored a range of ideas on ways to reduce the cost of housing and consider different built forms to address the needs of first-time homebuyers, renters and seniors. The resulting Our Affordable Future report presented a number of recommendations that will require the collaboration of municipalities and Industry if they are to be achieved. On December 13, 2012, the Board voted unanimously to approve the report. As a result, the implementation of the report’s recommendations has become an immediate priority for the Housing Committee.

The Housing Committee continued to make progress towards the full implementation of the Education and Awareness Strategy in 2012. The Strategy consists of multiple components, namely a Regional Housing Symposium and a Marketing and Communications Program.

Held on October 4, 2012, in the City of Leduc, the second annual Re/Envision Housing Symposium assembled a broad range of experts and practitioners to lead discussions on the importance of infill residential development in the Region. This year’s symposium attracted nearly 200 registrants who learned about the role of infill in enhancing the vitality, diversity and economic prosperity of both our communities and our Region. Symposium participants reviewed videos highlighting numerous examples of regional successes in this field. The event also included a tour of infill projects in Leduc that have strengthened its downtown and helped make it a more affordable and diverse community. The Symposium received financial support from the Province of Alberta ($17,000), Urban Land Development Institute-Greater Edmonton Chapter ($2,000), Canadian Home Builders Association - Edmonton Region ($2,000), and Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation ($2,500).

On August 9, 2012, the Board passed a motion to support the implementation of the Our Affordable Future Marketing and Communications Program, as developed and approved by the Housing Committee. The Marketing and Communications Program is a comprehensive strategy to dispel public misconceptions about the need and scope of ‘affordable’ housing. In particular, it will address the phenomenon known as NIMBY-ism (Not In My Back Yard –ism), which has hindered efforts to expand the diversity of our region’s housing supply. The Program will be launched pending the availability of funding.
We are proud of our success in connecting municipal officials, elected people and members of the building and development industry to re-examine and streamline how we provide housing in the region. We all need affordable housing for people who want to live and work in our communities.

— Councillor Ed Gibbons, Chair, Housing Committee

Adocacy & Communications

In 2012, the Advocacy and Communications Committee worked on the priorities identified in the Strategy document endorsed by the Board on June 14, 2012.

In an effort to continue building awareness and understanding of the Growth Plan, CRB members and Administration met with a number of organizations and made presentations at various events during this reporting period. Presentations were made to a diverse range of audiences and stakeholders, including the following: Urban Development Institute, Greater Edmonton Region Chambers of Commerce, Building Owners and Managers Association, Edmonton Economic Development Corporation, St. Albert and District Chamber of Commerce, Alberta Urban Municipalities Association Sustainability and Environment Committee, Federation of Canadian Municipalities Ukraine Municipal Local Economic Development Program, and the Canadian Water Summit.
Governance

In 2012, the Governance Committee oversaw many important activities, including the coordination of the 2012-2014 Business Plan, the completion of the 2011 Audited Financial Statements, the preparation of the 2011 Annual Report, and other financial and activity reporting to the Government of Alberta. The 2011 Annual Report was approved by the Capital Region Board and provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs on March 27, 2012. The Governance Committee facilitated the nomination and election of the first Board appointed Chair, Mr. Nolan Crouse, in February 2012, and the recruitment of the new Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Doug Lagore, who will join the Board in February 2013.

The Board convened a special Long-Term Funding Strategy workshop for all Board members on June 14, 2012, following a series of five focus groups held for Board members, their municipal councils and senior administrative staff. The purpose of the workshop was to generate feedback, ideas and input into the constraints, future direction and financial sustainability of the Board. The Board used that information and direction to develop the CRB Value Proposition and Funding Options Proposal document which was approved by the Board on September 13, 2012, and presented to the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Honourable Doug Griffiths on September 25, 2012. While awaiting feedback from the Minister, the Board approved an Interim 2013 Business Plan and Budget during its December meeting.
In November, to further the commitment to building awareness and support among the Region’s stakeholders, the Board launched its new website. It is designed to better organize and communicate the work of the Board, provide convenient access to all member municipalities and communicate the work underway at the Board. New features include: an events calendar with links to maps; the capability to post meeting agenda packages online; a regional headlines news board; and comprehensive resources and links sections throughout the site.

Consistent with the Board’s efforts to ensure that the Capital Region Growth Plan remains an up-to-date and “living” document, the Governance Committee began the process of updating the Capital Region Population and Employment Projections. The projections are required under the Capital Region Board regulation. Regional projections support the ongoing implementation of the Growth Plan, as well as the administration of Regional Evaluation Framework. Projections are used to assess the implications of regional land use development scenarios, housing, inter-municipal transit initiatives, and other region-wide changes as they arise.

The Governance Committee provided direction to a consulting team, working with CRB Administration, the Region’s CAOs, and a technical advisory committee composed of municipal administrators with expertise in economics. At the conclusion of this project, the Board will attain a population and employment model that merges macro and micro-level data to produce projections for the Region and its municipalities. The Board will have an opportunity to approve the updated projections in early 2013.
Regional Evaluation Framework

The Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) is the primary tool for the CRB to implement the Capital Region Growth Plan. REF provides submission and review criteria on which the Board evaluates proposed municipal statutory plans and amendments to ensure their consistency with the Growth Plan. The administration of the REF process was reviewed in 2011 and 2012. The 2012 REF Review report listed ten recommendations to improve the framework’s implementation which were approved by the Board in June 2012. The Board directed the Land Use Committee, with the assistance of the Planning Advisory Group and CRB administration, to act on the ten recommendations through the remainder of 2012 and early 2013.

Between January 1, 2012, and December 31, 2012, twelve municipal statutory plans and plan amendments were approved under the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF). The Board rejected two planning proposals during this period.
I am very proud to chair this dynamic, future-focused committee that supports the urgent need for the development of vital energy infrastructure related to the safe and reliable transportation of petroleum products to world markets. Our advocacy efforts have been recognized and applauded at the Provincial and National level as key elements in building support for a strong national economy that benefits all Canadians.

— Mayor Stuart Houston, Chair, Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee

Pipeline Linkages Strategy

The Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee held its first meeting in December 2011. During 2012, the Committee increased understanding and raised the profile of the Region, Alberta’s oil industry, and the Northern Gateway Pipeline project within and outside of the Capital Region. In addition to sending a letter of support to the Enbridge Northern Gateway Project Joint Review Panel, the committee created communications materials, conducted interviews with various local, Saskatchewan and British Columbia media, hosted trade booths at FCM and AUMA events, and sent letters to members of Parliament. It also conducted an outreach initiative with Treaty 6 First Nations, BC’s North Central Local Government Association Convention, and stakeholders in Prince George, Terrace and Kitimat.
FUTURE DIRECTION

THE 2010 APPROVAL OF THE CAPITAL REGION GROWTH PLAN BY THE MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS SET THE FOUNDATION FOR FURTHER WORK BY THE BOARD AND MEMBER MUNICIPALITIES IN IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN. THE BOARD HAS IDENTIFIED KEY PROJECTS GOING FORWARD AS THE CRB CONTINUES TO IMPLEMENT THE GROWTH PLAN IN EACH OF THE PLAN'S FOUR STRATEGIC PRIORITY AREAS, INCLUDING:

- Development of a planning framework for the five-year Growth Plan update
- Consolidation and update of the Regional Corridor information in the Growth Plan and to undertake studies to address infrastructure, energy and power corridors
- Participation in the North Saskatchewan Regional Planning process
- Implementation of the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) Report Recommendations
- Implementation of the Geographic Information Services Plan
- Updated population and employment projections for the Capital Region
- Intermunicipal Transit Governance Study followed by the development of a business plan
- Implementation of the recommendations contained in the Our Affordable Future: Market Affordable Housing Policy Framework report
- Completion of an environmental scan and development of a sub-regional planning model for the identification of non-market housing priorities
- Implementation of the market affordable housing Education and Awareness Strategy

Upon finalization of the 2013 grant agreement with Municipal Affairs, the Board will expand upon its 2013 Interim Business Plan and Budget to develop a longer term three-year business plan and budget.
Regulatory & Legislative Requirements

With the approval of the Capital Region Growth Plan and a new Ministerial Order for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) in place as of April 1, 2010, the Board's work has turned to administration of REF and implementation of the Growth Plan.

With the new Capital Region Board Regulation (Alberta Regulation 38/2012) coming into effect on April 1, 2012, the Board could no longer pass motions in camera. This regulatory change places the Capital Region Board meeting procedures under the same legislative requirements as Alberta’s municipal governments. As a result of this change, Board and Committee meeting procedures were updated, and existing administrative working and technical advisory groups, which had originally been formed by the Board to support the development of the Growth Plan, were disbanded. To provide a mechanism for committees to seek information and advice from administrative and technical municipal staff and private sector expertise, the Interim Chief Executive Officer established four administrative groups: the Planning Advisory Group, the Transit Advisory Group, Housing Advisory Working Group and GIS Advisory Group.

The CRB has achieved significant progress since 2008, becoming a model of regional collaboration for the Province and Canada; however, much remains to be done. The Growth Plan is a living document that needs to be kept current and used on an ongoing basis. The planning work, decision-making processes, implementation activities and day-to-day operations of the CRB require sustainable, long-term funding to continue.
In 2012 we elected our own chair for the CRB, a sign of growth and maturity for the board. Our committee also worked extensively on a long-term funding strategy, and the challenges and opportunities we face. We require provincial funding to advance and we have articulated that message to the Minister. The CRB is a good example for other regions in Alberta and we are confident the Province will continue to support us.
Procurement Policy # F002

Motion

'That the Capital Region Board approves the amendments to Policy F002 – Procurement.'

Background

- CRB Administration has revised the existing Procurement policy (F002) to account for changes in purchasing thresholds and the job titles. These changes are summarized below:
  - Purchasing thresholds that require a competitive bid process have been revised (i.e., lowered) to align with those established under Article 14 of the New West Partnership Trade Agreement. The policy formerly used the thresholds provided by the Agreement on Internal Trade, Annex 502.4.
  - The policy amendments clarify that the competition for the procurement of purchases that exceed the established thresholds will be posted to the Alberta Purchasing Connection (APC).
  - The policy amendments correct the job title of the CRB’s “Chief Executive Officer” from the former title of “Chief Officer”.

Rationale

- Sound business practices in both public and private corporations ensure that corporate policies and by-laws are in place to govern the organization and guide decision-making. To date, the Capital Region Board has approved a number of policies pertaining to administration, governance, finance and human resources.
- This policy required the updating of the purchasing thresholds to ensure alignment with those established by the New West Partnership and the correction of the job title of the CRB’s “Chief Executive Officer”.
PURPOSE

To conduct the purchasing and tendering activities of the Capital Region Board in the most effective, open and efficient competitive manner possible.

POLICY

The Capital Region Board will purchase goods and services in a manner that is effective, expedient, efficient, transparent and offers attains the best overall value.

GUIDELINES

1. The Capital Region Board will adhere to the highest possible standards of business ethics, professional courtesy and technical competence in all its purchasing practices.

2. The Capital Region Board will provide fair and equitable treatment to all suppliers and maintain the confidentiality of specifications and price quotations as permitted under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, RSA 2000 Alberta and amendments.

3. PURCHASES – GENERAL
   a. Purchasing methods, regardless of whether the purchase is for goods, services, or a combination of goods and services, will be determined by the total dollar value category.
   b. The total dollar value category will always be a combination of “like items” (i.e., screen, keyboard and processor = computer). Under no circumstances are items to be separated or split into two or more contracts.
   c. All purchases, when received, will be included in the current year’s budget, or as otherwise approved by the Capital Region Board, and will be authorized in accordance with Policy F001 Authorization to Purchase.

4. COMPETITIVE PROCESS
   a. The purpose of the competitive process is to ensure that CRB’s needs are identified to the widest market possible. Any competitive process should include at least three (3) solicited or unsolicited (Section 15) vendor responses.
   b. In identifying CRB’s needs to the widest market base, we are ensuring the acquirement of goods and or services or a combination of goods and services will be at the lowest cost to the CRB, keeping in mind service standards, quality, and time.
5. **DEFINITION OF COMPETITIVE BID PROCESS**
   a. Any competitive bid process has the following common characteristics:
      i. Closed competition amongst bidders, as opposed to an open competition (i.e., an auction).
      ii. Implication that there will be a fair and equal process for both the evaluations and award of a contract to all submissions.
      iii. The terminology and process in documents is similar to that of tendering (i.e., bid, aware, tender, closing date and time, etc.).
   b. Any of the bid formats are generally comprised of two (2) separate contracts:
      i. **Contract A (also known as the Bid Contract A)** – This contract is automatically formed between the Owner and each of the bidders who respond to the call of bids be it invitation to tender, request for proposal, or request for information and quotation. This part of the contract contains the terms and references for the call of bids.
      ii. **Contract B** – This is part of the contract is formed by the successful bidder’s bid being accepted by the Owner’s notification of award. The terms of Contract B are a combination of the terms contained in the original call (Contract A), the successful bidder’s bid and the notification of award letter. The actual project work will be completed under this contract.

6. **COMPETITIVE FORMATS**
   a. It is imperative that exactly the same information, regardless of which of the following format is used to relay the information, is provided to all vendors requested to provide a response/bid/quote/information.
   b. The information should always be as clear and concise as possible and should include as much information about the product or service to be provided as possible.

7. **PURCHASING METHODS**
   a. **Purchases less than $100,000** $75,000 – At the discretion of the Chief Executive Officer whether to utilize a formal quote or informal quote.
   b. **Purchases of over $100,000** $75,000 or greater – All procurement of goods or services or a combination of goods and services over $100,000 of $75,000 or greater, with the exception of construction, will be subject to the formal competitive process and must be advertised under posted on the Alberta Purchasing Connection, as per the Internal Trade Annex 502.4 requirements of the New West Partnership Trade Agreement, Article 14.
   c. **Construction of $250,000** $200,000 or greater – All construction projects $250,000 $200,000 and over will be subject to the formal competitive process and must be advertised under posted on the Alberta Purchasing connection, as per the requirements of Internal Trade Annex 502.4 the New West Partnership Trade Agreement, Article 14.
   d. Formal quotes will follow one of the following competitive bid formats:
      i. Request for Quotation (RFQ);
      ii. Request for Quotation and Contract Form;
      iii. Request for Proposal (RFP);
      iv. Invitation to Tender (ITT); or
      v. Request for Information (RFI)
   e. **Supplier Catalogues (Internet included)** – Implies products that are researched by “looking through” supplier catalogues or the Internet to determine the most appropriate product, price and delivery. All pertinent information such as supplier name, catalogue year, page number, etc. should be documented or the Internet page printed. This information should be attached to the purchase order and any other information should be filed.
f. **Email** – If the exact product is known, an email clearly identifying all pertinent information can be forwarded to the applicable suppliers. Exact same information must be provided to all suppliers.

g. **Telephone Quotes** – All vendors should be provided exactly same information. It will be the issuers’ responsibility to ensure that one vendor does not have more information than another. All pricing and pertinent information should be documented.

h. **Request for Quotation (RFQ)** – The Request for Quotation process is normally used where cost and other factors are considered in the award. Specifications may not be conclusive and an element of review may be required to ascertain lowest net cost and appropriate quality prior to award. Quotations are open to review with the vendor. Electronic submissions will be accepted. If a closing date (and time) is provided for the “RFQ”, submissions after this date (and time) will not be accepted and will be returned to the vendor.

i. **Request for Proposals (RFP)** – The Request for Proposals process may be used as an alternative method to the tender process. Normally used for the provision of services or completion of a specific project. This method provides the vendor with an opportunity to bid on work or a service using their unique skills. Specifications are general in nature. The selection of the successful supplier is based on the CRB’s appreciation of the proposal and the suppliers ability to complete the project or provide the service. Electronic submissions will be accepted. If a closing date (and time) is provided for the RFP, submissions after this date (and time) will not be accepted.

j. **Invitation to Tender (ITT)** – This format details, very specifically, the what, why, when, where and how the work/ project/product will be provided or completed. Providing that all tender terms and conditions have been met the only determining factor for the award, unless stated otherwise, is price. There is no negotiation of price (but could be with the scope of work) with the successful bidder. Other items of consideration may be past contractor performance with the CRB, reference checks, or whether the contractor has previous experience in the project in which the bid has been made. If these criteria are to be considered in the evaluation process they should be clearly indicated in the tender documents. The criterion provides the CRB with opportunity to exercise its right to reject a proponent if the CRB feels it is not in the best interest of the organization to award a contract to the lowest bidder. If the lowest bidder is not chosen based on one or more of the outlined criteria, it must be documented and approved by the Chief Executive Officer.

k. **Request for Information (RFI)** – This format is similar to the RFP but less “formal”. The RFI is used to solicit information from potential vendors for any of one or combination of the following:

i. Vendor availability;

ii. Market conditions;

iii. Industry / Technology;

iv. Pricing; or

v. Any other “missing” information.

A RFI should include the basic requirements of any competitive format in terms of closing date and time, contact person, solicitation number, etc. Depending upon the nature of the RFI, the option of process/next steps upon closing can be varied. The issuer can chose to go to RFP or an ITT process or they can choose to negotiate with only one supplier. Whatever the decision, it must be disclosed in the RFI documents.

**NOTE:** When developing any of the above formats, the use of the words “must” and “shall” should only be used when the requirement is mandatory. Otherwise words like “may” or “should” should be used.
I. **Tender Notice** – The tender notice is done through paper advertisement (local or otherwise), on the internet or on the Alberta Purchasing Connection website or any combination of the above. In any instance, the tender notice should include the following information:
   i. A brief description of the purpose of the tender;
   ii. Where or from whom the tender documents or further information can be obtained;
   iii. The conditions for obtaining the tender documents (i.e. if there is a cost for obtaining the tender);
   iv. Place where the tenders are to be submitted;
      
      **NOTE:** it is important to be very specific as where the documents are to be submitted (i.e.: main reception at Capital Region Board, #1405 Bell Tower, 10104 -103 Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H8);
   v. Date and time for submitting tenders should follow the format, May 26, 2010, 14:00:00 hours Mountain Daylight Savings time; and
   vi. Time and place of opening (type of bid opening) if applicable (Section 11).

8. **CONTRACT PERIOD**
   a. The length of a contract will be dependent upon the nature of the acquisition, the market conditions, and industry standard for the product/service being acquired.
   b. A contract can be as short as a onetime service or as long as 5 years. Option years may also be added to a contract if the contract will extend beyond one year (i.e. 1 year plus 2 single option years or 3 years plus 2 single option years).
   c. The purpose of the option years is to provide additional single years without having to re-tender if the market conditions are such that it is to the CRB’s benefit to maintain the existing contract. The supplier must also be in agreement in the exercising of one or more of the option years. A contract should never, or very seldom, extend beyond 5 years.
   d. Each contract, in particular those that are more than 1 year in duration, need to be individually evaluated to determine appropriate contract terms and approval.
   e. The length of the contract (if applicable) should be included in the tender documents.
   f. If a contract is to be used after the award, a sample of the contract should be included in the tender documents. This informs the supplier what is expected from them for the service or products. The contract is generally an extension of the tender, but includes any addendums that may be issued, any minutes from supplier meetings, and any other pertinent documentation that is applicable to the contract.
   g. Upon completion of the contract negotiation (if applicable) and agreement by all parties, where, if at all possible, the CRB should be the one to write/ initiate the contract. The purpose of this is to keep the interest of the CRB in the forefront.

9. **PROCESS**
   a. All suppliers, whether they were successful or not, will be notified through written communication.
   b. The successful supplier will be notified by letter of award.
   c. The unsuccessful supplier will be notified with a standard response letter. If the opening was public, a spreadsheet indicating supplier name and total bid amount may be attached. If the opening was restricted or private, no other information is to be released.

10. **RECEIPT OF COMPETITIVE TENDERS, PROPOSALS OR QUOTATIONS**
    a. All tenders, proposals and quotations, solicited or unsolicited, must include a closing date and time. Time must be indicated as in the following example: 14:00:00 hours Mountain Daylight Savings time, **May 25, 2012**.
b. All solicitations must indicate the format in which they will be received:
   i. Facsimile – If a facsimile is to be used as an acceptable format for the receipt of bids, normally, for quotations (RFQ), then it must be indicated as to whether or not a hard copy is also required.
   ii. Sealed Envelope – If the solicitation is to be in a sealed envelope, it must indicate the tender number on the outside as well as the supplier’s name and complete address on the upper left hand corner.
      
      As each solicitation is received, the date, time, and the first initial and complete last name of person who physically receives the tender must be written on the envelope. All bids will be forwarded, unopened, to the Chief Executive Officer as indicated in the instruction to bidders.
   iii. Email – Email may be considered if the tender or RFQ is a straightforward document and does not require bid bonds, brochures, etc. If email is to be an acceptable form of receiving tenders or RFQ’s, then again, a closing time should be identified.
      
      The computer-received time will be the determining factor as to whether the bid was received on time or not. Printed emailed quotes must include the receiving time for the bid to be considered.

c. Upon the closing time, all submissions will be “opened”. Opening will be dependent upon whether it is open (public) or closed.

d. Every bid will be reviewed to ensure it is completed in its entirety. Depending on the nature of incompleteness, a bid not completed in its entirety may be either disqualified, with the submission returned to the bidder with an explanation, or accepted.

   Examples of an acceptable incompleteness and not acceptable incompleteness:
   • Acceptable: A pricing extension is not carried through.
   • Not acceptable: Unit price is not completed.

e. Any submissions that are received after the closing date and time will not be accepted and are to be returned unopened to the originator with a letter explaining why it was returned.

11. BID OPENINGS

   a. “Tenders” will not be opened prior to the indicated closing time. Any bid or submission received should be placed in the file with the original tender request until the “tender closing time”.

   b. Bid openings are only openings and not the time in which an award will be made.

   c. Bid openings can be classified as follows:

      i. Public – This is an advertised Opening. The Opening is advertised in the newspaper or on the internet/electronically with the date, time and place of Opening. All bidders are to be advised in the instruction to bidders;

      ii. Restricted – Bidders are invited to attend; all bidders must be advised of the date, time and place of the Opening in the instruction to bidders;

      iii. Private – In the presence of the Owner only.

   d. There are no restrictions on the dollar value that must be adhered to before a competitive bid process should be considered for an opening forum. However, any bid that falls within the Agreement on Internal Trade will be subject to public openings.

   e. The time, location, and conditions of the opening shall be included in the original tender documents that are sent to each potential supplier. Two Capital Region staff members will be present at the public opening. One will record the bids; the other will open and read each bid.

   f. The only items that will be made “public” will be the supplier’s name and the bid amounts required in the tender documents. No other details will be disclosed. No decision will be made at
the opening and all suppliers present at the opening will be instructed of the same. There will be no exceptions.
g. Upon the completion of the opening, the evaluation process, as outlined in the original documents, will be used to determine the most suitable supplier.
h. All submissions will remain confidential as to each submission’s content. No information will be made known until the awarded supplier has been contacted.
i. At no time will the details of any submission, before, during, or after the tender closing, be made known to any other supplier. The only information that is provided is the awarded contractor’s name and the total dollar value.

12. SOLE SOURCE
a. The term “sole source” applies to goods or services where it can be demonstrated that no competitive market exists, by reasons of uniqueness of the goods or services or by vendor limitations or time limitations.
b. The decision to “sole source” is at the discretion of the Chief Executive Officer.
c. The best price, delivery, service and any other relevant factors should always be negotiated with the supplier.

13. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
a. Professional services are generally considered as a contract for service. (i.e., need for specialized services such as a consultant, architect, or auditor). These types of services are generally required over a short period of time.
b. Each of these types of services is very unique and may be required to be formalized through the competitive bid process as determined under Section 6.
c. Each service should be evaluated as to the extent of the competitive process required. Criteria that may be considered: industry standard (as in dollar value), normal or abnormal; availability of suppliers; type of service/work required, knowledge of the person(s)/department requesting the work.

14. VENDOR SELECTION FOR TENDERS
a. CRB will endeavour to make the needs of the CRB made known to the widest potential market. This can be done either through current suppliers as well through advertisements.
b. All suppliers will be given equal opportunity regardless of the suppliers’ location. Specifications cannot be indicative of any preference to location, unrealistic time, or requesting that local resources be utilized.
c. When suppliers are not known, suppliers can be sourced through the Internet or through Letters/Expression of Interest, which has been advertised both locally and regionally.
d. Suppliers should provide, at minimum, the following information:
   i. A company resume;
   ii. Resumes of key staff who will be working/assigned to the project;
   iii. Experience in similar projects or services;
   iv. Understanding of the project or requirements;
   v. References;
   vi. Bond ability; and
   vii. Time availability.
e. Potential suppliers may then be short listed and then invited to participate in the tender process.

15. SOLICITATION OF BIDS
a. **Solicited** – These are tenders, RFP’s or RFQ’s that are done by invitation only. These types of tenders are indicated as such through the letter of invitation. Any bid that is advertised or posted to Alberta Purchasing Connection does not qualify as a solicited bid. Any unsolicited bids in this process will not be accepted. An invited bidder cannot reassign their bid to another vendor without the CRB’s permission. All unsolicited bids will be returned to the supplier by courier.

b. **Unsolicited** – These types of bids are advertised either through the paper, local or otherwise, and the Alberta Purchasing Connection website. Therefore, the bids that will be received are not by invitation. When a supplier requests a copy of the bid, the supplier should provide the following information:
   i. Company name;
   ii. Contact name;
   iii. Company phone number;
   iv. Company fax number; and/or
   v. Email address of the contact person (if available).

   The purpose of the above information is that, should there be an addendum, each bidder can be contacted and provided the information.

   **NOTE:** Addendums should be posted on the Alberta Purchasing Connection websites.

16. CONFIDENTIALITY
   a. All information acquired through the tender process will be held in the strictest confidence.
   b. At no time will the tender be discussed with any supplier other than the awarded supplier.
   c. Until such time that the actual award has been formalized, suppliers will not be informed of any such decision.
   d. Upon the finalization of the award only the awarded supplier name and total dollar value will be released. This information can be provided in the standard response letter.
   e. Any inquiries from suppliers regarding such inquiries should be directed to the Regional Project Manager responsible for the tender process or the Chief Executive Officer.

17. PURCHASING ETHICS
   a. It is the aim of the CRB to treat all suppliers in a fair and equal manner. At no time will any individual responsible for purchasing jeopardize the CRB’s reputation with the supplier community as a whole.
   b. Any information that is given to one supplier will be given to all suppliers in the tendering process. Such information will be undertaken via formal notification. This is to help reduce or eliminate any potential confusion that may occur.
   c. At no time will any individual imply any commitment of any kind to any supplier until such time that the CRB is in a position to formally do so.

   _______________________________________________________________________________________

   **Chief Executive Officer**
LAND USE COMMITTEE
Committee Report #44
March 14, 2013

1. Committee Meeting — February 28, 2013
   - Next Meeting: March 28, 2013, Kings College Rm N101

2. Goods Movement Strategy - City of Edmonton
   Howiada Hassan and Rhonda Toohey from Edmonton’s Transportation Department gave a presentation on the City’s Goods Movement Strategy. Due to the changes in the transportation network over the past decade - the Anthony Henday, the northwest intermodal facility and expansion of the LRT - the City wanted to better understand the impact these changes had on truck movements. The project team conducted a roadside survey and carried out scoping interviews with stakeholders last fall. The results of the survey and the key themes from the interviews were shared with the Committee. Themes included: More planning of High Load Corridors; Anthony Henday has been a positive addition; need regional approach to goods movement; rail crossings; education of public with respect to sharing the road with trucks; better flow on Yellowhead; and Nisku-Leduc QE-2 exit congestion. Next steps include two stakeholder workshops this spring to develop goals and strategies followed by an implementation plan with specific recommended actions in the fall. The Committee passed a motion directing CRB Administration to send a letter thanking the City of Edmonton for the presentation and encouraging Alberta Transportation to support an expansion of the project to include all of the Capital Region.

3. Planning Advisory Group Report
   The Committee was updated on recent work being undertaken by PAG, specifically interpretation of the Cluster Country Residential Area and Non-PGA policies in the Growth Plan, and the use of the Population and Employment Forecast in the implementation of REF. The Report also indicated that the lack of funding and resources were limiting the ability of PAG to contribute meaningful input and advice to the Land Use Committee.

4. 2012 Land Use Committee Business Plan
   Review REF Administration Report Implementation:
   i. Recommendation 8 – Draft CAO Subcommittee Terms of Reference/Selection of the CAO Subcommittee and Eligibility of Acting CAOs

   Doug Lagore, CEO, updated the Committee on a recent meeting with member CAO’s. There was general support by the CAO’s to consider alternatives to the CAO Subcommittee in the review and approval of REF applications. CRB Administration is preparing options for the CAO’s consideration. Any recommendation by the CAO’s that requires a change to the delegation of authority granted by the Board would be presented to the Governance Committee for consideration and recommendation to the Board.

   ii. City of Edmonton Notice of Motion from February 14, 2013 Board meeting

   Doug Lagore, CEO, advised the Committee of the notice of motion put forward by the City of Edmonton that directs the Land Use Committee to evaluate the capacity of CRB Administration to evaluate submitted plans for REF. The motion will be considered at the next Board meeting. Ed Gibbons, Councillor, City of Edmonton, advised the
Committee that City staff were preparing a briefing that would be provided to Board members prior to the next CRB meeting.

5. **2013 Interim Land Use Committee Business Plan**

CRB Administration briefed the Committee on the results of the recent RFP posting for the Regional Energy Corridors Study. The only submission to the RFP was over budget. Administration has met with the proponents to discuss revising the submission to meet the budget. The Committee also discussed the project in terms of the overall workplan for the Land Use Committee and whether it was appropriate to reconsider the priorities in the Business Plan. This was followed up with a discussion of revisiting the Intermunicipal Planning Framework initiative, which was identified as an unfunded project for 2013. It was considered an important piece of work that needed to be done in light of the concerns raised at the February 14, 2013 Board meeting and the decision on the Acheson REF application. The other issue was implications of the upcoming Provincial Budget on the Committee’s ability to fund and resources future projects. The Chair and CRB Administration will review the Land Use Committee Business Plan and Budget following the Provincial Budget announcement and prepare a revised Business Plan for the Committee’s consideration at its next meeting.
1. **Last Committee Meeting** – February 22nd, 2013
   - **Next Committee Meeting:** March 22nd, 2013

2. **Transit Committee Project Updates**

   **Regional Transit Governance Study – Business Case**
   The primary purpose of this study is to develop a business case that will enable the Capital Region Board to assess the feasibility and merits of establishing a Regional Transit Commission. The secondary purpose is to develop a communication strategy and plan to support the engagement of the Province and other stakeholders in understanding the overall intent of this work and their involvement. The committee was advised that CRB administration is finalizing the contract with AECOM Canada Ltd. A project orientation meeting with the consulting team was held on February 27th to provide background information on the CRB and the project and to provide direction for the project work plan. The funding for the project is in place with $165,000 being received by St. Albert (on behalf of the regional Partners) and the balance of $85,000 being shared amongst the 12 participating municipalities - Edmonton, St. Albert, Strathcona, Morinville, Devon, Parkland, Leduc, Leduc County, Fort Saskatchewan, Sturgeon, Spruce Grove and Beaumont.

   **Regional Fare System Study & Implementation Plan**
   Following the receipt of the Regional Fare Strategy in January, the committee members were asked to circulate copies to their councils for general support and feedback on the recommendations. The main purpose was to ensure councils were aware of the proposed zone based fare strategy being recommended. Edmonton, Strathcona, Beaumont, Sturgeon, St. Albert, Morinville, Leduc County and Fort Saskatchewan all reported support from their councils. Committee members from Parkland and Spruce Grove were not in attendance and the City of Leduc was scheduled to review the report on February 25th.

   The committee discussed the implementation of the report recommendations and while the committee agreed they would not pursue the implementation of the zone fare system recommendations until the completion of the transit governance business case. The committee did pass a motion in support of the three operators continuing to work together to procure the smart card (fare) technology system and to prepare a regional Green Trip application. The procurement of a common smart card system for the region will allow the current operators to continue to set their own fares in the interim and will provide operating efficiencies and a more convenient experience for riders.

   **Green Trip**
   City of Leduc and the County of Leduc received approval from the Province for their Green Trip application of up to $3.4 M towards the cost of expanding and enhancing public transit service in the region. This leaves only one outstanding application from Round 1 to be officially approved by the Province - St. Albert’s Campbell Road Transit Center/Park & Ride. The committee will revisit the list of regional priorities once round 2 funding is announced.

---

Don Iveson, Chair Regional Transit Committee
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Committee Report #36

March 14, 2013

1. Committee Meeting – February 25, 2013

   • Next Meeting: March 18, 2013

2. 2012 Governance Committee Priorities

   Audited Financial Statements
   Michael Epp from Hawkings Epp Dumont provided an overview of the 2012 Audited Financial Statements and Audit Findings Letter. The 2012 Financial Statements were approved as presented.

   2012 Annual Report
   The Committee requested some editorial changed and passed a motion to present the 2012 Annual Report to the Board for approval on March 14, 2013.

   Update to CRB Growth Plan
   CRB Administration updated the Committee on the outcomes of the CAO meeting on February 8, 2013. A further update will be presented to the Committee at the next meeting.

   Population and Employment Project update
   CRB Administration updated the Committee on the last round of comments on the draft report. The Project Report will now be updated and presented to the Board at a future meeting. The Committee will be presented with further updates at the next Committee meeting.

3. Other Business

   Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee recommendation
   The motion was deferred to the April Committee meeting.

   CAO Sub-Committee
   The matter of alternates to CAO’s will be addressed through the review of the REF approval process.

   CCRA – PAG Working Group
   CRB Administration provided clarification on how the PAG Working Group was formed to review CCRA’s.

Linda Osinchuk, Vice Chair, Governance Committee
CCRA and Non-PGA Policy Clarification

- Strathcona County motion approved by the Board on September 13, 2012:
  
  “That the Capital Region Board directs the Land Use Committee and Planning Advisory Group to give priority to developing an interpretive guide to the policies in the Growth Plan and criteria in the Regional Evaluation Framework related to Cluster Country Residential Areas and Areas Outside of Priority Growth Areas as part of the current REF Administration Review Implementation project.”

- The Land Use Committee approved the following motion at its meeting on October 25, 2012:
  
  “That the Land Use Committee directs the Planning Advisory Group to prioritize the review of the policies for Cluster Country Residential Areas and areas outside of Priority Growth Areas as part of their work in implementing Recommendation 7 of the REF Review Report – Development of an interpretive policy guide for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) and the Growth Plan to assist municipalities in understanding the evaluation of planning documents under REF.”

- The Planning Advisory Group created two subcommittees to address the two areas identified in the motion: Cluster Country Residential Area (CCRA) subcommittee comprised of the 4 Counties that have CCRAs; and the Non-Priority Growth Areas (PGA) subcommittee comprised of members of PAG whose municipalities that included areas of the Region outside of PGAs.

- The CCRA subcommittee met September 27th and December 6. The Non-PGA subcommittee met on November 26. Both subcommittees met together on January 14, 2013 to prepare a presentation to the Land Use Committee on their progress.

- On January 23, 2013, the Subcommittees presented an update on their work to date and sought direction from the Land Use Committee. Issues identified:

  **CCRA - Application of assigned density target**

  1. Is it to be implemented as a maximum or an average density target? Is it to apply to each development plan or as a total across the entire CCRA? Current interpretations of the 2 u/gross ha density target in recent REF applications for development plans in CCRAs have treated the target as a maximum.

  2. Recent REF decisions for development plans in CCRAs have not considered flexibility depending on the development characteristics of individual quarter sections of land as was intended in the application of the density target.
Non-PGA - Population Forecasts for Growth Areas Outside of PGAs

1. a) Forecasts are being interpreted and used as caps in REF applications with the effect of limiting growth potential of Areas Outside of PGAs. The intent of the Principles and Policies of the Growth Plan is that all municipalities be allowed to have growth, appropriate to their size, as long as the cumulative amount and impact of such growth does not compromise growth occurring in PGAs and regional infrastructure investments required to service PGAs.

1. b) In Recommendations to Other Orders of Government contained in the October 2009 Addendum there is a specific recommendation supportive of Growth Areas Outside of PGAs stating “That the Government of Alberta support continued access to provincial infrastructure funding for municipalities located outside of PGAs and for Alberta’s Industrial Heartland”.

2. a) The preamble to Principal C of the Growth Plan (March 2009) states that “all municipalities should be allowed to have growth, appropriate to their size”. No definition or interpretation of ‘appropriate’ is provided; and its interpretation is therefore subjective.

2. b) The policies under Principle C state that development is allowed outside of PGAs if “the level of services provided is appropriate to the form of development”. As with the above, no definition or interpretation of ‘appropriate’ is provided.

Summary of Subcommittee Presentation

- Most of the issues identified with respect to CCRAs and Growth Areas Outside of PGAs were related to a lack of clarity in current policies and absence of definitions in the Growth Plan and REF Criteria.

- There is strong support to address these as part of the 5 year Review of the Land Use Plan since these inputs fall outside of the scope of the Amended Motion, and any outcomes will require an amendment to the Growth Plan.

Future Work

- Present recommendations in response to the Amended Motion to LUC at a later date.

- Identify and confirm with PAG the implementation issues related to CCRA and Growth Areas Outside of PGAs policies for consideration in the 5 Year Land Use Plan Review.

- The overriding concern of the subcommittees was the lack of resources and funding to support PAG work.

### Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2013 Annual Calendar Year Budget</th>
<th>Actual February</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOA Regular Grant - $218,750.00 x 12 months</td>
<td>$ 2,625,000</td>
<td>$ 750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA Planning Intern Grant</td>
<td>$ 19,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA Economic Roadmap Grant</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Carryover from 2011</td>
<td>$ 375,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed Services</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 3,019,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 750,395</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2013 Annual Calendar Year Budget</th>
<th>Actual February</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board and Committees</td>
<td>$ 305,000</td>
<td>$ 38,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>$ 195,000</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
<td>$ 4,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
<td>$ 8,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 1,803,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 239,050</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries/Benefits</td>
<td>$ 1,430,000</td>
<td>$ 192,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Lease/Utilities</td>
<td>$ 195,000</td>
<td>$ 28,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal &amp; Professional Fees</td>
<td>$ 60,000</td>
<td>$ 1,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 5,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>$ 4,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 3,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>$ 5,000</td>
<td>$ 891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>$ 3,000</td>
<td>$ 226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consulting Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 880,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 78,081</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Fees</td>
<td>$ 880,000</td>
<td>$ 78,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 11,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 603</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Roadmap</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Intern</td>
<td>$ 11,000</td>
<td>$ 603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 20,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ -</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Furniture/Equipment</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 3,019,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 356,225</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated Project Funds</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 394,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ -</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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