Meeting Agenda
September 11, 2014 – 9:00 a.m. – Noon

Chateau Louis, Grand Ballroom
11727 Kingsway, Edmonton

1. Call to Order

2. Chair’s Opening Remarks

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes of August 14, 2014

5. REF Applications
   a. REF 2014-006, Edmonton, Proposed Area Structure Plan Amendment
      – Edmonton Energy & Technology Park

      Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the proposed City of Edmonton
      amendments to the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Area Structure Plan in
      accordance with the Regional Evaluation Framework.

6. Strategic Plan – Presentation for receipt of report

   Motion: That the Capital Region Board receive the Capital Region Board 2014-
   2018 Strategic Plan Final Report for information.

7. Land Use & Planning Committee
   a. Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework Report

      Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the Capital Region Regional
      Energy Corridors Policy Framework Report as recommended by the Land Use &
      Planning Committee.

   b. Disband Energy Corridors Task Force

      Motion: That the Energy Corridors Task Force be disbanded.

8. Regional Services Committee
   a. Terms of Reference

      Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the updated Regional Services
      Committee Terms of Reference, as recommended by the Regional Services
      Committee.
9. Growth Plan Update Task Force

a. Regional Jurisdictional Advantage Assessment – mid-term report on findings

Motion: That the Capital Region Board receive the mid-term report Advantages and Competitiveness of the Capital Region (Project 1C) for information.

b. Growth Plan Update – Phase 1A Project – Endorsement of report as basis to proceed

Motion: That the Capital Region Board receive the draft final report for the Plan Review and Policy Evaluation (Project 1A) and endorse it as the basis for undertaking the Growth Plan Update.

10. Administrative Items

a. CEO’s Update
   i. Update on Economic Development Summit

11. Other Business

a. Bruderheim Motion – Transit Committee
   Request for recommendation to 2015 Workplan

Motion: That the Transit Committee be requested to include for consideration the needs assessment funding for specialized transit in the 2015 Workplan.

12. Board Information Requests Update

13. Committee/Task Force Minutes

a. Housing Task Force – Draft Minutes
b. Land Use & Planning Committee – Draft Minutes, Chair Update
c. Regional Services Committee – Draft Minutes, Chair Update
d. Transit Committee – Draft Minutes

14. Adjournment
Minutes of the meeting of the Capital Region Board held at Grand Ballroom, Chateau Louis Conference Centre on Thursday, August 14, 2014

Delegates in Attendance:

Mayor Nolan Crouse – St. Albert/Chair
Councillor Kathy Barnhart – Beaumont (alternate)
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord
Mayor Karl Hauch – Bruderheim
Mayor Don Faulkner – Calmar
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Reeve Wayne Woldanski – Lamont County
Mayor Greg Krischke – Leduc
Mayor John Whaley – Leduc County
Councillor Carol Tremblay – Legal (alternate)

Mayor Lisa Holmes – Morinville
Mayor Rodney Shaigec – Parkland County
Mayor Mel Smith – Redwater
Mayor Stuart Houston – Spruce Grove
Mayor William Choy – Stony Plain
Mayor Barry Rasch – Thorsby
Mayor Roxanne Carr – Strathcona County
Mayor Tom Flynn – Sturgeon County
Mayor Fred Lindsay – Wabamun
Mayor Ralph van Assen – Warburg
Gary Sandberg – Government of Alberta

Absent:

Mayor Bill Skinner – Lamont
Mayor Stephen Lindop – Devon

Mayor Doug Horner – Gibbons

CRB Administration:

Sharon Shuya, Acting CEO
Brendan Pinches, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager

Stephanie Chai, Assistant Project Manager
Brandt Denham, GIS Coordinator
Amanda Borman, Executive Assistant
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant
1. Board Photo – Ballroom Foyer

2. Call to Order
   Called to order 9:08 a.m.

3. Chair’s Opening Remarks
   Chair Crouse advised members that the GIS Regional Collaboration Grant was approved by the Province for the amount of $180,000. Chair Crouse added that the Housing Symposium e-invite was distributed August 13, also that the Province has approved $60,000 for the event. Chair Crouse noted the provided handout, Alberta Economic Development Authority Report on Competitiveness: Alberta 2013, and asked members to distribute it within their own administrations as they see fit.

4. Approval of Agenda
   Moved by Mayor Choy.
   **Motion:** To approve the agenda of August 14, 2014.
   **Motion carried unanimously.**

5. Economic Development Summit
   Moved by Mayor Katchur.
   **Motion:** That the attendance at the Economic Development Summit be by invitation only.
   **Motion carried unanimously.**

   **Information Request:** How will the Economic Development Summit be communicated to the media?

6. MGA Review – City of Leduc
   **Motion not moved by any members.**
   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board direct the Chair to forward a letter to the Minister of Municipal Affairs requesting recognition of the Capital Region Board in the Municipal Government Act, as part of the MGA review.
   **Motion withdrawn by** Mayor Krischke, with consent of the Capital Region Board members

7. Committee/Task Force Minutes
   a. **Transit Committee – Draft Minutes provided**
Chair Crouse opened the floor for members to bring forward the following items:

**Notice of Motion:** That the Transit Committee be requested to include for consideration the needs assessment funding for specialized transit in the 2015 Workplan.

Provided by Mayor Hauch.

Mayor Choy, Stony Plain, announced that the Town will be hosting the 2015 Capital Region Golf Tournament. He asked members to Save the Date, August 6, 2015 and advised that more details will be provided in coming months.

8. **Approval of Minutes of July 10, 2014**

   Moved by Mayor Smith.

   **Motion:** To approve the minutes of July 10, 2014.

   Motion carried unanimously.

9. **Committee of the Whole**

   Moved by Mayor Carr.

   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board move into Committee of the Whole to have a facilitated discussion on the Growth Plan Update.

   Motion carried unanimously.

10. **Presentation by Urban Strategies/ ISL Engineering and Land Services**

   Mr. Hassan Shaheen and Ms. Melanie Hare provided a review of the Project 1A Plan Review and Policy Evaluation for the Growth Plan Update.

11. **Facilitated Discussion on the Growth Plan Update** – Melanie Hare, Urban Strategies

12. **Return to Board Assembly**

   Moved by Mayor Carr.

   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board move back into Board Assembly.

   Motion carried unanimously.

13. **Receipt of Information**

   Moved by Mayor Carr.
Motion: That the Capital Region Board receive the Growth Plan Update for information purposes.

Motion carried unanimously.

14. Adjournment

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

CRB Chair, Nolan Crouse    CRB Acting CEO, Sharon Shuya
REF 2014-006, City of Edmonton
Proposed Amendments to the Edmonton Energy & Technology Park Area Structure Plan

**Motion**

*That the Capital Region Board approve the proposed amendments to the Edmonton Energy & Technology Park Area Structure Plan in accordance with the Regional Evaluation Framework.*

**Background**

On June 27, 2014 the Capital Region Board (CRB) received a Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) application from the City of Edmonton for approval of proposed amendments to the Edmonton Energy & Technology Park Area Structure Plan.

A CRB Administrative recommendation to approve the subject application (attached) and a Third Party Consultant evaluation (attached) indicating consistency with the Growth Plan were posted to the CRB website on July 25, 2014. In accordance with the REF Administration Procedures the CRB Administration recommendation was subject to a 14 day appeal period ending on August 8, 2014.

Two Notices of Appeal of the subject REF Application were received on August 8, 2014 from the City of Fort Saskatchewan and Sturgeon County (attached). No other appeals were received.

Pursuant to the REF Administration Procedures, when an appeal is received the application is presented at the next Board meeting for disposition.

**Attachments:**

1. REF 2014-001 CRB Administrative Recommendation
2. REF 2014-001 Stantec Evaluation
3. REF 2014-001 Notice of Appeal - City of Fort Saskatchewan
4. REF 2014-001 Notice of Appeal - Sturgeon County
REF 2014-006  
City of Edmonton  
Proposed Area Structure Plan Amendment – Edmonton Energy & Technology Park

Recommendation

CRB Administration recommends that REF application 2014-006 be approved.

Background

On June 27, 2014 the Capital Region Board (CRB) received a Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) application from the City of Edmonton (the City) for approval of proposed amendments to the Edmonton Energy & Technology Park Area Structure Plan (ASP). The City submitted the application pursuant to the following submission criteria in the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF):

3.3 A municipality must refer any other statutory plan or statutory plan amendment where the plan is within 1.6 km of the boundaries of the Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Area Structure plans, or the Edmonton International Airport Area Structure Plan.

CRB Administration deemed the application complete on July 3, 2014.

The Application

The purpose of the proposed text amendment is to allow for the development of a wider range of industrial production facilities within plan area, reduce constraints on site size limitations, update the contextual information, recognize the ASP as a part of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland, and provide clarification on risk management within the Plan.

Evaluation

CRB Administration obtained the assistance of Lovatt Planning Consultants Inc. to evaluate the application with respect to the REF requirements. The Lovatt evaluation (attached) reviewed the proposed MDP amendment in relation to the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan (the Growth Plan) in Section 11 of the Regulation, the Principles and Policies of the Growth Plan, and the evaluation criteria in Section 5.4 of the Regional Evaluation Framework. The Lovatt evaluation recommends that the proposed ASP amendments be approved.

CRB Administration Comments

The proposed text amendment in the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park ASP, approximately 15 kilometers southwest of the Alberta’s Industrial Heartland in the northwest portion of Edmonton, supports eco-industrial infrastructure standards and is development local in scale with no significant regional impact. The ASP encourages 4,800 hectares of industrial uses to capitalize on economic development opportunities with a clear focus on environmental responsibility. The amendment updates
the ASP context and identifies the area as part of the Alberta's Industrial Heartland. The application clarifies risk management and includes consultation with Sturgeon County, City of Fort Saskatchewan and Strathcona County.

The amendment area applies to Priority Growth Area ‘F’ (PGA ‘F’) of the Capital Region Growth Plan and does not impact regional infrastructure. The amendment concentrates new growth within PGA ‘F’ with a wider range of facilities, particularly in the Petrochemical Cluster Precinct of the plan area. The amendment aligns the Growth Plan principles and policies to sustain a variety of economic development activities, to minimize site constraints, and to support regional prosperity.

Overall, CRB Administration considers the proposed ASP amendments to be consistent with Section 11 of the CRB Regulation, the criteria in the Regional Evaluation Framework, and the Principles and Policies of the Growth Plan.

Recommendation

CRB Administration recommends that REF 2014-006 be approved.

Attachments

Evaluation Lovatt Planning Consultants Inc.

REF Documents
1 - Cover letter to CRB
2 - Council Report for Bylaw 16767
3 - Council Report Attachment 1 - Bylaw 16767
4 - Council Report Attachment 2 - Sustainable Development Report
5 - Council Report Attachment 3 - Amendments to Bylaw 16767
6 - Edmonton Energy and Technology Park ASP
7 - Letter from Sturgeon County
8 - Letter to Sturgeon County
Introduction

The Province has adopted the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) for the Capital Region Board’s review of statutory plans. The City of Edmonton has referred its proposed Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Area Structure Plan Amendment to the Capital Region Board (CRB) pursuant to Section 3.3 of REF being:

A municipality must refer any other statutory plan or statutory plan amendment where the plan is within 1.6 km of the boundaries of the Alberta Industrial Heartland Area Structure Plans, or the Edmonton International Airport Area Structure Plan.

Purpose

The Area Structure Plan (ASP) text amendment bylaw proposes to:

- Update the contextual information recognizing the ASP as part of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland and remove references to the Edmonton Regional Ring Road (ERRR);
- Allow for a broader range of energy inputs, with particular focus on natural gas;
- Remove the parcel size limit to increase flexibility;
- Strengthen policies related to risk management and air dispersion modelling to make them consistent with the purpose of the Capital Region Growth Plan (CRGP) regional buffer areas.

The amendments will assist the City in better marketing and capitalizing on potential major eco-industrial development, while maintaining a clear focus on environmental responsibility and represent minor adjustments to the content of the ASP. The changes proposed by the amendment will have no substantive regional implications.

The ASP is located in Priority Growth Area (PGA) “F”. The Plan area was added to the Alberta Industrial Heartland in 2010 and, accordingly, the amending bylaw that received 2nd reading on June 24, 2014 has been referred for evaluation. However, the CRGP and attendant maps have not been amended to reflect the addition of the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park ASP lands to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland. That said, the proposed amendment complies with all REF criteria.

Recommendation

That CRB APPROVE the proposed amendment to the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park ASP amendments.
Summary
Located in the northeast corner of the City of Edmonton, the Plan area comprises some 4,800 hectares designated for industrial type uses. The ASP describes an industrial development opportunity for this portion of PGA “F” and provides a framework to direct development. The Edmonton Energy and Technology Park ASP enhances the potential of the Alberta Industrial Heartland by adding a wider variety of energy inputs for petro-chemical developments.

Evaluation Criteria
Section 5.4 of REF lists the criteria CRB must consider in evaluating statutory plans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.4(a) Compatibility of the development with the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan (CRGP) as set out in Section 11 of the Regulation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ 11(a) To promote an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Capital Region;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The proposed ASP text amendments apply to an area located within PGA “F” and the Alberta Industrial Heartland. The amendments are consistent with the strategic and integrated planning approach for future growth in the Capital Region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ✓ 11(b) To identify the overall development pattern and key future infrastructure investments that would best complement existing infrastructure, services and land uses in the Capital Region, and maximize benefits to the Capital Region; |
| • The proposed amendments will clarify the relationship of the ASP to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland, remove lot size constraints, allow a wider range of energy inputs and strengthen risk management policies for the ASP lands within PGA “F”. The amendments will improve the marketability of the lands within the Petrochemical Cluster Precinct of the Plan area. |

| ✓ 11(c) To co-ordinate decisions in the Capital Region to sustain economic growth and ensure strong communities and a healthy environment. |
| • The strengthening of the risk management policies and including both risk assessment studies and air dispersion modeling will promote the maintenance of strong communities and a healthy living environment. The City met with Sturgeon County to obtain County input. The proposed amendments recognize this input so that decisions are coordinated. |

| 5.4(b) Whether the approval and full implementation of the plan would result in a level, type, and pattern of development consistent with all of the following: |

(i) The Land Use Principles and Policies of the CRGP including the provisions for:

| ✓ i. Buffer areas as shown on the Regional Buffer Areas Map in the Capital Region Growth Plan. |
| • The proposed amendments ensure that the purpose of the Safety and Risk Management Buffer is enshrined in the ASP. |

| ✓ ii. Priority Growth Areas as shown on the Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas map in the Capital Region Growth Plan. |
| • The ASP lands are located within PGA “F”. The amendments are consistent with the CRGP’s intention to concentrate growth in PGAs. |
| ✓ | iii. Cluster Country Residential Areas as shown on the Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas map in the Capital Region Growth Plan. | • Not applicable. |
| ✓ | iv. Density targets as outlined in the Capital Region Growth Plan. | • Not applicable |
| ✓ | v. Outside Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas. | • Not applicable. |

| ✓ | (ii) The regional population and employment forecasts in the Capital Region Growth Plan; • The proposed text amendments will not change employment numbers. |
| ✓ | (iii) The regional transportation network as shown in the Regional Transportation Infrastructure map in the Capital Region Growth Plan; • The proposed amendments are consistent with the regional transportation network. |
| ✓ | (iv) The Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan of the Capital Region Growth Plan (Figures 8, 9 or 10 of the Capital Region Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan), and a Transportation Master Plan as approved by the City of Edmonton; • The proposed amendments are consistent with the Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan and the Transportation Master Plan. |
| ✓ | (v) The regional infrastructure, and recreation, transportation and utility corridors as identified on the Regional Transportation Infrastructure, Regional Water and Wastewater Infrastructure, Regional Power Infrastructure, and Regional Corridors maps of the Capital Region Growth Plan; • The proposed amendments are consistent with all four maps. |
| ✓ | (vi) The boundaries and policies of the Alberta’s Industrial Heartland ASPs and the Edmonton International Airport ASP; • The ASP was added to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland in January 2010. |

**Attachment**

For Information: Evaluation of the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park ASP amendments against the Principles and Policies of the Capital Region Land Use Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>REGIONAL LAND USE PLAN</strong></th>
<th><strong>Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Area Structure Plan Amendment Evaluation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES</strong></td>
<td>(Adopted by the Capital Region Board March 5, 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES
1. Preserve and protect the environment.
2. Preserve agricultural land.
3. Protect natural resources.
4. Minimize the impact of development on regional watersheds and air sheds.
5. Minimize the impact of heavy industrial development.

- Air dispersion modeling studies completed as one of the prerequisites for development approval will assist in minimizing the impact of development on regional air sheds.
- Policies will ensure that risk management studies are undertaken. As well buffer areas will restrict uses that pose a risk of death of no greater than 1:1,000,000.

### II. MINIMIZE REGIONAL FOOTPRINT
1. Identify, Protect and Prioritize Lands for Regional Infrastructure
2. Concentrate New Growth Within Priority Growth Areas
3. Allow Growth Outside of Priority Growth Areas
4. Support Expansion of Medium and Higher Density Residential Housing Forms
5. Support Cluster Country Residential Development

- The Plan area is within PGA “F”. Concentrating the wider variety of industrial uses will assist in minimizing the regional footprint.

### III. STRENGTHEN COMMUNITIES
1. Create Inclusive Communities
2. Support Healthy Communities
3. Support Public Transit
4. Support Innovative and Affordable Housing Options

- Air dispersion studies and risk management assessments will guide development decisions focussed on providing safe and healthy living environments.

### IV. INCREASE TRANSPORTATION CHOICE
1. Integrate Transportation Systems with Land Use
2. Support the Expansion of Transit Service in Various Forms

- The proposed amendments will have no substantive impact on the ASP’s existing support for public transit expansion and integration.
### V. ENSURE EFFICIENT PROVISION OF SERVICES

| A. Design Integrated Physical Infrastructure within the Region |
| B. Maximize Utilization of Existing Infrastructure |

- The proposed amendments will have no substantive impact on the integration or utilization of infrastructure.

### VI. SUPPORT REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

| A. Ensure a Supply of Land To Sustain a Variety Of Economic Development Activities |
| B. Attract and Retain Individuals and Families with a Diverse Range of Skills to the Capital Region to Satisfy the Region’s Economic Development Goals |
| C. Support Regional Prosperity |
| D. Position the Capital Region Competitively on the World Stage |

- The proposed amendments will enhance the strategic importance of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland as a regional employment centre and a major driver of regional prosperity.
SUBJECT OF APPEAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF #</th>
<th>CRB Applicant Municipality</th>
<th>Statutory Plan(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-006</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Area Structure Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Administration Recommendation</td>
<td>Appeal Period</td>
<td>July 25, 2014 – August 8, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPELLANT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRB Appellant Municipality</th>
<th>Council Resolution #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>R135-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, state the reasons for appealing the subject REF application, including the specific provisions, sections and/or policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan or Capital Region Board Regulation which provide a basis for this appeal.

Please see attached document for statement of reason for appeal.

**Attach a separate page if more space is required.**

A notice of appeal must be received by CRB Administration within fourteen (14) days of the CRB Administrative Recommendation being posted to the CRB Website: www.capitalregionboard.ab.ca/framework. The most convenient method to submit the appeal is by emailing the Notice of Appeal to info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca.

Verification of Receipt - CRB Office Use Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Stamp – Appeal Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received By:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CITY OF FORT SASKATCHEWAN

Edmonton Energy and Technology Park CRB REF Appeal

Statement of Reason for Appeal to the Capital Region Board of the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Area Structure Plan Regional Evaluation Framework Application 2014-006

The City of Fort Saskatchewan has decided to appeal the Capital Region Board Administration’s approval of the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Area Structure Plan (EEETP ASP) (2014-006) based on the criteria outlined in Section 5.4 of the Regional Evaluation Framework. The itemized list of reasons for appeal are provided below.

1. CRB Growth Plan Appendix 2: Land Use Plan (March 2009) Section 2.2 – i. E. (f): Require appropriate risk management practices in applying heavy industrial development or other development in proximity to heavy industrial uses.

An independent Risk Assessment conducted by Doug McCutcheon and Associates determined that additional risk management was required. The report made the following recommendations:

1. Understanding the specifics of each of the proposed processes as to how the products will be produced, and any future plans to add new processes to the area.
2. Emergency planning specifically for toxic releases including company site operations, railroad and tank truck releases, and pipeline ruptures and leaks. Here it is suggested emergency planning up front may show significant public impact requiring evaluation by the City of Edmonton, Sturgeon County and the City of Fort Saskatchewan before any projects and undertaken.
3. Propose the City of Edmonton move the northern boundary of the proposed Ethylene Plant 0.5km south in order to allow Sturgeon County to manage their land uses.
4. Because of the need for transporting raw materials and products by truck, rail or pipeline engage in risk assessments for the planned routes as this will potentially have significant impact on Sturgeon County.
5. Evaluating the impact of “nuisance issues” on proposed future planning within Sturgeon County and to a lesser degree, the City of Fort Saskatchewan would be pertinent.

2. Growth Plan Addendum (October 2009) Section 2.7 – Safety and Risk Management b.: The standard for the risk management assessment shall be the standard as established by the Major Industrial Accidents Council of Canada (MIACC).

The EEETP ASP only references the use of MIACC Principles which does not bind them to following the full standards as is done in other municipalities in the AIHA. No specific buffer setbacks or other risk management policies are suggested in the ASP.
3. **Growth Plan Addendum (October 2009) Section 2.7 – Safety and Risk Management c.: Capital Region member municipalities shall identify the recommendations for risk assessment in the Municipal Development Plan and any applicable statutory plan.**

There is not adequate detail provided in the EETP ASP to be considered a recommendation for risk assessment.

4. **CRB Growth Plan Appendix 2: Land Use Plan (March 2009) Section 2.2 – I. D. (i): Any development which impacts the regional watersheds or airsheds shall comply with all applicable federal and provincial legislation.**

There is not adequate detail provided in the EETP ASP to suggest that the increased intensity and allowance for larger developments within the Petrochemical Cluster area within the EETP will not negatively impact regional watersheds or airsheds.
Resolution of Council

MOVED BY Councillor Sperling that Council approve Recommendation #1 provided by Administration in the in-camera report dated July 8, 2014.

Recommendation #1:

That Council direct administration to submit an appeal of the City of Edmonton REF Submission 2014 – 006 subject to the approval by the Capital Region Board.

Mayor Gale Katchur

Date

 Acting Director, Legislative Services

Date
R130-14 MOVED BY Councillor Garritsen that Council supports the City of Fort Saskatchewan in the participation of a joint regional transportation study through the Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

In Favour: Gale Katchur, Frank Garritsen, Stew Hennig, Arjun Randhawa, Birgit Blizzard, Sheldon Bossert, Ed Sperling

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

17.6 CUPE Local 30 Collective Agreement Ratification
Presented by: Renee Fitzsimmons, Director, People Services

R131-14 MOVED BY Councillor Blizzard that Council ratify the three year Memorandum of Agreement reached during collective bargaining between the City of Fort Saskatchewan and the Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local 30.

In Favour: Gale Katchur, Frank Garritsen, Stew Hennig, Arjun Randhawa, Birgit Blizzard, Sheldon Bossert, Ed Sperling

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

R132-14 MOVED BY Councillor Blizzard that the City authorize the Mayor and the City Manager to execute, on behalf of the City, the Collective Agreement incorporating the changes agreed to in the Memorandum of Agreement.

In Favour: Gale Katchur, Frank Garritsen, Stew Hennig, Arjun Randhawa, Birgit Blizzard, Sheldon Bossert, Ed Sperling

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

17.7 Confidential Intergovernmental Matter
Presented by: Troy Fleming, General Manager, Infrastructure & Community Services

R133-14 MOVED BY Councillor Hennig that Council move “in-camera”.

In Favour: Gale Katchur, Frank Garritsen, Stew Hennig, Arjun Randhawa, Birgit Blizzard, Sheldon Bossert, Ed Sperling

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

R134-14 MOVED BY Councillor Sperling that Council move out of “in camera”.

In Favour: Gale Katchur, Frank Garritsen, Stew Hennig, Arjun Randhawa, Birgit Blizzard, Sheldon Bossert, Ed Sperling

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

R135-14 MOVED BY Councillor Sperling that Council approve Recommendation #1 provided by Administration in the in-camera report dated July 8, 2014.

In Favour: Gale Katchur, Frank Garritsen, Stew Hennig, Arjun Randhawa, Birgit Blizzard, Sheldon Bossert, Ed Sperling
Regional Evaluation Framework

NOTICE OF APPEAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</th>
<th>Statutory Plan(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REF # 2014-006</td>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Applicant Municipality</td>
<td>Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Area Structure Plan Amendment – Bylaw 16767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Administration Recommendation</td>
<td>Appeal Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>July 25, 2014 – August 8, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPELLANT INFORMATION</th>
<th>Council Resolution #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRB Appellant Municipality</td>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.13 246/14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the space below, state the reasons for appealing the subject REF application, including the specific provisions, sections and/or policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan or Capital Region Board Regulation which provide a basis for this appeal.

Sturgeon County is of the opinion that the proposed amendments to the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Area Structure Plan do not meet the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan, as defined in the Capital Region Board Regulation Section 11 and Ministerial Order No L:270/10 Schedule A 5.4 (b).

While the City of Edmonton contends that the proposed EETP ASP amendments are minor, Sturgeon County is of the opinion that the proposed amendments will result in a significantly altered intent and vision for the EETP ASP. When first approved, the EETP ASP provided a vision for an eco-industrial park, where the primary function was to take raw downstream products generated within Alberta’s Industrial Heartland and upcycle the products. Development within the park was “intended to look, feel, and function differently than conventional industrial parks.”

By removing Policy 7.2.4 “This area is not intended to house extensive, upgrader style development. Therefore, site size will not exceed 30 hectares”, Sturgeon County contends that this will result in a scope change from the eco-industrial development to a traditional heavy industrial park within the PetroChemical Cluster Precinct. While the CRB Regulation speaks to land use planning for future growth within the Capital Region, it additionally identifies underpinning objective and policy themes. It is Sturgeon County’s opinion that the following are not adequately addressed and lacking a regional context.

- To promote an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Capital Region
- Protect the Environmental and Resources & Ensure Efficient Provision of Services, and
- Strengthening Communities.

To promote an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Capital Region

While Sturgeon County does not object to the proposed change in Vision for the EETP ASP, Sturgeon County contends that additional supportive documentation is required to analyze the regional impact of the heavy industrial amendments to the natural environment, infrastructure servicing, and quality of life. The development focus of the Petrochemical Cluster Precinct will enable heavy industrial development such as, Ethylene Production, Propane Dehydrogenation Plants, Methane Plants and Upgraders. Approval of the EETP ASP as proposed will see the City of Edmonton determine the need for the supportive documentation at the rezoning/development stage without Regional oversight or dialogue. Sturgeon County is concerned that this ad-hoc approval style sets a new precedent for Area Structure Plans, and the required supportive documentation. This reactionary approval process can lead to a fragmented decision process and inconsistent development requirements, which are not consistent with an integrated and strategic planning process.
Protect the Environment and Resources & Ensure Efficient Provision of Services (Supportive Documentation)
Currently the Area Structure Plan lacks several supportive reports to accompany the development aspirations outlined within the statutory plan. The EETP ASP does not address several significant criteria of the Growth Plan in regards to infrastructure service provision, environmental impact, regional employment targets, and compatibility of land use (to Sturgeon County). With the intensification of industrial activity now reflecting a traditional heavy industrial park, Sturgeon County believes that additional studies (consistent with other Heavy Industrial Heartland Area Structure Plans) should be incorporated as part the Area Structure Plan process (Environmental Assessment Reports, Utility Servicing Reports, and updated Transportation Master Plan etc.). Evaluation of the EETP ASP without the supporting studies provides little understanding and certainty of the vision and impact on the plan area (process water, Highway 37 intersections, cumulative air quality impacts on both the Edmonton and Fort Airsheds, employment generation).

Strengthening Communities
While the City of Edmonton has extensive zoning criteria to address specific development issues, Sturgeon County is concerned that the processing of these applications may not provide certainty or due-regard to the County resident’s or existing operations concerns (including CFB Edmonton bordering the EETP ASP lands). The City of Edmonton Zoning Bylaw lists ‘Heavy Industrial’ development as a Permitted Use within the Petro-Chemical Cluster, which limits the County’s ability to appeal a decision made by a City of Edmonton Development Officer. With applications of such a significant scale(upgraders, site size greater than 30 acres), the County has concern with City of Edmonton’s unwillingness to incorporate a setback buffer within the Area Structure Plan to address not only Risk Management, but also quality of life and land use conflicts between the City and the County. As with all other Heavy Industrial areas within the Capital Region, a Regional Buffer is identified requiring heavy industrial areas to mitigate incompatible land use transition. The City of Edmonton’s lack of incorporation of a compatibility buffer within the ASP, is contrary with existing Heavy industrial statutory plans in the Capital Region. This buffer, designed to mitigate risk, maintain quality of life, and reduce land use conflicts and serves to limit the impact on the existing community. In fact, it could be reasoned that the change to enable a heavy industrial park with development opportunities similar to those found within the Alberta Industrial Heartland Association, should require an amendment to the October 2009 Growth Plan Addendum by including a compatibility buffer around the EETP (see Section 2 Figure 3 - Land Use Regional Buffers Map). By only providing a buffer within the Zoning Bylaw, Sturgeon County contends that the responsibility for managing risk and mitigating incompatible land uses is shifted to the County. Sturgeon County contends that this approach is not “neighbourly”, and may limit existing land use opportunities for our landowners adjacent to the ASP area, ultimately having a negative impact on our rural community.

A notice of appeal must be received by CRB Administration within fourteen (14) days of the CRB Administrative Recommendation being posted to the CRB Website: www.capitalregionboard.ab.ca/framework. The most convenient method to submit the appeal is by emailing the Notice of Appeal to info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verification of Receipt - CRB Office Use Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Stamp – Appeal Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received By: ______________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CRB Mtg Pkg September 11/14
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Actions to be Taken: Agenda Item E.13 – July 8 2014

1. That Sturgeon County staff be directed to issue a Notice of Appeal to the FEETP ASP REF should it receive a favorable recommendation from CRB Administration, and should Edmonton not be responsive in incorporating the requested amendments,

and;

2. That the Mayor, on behalf of County Council, sign the Resolution of Council – July 8 2014 (see Attachment 2) accordingly.
June 23, 2014

City of Edmonton
Office of the General Manager – Sustainable Development
8th Floor, 10250 – 101 Street NW
Edmonton, Alberta
T5J 3P4

ATTN: Alayne Sinclair, Clerk - City of Edmonton

File: LDA13-0552 Edmonton Energy and Technology Park
Re: Bylaw 16797 Amendments and Public Hearing for Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Area Structure Plan (EETP ASP)

Sturgeon County would like to thank the City of Edmonton for engaging with the County on the proposed changes to the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Area Structure Plan (EETP ASP). As a member of the Capital Region Board and the Alberta Industrial Heartland Association, Sturgeon County recognizes the importance of industrial development to the future success of the Capital Region. Over the past 4 months, the City of Edmonton has engaged the County on two separate occasions regarding the proposed changes to the EETP ASP, and dialogue has focused on the following themes:

1. EETP ASP Change in Direction and Policy,
2. Necessary Supportive Documentation for the EETP ASP,
3. Impacts to Stakeholders,
4. Transportation Networks, and
5. Risk Management and Air Shed.

On Wednesday May 21, 2014, the City of Edmonton hosted a meeting to update Sturgeon County regarding the Air Quality Study and the Risk Management Study undertaken to support the ASP. Upon conclusion of the meeting, the City requested that the participants review the proposed policy changes to the Area Structure Plan and provide comment. Sturgeon County has the following comments regarding the proposed changes and outstanding considerations identified in pervious correspondence.

Risk Management Meeting Overview - At the meeting held on May 21st, the City shared the initial findings of the Risk Management Study. In the presentation, general findings of the report found that to obtain a 1:100000 year MIACC standard, a 1.5 km buffer was required from any hazardous material heavy industrial use. The study evaluated the impact of 4 different heavy industrial uses (Ethylene Production, Propane Dehydrogenation Plant, a Methane Plan and an Upgrader Facility). The findings concluded that the individual plants, with the incorporation of the 1.5 km buffer into the Zoning Bylaw, do not impose a risk management concern for Sturgeon County. On June 6, 2014, the City provided Sturgeon County with a with a copy of the report. This report is not yet supported/approved by the City of Edmonton for the Area Structure Plan.

Sturgeon County Comments: Sturgeon County received the finalized Risk Assessment on June 6, 2014. This referral timeline required a quick turnaround to meet the June 24, 2014 Public Hearing and did not conform with
the Schedule A's Intermunicipal Planning Referral and Notification timelines (28 days). Sturgeon County, along with the City of Fort Saskatchewan, referred the application to Doug McCutcheon and Associates to review the file in regards to MIACC standards. Based upon this Report dated June 20 2014, the following recommendations were provided to Sturgeon County and the City of Fort Saskatchewan.

The Area Structure Plan should:

1. Provide an understanding the specifics of each of the proposed processes as to how the products will be produced, and any future plans to add new processes to the area.

2. Provide emergency planning specifically for toxic releases including company site operations, railroad and tank truck releases, and pipeline ruptures and leaks. Here it is suggested emergency planning up front may show significant public impact requiring evaluation by the City of Edmonton, Sturgeon County and the City of Fort Saskatchewan before any projects and undertaken.

3. Propose the City of Edmonton move the northern boundary of the proposed Ethylene Plant 0.5km south in order to allow Sturgeon County to manage their land uses.

4. Engage in a risk assessment for the planned routes for transporting raw materials and products by truck, rail or pipeline, as this will potentially have significant impact on Sturgeon County.

5. Evaluate the impact of "nuisance issues" on proposed future planning within Sturgeon County and to a lesser degree, the City of Fort Saskatchewan would be pertinent.

In addition, The County has concerns with the Risk Management Study requirement (Policy 7.8.1), as there is no definition of what a "Hazardous Material" is within the Area Structure Plan. As there is no clear definition, this requirement could be relaxed indiscriminately, which concerns Sturgeon County in its application. As the City of Edmonton's own departments have not reviewed/approved the Risk Management Study, Sturgeon County suggests that closing of the public hearing, and any submittals to the Capital Region Board are premature.

Airshed Quality Overview - At the meeting on May 21st, the City shared the findings of the Air Quality Study and provided Sturgeon County with a copy of the report. This report looked at the impacts of heavy industry on the Alberta Capital Airshed.

Sturgeon County Comments: While the exact site of the EETP ASP is located within the Alberta Capital Airshed, the site lies directly adjacent to the Fort Airshed - the Airshed that encompasses most of Alberta Industrial Heartland Association (AIHA) lands. Sturgeon County is concerned that the Air Quality Study did not appropriately consider the impacts to the Fort Airshed and the impacts to the AIHA. The Fort Airshed does have considerations regarding the amount, size and type of heavy industrial uses to air quality. Sturgeon County is concerned that the amount of heavy industrial development proposed within the EETP ASP could have a significant impact to the Fort Airshed, possibly limiting already zoned heavy industrial activities within the Fort Airshed.

The City of Edmonton should refer this study to the Fort Air Partnership, through the AIHA, for their comment and input. As the City of Edmonton's own departments have not reviewed/approved these documents, Sturgeon County suggests that closing of the public hearing, and any submittals to the Capital Region Board are premature.

Policy/Zoning Overview – The City states that Sturgeon's concerns with the changes to the ASP are unwarranted as proposed Zoning will contain several provisions that will address the remaining concerns. Proposed changes
to the Zoning Bylaw will include a 1.5 km Risk Management Buffer that will limit the types of heavy industrial developments within the identified area and customized uses for development in the Buffer. The City of Edmonton has provided Sturgeon County with the proposed zoning that includes a 1.5 km Risk Management Buffer along the northern/eastern boundary the Plan area where no Heavy industrial activity will be permitted.

**Sturgeon County Comments:** Sturgeon County is encouraged to see that the proposed land zoning within the Chemical Cluster Zone states that no Heavy industrial uses will be permitted within the 1.5 km Risk Management Buffer. Sturgeon County maintains the previously expressed concerns that until the proposed zoning is approved, the existing zoning within the Chemical Cluster Zone lists Heavy Industrial as a Permitted Use. As such, the City could process a heavy industrial application without referring to Sturgeon County(see Schedule A), until the proposed zoning is adopted. Sturgeon County is also concerned that the 1.5 km Risk Management Buffer has not been applied to the western edge of Sturgeon County, along CFB Edmonton, and should be.

**Sturgeon County requests** the following be incorporated into the Area Structure Plan prior to submission to the Capital Region Board, based upon the above comments, including the McCutcheon and Associates review of the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Risk Assessment Report.

a. **[Petrochemical Cluster Precinct] Policy 7.2.4:** Lands located within 1.5 km from Sturgeon County's municipal boundary are not intended to house extensive, heavy industrial development. Therefore, site size shall not exceed 30 hectares within the 1.5 km Risk Management Buffer.

b. **[Risk Management Strategy] Policy 7.8.1:** A Risk Assessment is required for Industrial uses intended to produce, process, handle, and/or store hazardous material. A Risk Assessment is required for all proposed heavy industrial uses.

c. **[Risk Management Strategy] Policy 7.8.5:** A 1.5 km Risk Management Buffer shall be applied within City of Edmonton land from Sturgeon County's municipal boundary to limit proposed heavy industrial activities and uses that pose a risk of death greater than 1:1,000,000.

d. **[Public Consultation Requirements] Policy 11.4.1:** The City of Edmonton shall refer all Heavy Industrial zoning applications within the EETP ASP to Sturgeon County and the Alberta Industrial Heartland Association to ensure improved public and intermunicipal notification and input.

e. **[Environmental Protection] Policy 10.6.4 Air Quality 1:** The City of Edmonton shall require the submission of an Air Quality Technical Report prior to development approval for all heavy industrial activities within the EETP ASP.

f. **[Environmental Protection] Policy 10.6.4 Air Quality 2:** The City of Edmonton shall require Heavy Industrial uses to evaluate and study the effects on regional air quality to ensure that air quality exceedences do not occur in industrial areas.

g. **[Environmental Protection] Policy 10.6.4 Air Quality 3:** The City of Edmonton shall refer all Air Quality Technical Reports to the Alberta Industrial Heartland Association to ensure safe regional air quality is maintained and that the cumulative effects on both the Alberta Capital Airshed and Fort Airshed are understood.

h. A definition within the Area Structure Plan to identified what Hazardous Material is and means.
I. A direct reference to both the Airshed Quality Study and the Risk Management Study within the contents of the Area Structure Plan (as an appendix to the EETP ASP) to provide the context for the scale and type of development studied.

Sturgeon County values the opportunity to provide input and insight that reflects our residents' perspective so that both communities can continue to grow harmoniously. Sturgeon County recognizes the need for a transparent public engagement process and thanks the City of Edmonton for engaging the County on this application. Sturgeon values the newly fostered intermunicipal dialogue that is occurring and contributing to positive and mutually beneficial outcomes. If there are any questions regarding this response, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Best regards,

Collin Steffes
Associate General Manager, Planning & Economic Development

CS/ kp

cc Mayor Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County
   Peter Tarnawsky, CAO Sturgeon County
   Simon Farbrother, City Manager – City of Edmonton
   Rick Sloan - City of Edmonton
   Lisa Stern, Sustainable Development – City of Edmonton
   Kelly Greenland, Sustainable Development – City of Edmonton
CERTIFICATE

I certify that the attached document, comprised of two pages is a true copy of the July 8 2014, Council Minutes, Agenda Item E.13 - Intermunicipal Matter (In Camera Session), and the corresponding Resolution of Council.

Signed and Sealed

August 7, 2014

Nanette Best
Legislative Officer
E.13

REQUEST FOR DECISION
INTERMUNICIPAL MATTER
... continued

A Request for Decision pertaining to an Intermunicipal Matter was reviewed by Collin Steffes, Associate General Manager, Integrated Growth and Colin Krywiak, Senior Development Officer, Planning and Development Services.

246/14
S. Evans MOVED:

That County Council approve the actions outlined in the In Camera Administration Report E.13 (July 8, 2014)

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

247/14
S. Evans MOVED:


CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

E.14

BRIEFING TO COUNCIL
STURGEON COUNTY CAMPUS
... continued

I.

ADJOURNMENT

248/14
W. Bokenfohr MOVED:

That the meeting be adjourned at 12:11 a.m.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

______________________________
MAYOR

______________________________
COUNTY COMMISSIONER (CAO)

THE NEXT REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING WILL BE HELD ON
AUGUST 26, 2014 AT 9:00 A.M.
Resolution of Council – July 8 2014

County Council hereby authorizes Administration to take all necessary steps to file with the Capital Region Board, a signed and dated copy of this Resolution attaching the Capital Region Board Regional Evaluation Framework Notice of Appeal, based upon the Request for Decision dated July 8, 2014.

And Council hereby directs the Mayor to sign this Resolution on behalf of Council.

Mayor Tom Flynn

2014-08-08

Chief Administration Officer Peter Tarnawsky

Date
Capital Region Board Strategic Plan

Motion

*That the Capital Region Board receive the Capital Region Board 2014-2018 Strategic Plan Final Report for information.*

Background

The Capital Region Board underwent a strategic planning process in 2014. From February to date, the process included a strategic planning session and three facilitated workshops (vision, context and trends, and where do we want to go) with the Board. Interviews with Board Members and Chief Administrative Officers were conducted throughout the region to provide further input to the plan.

Rationale

The Capital Region Board 2014-2018 Strategic Plan is the result of an extensive collaborative process to determine the best possible future for Board activities. The final report is being brought forward to the Board for information and will come back to the Board for approval on October 9, 2014.

Attachments:
1. Final Capital Region Board 2014-2018 Strategic Plan
CAPITAL REGION BOARD
DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN
2014 – 2018

SEPTEMBER 2014
MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

Good leaders envision the future and find ways for their organizations to travel along new paths. The members of the Capital Region Board have provided effective leadership to the CRB initiative and continue to support the enhancement of the region and its activities.

This is not easy work and often requires a willingness to explore and consider innovative solutions. I am proud that the members of the Capital Region Board have been equal to the challenge, and have committed to the region’s future by developing this strategic plan.

I thank them for their hard work and look forward to our continued progress together.

Mayor Nolan Crouse

MESSAGE FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER (CEO)

The Capital Region Board is a bold initiative in shaping twenty-first century tools to maximize the opportunities of this new century. The Board brings together the experience and wisdom of twenty-four municipalities and builds upon their past successes to create a robust future.

This 2014 – 2018 Strategic Plan for the Capital Region Board is one of the results of this partnership. The plan is based on the best information about the environment in which the region will operate, and founded on a thorough understanding of the dreams and desires of each municipal member of the Board.

We believe this document will stand the test of time, and guide the work of the administration in helping the Board achieve its vision. I look forward to working with the members of the Capital Region Board fulfill the promise of this plan.

Doug Lagore
A. INTRODUCTION

This initiating strategic plan for the Capital Region Board (CRB) has been built on clear principles. These include:

- **Fact Based:** Underlying the work is a strong commitment to ensuring that the plan content is based on the best information available regarding current practice in similar situations, and relevant social, economic and regional information about the environment in which the Board will operate.

- **Collaborative Development:** The project design was also structured so that all members of the Board had similar opportunities to share their thoughts and visions for the Board, and that the report clearly identified the range of concerns and ideas that were contributed to the process.

- **Mutual Prosperity/Success:** A core belief is that the success of the Capital Region cannot be built on ‘winners and losers’. Every member brings value to the Board and has its own, unique contribution to make.

The result is a plan grounded in data and enriched by many years of municipal experience. The goals, while challenging, are achievable and are believed to be the ‘influential few’ that will take the CRB the farthest along its desired path.

B. PROCESS

B. 1. Strategic Framework

The Capital Region Board 2014 – 2018 Strategic Plan is the result of an extensive collaborative process to determine the best possible future for Board activities. This vision driven process emphasised developing a framework that:

- Identified four to six focus areas that would make a significant difference to the Capital Region Board in the next four years;
- Identified key activities to be accomplished in each of the focus areas, and
- Prioritized other activities, and developed a four year schedule of activity.
This project centered around creating and supporting the best possible process to allow the CRB to address its issues in a strategic way; to incorporate the relevant and related planning documents; to engage the key stakeholders in a way that gives them a meaningful voice in the deliberations; and to ensure a pathway to include the more granular CRB work plans. The end result is this four year strategic plan, generated and created by the CRB Board, informed by the appropriate stakeholders, and integrated and aligned with related plans and processes.

The chart below illustrates the process followed in developing the plan.
Capital Region Board Strategic Planning Process

- **Friday, April 11, 2014**
  - SESSION 1:
  - VISION WORKSHOP
  - EDMONTON PETROLEUM CLUB

- **Friday, May 09, 2014**
  - SESSION 2:
  - SUMMARY OF CONTEXT AND TRENDS
  - EDMONTON PETROLEUM CLUB

- **Friday, June 06, 2014**
  - SESSION 3:
  - WHERE DO WE WANT TO GO?
  - LOCATION: NOVA HOTEL, YELLOWHEAD

- **Saturday, February 08, 2014**
  - STRATEGIC PLANNING SESSION
  - EDMONTON PETROLEUM CLUB

- **Thursday, September 11, 2014**
  - FINAL PRESENTATION TO BOARD
  - CHATEAU LOUIS

- **2/8/2014**
  - ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

- **2/10/2014 - 3/14/2014**
  - INTERVIEWS WITH BOARD MEMBERS

  - FACILITATE STRATEGIC PLANNING WORKSHOPS WITH BOARD

- **6/9/2014 - 7/18/2014**
  - DRAFT STRATEGIC PLAN

September 1, 2014
B. 2. Environmental Scan

During the plan period, the Capital Region and the Province of Alberta are expected to experience strong economic growth, and increased numbers and diversity in population. The following are a few of the details considered by the CRB when developing its plan.

For the period of 2014 – 2018:

- Alberta will continue to outperform the national average in terms of % real GDP growth.
- The Alberta population will be younger than its national counterpart: % under 14 (Alberta); 18.8% (Canada) 16.75%
- Household incomes are higher: Average household income (Alberta) $100,810; (Canada) $79,102.
- The Aboriginal population is larger than the national average: (Alberta) 7.39%; (Canada) 4.26%.
- Many costs are higher than average: % Edmonton CMA population paying 30% or more towards shelter costs is higher than Alberta, particularly renters.

A summary of the external and internal issues and opportunities facing the Capital Region are summarized in the chart below.
Regional Issues and Opportunities

**Strengths:**
- Low unemployment rate
- Higher wages than national average
- Increase in building permits and construction
- Lower housing prices than the province
- Continued population growth
- High net migration

**Weaknesses:**
- Roadway system and transit infrastructure strain due to rising employment
- Labour shortage issues
- High percent of low income households
- Need for affordable housing (rental rates)
- High crime severity index and poor health indicators compared to the province

**Opportunities:**
- Strong economic growth
- Projected increase in consumer expenditures
- Projected increases in residential and non-residential expenditures
- Increase in working age population
- Increasing percentage of Edmonton City housing starts

**Threats:**
- Potential constraints on increased oil production beyond 2016 due to slower growth in the U.S and Europe
- Rising household debt
- Increasing old age dependency ratio
- Gender disparity in Northern Alberta

B. 3. Interview Process

An extensive interview program was conducted to get feedback on the essential elements of Vision, Strategic Assessment and Strategic Priorities for the CRB. Personal, on-site interviews were scheduled with the Capital Region Board Members, the CEO and Senior Management Team of the CRB, and the CAO of each municipality.

Major themes emerged in the early stages of the interview process to inform the Vision for the organization. These themes were tested and evolved throughout the interviews, as well as in the subsequent choice and drafting of the Strategic Priorities.

C. DEVELOPMENT OF CRB VISION

The Vision for an organization is not simply a Vision Statement. Rather, a Vision describes a realistic, credible, attractive and **inspiring future** for the organization. Often it is described in
categories that are relevant to the organization leadership. Governance, Funding, and Functions are examples of categories relevant to the CRB.

The Vision for the Capital Region Board (CRB) will evolve over time, as the Board builds trust and alignment of its members around its foundational responsibilities and interests.

Key elements of the Vision for the CRB Organization are summarized below. They are stated as conditions that exist for the organization in the long-term future (2065).

C. 1. Capital Region Board Governance

The Capital Region Board (CRB) practices good governance, and builds trusting relationships, engagement and openness.

Within its defined mandate, CRB focuses on long-term, high level decisions that affect the region.

CRB is a cohesive legislated body, future-focused on building a competitive, sustainable region and improving the quality of life of its residents.

CRB invests in creating value for all its members.

CRB invests carefully and strategically in the development of trust between members; it fosters a dynamic culture; it identifies elements that are foundational at CRB and establishes a framework and strategy that take it forward successfully.

The CRB decision-making process and voting structure may be refined as the culture of CRB evolves.

CRB advocates in support of its decision and policies; it is able to leverage and influence provincial decisions because it is aligned with provincial direction and priorities.

C. 2. CRB Funding

CRB has the resources necessary to carry out its functions.

A shared funding model, negotiated with the Government of Alberta, recognizes foundational responsibilities of the GOA.

GOA funding is largely operational; Municipal investments are more project-specific.
The “in-kind” investment of CRB members and the capacity restrictions of members are recognized.

C. 3. Capital Region Board Functions

As its primary function, CRB prepares a high level, comprehensive and long-term regional plan that is flexible, nimble and proactive.

CRB addresses regionally significant issues that are relevant to creating and maintaining a competitive and sustainable region.

Member municipalities embrace the spirit of the CRB Vision; the Vision influences municipal policies and plans.

CRB acts to influence senior government policy and improves alignment in support of the CRB regional vision and goals.

C. 4. Growth Planning and Economic Development

All growth within the region is guided by sound forecasting and planning methodologies that are adjusted on a regular basis.

The Capital Region Board growth plan focuses energy on creating a global economic powerhouse with a high quality of life attractive to international companies and talent.

The regional growth plan helps align CRB outcomes with senior government plans, as well as with sub-regional collaboration activities.

CRB participates in an economic development and marketing framework which is regional, collaborative and effective in positioning the capital region as a powerhouse for business attraction, retention and growth.

C. 5. Regional Diversity and Collaboration

CRB embraces diverse communities in the region, recognizing that people matter, relationships matter, healthy communities matter and that diversity both balances and strengthens our regional model.

CRB fosters and promotes sub-regional collaboration in areas of regional interest.
D. STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

After considering input from the stakeholder groups, and reviewing the best available information on the challenges ahead, the Capital Region Board identified four key Strategic Priorities for the 2014 – 2018 Strategic Plan. The Strategic Priorities and a brief description of each are illustrated below.

For each Strategic Priority, Council members developed specific outcome statements called Key Results that set the stage for the development of tactics and action plans to follow.

D.1. STRATEGIC PRIORITY #1: REGIONAL VISION

The Board develops a strong, long-term vision for the whole region based on the desires and dreams of the region's municipalities and citizens.

Key Results

KR 1.1: Regional stakeholders and citizens are engaged, and they develop a long term vision for the whole region.

KR 1.2: The Board adopts its long term Regional Vision.

D. 2. STRATEGIC PRIORITY #2: COLLABORATIVE CULTURE

The Board's activity promotes a collaborative culture among members. CRB focuses its efforts on high level issues that impact the region.

Key Results

KR 2.1: The Board understands the distinctive characteristics and needs of rural and urban members.

KR 2.2: CRB improves collaboration and governance practices through education, best practice research, educational speakers and workshops.
KR 2.3: CRB members agree on priority high level issues for the region and are validated on a regular basis.

KR 2.4: CRB actively pursues partnerships and collaboration with specific regional stakeholder organizations.

D. 3. STRATEGIC PRIORITY #3: REGIONAL GROWTH PLAN

_The Board develops and implements a high level, long term growth plan for the region, which is approved by the Government of Alberta._

Key Results

KR 3.1: A high level growth plan is prepared and adopted by the CRB.


KR 3.3: A process for approving and incorporating the Capital Region Growth Plan into Government of Alberta policy environments is developed, negotiated with Government of Alberta and approved by Capital Region Board.

KR 3.4: Municipal members ensure that municipal and sub-regional plans conform to the Regional Growth Plan.

KR 3.5: Outcomes of the Regional Growth Plan are measured, monitored and reported.

D. 4. STRATEGIC PRIORITY #4: GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS

_The Board understands the global situation and positioning of the region and the strategic opportunities to compete globally._

Key Results

KR 4.1: The CRB explores the regional economic development landscape and identifies opportunities for CRB to add value.

KR 4.2: The economic landscape is mapped and understood, and regional stakeholders are educated on our regional strategic advantages.
KR 4.3: Through this research on the economy, trust and collaboration increases and mutually agreed new roles evolve.

KR 4.4: Development approval processes across the region are improved and streamlined.

KR 4.5: A uniform regional site selector tool is developed.

E. IMPLEMENTATION

The CRB administration will oversee the development and implementation of tactical plans to accomplish the Key Results identified by the Capital Region Board members. This will involve the identification of lead roles, specific actions, timing and performance measurements.

The Administration will report regularly to the board on progress made towards accomplishing the Plan objectives and accommodate any adjustments necessary.
Capital Region Energy Corridors Policy Framework

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the Capital Region Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework Report as recommended by the Land Use & Planning Committee.

Background

- On May 23, 2013, the Land Use Committee approved the 2013 Business Plan and Budget including a project to develop a Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework.

- Following the review of the CRB Committee Structure in the fall of 2013, the Board established an Energy Corridors Task Force, which reports to the newly formed Land Use & Planning Committee, to lead the Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework project.

- On February 24, 2014, the project consulting team presented the terms of reference and preliminary findings from consultations with municipal and industry stakeholders to the Task Force. The Task Force clarified the scope of work, directing the consulting team to focus the policy framework on the identification and protection of corridors and the role of the CRB in planning for energy corridors in the region, and not pursue safety and emergency response or risk management since these areas are the responsibility of the Alberta Energy Regulator.

- On April 13, 2014, the consulting team presented the preliminary findings and draft deliverables to the Planning Advisory Group (PAG) for review and input. The PAG members supported the work of the consultants and suggested that the report place additional emphasis on the need engage the various stakeholders in an effort to raise the profile of energy corridors in the region and the importance of planning for them into the future.

- The Report includes a framework for establishing future energy corridors policy by the Board and recommends that the Board undertake the preparation of an Integrated Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan and direct the Performance (now Advocacy) and Monitoring Committee to develop an advocacy strategy for regional energy corridors.

- On June 23, 2014, the Energy Corridors Task Force approved a motion recommending the Land Use & Planning Committee recommend approval of the Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework Report to the Capital Region Board.
Rationale

- Growth in the Region is not just limited to population and neighbourhoods. The increasing demand for energy products will require further expansion of the energy corridor systems. The resulting land use conflicts will impact how and where the Region grows. To maintain the sustainability of the Region's growth and economic prosperity it is critical that planning for the future be undertaken through the application of the Growth Plan's core principles. The report framework notes that the principles in the Growth Plan are sound, however, do not go far enough in the policies to direct planning for the future. In particular the report notes that the current policy approach is to "identify and protect" as noted under the principles of Protect the environment and resources; Minimize the regional footprint; and Ensure efficient provision of services. The Report provides a framework for establishing policies that guide the future location and development of energy corridors in the Region.

Attachments:
1. Draft Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework Report
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1 Introduction and Summary

As the central hub of oil and gas exploration and development in Western Canada, the Capital Region is crisscrossed with an intricate web of petroleum pipelines and power transmission lines. The municipal members of the Capital Region Board are keenly aware of the challenges of planning communities in and around pipelines and power transmission lines. For this very reason, the Provincial Government mandated through the CRB Regulation that the Capital Region Growth Plan identify the location of corridors for transportation and utilities as part of a comprehensive, integrated regional land use plan for the Region. Planning for future growth must recognize and address the need to minimize land use conflicts arising from planned increases in oil and gas activity, and new power infrastructure within the Capital Region, while supporting economic development and diversification.

The Growth Plan currently identifies existing infrastructure and utility corridors within the Capital Region. However, there is little direction and policy to support planning for future corridors, energy or otherwise. An Energy Corridors Policy Framework must provide the Board with an understanding of the scope and magnitude of future energy corridor requirements, the opportunities and constraints with the region to accommodate additional or expanded corridors, and ultimately, with policy recommendations that will assist the Board in evaluating and directing the location of future corridors that align with the overall principles and policies of the Growth Plan.

For municipalities in the greater Edmonton area managing regional corridor growth will continue to be a significant opportunity and increased planning challenge. The combined growth in the Capital Region and petroleum pipeline and power transmission lines is increasing land-use constraints for industrial development and conflicts with residential land development.

Petroleum and power facility growth is forecast to continue, driven by the Capital Regions’ petroleum transportation and refining hub, forecasted growth in bitumen production and related demand for power transmission in the region and province. 14-16 major pipeline projects to facilitate bitumen production growth are forecast over the next 20 years. This growth translates into substantive jobs, new businesses and opportunities as well as strong sustained community growth that also require land for development. Without clear linear corridor access, pipeline routes and associated refining and storage facilities will have to move elsewhere.

Historically, in the late 70s, planning was initiated to address the need for growth in pipelines, power lines and road infrastructure in the greater Edmonton area. This resulted in the development of the Transportation Utility Corridor (TUC) for linear corridors around Edmonton and the North East Pipeline Corridor (NEPC) – an extension of the TUC. Both of these Corridors are administered and regulated by the Province. The NEPC is largely full today with real development constraints for future linear corridor development. Current models for linear corridors are more focused on proponent-driven solutions which has resulted in an increase in Capital Region Land fragmentation from multiple linear corridors across the region.

There are many stakeholders who influence energy corridor location and development. However, unlike the provincial 1970s Transportation Utility Corridors approach, there is not a clear agency guiding linear corridor management. The Capital Region Board, and Municipalities, have some, but
limited capacity to influence the location of linear corridors. Municipalities have the right to intervene, yet their strongest role is in the determination of land uses through their Municipal Development Plans. The Board’s main role is through its Regional Evaluation Framework.

This report recommends that the Capital Region Board adopt an Energy Corridors Policy Framework that supports the CRB in developing a master plan to guide the development of energy corridors and that the CRB leads the development of a comprehensive advocacy strategy with partners to address energy corridor issues.

2 Regional Energy Corridors

This section defines regional energy corridors and outlines the types of models used to develop regional energy corridors.

2.1 Regional Energy Corridors Defined

The Capital Region Growth Plan is comprised of a family of documents that includes a main document “Growing Forward”, 5 appendices – 4 of which specifically address each of the pillars of the Growth Plan: Land Use, Inter-municipal Transit, Housing and GIS, 2 addendums which further expand upon the work in each of the appendices, and additional documents added after the Plan was approved by the Province in 2010. Throughout the documents, attempts are made to define and distinguish local infrastructure from regional infrastructure, multi-use corridors from multi-mode movement corridors, recreation corridors, waterway corridors, etc.

Regional Energy Corridors are not specifically defined, however, there are references in the December 2009 Addendum to energy sector pipelines in a definition for Heartland Pipeline Corridor, power systems in the Regional Infrastructure definition, and transmission lines and pipelines within the definition for Multi-Use Corridor. Therefore, before defining Regional Energy Corridors, it is important to understand what would be in the corridors. In this regard, the Study is limited to Power Infrastructure and Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure which are described in the following sections.
2.1.1 Power Infrastructure

*Power Infrastructure* consists of Power Transmission Lines (highlighted in blue) that move electricity from generating stations (highlighted in black) to regional step-down Substations (highlighted in green). The bulk transfer of electricity generally occurs on Transmission Lines of at least 138 kV and up to 500 kV in the Capital Region.

Not considered in the definition of *Power Infrastructure* for Regional Energy Corridors are Power Distribution Lines which provide the final delivery of electricity from the substations to the end (i.e. retail) customers.

![Figure 1: Power Infrastructure Schematic](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electric_power_distribution)
2.1.2 **Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure**

*Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure* consists of Transmission Pipelines that move petroleum across the province and internationally and between storage and processing facilities.

Petroleum pipelines carry natural gas, natural gas liquids, crude oil and refined petroleum products. They range in size from 101.6 mm to 1,212 mm (4 in to 48 in.).

Gathering Lines (from well source to processing) and Distribution (local retail distribution) are not considered as a part of this project’s Regional Energy Corridor definition.

---

**Figure 2: Oil Liquids Transmission Schematic**

2.1.3 Regional Energy Corridor Defined

For the purposes of this study, and to distinguish the pipelines and power lines that are the subject of this study from local utilities, the following definition is used to describe Regional Energy Corridors:

*Regional Energy Corridors* – Linear corridors that support the placement of Power Infrastructure and Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure used for the transportation of electricity and petroleum products from generation facilities and extraction/refining facilities to locations within and beyond the Capital Region.

2.2 Regional Energy Corridor Development Models

There are a number of operational management and funding models that create energy corridors within the Capital Region. Each of these models has a different level of impact on broader planning and land management requirements within the CRB.

The four main models are described in below subsections and are currently being used within the Capital Region for both pipeline and power transmission lines.

2.2.1 Individual Corridor Development

Individual facility operators develop project design, location and routing. Routing is determined based on the single operators’ interest. Project right-of-ways are acquired and utilized by the individual facility operator. While individual corridors are necessary to access certain locations (i.e. project sites), they do create the highest degree of planning and land fragmentation.

2.2.2 Common Corridor Development

Facility operators make arrangements to route projects along certain common corridor routes and acquire and manage rights-of-way for their projects adjacent to other corridors. This common corridor arrangement is guided by regulation and provincial and national regulators to minimize corridor proliferation and land sterilization. Common corridors reduce planning and land fragmentation impact.

2.2.3 Provincial Transportation Utility Corridor (TUC)

Restricted Development Areas (RDAs) are defined under regulation to enable the province to establish and maintain multiple-use corridors. The RDAs are known as Transportation Utility Corridors (TUCs). TUCs are designed for long-term alignment of ring roads and major linear utilities in urban areas.

Most land within designated TUCs has been purchased by the province, or is under an offer to purchase by the province. TUCs can be considered a proactive approach to linear corridor management.

The TUCs can be considered highly successful as they have defined and managed corridor access for pipeline, power line, road and other infrastructure within the CRB. The challenge now, however, is that...
the TUC is at capacity in many areas and new linear developments need to find new routes (new land and planning challenges) to site their projects within the Capital Region.

2.2.4 Municipal Utility Corridor

One of the Capital Region Municipalities, Sturgeon County, has purchased land to facilitate pipeline routing. Sturgeon County purchased a corridor approximately 1.5km long to focus corridor access in one area and provide access into the North West Upgrader site. This proactive approach, like the Provincial TUC model, has been partially successful as some portions of the corridor have been used.

3 Regional Energy Corridor Development

Regional energy corridor development is driven by the Capital Region’s central location to Alberta’s oil, gas and electricity industries.

This section outlines the status of current energy corridor development, explores future power and pipeline corridor needs.

3.1 Existing Regional Energy Corridor Development

3.1.1 Pipeline Corridors

Edmonton area refineries, processing facilities and associated infrastructure play a fundamental role in the distribution of petroleum products throughout North America and the world. Linking these facilities to the producing areas in Northern Alberta, the storage hub in Hardisty, Alberta, and broader markets within Canada and around the world is an integrated pipeline system.

Today there are two major common routes from the Alberta Industrial Heartland (AIH) feeding the NEPC used by the various pipelines. This has resulted in establishment of the two routes as unofficial corridors. Future pipelines will most likely follow this alignment.

The NEPC was designed to provide an entrance point into the TUC for pipelines originating in northern Alberta and the proposed industrial area northeast of Ft. Saskatchewan. The intention was also that light industrial and residential growth would not be able to impact the space set aside for future pipelines. The NEPC was to run from just east of Highway 21 north of Sherwood Park, southwest into the TUC just north of Highway 16.

A growing natural gas processing and natural gas liquids petrochemical industry is also expanding in the Heartland, taking advantage of the now cheap natural gas feedstock and the abundance of natural gas liquids, which is driving an expansion of pipelines, petrochemical facilities and storage.

The current pipeline infrastructure footprint in the Capital Region is shown on Figure 3.
3.1.2 Power Line Corridors

The Capital Region is home to several key provincial electrical (coal) generation plants (Wabamun, Keephills and Genesee). The central location of these facilities and their proximity to the oilsands region and southern Alberta, have pushed the development of transmission lines through and around the Capital Region. Power transmission right-of way (ROWs) widths can vary by location and type of equipment used. Generally, ROWs are 30 meters wide for a 138kv transmission line (with structures 25 – 30 meters high) and 60 meters wide for a 240kv transmission line (with structures 45 to 50 meters high).

The current power line footprint is shown on Figure 4.

Figure 4: Capital Region Power Line Footprint
3.2 **Future Regional Energy Corridor Development**

This section outlines the estimated need for power transmission lines and petroleum pipelines within and through the Capital Region over the next 20 years.

3.2.1 **Power Transmission Corridor Needs**

The Alberta Electrical System Operator (AESO) is a not-for-profit company created under the Electric Utilities Act and is responsible for Transmission System Development throughout Alberta. AESO updates its Long-term Transmission Plan (LTP) every two years. The 2013 LTP outlines the AESO vision for Alberta’s power transmission needs to support the province’s economic growth over the next 20 years. The AESO models transmission needs by Planning Region (Figure 5).

*Figure 5: AESO Planning Regions*
The Capital Region covers the Edmonton Planning Region and part of the Northeast Planning Region.

Future growth assumptions and estimates over the next twenty years in the Capital Region are driven by the following drivers of need:

**Oilsands and Co-generation Growth**

- Growth in the oilsands and co-generation in the Northeast Planning Region, which covers Fort Saskatchewan, the Heartland and the Lower Athabasca region, is forecast to require an additional 3.5% (4,600MW) of new generation capacity.

**Urban Growth and Replacement**

- Urban load growth, retiring coal plants and aging cable infrastructure in the Edmonton Planning Region is forecast to require an additional 2.0% (2,600MW) of new generation capacity.

**Current Projects**

There are three current projects just completing or starting development in the Capital Region.

The Heartland Transmission Project (Figure 6) was recently completed and is now in operation. It provides one double-circuit 500kv alternating current transmission connecting the south side of the city of Edmonton through the TUC to a new substation in the Gibbons-Redwater. The approved (solid green) and alternate routes that were considered shown below provide an illustration of route planning. Each linear corridor project, pipeline or power transmission is required to plan and assess alternate routes as this map shows. The Heartland Project chose the route that included the TUC as its existing ROW was easier to access, more economic and less disruptive to the region and its stakeholders.
Two new 500 kilovolt direct current (DC) projects have been approved (2012) by the AUC to reinforce north-south transmission. AltaLink is developing the Western Alberta Transmission Line (WATL) connecting the Wabamun Lake hub at Genesee to the Calgary area hub near Langdon (Figure 7).
ATCO Electric is anticipating completion of construction at the end of 2014 for the Eastern Alberta Transmission Line (EATL – Figure 8) from the Heartland hub northeast of Edmonton to a southern hub at Brooks.
Future Power Transmission Projects

The AESO has forecast transmission load and related substation system needs over the next twenty years, to 2032, in its 2013 Long-term Transmission Plan (LTP). It sets out a vision for system needs in two planning areas corresponding to the Capital Region, the Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Planning Area and the Edmonton Sub Planning Areas (see Figure 5). These needs are outlined on Figure 9.

Figure 8: Eastern Alberta Transmission Line
Source: ATCO Electric

Figure 9: Future Power Transmission Corridor Needs
FIGURE 9: FUTURE POWER TRANSMISSION CORRIDOR NEEDS

Coordinate System: 3TM114-83
Projection: Transverse Mercator
Datum: North American 1983
central meridian: -114.0000 km

CRB Regional Boundary
Alberta's Industrial Heartland
Member Municipality (County)
Member Municipality (Urban)
Non-Member Municipality
Urban Service Area
Indian Reserve
Elk Island National Park
Provincial Park/Protected Area
Regional Road (Existing)
Water Course
Water Body
Power Transmission Constraint
--- Existing Power Corridor (Underground)
--- Existing Power Corridor (Overhead)
--- Power Corridor Under Construction
Purple Power Substation Need (Conceptual Location)
Purple Power Corridor Need (Conceptual Alignment)
Fort Saskatchewan Planning Region

Table 1: Fort Saskatchewan Region 20 Year Forecast Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2014 - 2017 | • 240/138kv source substation located between Deerland and Heartland substations  
|             | • 138kv Transmission Line to Redwater and Beamer (just north of Fort Saskatchewan) substations  
|             | • 500kv/240kv transformation (substation step-down) capacity at Heartland substation  
|             | • 240kv supply to Josephburg substation  
| 2018 - 2022 | • Increase 138kv transmission line capacity between Fort Saskatchewan and Westwood substations  
| 2023 - 2032 | • Increases transmission line capacity between the proposed large generation site and a new East Edmonton substation  

Source: AESO 2013 Long-term Transmission Plan

Edmonton Planning Area

Table 2: Edmonton Region 20 Year Forecast Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2014 - 2017 | West of Edmonton  
|             | • 138kv transmission line between Acheson and North St Albert substations  
| 2018 - 2022 | East of Edmonton  
|             | • New 240/138kv substation between Sherwood Park and Fort Saskatchewan  
|             | • 240kv transmission line from Clover Bar to new substation  
| 2023 - 2032 | South of Edmonton  
|             | • 138kv transmission line between Saunders Lake and Leduc substations  
|             | West of Edmonton  
|             | • New 500/240kv substation northwest of Edmonton to connect to the West Fort McMurray 500kv transmission line  
|             | • 240kv transmission line from the new northwest substation to North Calder substation  

Source: AESO 2013 Long-term Transmission Plan

3.2.2 Future Pipeline Corridor Development

The Capital Region’s success as a hub for petroleum production and distribution has exceeded original forecasts. Today, key components of our petroleum system are very close to being isolated with limited opportunities for growth and expansion. This is a direct result of a shortage of space for pipelines to export bitumen production.
Future pipeline growth is driven by the forecast growth for the export of crude bitumen from the oil sands regions of Alberta. The ERCB’s 2013 Energy Reserves 2012 and 2013 – 2022 Supply/Demand Outlook forecasts a decline in natural gas production, stable natural gas liquid and conventional oil production and a substantive increase of bitumen production from approximately 2 million barrels per day to 3.6 million barrels per day over a ten year period. (Figure 10).

Current “Announced” Projects

There are a series of pipeline projects that have been publically announced or are at various stages of conceptual planning, project permitting and construction aimed to transport forecasted growth in production. Two projects were recently completed and eight projects that have been formally announced as under design. These are major linear corridor projects. The following list does not include the numerous pipeline inter-connections between facilities within the Capital Region and AIH area or longer term projects.

This list serves as a reference for short and medium term pipeline corridor needs.

1. Alberta Carbon Trunk Line
   » A 240 km pipeline connecting CO2 from industrial emitters in and around the Industrial Heartland south to Clive, Alberta
   » Regulatory approval 2011, engineering work underway, no construction dates
2. Enbridge Woodland Pipeline Extension
   » Pipeline connecting Cheecham to Enbridge Tank Farm in “Refinery Row”
   » The first 16 km construction completed to Highway 21.
   » The remaining construction to the AIH and north to Cheecham to be completed 2014/2015

3. Enbridge Norlite Pipeline Project
   » 24” 489 km diluent pipeline from Stonefell to Fort McMurray
   » Regulatory application anticipated in 2014 with potential construction beginning in summer of 2015

4. Enbridge Northern Gateway
   » Two adjacent pipelines 1,177 kms from Bruderheim to Kitimat, BC
   » Regulatory application submitted in 2010, project decision anticipated in 2014

5. Pembina Pipeline Phase III Expansion
   » 24” Pipeline from Simonette to Edmonton
   » Preliminary field work underway

6. Inter Pipeline Fund
   » Pipeline between IPF’s Terminal in the AIH and “Refinery Row” adjacent to Edmonton
   » Construction expected to start summer of 2014

7. TransCanada Grand Rapids Pipeline
   » A dual diluent and blended bitumen pipeline project connecting Edmonton to Fort McMurray
   » Regulatory applications submitted in August 2013, construction anticipated to start in 2014

8. TransCanada Heartland Pipeline Project
   » A 36” crude oil pipeline connecting the Industrial Heartland with TransCanada’s Hardisty Alberta hub
   » Regulatory application submitted October 2013, construction anticipated to commence in late 2014

**Future Pipeline Projects**

Looking forward, increasing demand will require further expansion of corridor systems as a result of an increase in the number of planned pipelines, growth and shifts in the location of industrial development, and the projected future petroleum needs of an exporting country such as Canada. With this expansion comes an existing and future need for Regional Energy Corridor planning and protection in the Capital Region.

The Capital Region can anticipate:

- 8-10 additional projects from 2014-2024
- An additional 4-6 projects from 2024-2034
Today we are seeing a shift of industrial development to the AIH away from the historical “Refinery Row” area east of Edmonton in Strathcona County. This shift is expected to continue over the coming years. It is expected that this shift will not eliminate totally the need for interconnectivity between existing shipping and refining infrastructure in the “Refinery Row” area and the AIH (Figure 11).

**Figure 11: Future Pipeline Corridor Needs**
FIGURE 11: FUTURE PIPELINE CORRIDOR NEEDS
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The AIH and City of Edmonton see the development of secondary and tertiary industries dependent on feedstock supplied through pipelines as a future growth activity. These industries would be located throughout the AIH and the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park in Northeast Edmonton.

4 Regional Energy Corridor Opportunities and Constraints

4.1 Corridor Constraints

Siting and developing energy corridors in any region requires careful consideration of the region’s natural geography, developed areas and planning intentions. This section identifies the various constraints that impact the location and development of energy corridors in the Capital Region.

Energy Corridor growth constraints can be categorized in three different ways:

- Physical constraints – constraints related to corridor capacity, or existing development footprint, airports, coal extraction areas (Figure 12).
- Policy constraints – designated growth areas (PGAs, CCRAs, Alberta’s Industrial Heartland), lands outside local jurisdiction (reserves, CFB Edmonton) (Figure 13).
- Natural constraints – hydrology, parks, protected areas, environmentally sensitive areas; would result in fragmentation/disturbance (Figure 14).
- A consolidated constraints map is shown on Figure 15.

Figure 12: Regional Energy Corridors Physical Constraints
Figure 12a: Regional Energy Corridors Physical Constraints – Heartland Area
Figure 13: Regional Energy Corridors Policy Constraints
Figure 13a: Regional Energy Corridors Policy Constraints – Heartland Area
Figure 14: Regional Energy Corridors Natural Constraints
Figure 14a: Regional Energy Corridors Natural Constraints – Heartland Area
Figure 15: Regional Energy Corridors Consolidated Constraints
Figure 15a: Regional Energy Corridors Consolidated Constraints – Heartland Area
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4.2 Present and Future Growth Conflicts

There are a number of known present and future conflict areas between energy corridor needs and growth and development within the Capital Region. This section highlights some of the more challenging conflict areas.

Eight of the key areas are identified below and referenced by number on Figure 12 which provides an overall summary of constraints within the Capital Region.

1. **The easterly limits of Fort Saskatchewan – Urban development constraint.** One of the two unofficial corridors to feed into the North East Pipeline Corridor (NEPC) passes through the southeast corner of the easterly limits of the City. This area is scheduled for eventual development and is held by an active long term developer.

2. **The proposed Bremner Town Site – Urban development constraint.** The northwest corner of the proposed town site east of Highway 21 and northeast of Sherwood Park is bisected for approximately one kilometer by a significant number of pipelines entering the NEPC. Today, this alignment is the only one available for any new pipelines going into the Edmonton area.

3. **Aurum Industrial Park Development – Urban development constraint.** The current alignment of NEPC is basically filled to capacity and the Aurum Development in east Edmonton has greatly impacted the ability to expand the corridor for additional pipeline space. Existing and proposed developments along the Corridor will limit any ability to expand for future pipelines.

4. **Georgia Pacific Building – Urban development constraint.** Of additional concern and impacting future needs is the Georgia Pacific Building and property located on the north side of Highway 16 in the TUC. This property, although in the TUC, is not owned by the Province and as a result forms a major roadblock to future pipelines.

5. **Fort Hills (Sturgeon Land Holdings) – Urban development constraint, land owner conflict.** A major portion of developable lands in the Alberta Industrial Heartland in Sturgeon County are held by one oil company. Today, activity on this land is negligible. Corridor alignment space is required so that liquids can move from and to the Alberta Industrial Heartland in the direction of the west and north. This has proved problematic as the landowner, is not interested in breaking up its large industrial site until it confirms its end use for this land holding.

6. **North Bruderheim Area – Industrial development constraint.** There have been significant oil and gas activities including well sites and gathering systems in the area directly north and east of the Town of Bruderheim. There would appear to be significant land opportunities for Heavy Industrial Development in Lamont County. However, pipeline access to the west is all but eliminated with options from the south being impacted by the present industrial growth activities east of Bruderheim.

7. **Ellerslie Substation – Urban development constraint.** The TUC is at capacity around the Ellerslie Substation and it is bordered by residential neighborhoods, effectively blocking the ability to take an extra high voltage (500kv or higher) line out.
8. **Genesee Area – Environmentally sensitive areas and physical land constraint.** There are many environmentally sensitive areas in and around the Genesee area limiting the route options for future transmission lines.

### 4.3 Opportunities

The 2010 Stewart Weir “Linear Infrastructure Corridor Systems Proposed Pipeline Corridors” report identified eight potential corridors in the Capital Region considered here. The 2010 study identified the following potential new corridors or corridor additions identified below. The report was commissioned by the AIH and was developed closely with industry and the province. One outcome of this work was the purchase of additional lands in the NEPC by Alberta Infrastructure to better connect the TUC to lands around the Aurum lands. No further actions have been undertaken and similar issues are present today in a more acute form.

- NEPC Extension
- West Intersite Connector
- North East Intersite Connector
- Redwater Field By-pass
- Stonefell Access Corridor
- South East Ring Road Corridor
- Horse Hills Connector
- Highway 21/Heartland Connector

The interview process re-affirmed many of the findings of the 2010 study with industry identifying three areas where future corridors could be protected to reduce future conflicts:

- An east west corridor along the southerly limits of the AIH to facilitate pipeline alignments to the Hardisty area and provide an alternate route for inter-site activities in the AIH.
- A by-pass of the town of Brudereim to allow access north to the Cold Lake and Ft. McMurray areas of the province for petroleum pipelines.
- An east west corridor west of the North Saskatchewan River parallel to Highway 28 to facilitate access to and from the AIH.

As well, two existing corridors were identified where additional expanded capacity was required:

- Expansion of the NEPC
- Expansion of the AIH to NEPC corridors

The above five areas are shown on Figure 11 and identified as:

1. NEPC Extension
2. Highway 21/Heartland Connector
3. South AIH Corridor
4. Bruderheim By-pass
5. Sturgeon Land Holdings
4.4 Opportunities and Constraints Conclusions

The eight identified constraints will need to be addressed by a range of stakeholders to remove barriers to both corridor development but also growth management within the Capital Region.

Addressing corridor constraints proactively will:

- Reduce planning conflicts.
- Limit the increased alienation and sterilization of land within the region by focusing on corridor routes that meet the needs for Capital Region growth and industrial development. If certain constraint areas are not addressed corridors will be developed by routing around the conflict area, expanding into other areas and alienating a larger land base.
- Maintain industrial development energy corridor access within the region. There is the potential that further pipeline development between the AIH and the refinery area near Edmonton could be halted with a resultant significant economic impact to Capital Region.
- Prevent future pipelines and refining facilities from bypassing the Capital Region entirely. The Capital Region is currently seeing a movement from the Fort Saskatchewan area to the Heartland, for example. Continued constraints will see further movement to other potential hubs, further out from the Heartland, to Hardisty or to North East BC (natural gas) reducing the capital investment potential of the region.

5 Key Energy Corridor Stakeholders, Roles and Models

5.1 Stakeholder Roles

There is a broad range of Government, Regulatory, Industry and public and non-profit stakeholders who play a role in the design, development and operations of power and pipeline infrastructure. The key stakeholder roles that are played in Energy Corridor management are:

- **Regulatory:** A number of regulatory authorities lay out the regulatory terms for regional corridor review and permitting for pipelines: Alberta Energy Regulator (AER) and National Energy Board (NEB); and power transmission: Alberta Utility Commission (AUC) Key conditions that the regulators lay down include: public engagement, setback distances from related developments, alignment of energy corridors adjacent to other corridors as a preference.
- **Corridor Planning:** Corridor planning is primarily undertaken by industry. The AESO plays a role in the planning and designation of need for power corridors between two defined points.
- **Advocacy:** There are a number of advocacy interests around energy corridors: organized landowner groups, Municipality interventions at regulatory forums and industry groups.
- **Development:** Key development stakeholders are the pipeline and power transmission companies.

The CRB has four potential roles as a stakeholder in the planning and approvals of energy corridors and these are outlined in Table 3, Stakeholder Roles. The CRB’s roles include:
• Inform – Providing information and consulting on energy corridor design and development.
• Intervene – Providing testimony as a directly affected stakeholder in regulatory processes. The CRB does not have this role, however, its member Municipalities do.
• Recommend – Recommending courses of action to other stakeholders, using the role and influence of the 24 Member CRB to back its recommendations.
• Regulate – Governing decisions related to Member Municipality Statutory Plans for conformity to the CRB Growth Plan.
### Table 3: Stakeholder Roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Stakeholder Roles</th>
<th>CRB Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder roles the planning, development and regulation of regional energy corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Energy Board</td>
<td>The NEB Regulates the construction and operation of inter-provincial and international oil and gas pipelines, international power lines, and designated inter-provincial power lines.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Energy Regulator</td>
<td>The AER Regulates the construction and operation of intra-provincial oil and gas pipelines.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Electrical System Operator</td>
<td>AESO is responsible for the safe, reliable and economic planning and operation of the Alberta Interconnected Electric System (AIES). AESO contracts with transmission facilities owners (TFOs) to acquire transmission services and provide customer access.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Utilities Commission</td>
<td>The Alberta Utilities Commission regulates the utilities sector, natural gas and electricity markets to protect social, economic and environmental interests of Alberta where competitive market forces do not.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Energy</td>
<td>Alberta Energy manages the development of the province’s non-renewable resources and is responsible for ensuring the development of Alberta’s resources to the benefit of all Albertans.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Affairs</td>
<td>Municipal Affairs administers a safety system which ensures appropriate safety standards for the construction and maintenance of buildings and equipment through safety codes, and fire and emergency management systems.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Sustainable Resource Development</td>
<td>ESRD is the steward of air, land, water and biodiversity management and environmental oversight in the Province.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Transportation</td>
<td>Transportation manages the provincial highway and traffic safety system.</td>
<td>[ ] [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
<td>The CRB develops and manages the Capital Region Growth Plan and review and evaluate Municipal Statutory Plans within the Capital Region for conformity to the Growth Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality/Counties (24)</td>
<td>Municipalities develop and regulate Land Use By-laws and Municipal Development Plans to address development adjacent to corridor right-of-ways.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Stakeholder Roles</td>
<td>CRB Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder roles the planning, development and regulation of regional energy corridors</td>
<td>Inform/ Consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Operators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Operators</td>
<td>Pipeline owners design, build and operate pipelines within the Capital Region.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission Facility Operators</td>
<td>Transmission Facility owners design, build and operate pipelines within the Capital Region.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Land Owners</td>
<td>Private land owners manage their private property interests and participate in consultations, negotiations and project operations over third party uses (easements or sale) on their land.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Industrial Heartland Association</td>
<td>Alberta's Industrial Heartland Association strives to: provide a single approach to promote and facilitate industrial development proactively and efficiently collaborate on facilitating services and infrastructure plan for the area's use while maximizing attractiveness and efficient industrial development minimize conflicts on land use and the environment, and coordinate environmental quality and sustainability standards promote open communication and harmony of participating municipalities and interested parties, and provide opportunities for industrial and non-industrial landowners to take part in planning and development promote and support a coordinated approach to achieving and maintaining appropriate standards of emergency preparedness, public safety, and health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Urban Municipalities Association</td>
<td>The AUMA represents and advocates the interests of all members to both the provincial and federal governments. 20 of the 24 member municipalities are part of the AUMA. Lamont County, Leduc County, Parkland County and Sturgeon County are not members of the AUMA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td>Stakeholder Roles</td>
<td>CRB Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers</td>
<td>CAPP represents and advocates the interests of the Canadian upstream oil, oil sands and natural gas industry.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Energy Pipeline Association</td>
<td>CEPA represents and advocates the interests of the Canadian energy pipeline industry.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Electricity Association</td>
<td>CEA represents and advocates the interests of the Canadian electricity industry.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Association of Energy and Pipeline Landowner Associations</td>
<td>CAEPL represents and advocates the interests of landowner associations who represent landowners affected by energy and pipeline proposals and projects.</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Capital Region Board does not have the ability to intervene at regulatory AUC or AER Hearings, Municipalities do.
6 Draft CRB Regional Energy Corridor Policy Framework

This section of the report provides a brief overview of existing policy within the Growth Plan as it applies to Regional Corridors. It also identifies a policy framework that considers both the constraints and future needs for pipeline and power transmission as identified in this report. The intent is to provide the basis for a policy framework from which the CRB and its stakeholders can consider further through work associated with the five year review of the Growth Plan.

6.1 Current Regional Corridor Policy

The Capital Region Growth Plan provides policy direction that influences regional energy corridors in three areas. Below is a brief description of each.

1. Protection of the environment and resources
   Growth Plan Policy directs that natural areas and resources extraction areas are protected from fragmentation.

2. Minimize the regional footprint
   The Growth Plan provides clear policy that the CRB work with the Province to identify, prioritize the need for future infrastructure alignments.

3. Ensuring efficient provision of services
   The Growth Plan encourages municipalities to facilitate the integration of various existing infrastructure corridors. Policy directs municipalities to protect infrastructure through policy and graphic representation in municipal statutory plans.

The current policy approach for regional corridors is “to identify and protect” future corridors. Policy does not however guide the CRB as to how to achieve this – as it assumes knowledge of where future corridors will be located. Nor does existing policy define a role for the CRB as to how this policy could be implemented.

The Growth Plan does however provide policies that identify growth areas, and encourages the efficient use of land and infrastructure. This does provide a basis on which to build a policy framework for future energy corridors.

6.2 Proposed Policy Framework

There is a policy gap in the Growth Plan for planning future energy corridors – the current approach “to identify and protect” does not guide the CRB as to how to identify future corridors – as it assumes knowledge of where future corridors will be located. Municipalities, acting on their own have some resources and rights under existing legislation and regulations to react to proposed corridors (intervene at regulatory hearings), but have limited ability, on their own, to direct the location of
future corridors. Due to the role that corridors have on the regional economy, and the impact that can have on land development, and in order to achieve the Principles and Policies of the Growth Plan, it is necessary to develop a coordinated strategic approach to planning for future Regional Energy Corridors.

From the research and stakeholder interviews it is apparent that something must be done, and soon, before growth in the region prevents new and expanded power lines and pipelines from reaching their destinations, and as a result, threatens economic sustainability and increases land fragmentation.

6.2.1 Policy Framework:

1. The CRB is committed to securing economic growth that creates jobs and prosperity for the region.
2. The CRB recognizes that power transmission lines and petroleum pipelines are vital infrastructure necessary to support sustainable growth and enable the Region to compete globally.
3. Growth management planning by the CRB and within the Region should operate to encourage and facilitate, and not act as an impediment to, energy corridors.
4. Regional planning of energy corridors shall ensure compatibility of land uses and minimize the impact on municipal growth.
5. The CRB will plan for energy corridors in the Growth Plan to ensure the needs of industry are supported and sustained.
6. Growth Plan policies should recognize and seek to address existing and potential barriers to energy corridor development.
7. Policies in support of energy corridors shall align to the greatest extent possible with the Growth Plan principles and policies.
8. The CRB will actively promote collaboration between members, industry and the province to facilitate and prioritize the location of future energy corridors within the Capital Region.

6.2.2 Recommended actions:

1. Planning
   a. That the CRB develop a comprehensive master plan to guide the location and development of energy corridors within the Capital Region.

2. Advocacy
   a. That the CRB leads the development a comprehensive energy corridors advocacy strategy, in partnership with industry stakeholders, to communicate energy corridor issues and challenges in the Capital Region to the Provincial and Federal governments.

6.2.3 Recommendations by the Task Force to the Land Use & Planning Committee:

1. That the Land Use and Planning Committee direct that a Task Force be formed to oversee the development of an Regional Energy Corridor master plan. The purpose of the Plan is to
development detailed policies and criteria for identifying and prioritizing the location of future Regional Energy Corridors in the Capital Region.

2. That the Land Use and Planning Committee, through the Board, request the Performance Monitoring Committee to develop a:
   a. Detailed advocacy and communications plan that supports and advances the notion of a Regional Energy Corridor(s) that addresses existing and future electrical transmission and pipeline needs; and
   b. A monitoring and reporting process for the implementation of the Regional Energy Corridors master plan.
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### Appendix 1: Glossary and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AER</td>
<td>Alberta Energy Regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESO</td>
<td>Alberta Electrical System Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>Alberta Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIH</td>
<td>Alberta Industrial Heartland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRA</td>
<td>Cluster Country Residential Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical constraints</td>
<td>Constraints related to corridor capacity, or existing development footprint, airports, coal extraction areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy constraints</td>
<td>Growth areas (PGAs, CCRA, Alberta’s Industrial Heartland), lands outside local jurisdiction (reserves, CFB Edmonton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural constraints</td>
<td>Hydrology, parks, protected areas, environmentally sensitive areas; would result in fragmentation/disturbance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Heartland Pipeline Corridor | Regionally significant corridors that are identified and protected as conceptual locations of multiple new energy sectors’ inter-connecting and intra-connecting pipelines necessary in conveying product to processors and to the market in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland. These corridors function to minimize risk, land fragmentation and the impact on the environment. |

| Multi-use Corridor | Defined in the Growth Plan Addendum as ‘A corridor designed to accommodate multiple infrastructure facilities such as roads, transmission lines and pipelines within and beyond the region’. |

| NEB | National Energy Board |
| PGA | Priority Growth Areas |

| Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure | Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure consists of Transmission Pipelines and Feeder Lines that move petroleum across the province and internationally and between storage and processing facilities. |

| Power Infrastructure | Power Infrastructure consists of Electricity Transmission lines that provide the bulk transfer of electricity on regional 138, 240 and 500 kV Transmission Corridors and their Substations. |

<p>| Regional Energy Corridor | The identified Multiple-Use Corridors for regional Power Infrastructure - Electricity Transmission (138kv and larger) and Bulk System Substations and regional Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure - Transmission Pipelines and Feeder Lines within and beyond the region. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restricted Development Areas</th>
<th>Restricted Development Areas are defined under regulation to enable the province to establish and maintain multiple-use corridors and are known as Transportation Utility Corridors (TUCs).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setback</td>
<td>A setback is the absolute minimum distance that must be maintained between any energy facility (for example, a drilling or producing well, a pipeline, or a gas plant) and a dwelling, rural housing development, urban centre, or public facility. Setbacks vary according to the type of development and whether the well, facility, or pipeline contains sour gas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUCs</td>
<td>TUCs are designed for long-term alignment of ring roads and major linear utilities in urban areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Study Research Questions

The following questions guided project research and interviews:

1.0 What are the regulatory approval requirements for energy corridors in the Capital Region? Summarize the petroleum pipeline (AER) and power transmission line approvals process.

2.0 Who are the key stakeholders in petroleum pipeline and power transmission planning and development within the Capital Region?
   2.1 What are the roles of the key stakeholders?
   2.2 What are the opportunities for the CRB to participate proactively in energy corridor regulatory approvals and project developments? Define CRB’s proactive role in the regulatory process for advocating on behalf of CRB interests with respect to future petroleum pipeline and power transmission line initiatives in the Region.
   2.3 How can the CRB Consult Stakeholders on a Regional Energy Corridor Policy Framework?

3.0 What is the technical definition of Regional Energy Corridors?

4.0 What is the forecasted demand for pipeline and transmission projects? Identify a high-level forecast of what regional energy corridor needs are through the Capital Region (forecasted volumes, pipeline origins and destinations, electricity origins and destinations) over the next 20 years.

5.0 What are the desired project locations (corridors) for these projects and key issues to consider? Review potential future locations for Regional Energy Corridors within the Capital Region graphic representation of where future potential Regional Energy Corridors should or should not locate to meet future industry demands.

6.0 Operational Management and Funding Models
   Summarize existing models for funding and operating petroleum pipeline and power transmission line corridors and outline relevant considerations for implementation of these corridors.
   6.1 What Energy Corridor operational management and funding models can be considered for Regional Energy Corridors in the Capital Region?
   6.2 How would these Models interface with the CRB and Stakeholders? What roles would they have with each model?

7.0 What does a CRB Regional Energy Corridor Policy Framework need to entail and consider? Establish a policy framework for the linear and logical planning of regional energy corridors that address:
   ii. the location and co-location of infrastructure in these corridors;
   iii. a coordinated Regional approach for safety and emergency response planning;
   iv. minimization and mitigation of land use conflicts; and,
   v. risk management.
## Appendix 3: Interview List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Infrastructure</td>
<td>Lyle Markovich</td>
<td>Director, Land Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian DeJong</td>
<td>Manager, Land Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Board Oil Sands Secretariat</td>
<td>Gary Haynes</td>
<td>Director, Community and Regional Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
<td>Neal Sarnecki</td>
<td>Manager Regional Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Chai</td>
<td>Regional Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipalities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>Rick Sloan</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anne Denman</td>
<td>Senior Consultant, Office of the General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kunai Sharma</td>
<td>Strategic Initiatives Coordinator, Business Strategy and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>Gerry Gabinet</td>
<td>Director Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lori Mills</td>
<td>Energy Exploration Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garret Matteotti</td>
<td>Business Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>Jordan Rumohr</td>
<td>Economic Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>Jim Newman</td>
<td>Economic Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Terry Stacey</td>
<td>Economic Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Electrical System Operator</td>
<td>Bill Strongman</td>
<td>Director, Regional System Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Industrial Heartland</td>
<td>Neil Shelly</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pipeline Companies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransCanada Pipelines</td>
<td>Scott Clark</td>
<td>Capital Projects Land Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enbridge Pipelines Inc.</td>
<td>Brent Kaup</td>
<td>Sr. Manager, Land Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyera Energy</td>
<td>Jason Johnson</td>
<td>Commercial Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InterPipeline Fund</td>
<td>Michelle Dawson</td>
<td>Director of Regulatory Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Operators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AltaLink</td>
<td>Mark Johns</td>
<td>Director, Stakeholder Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AltaLink</td>
<td>Britney Wickham</td>
<td>Right-of-Way Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Companies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Land</td>
<td>Terry Jewel</td>
<td>President Phoenix Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Land</td>
<td>Elliott Fredrichs</td>
<td>General Manager Progress Land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Interview Summaries

A summary of interview responses by question is outlined below.

1.0 What are the regulatory approval requirements for energy corridors in the Capital Region?

Summarize the petroleum pipeline (AER) and power transmission line approvals process.

- On the technical side:
  - You must show participation in a consultation process.
  - You must show following existing linear disturbances – no greenfield.
  - You must address environmental considerations.

- Alberta Energy Regulator as part of the application process – they review, approve and can dictate decision.

- Municipalities – i.e. Strathcona County reviews and participates in the process. They have the capability and the resources and do not shy away from the concept of intervening before the Regulator. Other municipalities challenge is that they need to up their game. (This does identify an area for better regulation and potential area for the CRB to participate – take up the work for the municipalities that Strathcona is doing. This would mean less work for the individual municipalities.)

- Regulatory approval requirements – Alberta Energy Regulator, NEB, AESO and TUC. Strathcona has a strong belief that they are part of the approval process because of: the large number of pipelines in their area, more challenges in their area, more at stake and the more resources they have in place. They feel they have a good understanding of the industry – upstream and midstream. They also believe strongly in the value added benefit to all.

- AER, NEB, TUC. Municipal approvals and permits are required for above ground facilities.

- Today the regulatory process has two active bodies – TUC and AER – dual process provides more uncertainty. On Provincial Land, AER must approve the project before they get land. This is backwards as they spend the time and money planning one direction and then they are pushed in a different alignment.

- Governments – provincial and municipal. We gain social license through consultation. We address risk through the process.

- Government is the authority – AESO has the role for power. Our county is very important in the process. We have used intervener status in the past and it is fair to say the mind-set is there. We want to be more involved in the process but at times lack the ability to do this. Some of us understand the economic advantage to right of ways and others don’t. Some are aware of the linear tax and recognize the jobs from additional industry development. The understanding differs between counties. The issue is a “rounding error” or above ground recognition problem. Some counties look to the large above ground facilities like NWR Upgrader and say all the benefit is going to one county. They don’t realize how these facilities impact everyone in the Capital Region.
• Government is involved in the approval of projects. Our county has an Oil and Gas Extraction and Transportation Committee. The County hasn’t been active on the planning side. We want to get to the same project involvement as Strathcona.

• We are fortunate that recent pipeline activities are following an existing corridor in our area. This area is becoming an issue because the developer is having land taken for pipelines and we are considering setbacks for future development. We are looking at opening up our Area Structure Plan to review as a result of our set back considerations. We would like to be more involved but lack the will or the ability to become involved. A side issue for us is from a hazard point of view, what do we do when the product being shipped changes? As a general comment - The public does not understand the economics of the industry – AIH has been working on this.

• The requirements depend on what you are building. AER, Forestry/Environment conservation and rec. plans, Counties and Municipalities crossing agreements, road use permits, AT

2.0 Who are the key stakeholders in petroleum pipeline and power transmission planning and development within the Capital Region?

- Land owners both direct and adjacent, regulators, municipalities, various government departments, general public as a whole, First Nations and other operators both adjacent and crossing
- Land owners, communities, First Nations, other industry, government and the energy industry (The actual owner of the product being shipped is impacted by the results of the consultation and regulatory process.)
- Province, citizens, various municipal governments. As a comment, different municipalities are more active in the planning and development of projects. Strathcona County is good at involvement while the City of Edmonton is learning.
- Key stakeholders - Residents and tax payers. There is a difference between residents and tax payers. In other words, there is a difference between those being impacted and others in the community that are benefiting from jobs and tax revenues. Additional stakeholders include the GoFÀ (various departments) and the oil and gas industry.
- Major pipelines, AESO, ATCO, AltaLink, landowners, communities, governments
- Land owners, pipeline companies (all are not equal), AESO, SRD, SRB, AT, Alberta Regulator
- Anybody that is impacted by the infrastructure, counties, adjacent land owners/infrastructure, employees of oil and gas infrastructure facilities, everybody else
- All pipeline companies, transmission companies (Atco, AltaLink), land owners, municipalities, AESO, AT, AE, AER, NEB.
- Strathcona believe they can play a role in determining alignments to ensure compliance with the greater good need. They also believe that a major need they participate in is the need for responsible growth.
- Key Stakeholders - Land owners, County, Communities, Government, Oil and Gas companies. The majors don’t connect with the communities as much as the locals that are there often. We are there to protect our land owners and communities.
2.1 What are the roles of the key stakeholders?

- Regulators review approval and confirm it is constructed according to the approval granted. The land owner has to be willing to grant right of way and the right to operate and maintain the pipe. Other operators need to grant agreements for adjacent and crossing activities.
- Roles – Community, FN and land owners – we need their social license to go with the project
- There is a general feeling in our county that we want to engage with the industry player and help facilitate and work with them.
- Our county’s role – education related to benefits. As we become more involved we need to show the benefits to our residents. For our councilors it is hard for them to wear a business hat instead of a resident hat. Councilors don’t think long term. This becomes an issue when trying to build on the corridor concept because we have short term pain with long term gain.
- From our county point of view, we are there to protect our land owners and communities.
- Roles of land owners – because we have to access the land we need input into routing

2.2 What are the opportunities for the CRB to participate proactively in energy corridor regulatory approvals and project developments? Define CRB’s proactive role in the regulatory process for advocating on behalf of CRB interests with respect to future petroleum pipeline and power transmission line initiatives in the Region.

- There needs to be a strategic relationship between the CRB, regulator and even the operator. Corridors bring definition; certainty and time clarity. We get there by zoning and possibly expropriation.
- The CRB can invite key stakeholders to review both Stakeholder and CRB Growth plans.
- Define corridors; enforce the use of the corridor by zoning and planning. The TUC has been the most effective tool in the last 30 years. They need to become part of the solution, maybe as a facilitator. Important thing to remember – the one thing pipeline companies can do is follow rules.
- Education: The Regulators believe there is a general lack of understanding by the majority of municipalities regarding pipelines and population, risk management and the upstream and downstream aspects of the business and the benefits. (They mentioned at least three times the financial benefit of pipelines and the petroleum industry to the county through taxes, job, and spin off industries). (The public has no idea of the significance).
- All those in this interview are worried about CRB moving into their domain and undertaking tasks they feel are theirs. They identified education as a major need amongst municipalities, politicians and the general public. (Note- Maybe the CRB is the vehicle that the “have not” municipalities could use to address their needs related to this issue?) Having people understand the industry, why there is a need for connecting the parts, how growth will come and the risks associated with everything is part of the education process. Consistency is needed between the various municipalities.
- Education, industry association presentations, hear directly from the pipeline companies and associations including CEPA, CAPP, and CNDN Heavy Oil Association.
- There is need for a body to bring players together including industry, government, municipalities in order to develop a coordinated energy plan for the region and to preserve development able land. Today the risk is that infrastructure on lands can make it not fit for large development projects
- Corridors need to be tied to an overall plan.
- Awareness and support of ongoing developments. The issue of social license has become more prevalent for all linear developments. Independent support from the CRB and their views on the economic benefits to the region and public would be helpful.
- Set the standards to the existing layers – standardization, take the arbitrary nature out of the various counties. A good example is setbacks – the setbacks don’t make sense from a risk management point of view. How does the counties’ setbacks trump the AER? There is a need for an interface between the CRB and the AER.
- Governments representing Environment – They walk a fine line between minimizing footprints and putting unrealistic duties on projects. Club root is an example – the default is to follow previous project’s approach and not take a stand that is responsible and based on fact. An additional example would be Forestry offices, as there are differences between each office in how they work.
- Role of CRB – get everyone to the table.
- CRB Participation could be high level policy stuff – not in day to day decisions – they could make sure policies are aligned. We do not need another level slowing things down – set high level policy – area structure plan – maybe needs a bit of a hammer for times
- The role of CRB is to get everyone to the table but need the respect of municipalities. CRB could bring standardization, one door instead of multiple. The AIH is an example of this. Huston is also somewhere where we have seen this – there they have everything in place, a regional board with 40 communities and with legislative authority. The CRB could be part of the public consultation – because of NIMBY there is a need to be out there ahead of time.

2.3 How can the CRB Consult Stakeholders on a Regional Energy Corridor Policy Framework?

- CRB consultation – Use media, become more public – a good example are the Enbridge Benefit Commercials associated with NGP.
- Need a forum for industry to be heard as well as the ancillary support businesses – engineering houses, environment, and land.
- Undertake presentations or receive feedback from pipeline industry group committees such as CEPA. General comment - Constituents are more likely to become involved in discussions through their local county so use the municipality as the method of engaging general public.
- Hard to answer – when you hold an open house and ask the public at large to participate you see groups that have an axe to grind show up. If you had Observer Status at some initial municipal meetings we would need to worry about confidentiality.
- The CRB could be the avenue to establish corridors. They can’t be a regulatory body. They have no expertise. They could be the where but not what pipeline is going to happen. Everyone needs to see the impacts of what doing nothing will do or we will get nothing done.

3.0 What is the technical definition of Regional Energy Corridors?

- A group of linear disturbances.
- A corridor with multiple pipeline and or transmission lines
• Movement and transportation of goods, products, raw materials within the region and with connections outside the region. A challenge is how do we fit this in with land use – it should be part of planning – zone the corridors. Not sure what the magic number of pipelines that are required for a “corridor” to become an actual corridor

• A group of pipelines within a defined area and defined alignment – working with other stakeholders with common area and no sterilization of

• Lands designated or set aside for utilization of linear infrastructure. The TUC is unique as it has designated areas for municipal servicing and different infrastructure as well as industry needs.

• A defined space that allows the expansion and development of energy infrastructure – allows this physically and by regulation. Assists communities with planning and risk management.

• A corridor designed for linear facilities including plants, power and pipelines that facilitates the growth of energy. It crosses multiple jurisdictions by crossing municipal boundaries while providing clarity on the approval process

• An alignment of pipelines, power lines, utilities in a cohesive manner that tries to avoid land waste and fragmented parcels. A corridor is protecting our long term interest and insures we can capture long term opportunities. We should establish corridors the same as the TUC. Today we are playing catch-up – we need to protect our long term interests and grow.

• Not sure how many pipelines or structures it takes to be corridor. Railways are becoming a big deal. A common group of pipelines. We need to recognize we are a small component of a larger part – We are a part of a pipeline or power line system that comes from Ft. McMurray and goes to a refinery. We need to think bigger.

• Corridors start with one – What is the most effective width for an individual pipeline – do they take too much? Corridors are about using land effectively and not sterilizing land. There isn’t any force that will push a pipeline into a specific location such as the case with well sites

• Similar to TUC – Anything for the transportation of goods or products. Multiple uses. Not sure what number or size would determine the definition.

• Multi use corridor that links Edmonton to Ft. McMurray and includes Hardisty. The region is part of an industry that is much more than the Edmonton area. Think bigger, must include linking producing hubs with storage and shipping hubs. It needs to be east west and north south.

• Where you have a significant amount of infrastructure, where we have common exit points, distinct exit points, includes pipelines and sometimes power.

4.0 What is the forecasted demand for pipeline and transmission projects?

Identify a high-level forecast of what regional energy corridor needs are through the Capital Region (forecasted volumes, pipeline origins and destinations, electricity origins and destinations) over the next 20 years.

• Forecasted demand – next 10 years – 2 or 3 big lines as part of the ramp up to 3 million barrels/days into the AIH and Edmonton area. Five or so between the AIH and Edmonton.

• Forecasted demand – at present there are 11 interested parties looking at developing in the AIH. We appear to be ramping up to 5 million barrels a day. We are seeing a shift – where the AIH will be the HUB and not Refinery Row. Future growth is about gas, natural gas and gas liquids with NE British Columbia going to be our source.

• The AESO produces a 20 year Long Term Plan every 2 years. That should form the base forecast for any transmission demand.
• Need corridors near Williams river crossing, AIH into Refineries, into and through Lamont as well as through Sturgeon. (They mentioned risks zones around rail and heavy industry)
• Continued ramp up of oil sands will have a continued need for infrastructure. In the Refinery Row area we see a shortage of room for additional tankage. As well, corridor access into the area has become an issue. AIH has been on the radar for ten years. Site activity builds pipe infrastructure activity. All the major pipeline companies have acquired land holdings in the AIH and with the shortage of land in the Refinery Row area, it is realistic to expect a shift to the AIH.
• The next 8 years are going to be intense. AIH is going to expand and become a bigger hub. There will be a continuation of the need to run some new lines between AIH and the Refineries. The ability to interconnect in the AIH is a problem – very limited opportunities for alignments. Setbacks on industrial land are a problem as well.
• There is a shift away from the refineries area near Edmonton to the AIH. We will see less lines coming into Edmonton. Rail will continue to grow. We do not see it slowing down. Is there public sensitivity towards rail? The tax benefit for the municipalities is minimal for railways.
• The sense is that there is continued interest. It is becoming more and more evident that we have problems with skilled labour and lack of tide water. As extraction increases and shale gas ramps up we are going to see a bigger demand to ship our raw products elsewhere for enhancement and manufacturing.
• For the next 15 to 20 years we are going to see increases in products being shipped. We are seeing a significant increase to rail car activity – (from memory) in 1955 5700 car movements, in 2035 there will be 235,000 car movements. This year we are seeing 3 trains per week from the area, next year 8 to 10 trains a week. We see a significant amount of our tax revenue from pipeline and power line infrastructure.
• Power lines are finished – the Heartland Transmission Project took care of that. Ongoing need for pipelines with continued growth for the next ten to twenty years. New developments in the AIH will need new pipelines. It is likely we will see some of the pipelines being a duplication – but they will meet a business need of a different supplier.
• Forecasted demand – The day when we complete the big export pipeline the price will go up, this will drive development and increase the players. The role of Edmonton will decline with the AIH seeing more and more coming and going from this area. He asked the question – will new technologies improve efficiencies which will result in the need to increase capacity. As we see our population growing we will see more opportunities for additional services and opportunities for industries.
• Oil sands are in a significant growth mode. We are going from 2mbd to more than 5mbd. A great deal will go through the port of Prince Rupert. Impact of NGP will be to accelerate the time frame. Project and capacities will increase sooner than originally thought. Today we are seeing different avenues for oil – important integration of rail and pipe.
• Significant build in the Heartland, smaller projects, for the next 4 or 5 years very significant growth, shifting more to the AIH as it is too congested in Edmonton, recognize the fact all the majors have purchased lands in the AIH Comment about congestion in Edmonton area. We had two 300km pipelines and a 45km pipeline all start at the same time. The 45km pipeline in the Edmonton to AIH area is still bogged down and slow to start – no space, too much congestion. The others are basically finished.
5.0 What are the desired project locations (corridors) for these projects and key issues to consider?

Review potential future locations for Regional Energy Corridors within the Capital Region graphic representation of where future potential Regional Energy Corridors should or should not locate to meet future industry demands.

- Desired corridor locations – No additional needed if they designate the existing corridors to expand – we do not need anything else
- Desired corridor locations – the original study (Stewart Weir) was good. Presently we see a demand in Lamont County as there is a shortage of useable land in Sturgeon and Strathcona. We need to make sure we do not sterilize land.
- There are limitations to the co-location of transmission lines and pipelines as there is electricity induction issues and associated metal corrosion on pipelines proximate to transmission lines.
- If we are going to expand the number of corridors then this needs to be a political decision and recognition that it is a political need.
- From an electricity transmission perspective, there is a risk issue if all transmission is dedicated to one corridor if an extreme weather event takes out transmission lines.
- Transmission Facility Owners (TFOs) prefer to be located away from road allowances.
- Current CEAA, AER and AUC legislation push the location of linear corridors to follow other corridors.
- Desired Locations of Corridors - Should have regulated corridors. Like the concepts and original plans from the 2010 study. The AIH is the only place to be, we need to be able to access the area.
- From the North Saskatchewan River (AIH) south into the NEPC. Inside the AIH and trying to get out of the AIH has become a problem as well. Allowing industrial subdivision growth along the NEPC as created a major problem with very limited options. The TUC needs to address the Georgia Pacific property. If the AIH is the new hub, you need clear entry and exit points into the AIH. General comment – If the need for a pipeline corridor is framed to be an industry issue, then it appears that the government is in industry’s back pocket and the big issues of efficient development of land and fragmentation of land are forgotten.
- In the AIH we need a corridor to the river and outlet west as well as gain access to Hardisty. Expansion of the corridor to Edmonton and we need access to the North – would be fine if they were able to go out through Lamont County to the river.
- We need a holistic view and recognize the priority of our system. The Georgia Pacific land needs to be addressed. Any corridor needs to be concerned about length. We need a better use of right of way space. Today our main focus of activities is in the Refinery area to AIH.
- We should have regulated corridors. I like the concepts and original plans from the 2010 study. The AIH is the only place to be, we need to be able to access the area.
- Would like to see any corridor regulated. There is an immediate need in the AIH. There is a need for access from the Cold Lake direction into the AIH.
- Refineries to AIH – there is a shift from the East Edmonton to AIH, Sturgeon and Lamont. In forecasting there are an awful lot of what ifs? Huston has also showed a realization of what can happen when there is no more space. We need to focus on the areas that want it and will be developing in the future. We need to realize we are an exporter type market with transportation as a key component.
• Acreage development in Lamont is threatening to block development and pipeline capacity. What is the growth plan for Acheson (possibly Campbell and the international airport should be looked at).

• TUC pinch points – Georgia Pacific and NEPC. We are going to see more pipes going to the AIH to individual sites – not everyone goes to the same site.

6.0 Operational Management and Funding Models

Summarize existing models for funding and operating petroleum pipeline and power transmission line corridors and outline relevant considerations for implementation of these corridors.

6.1 What Energy Corridor operational management and funding models can be considered for Regional Energy Corridors in the Capital Region?

6.2 How would these Models interface with the CRB and Stakeholders? What roles would they have with each model?

• Management and funding – If designated then over time they should be acquired. Put in place a TUC like structure that is revenue neutral. The problem with an industry model is that they don’t trust each other. The TUC model has worked until Henday and the arrival of pinch points.

• Regulated utilities cannot get a return on their investment from land purchased in advance, or on speculation for a future corridor. Their funding or operational management models are limited by the legislation.

• Management and funding – Maybe the Edmonton Pipeline Group has a role. You need an outside party. A group could better address the need for Risk Management. Maybe the big companies should be brought to the table to participate?

  » Models - Private, municipalities, P3. It needs to be regulated to back it and push the companies in the direction. You need someone to set it up.

  » Roles – The CRB role could be to consider where they go and make sure they are aligned with the plan. Make sure any new pipelines are compliant. The danger is that we get too many people or groups involved and we start to see “scope creep”.

• Operational and funding models – TUC, Private model, municipality controlled, some arms-length government involvement, a land trust. Ownership is the key – regulation gets you there. The problem that arises is the ability to expropriate and the ability to regulate – do you really need that? Management and funding models – P3 with industry, provincial and federal dollars. In urban areas, controlled is better. In rural self- regulated is preferable.

• Operational and Management Funding Models - Province should buy land. We need a National Energy Strategy and include the Feds in this. The Provincial Government needs to step up as there is no real impetus for this. A model based on Industry involvement will not work.

• History has shown that where a designated corridor is not owned, the pipeline companies are held to ransom. The TUC and NEPC are effective models as they provide certainty. There are some areas where problems are encountered in these corridors and that is where the government has failed to purchase the land.
• One option is for the government to buy a strip of land for a corridor— to be effective it should be continuous and not voluntary. The idea of government and industry will not work as the perception is that industry is driving the process not regional or land use planning— without the government stepping up the companies will continue to do as they do now.

• Would like to see purchased and completely regulated. Would suggest that industry could fund it for certainty purposes. Government would be responsible for regulation – maybe provide licenses based on your contribution. You could sell your license if you wanted to.

• We need a regulated and controlled corridor – Government needs to be in charge. Industry doesn’t have the best intentions – the competing interests of the industry players would prevent them from getting along. For funding – Industry should put some funds into the process. Government has the better sell for the idea of the greater good.

• Industry needs to be part of this, they must be at the table. We must also include municipalities. Funding should be by all levels of government. The Federal government and First Nations can’t be left out.

• The TUC worked – don’t mess with something that worked. Funding – government funding with opportunities for municipalities to participate as well as industry. The funds are there (linear assessment and easement costs), they just aren’t dedicated to the issue.

• – P3 with industry, provincial and federal dollars. In urban areas, controlled is better. In rural self-regulated is preferable.

• It is hard to believe that industry could take on the ownership or management of a corridor as they have too much vested interest. With any third party buying and managing a corridor there is a timing issue. The revenue schedule is risky as the timing is unsure. There is too much land for third parties to be involved.

• A bought corridor would be more reasonable, you wouldn’t lose money, it would be much easier as we wouldn’t be negotiating against each other and we would save time.

• Funding – economic evaluation should be done – it would be similar to TUC payback. There is an existing tax on the linear infrastructure with a rate based on pipe diameter. There is revenue flowing to all levels of government.

• Unrealistic to think industry would participate because we would see the companies trying to control projects by influencing or holding land.

7.0 What does a CRB Regional Energy Corridor Policy Framework need to entail and consider?

Establish a policy framework for the linear and logical planning of regional energy corridors that address:

i. the location and co-location of infrastructure in these corridors;

ii. a coordinated Regional approach for safety and emergency response planning;

iii. minimization and mitigation of land use conflicts; and,

iv. risk management.

• There is often talk of the need for multiple use corridors. The Lower Athabasca Regional Plan, for example discussed the need for Corridors. However it did not designate a corridor.

• Will a designated corridor facilitate routing approvals or will alternate routes need to be reviewed and studied for the regulators?
• If the CRB were to consider a corridor it would need to be clear on the future use of that land and support future energy infrastructure in that corridor when development comes. One lesson learned from the TUC was that residents and Municipal councillors often challenged the end use of the Corridors. Are the TUCs greenspace or energy corridors?
• Development restrictions can be used to ensure that land is not set out in conflict for a linear corridor.
• Regional Land Use Plans guide project decisions through the Electrical Utilities Act.
• Standardization of regulations – setbacks are an issue.
• It has to be taken to a point where we have an action plan and actual actions. Without actions this is all words. The need for corridors is a pressing issue. We need to relate this to the individual municipalities.
• High level considerations, create policy.
• The CRB should be involved because of the different municipalities. There is a need for an integrated approach with the petrochemical flow out and the by-products. This is more than a one off activity, this is about integration.
• Routing is very well defined, follow existing linear disturbances. There are problems in the TUC – pinch points where there is interference, conflicts with moving people – can’t cross under piles, we need to weigh value with the environment and our ability to get around.

General comments
• Today municipalities and counties are in a tough spot. They need to recognize not only the above ground infrastructure but also what they don’t see and that is the pipeline infrastructure. They are all not at the table to the same extent. Strathcona County is very active talking to industry. They understand the revenues and importance of the pipeline infrastructure to their county.
• It is a stretch to think buying a corridor will take place. Planning is a mechanism where the issues can be identified early but we need processes to be in place where the potential issue can be acted upon.
• General comments – Time is the key, change from an engineering perspective impacts the client. – Costly delays increases the net costs to the project which impacts the producer.
• We see today that there is a potential where you can get dragged down in the process and never get your approval. We also see that the regulatory approval process has been used by special interest groups to highjack the process.
• Whenever planning a pipeline we use Abadata which gives us the information about what is there and we try and follow existing alignments. Planners need to know what is there and recognize it.
• The corridor concept allows the ability to gather resident information as well as helps with costing and addressing the annoyance of bothering people.
• Taxes are a big concern – we have site and linear taxes – be wary of pushing industry away because of tax.
• A corridor provides a means to control the separation of industry types while providing a stable environment for linear development and clarity. It will help to improve the regulatory process.
• The idea of further developing corridors is long overdue, they need to persevere. Education is significant - policy needs to be sold – you need a vision and keep on the path.
• We have pressure points that need addressing but we need to look beyond that. We can’t let the dollars limit our creativity or we will never get this done.

• Not everyone is coming from the same place, but they are probably going to the same place. Planners see the faces of the locals but they don’t see the face of business. There needs to be a forum to tell the public about pipelines. A corridor eliminates the public impact on routing – the definition is there and it helps great

• THE SRB IS NOT ALIGNED WITH BASIC PLANNING PRINCIPLES – wasting land.

• Problem – when you declare a regional corridor – what does it do to land values? Does it create a land grab issue?

• Coordination of the use of our land is a must. How we connect into the markets and other areas is just as important. Corridor needs to be tied to an overall plan. Being proactive is a key – there are lessons learned from the oil sands (Tying up land where infrastructure is needed – shape of leases). How corridors fit with development, needs to be addressed.

• Need to recognize that the energy industry is vital to our growth.

• The fact that this study will bring education to some is a major benefit and a step forward.

• Defined corridors eliminate the competition for linear space – this also helps to build the case for other entries into the corridor concept.

• Viable corridors do provide positive growth and help build our communities – tax is very beneficial.

• People have to understand that pipelines are a reality as we are a resource province. They need to look at a refinery as 1500 people, all with children, needing schools, doctors etc.
Appendix 5: Regulatory Approval Requirements for Energy Corridors

A draft tabular summary of Regulatory Approval Requirements is provided in the following Table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Key Authorities</th>
<th>General Role and Mandate/ Specific Regulatory Role Influencing Energy Corridors in the CRB</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulator</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pipeline</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Energy Board</td>
<td>National Energy Board Act</td>
<td>The National Energy Board (NEB) promotes safety and security, environmental protection and efficient energy infrastructure and markets in the Canadian public interest. The NEB regulates the construction and operation of inter-provincial and international oil and gas pipelines, international power lines, and designated inter-provincial power lines. Its mandate is also defined by the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act.</td>
<td>License Application to NEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Energy Regulator</td>
<td>Responsible Energy Development Act. 2012 Chapter R-17.3</td>
<td>Establishes the mandate and role of the Alberta Energy Regulator (Board) covering all energy except hydro energy to provide for responsible energy development and regulate the disposition of public lands, protection of environment and conservation and management of water.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Pipeline Act</td>
<td></td>
<td>14. The Regulator, in a licence or an amendment of a licence, may (a) prescribe the location and route of the pipeline as precisely as it considers suitable, and (b) prescribe the location of the right of way of the pipeline and the relationship of its boundaries to the pipeline or any part of the pipeline.</td>
<td>License Application to AER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38. No pipeline may be constructed on, across, over or under a highway without the approval of the Minister of Transportation. (2) An application for approval under subsection (1) shall be accompanied with a plan and profile of the portion of the highway affected. (3) The land in which an interest is required for a pipeline parallel to a highway shall not be located nearer than (a) 30 metres from the boundary of the highway, in the case of a highway other than a freeway under the Highways Development and Protection Act or 115 metres from the centre line of such a freeway, without the approval of the Minister of Transportation, or</td>
<td>Permit Application to Transportation Minister and AER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Key Authorities</td>
<td>General Role and Mandate/ Specific Regulatory Role Influencing Energy Corridors in the CRB</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) any greater distance from the boundary or centre line that the Regulator stipulates. (4) If a pipeline crosses a highway, no bend shall be permitted in that part of the pipeline that is (a) within the boundaries of the highway without the approval of the Minister of Transportation, or (b) within (i) 30 metres from the boundary of the highway, in the case of a highway other than a freeway under the Highways Development and Protection Act, or 115 metres from the centre line of such a freeway, without the approval of the Minister of Transportation, or (ii) any greater distance from the boundary or centre line that the Regulator stipulates.</td>
<td>(Land Use Bylaw Requirement) Subdivision setbacks for development permits related to AEUB/ AER/ AUC setback requirements.</td>
<td>Subdivision Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Power Transmission**

Alberta Utilities Commission Electrical Utilities Act

To provide an efficient Alberta electric industry structure including independent, separate corporations to carry out the responsibilities of the Independent System Operator and the Balancing Pool, and to set out the powers and duties of those corporations.

Alberta Electricity System Operator Electrical Statutes Amendment Act

Province

Alberta Land Stewardship Act

To provide a means to plan for the future, recognizing the need to manage activity to meet the reasonably foreseeable need of current and future generations of Albertans.

Municipal Affairs Municipal Government Act (MDP requirement) (Land Use Bylaw Requirement) Plan Authority

Subdivision and Subdivision Authority
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Key Authorities</th>
<th>General Role and Mandate/ Specific Regulatory Role Influencing Energy Corridors in the CRB</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Regulation</td>
<td>Land Assembly Project Area Act. SA 2011 (not proclaimed)</td>
<td>Statute has not come into force (as at December 03, 2013). Proposes a more clear process for property owners when government is planning for land assembly projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Assembly Project Area Act. Statutes of Alberta, 2009 Chapter L-25</td>
<td>Act enables the Governor in Council to plan, designate and assemble land, consult and compensate landowners for large scale infrastructure projects including utility corridors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Government Act. Capital Board Regulation (AR 38/2012)</td>
<td>The Capital Region Board (CRB) Regulation establishes the CRB, its mandate and powers, including duties for the Capital Region Growth Plan and approval of municipal statutory plans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Board Regulation (AR 17/2010) Regional Evaluation Framework. Ministerial Order No L:270/10</td>
<td>The purpose of the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) is to provide criteria to allow the Board to evaluate municipal statutory plans and statutory plan amendments to ensure consistency with the long-term interests identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan, and the Capital Region Board Regulation. Municipalities must submit proposed IDPs, MDPs, ARPs and any proposed amendments to the Board for review and evaluation based on identified criteria.</td>
<td>REF evaluation of municipal statutory plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Key Authorities</td>
<td>General Role and Mandate/ Specific Regulatory Role Influencing Energy Corridors in the CRB</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Industrial Accidents Council of Canada (MIACC)</td>
<td>MIACC is a non-profit, multi-stakeholder organization, focusing on the wide spectrum of prevention, preparedness and response (PPR) activities relating to the manufacture, storage, distribution, transportation, handling and disposal of hazardous substances. MIACC is the national focus and leader for cooperative action to reduce the frequency and severity of major industrial accidents involving hazardous substances. Risk assessment must become an integral part of land use planning and control, and this requires a co-ordinated effort of industry and all levels of government and recommends that: • the provincial governments review existing planning legislation, regulations and guidelines with a view to including more specific powers concerning risk assessment; • provincial and municipal governments require risk assessments as part of their land use planning and control tools; • the proposed guidelines for acceptable levels of risk be used as a starting point for public discussion of such levels with a view to their inclusion by provincial and local governments in official plans, standards and regulations and impact assessment procedures; and • industry representatives work with provincial and local governments to favour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Key Authorities</td>
<td>General Role and Mandate/ Specific Regulatory Role Influencing Energy Corridors in the CRB</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality/ County</td>
<td>Land Use Bylaws</td>
<td>By-law requirements for managing land use along Utility corridors, pipelines and transmission lines</td>
<td>Development Applications, Development Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Structure Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td>The five municipal members of the AIHA, Fort Saskatchewan, Lamont County, Strathcona County, Sturgeon County and the City of Edmonton have created complimentary Areas Structure Plan By-laws that set out land use zoning designations, concepts and implementation for each area to ensure that land use planning and growth throughout the Heartland region would occur in a coordinated and responsible manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lamont County</strong></td>
<td>LUB 6.8</td>
<td>Any development involving pipeline and/or power line rights-of-way shall be sited to comply with all relevant Federal and Provincial legislation and regulations. Setbacks from pipelines and other utility corridors shall be in accordance with appropriate Provincial legislation and regulations and any regulations established by the Alberta Energy and Utilities Board or pursuant to the Alberta Industrial Heartland Area Structure Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Leduc County** | LUB 6.11        | 6.11.1 Development setbacks from pipeline rights-of-way, oil and gas installations and other utility corridors shall meet or exceed the requirements of the Province.  
6.11.2 Notwithstanding 6.11.1, for the following uses, the minimum setback from the right-of-way of pipeline with a maximum licenced operating pressure of 3447.5KPa or greater is: (a) 1.0 m (3.3 ft.) for an accessory building (b) 15.0 m (50 ft.) for a principal residential, commercial or industrial building; and (c) 200 m (656 ft.) for a principal building for community recreation services, private education, public education, spectator entertainment, exhibition and convention facilities, major health services, religious assemblies, or spectator sports. |                                                                          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Key Authorities</th>
<th>General Role and Mandate/ Specific Regulatory Role Influencing Energy Corridors in the CRB</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>LUB 6.7</td>
<td>LUB 6.7 A minimum setback from the right of way of a petroleum products pipeline with a maximum licensed operating pressure of 3447.5 kPa or greater shall be provided for the following uses: a)(i) Urban Service Area: 15.0 m for a principal residential, commercial, or industrial building. For residential development only, and subject to the approval of the Development Officer, the pipeline setback may be reduced to 7.5 m if the applicant for development permanently fences the property line adjacent to the pipeline right of way before the construction of abutting development. Prior to any construction, a plan shall be provided to the Development Officer that accurately indicates the location of the pipeline right of way. Within the Urban Service Area, any proposed development in the AD Future Development, RC Country Residential or RA Rural Residential/Agriculture district shall adhere to Section 6.7.1 (a)(ii). (Bylaw 24-2002) (ii) Hamlets and Rural Areas: 15.0 m for a principal residential, commercial, or industrial building, provided it is clearly marked with identification posts and flags from a surveyed pipeline right of way. Prior to any construction, a plan shall be provided to the Development Officer that accurately indicates the location of the pipeline right of way. (Bylaw 24-2002) b) 1.0 m for an accessory residential, commercial, or industrial building, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Key Authorities</td>
<td>General Role and Mandate/Specific Regulatory Role Influencing Energy Corridors in the CRB</td>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) 200 m for a principal building for community recreation services, private education, public education, emergency services, spectator entertainment, exhibition and convention facilities, major health services, religious assemblies, or spectator sports. 6.7.2 A minimum setback of 5.0 m shall be provided from a pipeline right of way with a maximum licensed operating pressure of less than 3447.5 kPa for all principal buildings. 6.7.3 Subject to the approval of the Development Officer, petrochemical plant sites may be exempt from the pipeline setback requirements of Sections 6.7.1 and 6.7.2. (Bylaw 24-2002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>LUB 6.4</td>
<td>Any development involving pipeline and/or power line transmission rights-of-way shall be sited to comply with all relevant Federal and Provincial legislation. Setbacks from pipelines and other utility corridors shall be in accordance with appropriate Provincial Regulations or Acts and any regulations or directives established by the Energy Utilities Board (EUB).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disband Energy Corridors Task Force

Motion

That the Energy Corridors Task Force be disbanded.

Background

- On May 23, 2013, the Land Use Committee approved the 2013 Business Plan and Budget including a project to develop a Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework.

- Following the review of the CRB Committee Structure in the fall of 2013, the Board established an Energy Corridors Task Force, which reports to the newly formed Land Use & Planning Committee, to lead the Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework project. The mandate of the Task Force was to oversee the development of the Regional Energy Corridors policy framework, including the preparation of a report, recommendations, and executive level presentation by July 2014.


Rationale

- The Energy Corridors Task Force has completed its mandate and deliverables in accordance with the terms of reference (Attached).

Attachments:
1. Energy Corridors Task Force Terms of Reference
BACKGROUND

The purpose of the Regional Energy Corridors Study is to define a framework for accommodating Regional Energy Corridors within the Capital Region in a manner that is consistent and compatible with the principles and policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

MANDATE

The purpose of this task force is to oversee the development of the Regional Energy Corridors policy framework.

*Deliverables*

This task force will oversee the completion and recommendation of the following deliverables to the Board, through the Land Use & Planning Committee:

- The final report will document all information gathered, analyses carried out and conclusions and recommendations reached by July 2014
- An executive level presentation (PowerPoint) that will include the study objectives, process, key findings and recommendations

MEMBERSHIP

The Board will consider the project requirements and members who have a vested interest and/or expertise to enable the best possible outcome for a specific project. Whenever feasible, membership will remain consistent until project completion.

This task force membership will consist of three members: one City, one County and one Town.

TERM

This task force was established in late 2013 with an expectation that the project deliverables will be recommended to the Board by the summer of 2014.

LEADERSHIP

At its first meeting, the task force will select its Chair and Vice-Chair from amongst its membership.

SUPPORT/RESOURCES

This task force will be supported by the Chief Executive Officer, CRB administration and consultant resources, and others as determined by its mandate and the Board’s approved business plan and budget. The Chief Executive Officer may establish an administrative working or advisory group as deemed necessary to support the task force.
MEETING FREQUENCY

Meeting frequency will be established to align with key milestone and delivery dates of the project where policy guidance and recommendations to the Board are required and, where warranted, at the call of the Chair.

AUTHORITY

All meeting groups established by the Board are considered advisory bodies to the Board and therefore must, by a passed motion, provide recommendation(s) to the Board for decision.

This task force has been established under the guidance of the Land Use & Planning committee and is expected to seek counsel and support for any motions from this committee before proceeding to the Board for decision.

EX-OFFICIO

The Board Chair will be considered a non-voting ex-officio member of this task force.

Whenever viable, Provincial and/or key stakeholder representatives will be invited to attend task force meetings as ex-officio members to contribute their expertise and knowledge towards a particular outcome.

DECISION-MAKING

Decisions, recommendations and actions determined by the task force will be driven by the desired outcome to do what is in the best interest of the Capital Region. Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the task force, or their designated alternate, may vote. Each member will have one vote.

All motions must be moved by a voting member. Motions require a majority of members in attendance to pass (50 percent plus one).

QUORUM

Quorum is defined as all three members.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

The task force Chair is accountable for ensuring effective and collaborative operations and decision-making. Where the Chair’s efforts are unable to resolve a dispute, the matter will be brought to the Land Use & Planning committee or the Board for discussion and resolution.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Chief Executive Officer will act as the single point of contact for all communications requests for this task force and will determine the appropriate level of response required. This may result in responses being required from the Board Chair/Interim Chair, the task force Chair, members, Board administration, or the Chief Executive Officer.

STATUS OF MEETINGS

Task force meetings are open to the public, including all members of the CRB (elected officials and their alternates), administrative representatives from all CRB member municipalities and members of the public.
Individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/committee members may be invited to participate in specific agenda items. Task force minutes are public records.

Section 602.08 (1) of the Municipal Government Act (MGA) states that the committee may close all or part of their meetings to the public if a matter to be discussed is within one of the exceptions to disclosure in Division 2 of Part 1 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

*All members (elected and administrative) attending the in camera session shall respect the confidentiality of the in camera items.*

**REPORTING**

This task force is expected to provide the Land Use & Planning Committee sage advice and recommendations to resolve existing issues and progress as it relates to its mandate and expected deliverables.

**MEETING AGENDAS AND MINUTES**

All meeting agendas, minutes, reports, briefings and supporting documentation will be provided in an electronic format.

In general, meeting agendas and pre-read materials, where available, will be provided at least one week in advance of a scheduled meeting.

The task force will include its meeting minutes with the next Board meeting agenda package.

_____________________________
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Terms of Reference Amendments

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the updated Regional Services Committee Terms of Reference, as recommended by the Regional Services Committee.

Background

The Capital Region Board approved Terms of Reference for all committees and task forces in November 2013 based on the new committee structure. Terms of Reference for each committee and task force were developed to include background, mandate, membership, leadership, support/resources, meeting frequency, authority, ex-officio, decision-making, quorum, dispute resolution, communications, status of meetings, reporting, and meeting agendas and minutes.

The Capital Region Board approved Terms of Reference for all committees and task forces in May 8th, 2014 based on the new committee structure. The Transit Task Force was to report to the Regional Services Committee, which had identified an ongoing role for the Transit Task Force to provide leadership and strategic oversight of regional transit projects to support the implementation of the Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan.

Rationale

The intent of establishing Task Forces was to ensure sufficient focus on the issues identified as priorities, rather than compete for attention in the multi-issue agenda of Standing Committees.

At the first meeting of the Regional Services Committee the three transit operators suggested the Transit Task Force be returned to Standing Committee status because:

- The Transit Task Force would not be sufficient to address all the transit-related work identified, including developing regional policy positions to respond to provincial legislative changes affecting intermunicipal bus service, and coordinating the region’s GreenTRIP priorities.
- The Transit Task Force agenda already includes multiple issues: recommending the next steps for the Intermunicipal Transit Governance Study; coordinating the GreenTRIP priorities for Round 2 applications; overseeing the procurement of Smart Fare Technology to support a Regional Fare Strategy, and developing an Advocacy Strategy and Plan for Regional Transit.

On June 19, 2014, the Regional Services committee passed a motion to recommend that the Transit Task Force be changed to a Standing Committee of the Board effective immediately. On August 28, 2014 the Regional Services Committee recommended to the Board its Terms of Reference be approved to include these changes.

Attachments:

1. Regional Services Committee Terms of Reference
BACKGROUND

This committee provides leadership in the development of policies and programs for regional services and non-land use projects as authorized by the Board.

MANDATE

Reporting to the Board, this standing committee will be responsible for the following:

**Business and Budget Planning**

On an annual basis, recommending rolling four year business plans and budget for this committee, Geographic Information Services (GIS) and the Housing Task Force to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee for consideration in the Board’s annual business plan update

**GIS**

- Guide and oversee the implementation of GIS policy and GIS strategic priorities for the Board
- Facilitate education and sharing of best practices among municipalities

**Housing**

- Guide and oversee the implementation of the Housing Vision and Plan through a policy framework that includes the integration of all strategic priorities of the Growth Plan
- Provide leadership for the development and implementation of an effective regional planning model to facilitate a greater supply of non-market and market affordable housing, based on need and priority, throughout the Region
- Provide leadership on behalf of the region to work with other orders of government to advocate for policy changes affecting the supply of non-market and market-affordable housing. This may include, but is not limited to, funding models, legislative or regulatory changes, programs, policies and priorities to effectively address the supply and distribution of non-market and market affordable housing in the Region
- Oversee the development of a monitoring and measurement framework that will report on housing trends in affordability, density, diversity of housing types and housing need
- Provide leadership in developing strategic partnerships with all stakeholders involved in enabling non-market and market affordable housing in the region
- Facilitate education and sharing of best practices among municipalities

**Housing Task Force**

- Provide policy oversight and guidance to the task force
- Recommend intermediate updates and final reports to the Board

MEMBERSHIP

Membership for this committee will consist of 11 members: Edmonton, two Cities, three Counties, four Towns, and one Village, as determined by the Board or as approved by the Board. Membership will be reviewed by the Board every two years.
LEADERSHIP

At its first meeting, the committee will select its Chair and Vice-Chair from amongst its membership. If there is a change in the committee’s membership, the committee should review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.

At the end of a two year period, once the committee membership has been reviewed by the Board, the committee will also review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.

SUPPORT/RESOURCES

The CEO will support this committee, drawing upon CRB administration as required.

This committee will also be supported by consultant resources, and others as determined by its mandate and the Board’s approved business plan and budget. The Chief Executive Officer may establish an administrative working or advisory group as deemed necessary to support a committee project.

MEETING FREQUENCY

It is proposed that this committee meet bi-monthly or at the call of the Chair as warranted.

AUTHORITY

All meeting groups established by the Board are considered advisory bodies to the Board and therefore must, by a passed motion, provide recommendation(s) to the Board for decision.

EX-OFFICIO

Non-voting ex-officio: CRB Chair.

Whenever viable, Provincial and/or key stakeholder representatives will be invited to attend committee meetings as ex-officio members to contribute their expertise and knowledge towards a particular outcome.

DECISION-MAKING

Decisions, recommendations and actions determined by the committee will be driven by the desired outcome to do what is in the best interest of the Capital Region. Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the committee, or their designated alternate, may vote. Each member will have one vote. All motions must be moved by a voting member. Motions require a majority of members in attendance to pass (50 percent plus one).

QUORUM

Quorum is defined as 50 percent plus one of standing membership.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

The committee Chair is accountable for ensuring effective and collaborative committee operations and decision-making. Where the Chair’s efforts are unable to resolve a dispute, the matter will be brought to the Board for discussion and resolution.
COMMUNICATIONS

The Chief Executive Officer will act as the single point of contact for all communications requests for this committee, and will determine the appropriate level of response required. This may result in responses being required from the Board Chair/Interim Chair, a committee or task force Chair, members, Board administration, or the Chief Executive Officer.

STATUS OF MEETINGS

Committee meetings are open to the public, including all members of the CRB (elected officials and their alternates), administrative representatives from all CRB member municipalities and members of the public. Individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/committee members may be invited to participate in specific agenda items. Committee minutes are public records.

Section 602.08 (1) of the Municipal Government Act (MGA) states that the committee may close all or part of their meetings to the public if a matter to be discussed is within one of the exceptions to disclosure in Division 2 of Part 1 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

All members (elected and administrative) attending the in camera session shall respect the confidentiality of the in camera items.

REPORTING

This committee is expected to provide the Board, through established communication channels and schedules, sage advice, descriptions and recommendations to resolve existing issues, status and progress as it relates to its mandate and expected deliverables.

MEETING AGENDAS AND MINUTES

All meeting agendas, minutes, reports, briefings and supporting documentation will be provided in an electronic format.

In general, meeting agendas and pre-read materials, where available, will be provided at least one week in advance of a scheduled meeting.

The committee will include its meeting minutes with the next Board meeting agenda package.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
BACKGROUND

This committee provides leadership in the development of policies and programs for regional services and non-land use projects as authorized by the Board.

MANDATE

Reporting to the Board, this standing committee will be responsible for the following:

**Business and Budget Planning**

On an annual basis, recommending a rolling four year business plans and budget for this committee for Geographic Information Services (GIS) and its the Housing Task Forces to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee for consideration in the Board’s annual business plan update.

**GIS**

- Guide and oversee the implementation of GIS policy and the integration of all GIS strategic priorities for the Board of the Growth Plan
- Facilitate education and sharing of best practices among municipalities

**Housing**

- Guide and oversee the implementation of the Housing Vision and Plan through a policy framework that includes the integration of all strategic priorities of the Growth Plan
- Provide leadership for the development and implementation of an effective regional planning model to facilitate a greater supply of non-market and market affordable housing, based on need and priority, throughout the Region
- Provide leadership on behalf of the region to work with other orders of government to advocate for policy changes affecting the supply of non-market and market-affordable housing. This may include, but is not limited to, funding models, legislative or regulatory changes, programs, policies and priorities to effectively address the supply and distribution of non-market and market affordable housing in the Region
- Oversee the development of a monitoring and measurement framework that will report on housing trends in affordability, density, diversity of housing types and housing need
- Provide leadership in developing strategic partnerships with all stakeholders involved in enabling non-market and market affordable housing in the region
- Facilitate education and sharing of best practices among municipalities

**Regional Transit**

- Advocate and continually promote (under the policy guidance of the Board) the Capital Region’s Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan
- Represent regional transit interests while respecting and giving due consideration to local issues and preferences
- Provide oversight and policy guidance to the deployment of intermunicipal transit facilities and services ensuring that these are integrated and aligned with the region’s transportation needs and the Capital Region Board’s Land Use Plan
Regional Services Committee – Terms of Reference

- Recommend priorities for deployment of regional capital and operating resources for regional transit projects

**Transit and Housing Task Forces**
- Provide policy oversight and guidance to the task forces
- Recommend intermediate updates and final reports to the Board

**Membership**

Membership for this committee will consist of 11 members: Edmonton, two Cities, three Counties, four Towns, and one Village, as determined by the Board or as approved by the Board. Membership will be reviewed by the Board every two years.

**Leadership**

At its first meeting, the committee will select its Chair and Vice-Chair from amongst its membership. If there is a change in the committee’s membership, the committee should review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.

At the end of a two year period, once the committee membership has been reviewed by the Board, the committee will also review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.

**Support/Resources**

The CEO will support this committee, drawing upon CRB administration as required.

This committee will also be supported by consultant resources, and others as determined by its mandate and the Board’s approved business plan and budget. The Chief Executive Officer may establish an administrative working or advisory group as deemed necessary to support a committee project.

**Meeting Frequency**

It is proposed that this committee meet bi-monthly or at the call of the Chair as warranted.

**Authority**

All meeting groups established by the Board are considered advisory bodies to the Board and therefore must, by a passed motion, provide recommendation(s) to the Board for decision.

**Ex-officio**

Non-voting ex-officio: CRB Chair.

Whenever viable, Provincial and/or key stakeholder representatives will be invited to attend committee meetings as ex-officio members to contribute their expertise and knowledge towards a particular outcome.

**Decision-Making**

Decisions, recommendations and actions determined by the committee will be driven by the desired outcome to do what is in the best interest of the Capital Region. Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the committee, or their designated alternate, may vote. Each member will have one vote.
The approved Governance Model for Transit requires a majority vote (six of 11) including unanimous support of the three current transit operators (Edmonton, St. Albert and Strathcona) on matters pertaining to conventional transit.

All motions must be moved by a voting member. Motions require a majority of members in attendance to pass (50 percent plus one).

**QUORUM**

Quorum is defined as 50 percent plus one of standing membership.

**DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

The committee Chair is accountable for ensuring effective and collaborative committee operations and decision-making. Where the Chair’s efforts are unable to resolve a dispute, the matter will be brought to the Board for discussion and resolution.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

The Chief Executive Officer will act as the single point of contact for all communications requests for this committee, and will determine the appropriate level of response required. This may result in responses being required from the Board Chair/Interim Chair, a committee or task force Chair, members, Board administration, or the Chief Executive Officer.

**STATUS OF MEETINGS**

Committee meetings are open to the public, including all members of the CRB (elected officials and their alternates), administrative representatives from all CRB member municipalities and members of the public. Individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/committee members may be invited to participate in specific agenda items. Committee minutes are public records.

Section 602.08 (1) of the Municipal Government Act (MGA) states that the committee may close all or part of their meetings to the public if a matter to be discussed is within one of the exceptions to disclosure in Division 2 of Part 1 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

*All members (elected and administrative) attending the in camera session shall respect the confidentiality of the in camera items.*

**REPORTING**

This committee is expected to provide the Board, through established communication channels and schedules, sage advice, descriptions and recommendations to resolve existing issues, status and progress as it relates to its mandate and expected deliverables.

**MEETING AGENDAS AND MINUTES**

All meeting agendas, minutes, reports, briefings and supporting documentation will be provided in an electronic format.

In general, meeting agendas and pre-read materials, where available, will be provided at least one week in advance of a scheduled meeting.
The committee will include its meeting minutes with the next Board meeting agenda package.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Regional Competitive Analysis

Motion
That the Capital Region Board receive the mid-term report Advantages and Competitiveness of the Capital Region (Project 1C) for information.

Background

- On July 13, 2013, the Board accepted the Project Charter identifying the approach, process, planning timelines and high level outcomes for updating the Capital Region Board’s growth management plan – Growing Forward.

- Following the review of the CRB Committee Structure in the fall of 2013, the Board established a Task Force to oversee the updating of the Growth Plan by December 2015. To support the Task Force from a technical perspective, the CRB CEO established a Technical Advisory Committee of four senior administrative planners from the region and two consultants as strategic advisors.

- CRB administration recommended a Program approach to updating the Plan consistent with the four Phases identified in the Project Charter: Phase 1 - Background and Foundation, Phase 2 - Policy Development and Update, Phase 3 - Implementation Plan and Phase 4 - Communications Plan. Phase 1 would be divided into three distinct projects:
  - Project 1A – Plan Review and Policy Evaluation
  - Project 1B – Spatial Data Inventory and Data Assembly
  - Project 1C – Regional Competitive Analysis

- Project 1C was established to provide the Board with an evidence based analysis of the unique strengths and related opportunities for the region to assist in understanding the global competitiveness of the region.

- Sift Every Thing is an Economic Analysis and Market Intelligence Company uniquely positioned to bring the region’s strengths, opportunities and challenges to light in an effective and compelling manner to inform the Growth Plan update.

- The intent of the project is on creating awareness, understanding and acceptance of the strengths of the different industry sectors of the region and sub regions and what it takes to be globally successful.

- The key outcomes of Project 1C include:
  - Clear evidence to inform the Growth Plan and strategic priorities of the Board going forward;
Growth Plan Update Task Force
Recommendation

to the Capital Region Board

• Clear economic data and analysis that can be leveraged by each member municipality to help respond to regional opportunities; and
• Clear focus for the Board in terms of where to invest resources to support economic prosperity and regional sustainability.

This mid-term report provides the Board with the early insights and observations that will inform the final analysis and report due in November.

Attachments:
1. Draft mid-term Report – Project 1C - Advantages and Competitiveness of the Capital Region
Advantages and Competitiveness of the Capital Region

MID-TERM REPORT

August 18, 2014
INTRODUCTION

This project is about identifying the unique strengths of the region and understanding how those advantages create opportunities for its 24 municipalities. Our analysis provides clear evidence of the region’s jurisdictional advantages. Its economic growth is testament to the attractiveness of these strengths. But, with no clear regional voice, sub-regional turf wars erode the region’s global relevance.

We’re two-thirds of the way through our analytical process. So far, we’ve interviewed 77 executives, have gathered most of the data we need, and are in the process of integrating the interviews and analytical results. This is a mid-term report.

For this project, we’ve used three analytical tools:

- Jurisdictional Advantage Assessment provides an analytical measure of regional strengths that determine investment success. The process leverages Sift Every Thing’s Market Intelligence database. The database is built from 833 one-on-one interviews with executives of Western Canadian and international companies. We use it to identify potential areas of advantage. Our database is supplemented by executive interviews tailored to this project. In these we’ve focused on areas where the region’s unique advantages create economic opportunities. Interview results are tested against our 72 proprietary indicators. This provides an evidence-based assessment of core strengths, related barriers, and emerging opportunities. Jurisdictional Advantage Assessment interviews and data provide the foundation for the rest of our analytical process. The assessment identifies the:
  - Capacities, supporting infrastructure, available resources, and economic ecosystem that combine to influence regional economic success;
  - Barriers and gaps that threaten investments or inhibit market opportunities; and
  - Evidence needed to focus on a few investment areas and defend that focus from unfiltered flash options.
- Systemic Competitiveness Analysis is the battlefront of modern global markets. More than the individual competitiveness of firms, it is competitive regional systems that create access to markets and opportunities for innovation. In the last 3.5 years, we’ve interviewed more than 800 executives about their corporate priorities, key barriers, and future opportunities. Keystone companies in Western Canada say they’re sensitive to the systemic competitiveness of regions. It’s the top driver in investment decisions. As a group, these executives clearly see the critical importance of competitive access to resources and inputs, regulations, infrastructure, taxes, and incentives. But companies find it difficult to translate the tangible impact of government activities in these areas. And governments struggle to model and benchmark the dynamics they manage. Clear evidence on value chains helps illustrate both the good and bad consequences of systemic decisions. Systemic Competitiveness Analysis identifies:

  - Areas where value chains are successfully encouraged by existing programs. It also clearly outlines those areas where better programs are needed.
  - Program incentives that drive or inhibit economic opportunities. It examines the strengths and unintended consequences of government policies.
  - The impact of the region’s competitive position on corporate decisions. Is there a clear link between the priorities of municipalities and the incentives their programs create? How closely aligned are corporate executives and government decision makers in the data they use to make choices and judge success?
  - Evidence that tests the impact of fiscal policies on the costs of doing business, tax structure, innovation investments, infrastructure challenges, labour advantages, productivity performance, and regulatory structure.

- Global Scans integrate the results of the Jurisdictional Advantage Assessment and Systemic Competitiveness tools to search the world for other jurisdictions with similar strengths. They find alternative economic development options and systemic structures being pursued in other places. We compare regions to provide examples of tangible outcomes and strategic results. Global Scans identify alternative investment paths and investment criteria and bring back lessons learned.
CONCESSIONS AND CAVEATS

We’re not done our work. We’ll be working through our analytical results until mid-October. The project is scheduled to finish mid-November.

We use a triangulation process to test the veracity of the intelligence we’ve gathered. This approach allows us to prioritize issues and focus on areas where the data connects to issues discussed by both executives and mayors. Sometimes, for example, mayors will raise an issue on which data is available, but which no executives discussed. If we can find three points within one intelligence source (in this example, three mayors) plus a complementary point of evidence among other sources (the data), we’ll still screen it in.

The point of bringing this up is that we aren’t done triangulating yet. Still, we understand that the region is moving forward on issues where our work is relevant. We know decision makers continue to move even before all the available intelligence is in hand.

So we’ve made a concession in creating this mid-term report, in spite of our process. It comes with some caveats, though. Reader, beware:

- Below we discuss issues that don’t yet have the full support of our process.
- We’re willing to do so with the caveat that our process might identify more important issues or, worse, prove that some of the issues flagged here aren’t nearly as important as they seem now.
BRILLIANCE AND SHADOW

Where there is light, there is shadow. This project is a study of both. The Capital Region’s greatest strengths are often the source of its greatest challenges.

The region’s core engine is oil and gas. Energy drives this economy. Immigrants and new companies, drawn by growth, come here and find several kinds of municipalities (counties, villages, towns, small and large cities) that offer an attractive range of options. All of this is anchored by the infrastructure that’s been built to support oil, gas, and the value chains around these sectors. Each of these strengths is brilliant—but also offset by shadows.

OIL AND GAS

Brilliance: Core economic engine

The core engine of the Capital Region’s economy is oil and gas. The dominance of the energy sector drives vibrant, supportive supply chains.

Data for the last three years shows oil sands, pipelines, oil and gas, and petrochemicals, comprising at least 75 per cent of all major project investments in the province.\(^1\) For 2014, the province is reporting $223 billion in its project inventory.

Just under 30 per cent of provincial GDP was generated by the sector in 2013.\(^2\) No other sector came close to this GDP figure.\(^3\)

\(^1\) Government of Alberta. 2014. Inventory of Major Projects.
\(^2\) Statistics Canada. Table 379-0028 - Gross domestic product (GDP) at basic prices, by North American Industry Classification System (NAICS), provinces and territories, annual (percentage share).
\(^3\) This combines the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes 211, 2121, 21229, 21311A, 2211, 2212, 32411, 32419, 486.
About one per cent of companies in the Capital Region were directly engaged in oil and gas production in 2013. Executives say a large portion of the 20,000 businesses in construction, manufacturing, professional/technical services, and transportation and warehousing are integrated with the sector. Even if we take out construction (which is often residential in nature), Beaumont, Calmar, Devon, Leduc, and Lamont show more than 30 per cent of their labour force employed in areas often related to energy.

**Shadow: Need for diversification**

The economy is driven by oil and gas, but many mayors and executives question the region’s dependence on one sector. Without diversification, they think the economy is vulnerable.

It’s true that the economic growth built on oil and gas is eating up resources needed to diversify away from it. It absorbs available labour. It eats up extremely productive agricultural land. This land is needed to produce food and, perhaps more importantly, offset the region’s corroded global reputation. Executives and mayors see food production and sustainable agriculture as assets for pushing back the shadow of dirty oil.

A stronger reputation might encourage tourism. Edmonton’s share of Alberta-destined tourism has hovered around 22 per cent since 2006. In 2012, 6.5 million visits were reported for the region (84% of these were other Albertans). International tourists (U.S. and overseas) totalled 242,000. That’s just short of half the number of international visits reported in 2006 (468,000). We’re not suggesting this drop in international visitors is directly related to the region’s oil and gas reputation, but executives say tourism depends on a strong, clear, and attractive image the region hasn’t got.

---

4 Custom data from the Canadian Business Pattern Database. 2014.
5 Sift Every Thing executive interviews. 2014.
The supply chain that feeds oil and gas is overwhelmed. We’ve done previous work around productivity related to heavy industrial construction. From 2005 to 2010, average labour productivity in Alberta’s construction sector fell by 22 per cent. Gross domestic product per hour worked, for 2012, was $48.50 in transportation, $50.20 in construction, $64.60 in manufacturing, and $100.80 in finance. Oil and gas, the driver of this pressure, is heavily capitalized. Its massive investments in equipment and machines encourage productivity. Its employees produce $425 per hour. If oil and gas is excluded, Alberta’s labour productivity was $51.30 per hour, just slightly above the Canadian average of $47.70.

Executives of heavy industry feel well understood by municipalities. But they’re concerned that growth in oil and gas will overstretch the supply chain. They warned us that municipal governments need to understand this pressure, draw new workers to the region and keep existing ones, and beef up their knowledge of construction and manufacturing (which, the executives argue, is woefully thin).

Manufacturers, in particular, feel ignored by the decisions, tax pressure, and priorities of municipal governments. Mayors talked about the need for high-tech industries; the reality is that 39 per cent of manufacturing jobs in the Capital Region were in high-tech areas in 2011. But that’s down from 43 per cent in 2006. Statistics Canada’s Occupation Demand Outlook suggests this downward pressure is likely to continue. The labour force in these categories was down by about 12 per cent (5,000 jobs) even though wages were up by 40 per cent and now average $70,000 per year.

Executives argue that for municipalities to respond to the pressure that rapid economic growth creates, they need to become more sophisticated, proactive, and engaged with the industries their decisions impact.

---


9 Statistics Canada. 2012. GDP at basic prices in 2007 constant dollars.

10 Custom Data, Statistics Canada Labour Force and Income at 4-Digit NAICS. 2014. Obtained from Natural Resources Canada.

11 Medium tech roles made up another 32 per cent.

ONE REGION, MANY MUNICIPALITIES

Brilliance: Diversity of residential and industrial options

Executives are very confident in the residential and industrial real estate options in the region. Unlike the municipalities, which are constrained to options within their borders, companies have a holistic view of the region and feel they’ve got the flexibility needed to take advantage of their opportunities. None of the executives we interviewed were worried about the availability of land in the region.

It was a surprise for us to hear how satisfied companies are with their relationship with local universities and NAIT. This isn’t often the case. There’s the usual complaint that schools can’t keep pace with industrial change, but overall the companies agree these institutions remain valuable.

The mayors we interviewed assured us that industry locates where it feels its needs are met. The executives agreed and said they see a range of possible options, within the region, that meet their current strategic needs. None of them felt that the region wasn’t able to accommodate their growth requirements.

Shadow: Fragmented visions, constrained borders

Almost every one of the 77 executives we interviewed commented on the lack of cooperation among regional municipalities. The most punishing leaders spoke about the naivety of competing municipally on a global stage. Going to international (or even national) trade shows and vying for the attention of industry at a municipal level is, from the perspective of these executives, amateur at best.

---

13 Some are concerned by the shortage in affordable housing.

14 But they worry about finding the labour and infrastructure to support future growth. We cover both below.
The universities and college, so beloved by industry, described the frustration they feel when pursued by Capital Region municipalities to build locations outside of Edmonton. They said these requests ignore the economies of scale and advantages of concentration that easily overwhelm anything gained by dispersing their physical presence throughout the region.

We’ve already mentioned manufacturers who feel they’re misunderstood and ignored by their municipalities. To this we add heavy industries that see residential encroachment on the setbacks they were promised as a bit of bait and switch. If they’d known that long-term safety and future growth opportunities would be compromised for the sake of incremental development gains, they would have located their massive capital investments elsewhere.

These misunderstandings are symptomatic of a larger strategic issue that we’re not satisfied we’ve had enough time to analyze. From here it seems there’s a disconnect between the temporal needs of companies and the ability of municipalities to meet those needs. For example, several of the companies we interviewed spoke about the value they place on being distanced from residents who might otherwise complain about noise. For the sake of isolation, these companies are willing to look past the gravel roads, commute times, and lack of services that come with the territory. But it’s obvious to everyone that this is just a short-term situation.

As the area develops, paved roads will be needed. Services will be added. The companies that value isolation will be expected to help pay for these investments. But some won’t want them. Tensions will mount. As we’ve seen above, companies that located here with an interest in the setbacks they were promised now feel those commitments are threatened. There are situations like this all over the region.

The point is, things change. What works today likely won’t work several years from now. Standing back, as municipalities, and believing industry will locate where its needs are met ignores the reality that the needs companies have today often won’t be their most important future needs. Mayors might argue that these are issues that companies themselves need to navigate, but that argument ignores how quickly corporate needs become political concerns. Look at the heavy industrial bridges everyone so
clearly sees the need for now. Who’s going to pay for them? These concerns were merely industrial interests, now they’re political issues.

**ATTRACTIVE TO IMMIGRANTS**

**Brilliance: Growing waves of immigrants and foreign workers**

In Canada, Alberta has the highest concentration of foreign workers (42% of total immigration and two times more skilled workers than Ontario).\(^{15}\) In 2012, 84,500 foreign temporary workers were employed in the province. There were 670 per cent more foreign workers here in 2012 than in 2005. From 2011 to 2012 alone, employment of foreign workers grew by 100 per cent.

Edmonton and the municipalities around it attract about 30 per cent of Alberta-destined immigrants each year.\(^{16}\) Its regional share is increasing while Calgary’s falls. The Capital Region enjoyed growth from 27 per cent in 2001 to 34 per cent in 2012 while immigration to Calgary fell from 63 per cent to 52 per cent.

The region is attracting highly skilled, internationally networked immigrants and foreign workers. Relative to Canada, Alberta gets about 44 per cent of skilled foreign workers. From 2007 to 2012, the ratio of skilled to unskilled labour coming into the province increased from 33 per cent to 49 per cent.

---


\(^{16}\) Statistics Canada. Table 051-0063 - Components of population growth by census division, sex and age group for the period from July 1 to June 30, based on the Standard Geographical Classification (SGC) 2011, annual (persons).
Shadow: Serendipity is no substitute for intention

Labour is the number one concern among executives, and the region is deeply vulnerable to changes in federal regulation of foreign workers. To deal with this threat, executives say the region needs to embrace “immigration greatness.” In the same way that we’re proud of our ability to drill wells, we must become proud of our ability to encourage immigrants to stay.

In a 2012 review of immigration in Canada, Edmonton and Toronto were the only two cities with formal immigration and settlement policies.\(^{17}\) Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, and the Peel Region had active council advisory bodies in this area. Calgary (ISCC), Edmonton (ERIEC), and Toronto/Peel Region (TRIEC) participate in multisectoral coalitions to address labour market issues. Vancouver and Abbotsford were the only cities to adopt provincial multicultural policies.

Where Vancouver itself drew 31,000 immigrants in 2011, Alberta attracted 37,000.

This deep, pervasive need for labour wasn’t really a focus issue among the mayors we interviewed. Those conversations centred on the need to attract industry and industrial tax dollars. Yet municipalities hold nearly all the cards needed to coax foreign workers to immigrate. If the region intends to follow its current path of economic growth, mayors and executives need to connect on this hypercritical constraint. It’s the place and not the companies that will keep the people the region needs.

ANCHORED BY INFRASTRUCTURE: THE REGION’S GREATEST ASSET—AND GREATEST CHALLENGE

Brilliance: Converging resource channels

All of the executives we interviewed in heavy industry knew, by heart, the region’s infrastructure statistics. Miles of pipeline that end up in the region. Miles more that run to markets. All of them talked about the trucks and rails being used to pull pressure off the region’s need for more pipes.

Of the $193 billion to be invested in major projects in 2012, $21 billion was located in Edmonton.¹⁸ This year, the inventory for Alberta is at $223 billion. In just three years, the inventory grew by $30 billion.

We haven’t got statistics for all the municipalities, just Edmonton, but even there the investment is significant. From the $120 million invested in roads and transit in 2000, investment increased to $535 million in 2011. The province and region’s investment in building the Anthony Henday is seen as a vital success. More is needed, and executives say the value is proven.

These infrastructure investments anchor energy’s relevance in the local economy. Its supply chains in transportation, logistics, manufacturing, professional services, and finance have grown up as a result.

Shadow: Bottlenecked by past choices

Mayors see pipelines as both a bane and a boon. The region’s high concentration of pipelines (which also run to and from individual industrial sites) means the land they run under is sterilized. Executives and mayors alike recognize the need for cooperative pipeline corridors. But so far, at least from the perspective of executives, that cooperation isn’t taking place.

Similarly, commuter and industrial traffic is creating congestion concerns. Skilled workers who move away from the region often cite congestion. It’s also a safety issue. The problem is only exacerbated by the wait times caused by increased use of rail to transport regional energy products.

While infrastructure anchors the region, it’s also the focus of the most strident demands. Heavy-load bridges, rail access, more pipelines, and protected industrial setbacks were a major focus in most interviews. The critical need for infrastructure to support economic growth drives our comments on the need for strategic development above. This need can’t be taken care of as it happens. It must be intentional and anticipatory.

**BORDERS, POLICY INTELLIGENCE, AND COMPETITION**

In 2013, the OECD published *Region and Innovation: Collaborating across Borders.* Based on analysis of six regional case studies, they’ve begun to advocate intelligent cross-border instruments. Public funding models stop at borders, but economic opportunities don’t.

Regulations, tax mechanisms, and the varying sophistication of neighbouring jurisdictions encourage municipal competition. Yet the real competition is global, not regional. Companies are indifferent to these political borders but not the turmoil they create. Ambivalent executives think inter-municipal battles are amusing, but most say such conflict is having direct and negative consequences in the economy. Companies say that municipalities’ vying for access to land and industrial real estate is stalling their investment choices.

Executives think it’s important that mayors pay careful attention to options for municipal specialization. Not every municipality is relevant to industrial real estate needs. Yet most municipalities have roles to play in the housing, entertainment, and service of

---

the economy. Competition ignores the opportunity to fill unique roles and benefit from cooperation. The municipal funding structure favours a single, industry-heavy model. That structure is broken.

Small is beautiful

Small villages and towns are attractive to two unique kinds of industrial players.

Transportation companies are attracted by the space offered by smaller municipalities with available land. They like accessing trade routes without the congestion that comes with being located near highly populated areas.\textsuperscript{20}

Small places are also attractive to niche companies. We interviewed four niche-oriented companies for this project and have interviewed many more for other work. These companies describe themselves as location indifferent. As destination businesses, they offer specialized products and great service, and can compete even though they’re difficult to reach. Internationally oriented niche companies can ship from a village just as easily as from a city. With dominant market shares, they value uncontested access to the local labour force over the advantages they’d get from being more central to the region.

These companies did flag an important issue. As some of the most important taxpayers in their municipality, they argue they should have a clearer voice in local economic choices. Leaving them out of municipal decisions can undermine their commitment to stay. They also argue that small places need to work harder at understanding the needs of niche businesses and actively advancing their interests. They all had lists of other municipalities working hard to attract companies like theirs. They notice and tell people with similar business needs.

\textsuperscript{20} A few more minutes on a truck or in a railcar makes nearly no difference in their business.
Heavy weight of industrial interests

Heavy industrial players, with their massive sunk capital commitments, warn that regional strife is derailing expansion and follow-on investment. For companies aren’t headquartered in the region the municipal volatility is concerning. The few that are headquartered here say it erodes their credibility.

Companies take a provincial, national, and international view. Municipal governments need to as well. For this to happen, the working sets of incentives need to change.

Executives argue for cooperative mechanisms, like the joint ventures they use. Working together can reduce risk and increase gains. It rewards partners for their uniqueness rather than wasting internal resources to match the strengths of their competitors.

For municipalities to do this, they need to see the world beyond their borders. With a clear regional voice and a unified position, municipalities can share the larger benefit of working together. In our interviews, we asked whether anyone knew of a mechanism, deliberately and transparently designed, that encourages municipalities to cooperate and allows them to share the result. No one has seen anything like that.21

We’re convinced that this is the keystone issue of the region. We need to bring together a sophisticated, small group of 1) open-minded politicians, 2) aggressive lawyers, 3) experienced economic developers, and 4) deeply respected business leaders to hammer out a simple, deliberate, and transparent mechanism for sharing municipal revenue pools across borders. For now, from here, this appears to be the most important step the region can take toward pursuing its potential.

21 We’ve seen, and heard executives describe, the cooperative groups of municipalities within the region. The cooperation of Parkland County, Stony Plain, and Spruce Grove is widely admired and thought of as progressive. Small places like Breton, Warburg, Thorsby, and Calmar are working together on shared issues. The Industrial Heartland is a brilliant example of what can be achieved by working together to meet the needs of heavy industry. But, even among these groups, there remain concerns about inequality, unbalanced partnerships, and less-than-transparent allocation of costs and benefits. This is why we’ve advocated for simplicity and transparency.
Plan Review and Policy Evaluation

Motion

That the Capital Region Board receive the draft final report for the Plan Review and Policy Evaluation (Project 1A) and endorse it as the basis for undertaking the Growth Plan Update.

Background

- On July 13, 2013, the Board accepted the Project Charter identifying the approach, process, planning timelines and high level outcomes for updating the Capital Region Board’s growth management plan – Growing Forward.

- Following the review of the CRB Committee Structure in the fall of 2013, the Board established a Task Force to oversee the updating of the Growth Plan by December 2015. To support the Task Force from a technical perspective, the CRB CEO established a Technical Advisory Committee of 4 senior administrative planners from the region and 2 consultants as strategic advisors.

- CRB administration recommended a Program approach to updating the Plan consistent with the four Phases identified in the Project Charter: Phase 1 - Background and Foundation, Phase 2 - Policy Development and Update, Phase 3 - Implementation Plan and Phase 4 - Communications Plan. Phase 1 would be divided into three distinct projects:
  - Project 1A – Plan Review and Policy Evaluation
  - Project 1B – Spatial Data Inventory and Data Assembly
  - Project 1C – Regional Competitive Analysis

- Project 1A is foundational work that will inform future phases of the Update. The recommendations are intended to provide the Task Force with advice on how to proceed with the update of the plan to address gaps in policy and implementation, and improve the overall effectiveness of the plan.

- Work for Project 1A began in March 2014 with the hiring of the project consultants. The consultant team of ISL Engineering & Land Services and Urban Strategies Inc. (Consultant Team) was awarded the Project 1A consulting contract.

- On June 25, 2014, the Consultant Team presented a draft Contextual Analysis to update the Task Force on the changes in the Region since the Growth Plan was approved and reveal their preliminary Findings based on precedent research, consultations with the CAOs, and from the consultant’s review of the plan and evaluation of the policies. Since then the Findings, Contextual Analysis and draft Recommendations have undergone additional refinement based on a round table
consultation with the CAOs on July 24, 2014. The feedback from the CAOs was supportive of the Findings and draft Recommendations.

• On August 14, 2014, the Consultant Team presented the draft Contextual Analysis and Findings to the Board for review and input. The Board was in general agreement with the Findings.

• The final report includes 15 Recommendations for approaching the update of the Growth Plan based on the Contextual Analysis and the final Findings of the Consultant Team. The Recommendations identify a range of issues and opportunities to be considered as part of the next phases of work of the Growth Plan Update – Phase 2 – Growth Plan Update and Development and Phase 3 – Implementation Plan.

• The recommendations respond to the following key questions:
  ▪ WHY we need a Growth Plan?
  ▪ HOW to create the Growth Plan?
  ▪ WHAT should be addressed in the Growth Plan?
  ▪ WHAT the Growth Plan should look like?
  ▪ HOW to mange growth over time?

• On September 4, 2014, the Growth Plan Task Force approved this report and recommended it be presented to the Capital Region Board for its endorsement as the basis for undertaking the Growth Plan Review.

Attachments:
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Alberta’s Capital Region is at a critical juncture. The Capital Region Board (CRB) faces an important choice about how to manage growth and change in the future. The cumulative effects of rapid growth over the coming decades can either be directed in a coordinated manner to strengthen the Capital Region, or if left unbridled, these effects will impact the quality of life, prosperity and diverse offerings enjoyed today.

The Capital Region Growth Plan has a key role to play to manage high levels of growth and rapidly changing landscapes. The Growth Plan Update process is an important opportunity to build upon the strengths of the current Plan, engage in dialogue around challenging regional growth issues, and substantively strengthen the Plan’s policies and implementation mechanisms, so that growth contributes to a strong, healthy and globally competitive region.
Why Regional Growth Management is Important in the Capital Region

The Capital Region is a dynamic and rapidly growing region in terms of population and employment growth, both historically and projecting forward. By 2044, the Capital Region is projected to have over two million people and one million jobs – the size today of Metro Vancouver, Portland and Denver. This represents an average growth rate of 30,000 new people and 13,000 new jobs a year. As is clear from regions of this scale and critical mass, the key question is no longer IF we need a growth plan, but why we cannot afford to NOT effectively manage growth. The success of the City of Edmonton and the Capital Region is critical not only to the member municipalities, but also as a significant economic generator at the provincial and national levels.

In this context, effectively managing growth over the coming decades is important to:

• Efficiently build infrastructure and servicing at a pace that keeps up with growth, but to also maintain and expand it in a financially sustainable manner over time;
• Optimize the regional economic advantage by working together as one Region rather than competing with one another in the national and global marketplace;
• Anticipate and respond to the cumulative impacts of growth, such as increased commute times, availability of potable water, clean air, and the loss of some of the Region’s best agricultural land;
• Plan for the resiliency necessary to respond to significant shifts in current economic drivers; and
• Leverage senior government funding for regional infrastructure by collaborating and speaking with one collective regional voice.

What Is Needed To Manage Growth

As the Capital Region grows, member municipalities will be faced with service demands and expectations that they have not historically had to address. This includes access to potable water, clean air, high quality local food sources, the provision of schools, transit service, recreational facilities, police and fire stations. As communities age, they will be increasingly faced with diminishing infrastructure capacity, and escalating infrastructure renewal costs that will compete with growth related expenditures, or demand consideration of different service levels.

In order to address these key challenges the Capital Region Growth Plan needs to:

• Determine where population and employment growth should be located relative to existing, planned and future infrastructure as well as existing natural heritage assets and man-made constraints;
• Determine the nature and density of residential, commercial and industrial development relative to infrastructure, land consumption, loss of agricultural land and valued natural assets;
• Determine an appropriate mix of transportation facilities and services to effectively serve the mobility and accessibility needs of the Region;
• Establish a regional framework for employment clusters to support and strengthen the Region’s competitive edge on the national and global marketplace;
• Clarify the role of agriculture in the Region, and in particular define what and where the disposition and protection of agricultural lands is appropriate; and
• Set the framework for the streamlined coordination of infrastructure implementation, recognizing the distorting effects of differing cost structures, funding mechanisms and revenue sharing mechanisms for member municipalities in the Region.
Why The Plan Needs To Be Updated

The 2009 Growth Plan was a critical step to re-institute growth management in the Capital Region. The Plan was prepared, as mandated by the Province, in response to a pattern of uncoordinated growth and infrastructure investment in the Capital Region, and elsewhere in the Province. The Plan established a solid foundation of regional principles and policies, initiated regional collaboration and cooperation and introduced innovative mechanisms, such as the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) process, residential density targets and Priority Growth Areas (PGAs). Over the past five years, the CRB and its member municipalities have worked with the Plan. This work has revealed shortcomings that have impeded the Board’s ability to effectively manage and facilitate growth in the Region. In June 2013, the Capital Region Board prepared a Project Charter that outlines a high level scope and key gaps that need to be addressed in the legislated five year review of the Growth Plan.

The CRB is undertaking the Growth Plan Update in multiple phases, to be completed by December 2015. Project 1A, the focus of this report, is the Growth Plan Review. The Review of the Growth Plan, undertaken by Urban Strategies Inc. and ISL Engineering Land Services Ltd., included an objective evaluation of the overall Plan, principles, policies and implementation mechanisms, and precedent research on other North American regional growth management approaches. The Review identified the Plan’s strengths, areas for improvement and key gaps to inform the scope and mandate of the Update process. The Plan’s strengths create a strong policy foundation for the Plan Update, and include the following:

• Visions and regional strategies for land use, transit, affordable housing and geo-spatial information gathering;
• Principles that provide a solid basis to plan for future growth and development;
• New regional land use provisions, particularly focused on residential growth;
• Identification of key transportation and transit networks and future regional water and wastewater infrastructure investments;
• An innovative regional needs-based affordable housing strategy;
• Foundations for a regional geo-spatial database; and
• An emerging culture of regional collaboration.

Together these strengths provide a critical starting point for managing growth in the Capital Region. However, as can be evidenced from precedent regional growth plans across North America, effective growth management takes time to evolve and effectively implement. In the case of Portland Oregon, the growth management strategy continues to evolve and be strengthened even after forty years. In the Capital Region, the Plan is only five years old.

What The Growth Plan Update Should Consider

Key Findings

In addition to the strengths identified above, the Project 1A Key Findings identify a series of key gaps and areas for improvement to the Plan. These include:

• The Growth Plan lacks a clear imperative and a cohesive vision for managing growth in the Region.
• The principles and policies do not recognize the full diversity within the Capital Region.
• The Growth Plan lacks an integrated Growth Plan Concept, limiting the ability to align growth patterns with infrastructure plans and investment.
• The Growth Plan does not effectively address regional economic competitiveness as a key driver for growth and prosperity in the Region.
• The absence in provincial direction creates gaps in critical areas such as agricultural land, water and air quality, affordable housing, employment and infrastructure.
• The Growth Plan consists of a large “family” of eleven documents that are difficult to navigate, understand and interpret.
• There is a need to better address the key challenges to Growth Plan success, including those related to governance, funding and collaboration.
• The Growth Plan’s implementation mechanisms are not explicit and are not integrated within the overall Plan framework, in particular, mechanisms related to progress indicators, approval processes, amendments, and regional stakeholder engagement.
Recommendations from the Review

On the basis of the Key Findings, a substantive update to the current Growth Plan is needed to ensure the Capital Region pro-actively responds, and has the right policy and implementation tools to capitalize on the dynamic and rapid scale of projected growth over the next thirty to fifty years. The Recommendations address the scope, approach and method for the Growth Plan Update. These Recommendations are structured to respond to the following key components.

**WHY we need a Growth Plan**

1. As a first step in the Update process, clearly define the Imperative for managing growth in the Capital Region.

**HOW we create the Growth Plan**

2. Take every opportunity to enhance collaboration with Capital Region communities.
3. Create a canvas of regional assets and determine strategies to build on the diversity of the Region.
4. Clearly articulate the scope and mandate for the Capital Region Growth Plan Update.
5. Engage senior levels of government early in the Growth Plan Update process and seek partnership opportunities.
6. Respond to the risks and challenges to successfully implement the Growth Plan including governance, funding and regional collaboration.

**WHAT should be addressed in the Growth Plan**

7. Ensure Growth Plan policies respond appropriately to the diverse contexts and scale of communities in the Region.
8. Introduce a Growth Plan Concept that delineates centres and corridors, infrastructure, employment areas and conservation areas.
9. Ensure the Growth Plan policies address the full spectrum of growth and land uses.
10. Advance and expand on existing residential growth targets.
11. Address key gaps in the Growth Plan including affordable housing, economic competitiveness, water and air quality, agricultural land and implementation mechanisms.
12. Emphasize the integration of land use, transportation and infrastructure planning as a fundamental growth management principle.

**WHAT the Growth Plan should look like**

13. Create a concise, clear and compelling Growth Plan document.

**HOW to manage growth over time**

14. Build the constituency in the Region that understands and supports growth management.
15. Establish the means to track progress, celebrate success and seek improvement in the Plan.

**Conclusion**

The 2009 Growth Plan provided a critical foundation for growth planning and regional collaboration. The Plan Update process is an important opportunity to substantively update the Plan to address key policy gaps, improve the structure and organization of the Plan, provide a greater level of substance and level of detail, set more progressive targets, and respond to the complexities and diversity of communities within the Capital Region.

The Growth Plan Update is also an opportunity to create a Plan authored by, and structured to meet the needs of the Capital Region. As a future region of over two million people and one million jobs, a Plan that pro-actively manages growth, coordinates infrastructure investment and enhances the economic competitiveness of the whole region will be key to the success and sustainability of the Capital Region.
The Growth Plan Update is not only an important challenge but also a critical opportunity for the Capital Region to craft a new Growth Plan that can best serve the needs of this dynamic and fast growing Region. Since the approval of the Growth Plan in 2010, the Capital Region continues to evolve and its physical landscape changes as the effects of new economic investment, changing settlement patterns and continual urbanization are felt.

With rapid growth in population and employment in the Region expected to continue over the next thirty years, it is now imperative that the Growth Plan be reviewed and refreshed to pro-actively manage the increasing pressure on regional infrastructure, agricultural land base and natural systems. The Growth Plan has an important role to advance the Capital Region’s position in an increasingly competitive global marketplace, while maintaining the high quality of life and opportunity offered within the Region today.

Over the past five years, the Capital Region Board (CRB) and its member municipalities have worked with the existing Growth Plan. This work has revealed shortcomings that have impeded the Board’s ability to actively manage and facilitate growth in the Region. For these reasons, it is now timely that the CRB embark on a critical review and update of the Plan.

The CRB is undertaking a phased approach to prepare the Growth Plan Update, consisting of multiple phases and a series of separate but inter-related components. A Project Charter, accepted by the Board in July 2013, and endorsed by the Region’s CAOs, described the scope, process and deliverables for the 2015 Growth Plan Update. From this basis, the purpose of Project 1A was to conduct a thorough review of the existing Growth Plan.

The Review involved the following:

- **Precedent Research** - researching and comparing the Growth Plan with other regional plans in North America including indicators and progress reporting mechanisms;
- **Contextual Analysis** – identifying and reviewing key contextual drivers and areas of change in the Capital Region;
- **Growth Plan Evaluation** – reviewing and evaluating the existing Plan’s components, including the principles and policies within each component, identifying the Plan’s strengths, weaknesses and policy gaps for further consideration; and
- **Recommendations** – preparing a set of recommendations, identifying areas that should be included in the next phases of the Growth Plan Update and policy measures that would improve the effectiveness of the Growth Plan.
The results of the evaluation process have been synthesized into eight Key Findings. The Key Findings summarize the outcomes from the evaluation process, build on the input from the CAO stakeholder interviews, and incorporate feedback from the CRB’s Regional Technical Advisory Committee and the Growth Plan Update Task Force.

Building and responding to these Key Findings, the Consultant team prepared Recommendations for the Plan Update. These Recommendations identify key components and considerations for the Growth Plan Update process. The intent of the Recommendations is to outline a range of approaches to address these issues as part of the next phases of the Growth Plan Update.

1.3 The Team

The Project Team for Project 1A was multidisciplinary, and consisted of:

- **CRB Project Manager and Administration** to oversee the planning, execution and completion of the project;
- **Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC)** made up of senior planners from the Region, to provide guidance on process and input to key deliverable;
- **The Consultant Team** - ISL Engineering and Land Services Ltd. and Urban Strategies Inc., to conduct the Plan review, evaluation and prepare recommendations for the Plan Update; and
- **Strategic Advisors** - subject matter experts in their field, to provide observations about the existing Plan, including:
  - Joe Berridge of Urban Strategies Inc. – expertise in North American and European regional growth management trends and best practices;
  - Darrell Toma of Toma & Boma Management Consultants – expertise in economic development and agriculture;
  - Enid Slack of University of Toronto’s Institute on Municipal Finance and Governance – expertise in sustainable municipal financing of capital infrastructure; and
  - Ed Starr of SHS Consulting - expertise in affordable housing.

**Stakeholder Consultation** - The Growth Plan Review and Evaluation included two rounds of consultation with CAOs from the member municipalities. In the first round, the CAOs participated in semi-structured individual interviews and provided their insights into the key issues for consideration in the review process. The CAOs provided input on the strengths, challenges and gaps of the Plan and provided the Consultant Team with a deeper understanding of the Region and its challenges. In the second round, CAOs provided feedback on the draft Key Findings and Recommendations.
2.0 OUR REVIEW AND FINDINGS

This Section includes a summary of the Review Findings, including the outcomes of the Contextual Analysis and the Key Findings from the qualitative evaluation of the Growth Plan.
2.1 Understanding the Region: Contextual Analysis

Understanding how the Capital Region has grown is an important first step towards identifying a vision for growth, and identifying choices about where and how the Capital Region should grow.

A History of Rapid Regional Growth

Over the past forty years, the Capital Region has nearly doubled in population, from approximately 560,000 to 1,320,000. In 1974, most cities and towns had less than half of their land area developed. At that point in the Region’s history, there were vast areas of undeveloped lands separating towns and cities from each other. Small urban municipalities closest to Edmonton, such as Leduc, Spruce Grove, Stony Plain, Fort Saskatchewan, Beaumont and Morinville, were in their relative infancy in terms of size and diversity of land uses. The industrial areas of Acheson, Nisku and Alberta’s Industrial Heartland were only a patchwork of lands devoted to industrial uses.

By 1994, the Region’s population had grown to 880,000 with most growth occurring in towns and cities. In most of these communities, the developed lands started to exceed the remaining vacant lands. Communities that were in their infancy in 1974, were clearly well established and on a growth trajectory in terms of their size and the variety of development within their boundaries. The industrial areas outside Edmonton were clearly gaining critical mass as recognizable clusters of industrial activity of some scale. By 1994, the metropolitan structure had become clearly recognizable as a central large city with three highway corridors radiating out to smaller centres: Highway 16 to Spruce Grove and Stony Plain to the west, Highway 15 to Fort Saskatchewan and Alberta’s Industrial Heartland to the northeast and the Queen Elizabeth 2 Highway to Leduc the south.

Historic consumption of land in the Capital Region’s urban communities and employment areas through the subdivision registration process in 1974, 1994 and 2014.

Sources: AltaLIS cadastral mapping and City of Edmonton parcel mapping
Today, with an estimated regional population of 1,132,000 the Capital Region has matured to the point where many towns and cities are "bursting at the seams" and running out of land to grow their residential, commercial and industrial bases. This is the case for Edmonton, Spruce Grove, Leduc, Fort Saskatchewan and Beaumont - three of which are contemplating annexation from their neighbouring rural municipalities. Another quite evident feature of the Region's metropolitan structure is the amount of undeveloped land separating the communities in the central portion of the Region has shrunk considerably. Today the three main industrial areas are highly developed and mature. There is no longer much vacant land between Edmonton and St. Albert and between Edmonton and Sherwood Park. The three highways radiating out from Edmonton are now more intensely lined with development, particularly to the south. In light of these trends, the Capital Region faces important choices and decisions about where and how to grow.

Over this forty year period, the average annual population growth rates for the Capital Region have varied from 0.5 to 3.8%. The growth rate for each member municipality varies considerably. Between 2006 and 2011, the municipalities experiencing the greatest growth rates are within the outer ring of suburban communities, including Beaumont, Fort Saskatchewan, Leduc, Morinville, Spruce Grove and Stony Plain. However, the smaller municipalities of Bon Accord, Lamont County and Redwater have experienced modest population decline since 2006 despite experiencing increases in dwellings.
Diversity of Communities

The population distribution in the Capital Region varies greatly across the different member municipalities. The majority of the Region’s population is concentrated in the City of Edmonton, with over 800,000 people. The City has nearly ten times the population of the next largest municipality, Strathcona County. The population distribution reflects the historical urban growth pattern in the Region. The City of Edmonton has historically grown around a strong urban core, offering cultural amenities, educational and economic opportunities, and is supported by a mix of social and physical infrastructure.

Population of CRB Member Municipalities

Population & Lifecycles across the Region

In terms of the Region’s distribution of population by age, the City of Edmonton has the highest proportion of people aged 20 to 34, and 75 and over. The City provides strong post-secondary education opportunities, cultural and recreational amenities, and housing appropriate to income levels for younger adults. For those aged 75 and over, the City of Edmonton offers greater access to social and health services, and seniors and assisted housing.

The balance of the Region leads in the proportion of people aged 5 through 19 and 40 through 74, while other urban communities within PGAs lead in the 0 to 4 and 35 to 39 cohorts. This suggests that families prefer to live in smaller municipalities rather than in the City Edmonton, and that parents remain in these municipalities for a considerable amount of time after their children move from the nest. The other urban PGA communities align more closely with the balance of the Region in ages 5 through 19 while aligning more closely with Edmonton in ages 45 through 74.

Population by Age Cohort per 100,000 People, 2011

Sources: Statistics Canada (2011 census) and Strathcona County (2011 census breakdown for Sherwood Park)
The Region’s Existing and Future Employment Clusters

A number of key economic drivers in the Capital Region will be important components of the Region’s growth management strategy moving forward.

Today, the Region’s existing employment areas are located in major clusters. Nearly all of the Region’s commercial employment lands are located within urban communities, and concentrated in Downtown Edmonton, Sherwood Park and St. Albert’s urban core. Industrial employment lands are concentrated within the urban communities of Edmonton, Sherwood Park, Fort Saskatchewan, Leduc and Spruce Grove. Other significant employment nodes are within rural areas including Nisku, Acheson, Alberta’s Industrial Heartland and Sturgeon Industrial Park. Employment lands also concentrate around the Region’s airports, particularly the Edmonton International Airport, Villeneuve Airport and CFB/ASU Edmonton. Institutional employment lands, including post-secondary and healthcare campuses, are scattered throughout Edmonton’s urban communities. The vast majority of rural lands in the Capital Region are subject to various agricultural activities that generate employment. Lands in the peri-urban territories of urban municipalities are also subject to some agricultural activities. Coal extraction is focused on deposits in west-central Parkland County and northwest Leduc County, which further facilitates employment in power generation within these areas.

Approximately 90% of the Capital Region’s population is located within a one hour drive of Edmonton’s downtown core. One-way commutes to the downtown core from areas within Anthony Henday Drive are less than 40 minutes. Based on current trends, as the Region continues to grow outward, commute times will continue to increase.

The Capital Region has a large supply of unabsorbed designated employment lands, particularly in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland to the northeast, and around the Edmonton International Airport, Nisku and Leduc to the south. Planning for the future of these employment lands will be a critical component of the Growth Plan Update. It will be important to determine how much, and when these lands will be required to meet future employment demand. To advance the Region’s economic competitiveness, future growth patterns should consider capitalizing on key drivers, building on existing sectors, and tapping into emerging sectors.
Countryside and agricultural lands cover an extensive portion of the Capital Region. Historically, urban communities developed in areas within or near prime agricultural land, and along the North Saskatchewan River. Current growth trends represent a continuation of this pattern. The Region’s identified growth areas, including portions of the PGAs and CCRAs are located in areas classified as Better or Best Agricultural Land. Nearly 79% of the agricultural land located in the PGAs absorbed as of 2009, was classified as Better or Best Agricultural Land. Of the remaining unabsorbed land within PGAs, 81% was classified as Better or Best Agricultural Land.

Despite these trends, one of the existing Growth Plan’s principles is to preserve agricultural land, and the Plan includes policies to identify lands for preservation from future fragmentation and conversion to other uses. Further, all five counties within the Capital Region have policies to protect land with Canadian Land Inventory (CLI) agricultural soil capability ratings of at least Class 1 and 2 (Best Agricultural Land). As the Capital Region continues to grow, it will be critical to determine if, and how the Region will protect agricultural resources and enhance this asset.

Agricultural Soil Capability and Non-Agricultural Land Use, 2009

Sources: GeoGratis (Natural Resources Canada), AltaLIS cadastral mapping, City of Edmonton parcel mapping, and the Capital Region Board’s 2009 regional land supply analysis (as amended), compiled from member municipality land use bylaws, municipal development plans and area structure plans.
The Future Challenges

In 2014, the Capital Region has much to offer in terms of its economic, cultural, social and capital assets. By 2044, the Capital Region will grow to a metropolitan region of over two million people. It will be approximately the same size as Metro Vancouver, Portland and Denver are today.

As the Region grows to a size that puts it on a list of world scale city-regions, it will have to look more outwardly and position itself on that world stage. The addition of one million people and a half a million jobs will place an unprecedented level of demands on the Region’s hard and soft infrastructure. This will be accentuated by a much keener levels of interest from outside investment and business interests.

The Growth Plan Update needs to recognize this changing environment and create a policy foundation that will enable the Region as a whole to put its best foot forward in terms of its economic competitiveness, attraction of skilled labour, investment potential and outstanding quality of life.

As the Growth Plan is updated, considerable attention must be given as to how to channel the Region’s competitiveness and assets to enhance the overall Region’s prosperity and well-being. In a Region of over two million people and a million jobs, the member municipalities must learn to set aside self-interest and parochialism and embrace a high degree of regional collaboration as the operating norm.

The Growth Plan will ideally set out a policy framework that allows it to stand out in a crowded sea of global competitors. In order to do this, the Growth Plan will need to establish where new people and jobs will be located and what infrastructure will be needed to support them in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

A significant and compelling variable that is unfolding as the Region grows, is the increasing role that immigration will play in the rate of growth, and the living and working choices that new immigrants will make.

Regions of over two million people invariably struggle to provide services and meet the infrastructure demands of their citizens. As CRB member municipalities grow, they will be faced with increasing service demands and expectations that they have not historically had to address. This applies to access to potable water, clean air, a secure food source, provision of schools, transit service, recreational facilities, police and fire stations etc. As communities in the Region age, they will increasingly be faced with the diminishing capacity of existing infrastructure, escalating infrastructure renewal costs that will compete with growth related expenditures or demand consideration of different service levels.

The Growth Plan will need to:
- Determine where population and job growth should be effectively located relative to existing and future infrastructure as well as natural systems, agricultural land and man-made constraints
- Determine the nature and density of residential and commercial, industrial and recreational development relative to infrastructure, land consumption and impacts such as loss of agricultural land and valued natural assets.
- Determine an appropriate mix of transportation facilities and services that effectively serve the mobility and accessibility needs of the Region.
- Establish a regional framework for employment clusters to support and strengthen the Region’s competitive edge on the national and international stage.
- Clarify the role of agriculture in the Region, and in particular define what and where the disposition of agricultural land is appropriate.
- Set the foundation for a more streamlined coordination of infrastructure implementation that recognizes the distorting effects of differing cost structures, funding mechanisms and revenue sharing mechanisms.
2.2 Evaluation Findings

The 2009 Growth Plan set the foundation for a new era of regional planning and collaboration in the Capital Region. The CRB and its member municipalities have committed to an important and difficult task to complete the 2015 Growth Plan Update. This Plan Review provides an opportunity to critically evaluate the current Plan’s components, including the principles, policies, and to identify policy gaps and critical areas for further consideration during the Growth Plan Update.

**Strengths of the Growth Plan**

- The 2009 Growth Plan is an important starting point and sets the stage for collaboration and dialogue across a diverse Region of twenty-four municipalities.
- The CRB responded to the Provincial Capital Region Board Regulation, requiring the Plan to include the four principal components – a Land Use Plan, Housing Plan, Inter-municipal Transit Network Plan and Geographic Information Services Plan.
- The Plan includes discrete planning documents for each component, detailing a vision and strategies for each component. These documents together set an initial foundation for growth management in the Region.
- The Land Use Plan introduces a new regional land use perspective with a strong focus on residential growth. The set of six principles provides a solid basis to plan for future growth and development, and incorporate themes related to the environment, regional footprint, communities, transportation, water and wastewater services and regional economic development.
- The Inter-municipal Transit Network Plan, and the subsequent Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan make important advances to identify future transportation infrastructure investments on a regional scale.
- The Housing Plan promotes a strong regional perspective, integrates housing as a pillar of growth and development, and recommends an innovative regional needs-based housing projection model.
- The Geographic Information Services Plan provides the CRB the basis to make significant advances to compile a regional geo-spatial database. As the Plan Update progresses, this database has the potential to become a key implementation and monitoring tool for the CRB and its member municipalities.

Building on these foundational elements and strengths of the existing Plan, the following Key Findings focus on critical gaps and identify key areas to create a compelling, effective and implementable Plan.

Each Finding summarizes critical observations from the Review and Evaluation, including key challenges and gaps in the existing Plan, and concludes by highlighting areas for improvement. Examples from other North American regional growth plans provide insight and direction on how other jurisdictions address similar challenges and issues.
The Growth Plan lacks a clear imperative and a cohesive vision for managing growth in the Region.

In 2008, the Province of Alberta adopted the Capital Region Board Regulation and set the mandate for the creation of a Capital Region Growth Plan. Although the existing Growth Plan responded to the fundamental requirements of the Regulation, within the Plan documents, there is no clear definition of why a regional growth plan is necessary. There is no clear description of the circumstances leading to the need to manage growth or explicit explanation of what the Growth Plan should address – also known as the “Imperative” for the Plan. As a result, there is no compelling case to build support and buy-in for the Plan.

Observations from the Review

• There are multiple vision statements included in the 2009 Growing Forward documents, however none of these statements speak to a cohesive vision for managing growth in the Region - how this would look, what the optimal outcomes would be, and how this would be accomplished.

For the Calgary Metropolitan Plan, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe - Ontario, and the Chicago Metropolitan Plan, defining the imperative and a creating a vision for growth were key departure points for regional growth planning. Clearly defining the need for a regional growth plan helped establish a compelling case to support the growth plan, and provided an effective rationale to develop principles, policies and strategies.

The Capital Region is a large and complex region, made up of a diversity of communities in terms of scale, and urban, suburban and rural contexts. The Growth Plan policy framework does not fully address the diversity in the Capital Region, but instead applies a ‘one size fits all’ approach.

Observations from the Review

• The policy framework does not differentiate between different municipal contexts and types of places to address the variation of the size, form, intensity and scale of growth across the Region.

• As a way to recognize smaller urban and rural communities, the Growth Plan allows communities to grow by permitting growth outside of PGAs and in CCRAs. This approach allows for a wide spectrum of growth without more detailed policies tailored to the specific context and providing direction on when and how this growth should occur. Further, the Plan lacks adequate direction on what type of growth is appropriate to sustain the viability of all communities, including smaller towns, villages and hamlets.

The Denver Region Council of Government’s Metro Vision recognizes the diversity of the region by identifying different areas suitable to accommodate growth, including Urban Centres, Rural Town Centres, and Freestanding Communities. Each municipality then determines the specific locations that are appropriate to accommodate growth, based on the future projections and historical development trends.

Rather than applying a set of land use policies that apply uniformly across the Region, the Growth Plan would benefit from a set of land use policies that respond to the range of contexts, including rural areas, new suburban areas, and intensification and reinvestment within existing urban communities.
Through the consultation process with the Task Force, RTAC and CAOs, regional economic competitiveness was identified as a common regional interest that should be a focus for the CRB and the Growth Plan. The existing Plan does not position the Region as a competitive place in the international market. The Plan lacks a strategic vision and policies to promote economic competitiveness and employment growth.

**Observations from the Review**

- The existing Growth Plan contains a number of maps and associated policies, identifying PGAs, CCRAs, regional buffer areas and regional corridors, natural areas, and infrastructure.
- The identification of PGAs is an important step to identify future growth areas, however the PGAs cover extensive land areas, focus exclusively on future residential growth, and would need to be delineated in a more detailed way to effectively coordinate transportation and other infrastructure plans.

**The Greater Golden Horseshoe’s Places to Grow**

contains a Growth Concept Plan that identifies Urban Growth Centres across the Toronto Region in relation to existing and future transportation corridors, maps transit improvements, and locates key infrastructure and employment zones, including airports, ports and economic zones. The Places to Grow Concept Plan works together with Metrolinx’s Big Move Transportation Plan to coordinate growth areas with existing and planned transportation infrastructure.

The Greater Golden Horseshoe’s Places to Grow contains a Growth Concept Plan that identifies Urban Growth Centres across the Toronto Region in relation to existing and future transportation corridors, maps transit improvements, and locates key infrastructure and employment zones, including airports, ports and economic zones. The Places to Grow Concept Plan works together with Metrolinx’s Big Move Transportation Plan to coordinate growth areas with existing and planned transportation infrastructure.

**Metro Chicago’s GO to 2040 Plan**

puts economic competitiveness at the centre of the planning framework. The Plan identifies human capital as a key asset for the Region, and includes strategies to improve education and workforce development and support economic innovation. The Plan recognizes that promoting compact development and creating livable and sustainable communities are critical elements of creating a prosperous and competitive metropolitan region.

The Growth Plan would benefit from an integrated regional growth plan concept to coordinate growth with infrastructure plans, and provide more detailed structure that would align highest intensity forms of growth in strategic locations, including urban centres, transit corridors and employment nodes.

Through the Plan Update, the CRB should consider elevating regional economic competitiveness as a key driver for growth by reframing the Growth Plan’s focus on land use to include this regional goal, and defining the key infrastructure components and assets to support the Region’s economic competitiveness.

The Growth Plan lacks an integrated growth plan concept, limiting the ability to align growth patterns with infrastructure investment.
The Growth Plan responds to new provincial planning directions, including the Provincial Land-use Framework (2008), and the emerging provincial interest in sub-regional planning and regional growth management. However, there remains a critical absence in provincial direction on key policy areas impacting growth management in the Capital Region, including agricultural land, affordable housing and infrastructure policies.

Observations from the Review

• The Growth Plan includes recommendations to other orders of government, but the Plan does not clearly identify and articulate the role of the Province in regional growth management.
• Essential components of growth that are regulated by the Province are not dealt with sufficiently, including energy corridors and pipelines, agricultural policy and Alberta Transportation projects and plans.
• In the area of agriculture, the Plan includes a principle that states that agricultural lands should be preserved, however the Plan has no policies to protect agricultural land from development. Rather than establishing leadership on this issue, the Plan defers to the Province to develop and propose policy on the protection of agricultural land.

Metro Chicago’s GO to 2040 Plan includes recommendations to various levels of government to pursue coordinated funding and investment decisions to implement the Plan, including capital funding for transit, freight rail, post-secondary education and workforce development.

In order to address the gaps in the provincial direction, the CRB has the opportunity through Growth Plan Update to establish regional leadership, define a regional policy direction in these areas and advocate on behalf of its members to influence provincial policy so that it works for the Capital Region.

The Growth Plan consists of not one but eleven documents and supporting materials that together are difficult to navigate and lack a unifying coherent structure.

Observations from the Review

• The Plan identifies six core principles that are clear and provide a strong foundation. However, the Plan’s policies are more difficult to find, are not always linked to the principles, and are not consistently articulated in terms of level of detail.
• More specifically, the policies are located throughout the family of documents, and in some instances, are not written as outcomes-based policy, but rather as principles. Many of the principles provide high level direction but can be broadly interpreted, leading to varied outcomes.
• The differences between explanatory and descriptive text and policies are unclear.
• As a result of these issues, it is not apparent what elements of the Plan will be used to evaluate and determine compliance and consistency with the Plan.

Metro Vancouver’s and the Calgary Regional Partnership’s regional plans are concise and well-structured planning documents that are easy to use and interpret. Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy is organized around five goals, and each goal contains strategies, actions and implementation procedures, and recommendations to the Province of British Columbia.

The family of eleven documents should be consolidated into one concise, well-structured and organized document.
The Project Charter identified a number of significant challenges that impact the success of the Growth Plan, including issues related to the governance and funding of the CRB, and collaboration between the CRB, member municipalities and the Province of Alberta. The Province established the CRB as a regional board to administer and implement the Growth Plan, however the CRB itself does not have a sustainable funding model or governance structure to administer regional infrastructure projects and coordinate regional investment. These issues should be addressed in the Plan.

Observations from the Review
• The Growth Plan does not incorporate the tools to coordinate decision-making regarding economic growth, infrastructure investment and planning.
• The Plan does not advocate a regional voice and establish regional priorities in order to influence provincial and federal decision-making and to coordinate infrastructure investment.

The Bay Area Plan includes a detailed investment strategy to implement the regional growth concept. The strategy identifies strategic investments and assessed regional transportation projects required to implement the growth concept. Although the Plan does not have any legislative status over local land use planning, the investment strategy provides financial incentives for local municipalities to adhere to the Plan, and identifies key infrastructure projects to attract federal, state and private funding.

The Growth Plan Update should consider the challenges and risk factors that need to be addressed to successfully develop and implement the Growth Plan, including elements that go beyond the current scope and mandate of the CRB.

The Growth Plan’s implementation mechanisms are not explicit and are not integrated within the overall Plan framework, including mechanisms such as progress indicators, approval processes, Plan amendments, and stakeholder engagement.

The implementation section of the Land Use Plan, together with the Municipal Planning Toolkit, provides important guidance on the implementation and interpretation of the Plan. However, the Plan lacks a detailed section on the implementation and interpretation of the Plan that clearly describes and defines responsibilities, mechanisms and procedures in order to implement the Plan.

Observations from the Review
• The Plan lacks an explicit measuring and monitoring mechanism. Section 3.3 of the Land Use Plan refers to monitoring tools, indicators, annual reports and Regional Context Statements, however when and how these mechanisms should be used is unclear. To date, none of these have been completed.
• Aside from the REF process and the statutory plan approval stage, the Plan does not include mechanisms to measure if municipalities are conforming to the Growth Plan.
• The Plan lacks a set of indicators and performance measures to track progress and measure success.

The Metro Vancouver Regional Strategy and the Calgary Metropolitan Plan clearly outline the roles and responsibilities of all actors, and clearly identify how the Plan will be updated, and performance metrics to measure progress and track success should be embedded within the policy framework.

The Growth Plan document should clearly describe and define how all components of the Plan relate to one another, how the Plan will be implemented, and what will be used to test compliance and conformity with the Plan. The CRB should also examine ways to improve the implementation process by building a constituency of regional stakeholders who support the Plan.
The Key Findings indicate that in order to effectively manage growth across the Capital Region, a substantive update to the 2009 Growth Plan is necessary. The 2009 Growth Plan sets an important foundation for regional planning, however the existing planning framework does not provide the CRB the full range of policies and tools to effectively manage and plan for growth, integrate land use planning with infrastructure, and promote the long-term prosperity and sustainability of the Capital Region.

Building on the Key Findings, the Recommendations identify critical components and considerations for the Growth Plan Update process.
3.1 Our Recommendations

The Recommendations identify critical components and considerations for the Growth Plan Update process. The Recommendations do not propose specific outcomes for the Growth Plan Update, but detail a range of issues and opportunities that should be addressed as part of the next phases of the Growth Plan Update. More specifically, the Recommendations address key policy gaps in the existing Growth Plan, identify areas that should be included and further refined in the Plan Update, and ways to improve the planning process and the implementation of the Plan.

Seize the Plan Update as an Opportunity to Move Toward Growth Management

The 2009 Growth Plan established a new foundation to plan regionally for growth by creating land use policies and identifying population and job forecasts, residential density targets, priority growth areas and infrastructure networks. Each of these components are independent. This provides the CRB the ability to plan for the anticipated amount of growth, but not the ability to effectively direct where and how growth should occur and be managed to optimize infrastructure and support regional assets.

Growth management, in contrast to growth planning, defines where and how to grow, where not to grow – where to conserve and protect for the long term prosperity and sustainability of the Region. As a starting point, for the Growth Plan Update, the CRB should consider strategies that will effectively manage growth in the Region. The Growth Plan Update needs to consider what policies, strategies and implementation tools are necessary to effectively move from planning for growth to managing growth in the Region.

The following Recommendations provide approaches, actions and ideas for the CRB to pro-actively move from growth planning to growth management. The Recommendations are ordered to respond to the following key questions:

WHY we need a Growth Plan?
HOW to create the Growth Plan?
WHAT should be addressed in the Growth Plan?
WHAT the Growth Plan should look like?
HOW should growth be managed over time?

While the 2009 Growth Plan has been an important first effort at growth planning within the Capital Region, the Plan Update should take every effort to advance regional growth management in terms of addressing key policy gaps, plan structure, substance and level of detail, setting progressive targets, and responding to the complexity of communities within the Capital Region.
Define WHY we need a Growth Plan

1. As a first step in the Update process, clearly define the Imperative for managing growth in the Capital Region.

The forecasts for the Capital Region indicate that the Region is projected to double its population and workforce by 2044. The scale of communities, commute times, pressure on environmental systems, agricultural land, infrastructure networks will be impacted. Defining why the Capital Region needs a growth plan, what challenges the Region will face without managing growth, and therefore what the Growth Plan should accomplish, hereon referred to as the Imperative for creating a Growth Plan, is a critical first step in the Plan Update. The following steps are recommended:

a. **Create a highly graphic and compelling story** around the Imperative that builds on the Contextual Analysis to address current regional conditions and trends in terms of location and form of development, economic strengths/drivers and sectors, growth pressures, demographics, extreme weather/climate change, impacts on the environment and agricultural lands, cost and form of infrastructure to support growth etc.

b. **Define the Imperative for the Growth Plan** by working closely with the Task Force and engaging the Board.

c. **Create a long-term Vision for Managing Growth** in the Capital Region to respond to the Imperative. The visioning process should involve the Task Force and the Board in consultation with key stakeholders including the regional CAOs to create a draft Vision statement. This draft may be used as a starting point for broader stakeholder engagement and input into the future of the Capital Region.

Define HOW we create the Growth Plan

2. Take every opportunity to enhance collaboration with Capital Region communities.

As a region of twenty-four member municipalities, enhancing the collaboration, and creating a positive dialogue throughout the Plan Update process will be critical to the Plan’s success.

a. **Articulate the role and responsibility of the CRB and member municipalities** in the Plan document.

b. **Consider the Region without local municipal boundaries** when defining assets, metropolitan structure, and testing growth scenarios to encourage regional thinking.

c. **Build upon the leadership of the Task Force** to determine critical opportunities throughout the Plan Update process to update the Board and focus Board attention on key topic working sessions for input.

d. **Include opportunities for working sessions with regional CAOs** to gather their input at key junctures of the Plan Update (canvas of regional assets, growth scenario testing, policy development, etc.).

e. **Develop a regional stakeholder strategy** and potentially a **Stakeholder Advisory Committee** (including businesses, institutions, agricultural sector/farmers, investors, developers, environmental groups) to solicit external stakeholder perspectives regarding the canvas of regional assets and other key aspects of the Plan Update and encourage their role as ambassadors of the Plan.

An example of a Vision for Managing Growth could be:

“The Capital Region will continue to grow to be one prosperous and sustainable Region, a constellation of complementary communities, that together provide a high quality of life and diversity of offering in terms of jobs, housing, healthy environment, culture and recreation.”
3 Create a canvas of regional assets and determine strategies to build on the diversity of the Region.

Create a visual and text based inventory of the range and scale of assets to graphically depict the diversity of communities and shared assets in the Region. The canvas should depict major employment areas, economic drivers, natural heritage systems, agricultural lands, airports and other components that are regionally significant or distinguish each community in the Region.

For example: St. Albert’s vital downtown main street; Strathcona County as a specialized municipality with a combination of agriculture, rural and urban communities; Edmonton as the largest urban community and financial, education, health and cultural centre; Stony Plain as a hub of local food.

a Engage the Task Force, CAOs and the Board to identify regional core assets. Map these on a base drawing of the Region without municipal boundaries.

b Determine strategies for managing growth while strengthening core assets. For example: What would strengthen the education/health sector? Where are the centres for innovation? Which industries/businesses are expected to grow significantly What infrastructure will be critical to their success? What range of housing is needed to accommodate the future demographics of the Region? How will the agricultural sector continue to contribute to the Region?

c Identify regional economic assets and areas of strength/potential growth that build upon the Project 1C outcome.

For example the mandate for what the Growth Plan should accomplish could be:

“The Capital Region Growth Plan will seek to strengthen regional assets, efficiently use existing, planned and future infrastructure, accommodate 25-year (population and employment) growth forecasts, plan for a long-term (50-year) Vision for growth (to 3 million people and 1.5 million jobs), and increase the economic competitiveness of the Region in the provincial, federal and international context.”

4 Clearly articulate the scope and mandate for the Capital Region Growth Plan Update.

Building on the Project Charter and responding to the Imperative, review and refine how the four provincially mandated components are addressed, and consider other key directives. The Growth Plan Update should focus on the critical components related to growth management, including Land Use, Housing and Transit. GIS should be considered a tool to implement and monitor growth management rather than a component of growth management. Additional components that are critical to the future success of the Region should be considered including economic competitiveness, the integration of land use and regional infrastructure, and strengthening regional assets.

a Based on the draft Imperative, review and confirm the core components of the Plan to ensure the components effectively respond to the Imperative.

b Create an identity or brand for the new Growth Plan that will be accessible and inspire or peak interest in the Growth Plan process. Growing Forward was the brand of the 2009 Plan. Working with the Task Force and the Board as part of the visioning process consider options such as Capital Future 2045, Growing Our Future, Capital Region 2045, Growing our Prosperous Region 2045.

c Review, define and confirm the appropriate boundaries for the Growth Plan for the Capital Region. Responding to the Imperative, the boundaries should include the communities for which there is relevance and to which there are relevant policies to direct and manage growth and regional infrastructure investment.

d Establish a Two-Tier Planning Horizon including a 50-year horizon to envision the long-term future of the Region and a 25-year horizon to coordinate growth (population and employment) projections with infrastructure plans.

e Review and refine the Growth Plan’s principles and policies to align them with the Imperative, mandate and core components of the Growth Plan. The six principles may need to be refined and more fully explored. A substantive review of the policies will be required to create a consistent, effective and robust policy framework to implement the Plan’s principles.
5 Engage senior levels of government early in the Growth Plan Update process and seek partnership opportunities.

The Province is an important partner in the Growth Plan Update process, as the Land-use Framework, the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan, and provincial infrastructure investments set the overall framework for the Plan Update. In the absence of provincial direction, the CRB should demonstrate leadership in key areas to articulate positions that support the CRB’s vision and perspective.

The federal government is also an important partner in terms of major infrastructure, transit, transportation, economic competitiveness and policies related to the environment and natural resources. The CRB should pro-actively engage federal ministries and members of parliament during the Growth Plan Update to explore opportunities to align funding and policy directions.

a Ensure alignment of the Land-use Framework (LUF) sub-regional planning initiatives and emerging policies.

b Continue to engage the provincial government throughout all phases of the Growth Plan Update. Consider requesting the creation of an integrated provincial team dedicated to work with the CRB throughout the Update process to gather perspectives from all related ministries.

c In the absence of provincial policy, establish regional leadership and discuss policies that address growth management in a comprehensive and holistic manner. This includes policies related to agricultural land, the environment, affordable housing, economic competitiveness and employment uses.

d Explore targeted funding and investment strategies that align provincial and regional policies and regional infrastructure investment.

e Prepare a strategy that identifies key areas of common interest between the federal government and the Capital Region.

6 Respond to the risks and challenges to successfully implement the Growth Plan including governance, funding and regional collaboration.

The Plan Update process should consider and address the risks and barriers and the key innovations that are required to create a successful Plan. These may include elements that go beyond the existing scope and mandate of the CRB and the Growth Plan such as regional infrastructure investment.

a Identify what is necessary to respond effectively to the Imperative and make the Growth Plan work, within and outside the CRB’s jurisdiction. Key areas identified through the review include: governance, funding, and collaboration.

b Create a “call to action” that outlines areas for change and innovation in terms of mandate, roles, mechanisms and partnerships, and utilize the “call to action” as the foundation to engage in discussions with the provincial government.
Define WHAT should be addressed in the Growth Plan

7 Ensure Growth Plan policies respond appropriately to the diverse contexts and scale of communities in the Region.

The Capital Region is comprised of a constellation of twenty-four communities that are diverse in terms of scale, population, economic base, level of amenity and potential for growth. The Growth Plan Update needs to move beyond the one size fits all approach to recognize the needs of diverse communities and the role of both the urban settlement and the rural working landscape, and consider policy approaches to respond to this diversity.

a Consider the introduction of rings or tiers of development and related policies to recognize diverse communities (urban, suburban, town, village, hamlets, rural areas).

b Introduce policies that respond to the range of contexts including rural areas, new suburban communities, intensification and reinvestment within existing urban communities and employment areas.

c Recognize the rural working landscape (including agricultural land, natural heritage systems and watersheds, resources and rural settlements) as integral to the health and sustainability of the entire Region and enhance policies that can conserve these assets.

8 Introduce a Growth Plan Concept that delineates centres and corridors, infrastructure, employment areas and conservation areas.

A Growth Plan Concept is a drawing that articulates land settlement patterns, the organization of land uses and development form, regional infrastructure and conservation areas at a regional scale. Growth Concepts depict a strategy for managing growth by identifying strategic locations to focus growth to align future development with major regional transportation and water and wastewater servicing infrastructure.

The introduction of an integrated Growth Plan Concept is recommended as part of this Growth Plan Update and in particular that the process:

a Utilize Growth Scenarios to explore, test and define a Growth Plan Concept.

b Refine the existing PGAs with expanded and differentiated targets to align with the Growth Plan Concept.

c Integrate key regional infrastructure components into the Growth Plan Concept: transit and transportation corridors, airports, institutional uses, utilities, and intermodal nodes.
Ensure Growth Plan policies address the full spectrum of growth and land uses.

Expand on the current residential land use policies to effectively address the full range of land uses and employment opportunities, including commercial uses, institutional, recreational and industrial uses.

a. **Build on defined industrial areas and economic development plans** to distinguish employment areas/clusters, determine key infrastructure and assets and identify future anticipated growth areas.

b. **Undertake an assessment** to determine the potential of employment growth, lands and required infrastructure.

c. **Determine employment land need, activity rates and potential targets** (employee density, Floor Space Index).

d. **Consider phasing of significant employment areas** to establish a logical, and strategic deployment of employment lands from a servicing, managed land supply and market demand perspective.

Advance and expand on existing growth targets.

Current residential density targets should be reviewed and advanced to pro-actively and effectively manage growth and provide efficient municipal infrastructure and services. During stakeholder interviews, CAOs from many of the member municipalities identified that they were achieving or surpassing the planned density targets in their Area Structure Plans. The Plan should provide clearer direction in terms of implementation and monitoring of targets.

a. **Introduce more detailed policies** to clarify how residential targets are to be measured, monitored over time and what mechanisms can be introduced to encourage compliance, including the use of indicators to monitor development.

b. Consider the **introduction of intensification targets** to support infill and reinvestment within existing serviced areas.

c. **Consider comprehensive reviews to identify long-term land needs** and urban growth boundaries, and align land need with growth forecasts.

d. **Consider the introduction of activity rates** (employment/population ratios) to encourage mixed use and employment growth in key nodes in the Region.
Address key gaps in the Growth Plan including affordable housing, economic competitiveness, water and air quality, agricultural land, and implementation mechanisms.

As identified in the Project Charter and through the Growth Plan Review, there are a number of critical gaps in the 2009 Plan that should be addressed with the Plan Update, including affordable housing, employment uses, agricultural land and agri-economy, and implementation policies. The Growth Plan needs to address these gaps to manage growth at the regional scale.

a  **Advance affordable housing strategies** and integrate a set of supportive policies into the Plan.

b  **Introduce regional economic competitiveness** as a key driver and component of the Plan and consider reframing the traditional land use plan around this regional goal.

c  **Build on defined employment areas** to include an expanded set of policies that address the full range of current and future jobs and employment opportunities.

d  **Recognize the agricultural sector’s contribution** to the regional economy (GDP, jobs, Gross Farm Receipts) and introduce policies that protect prime agricultural land and agricultural viability through a range of economic activities.

e  **Introduce implementation policies** that address: the Growth Plan review processes, relationships to provincial and municipal statutory plans, use and application of forecasts, conformity tests and the role of the REF process.

f  **Consider the expansion of the REF process** to evaluate infill and intensification plans (for example Area Structure Plans).

g  **Consider innovative financial tools and mechanisms** to achieve growth management objectives, including revenue sharing, cost sharing, and municipal financial sustainability.

Emphasize the integration of land use and infrastructure planning as a fundamental growth management principle.

The Integrated Regional Transportation Plan (IRTMP) and the Integrated Regional Transportation System Study (IRTSS) set an important foundation for integrating transportation plans with land use policies. These elements should be further integrated in the Growth Plan policies and through the creation of a Growth Plan Concept.

a  **Build on the IRTMP and IRTSS delineation of transportation and transit corridors**, and link these with land use policies as key layers within the Growth Plan Concept.

b  **Introduce mechanisms in the planning and approval process** to support the integration of land use and infrastructure, and to require that new development occurs in phases to respond to infrastructure investment.

c  **Establish a mechanism such as integrated investment strategies and targeted funding approaches** to align infrastructure investment with growth at the municipal, provincial and federal level.
Define WHAT the Growth Plan should look like

Create a concise, clear and compelling Growth Plan document.

The current family of documents should be consolidated into one concise, easily understood and accessible document.

a. **Structure the Plan** to include the following interrelated and nested components: the Imperative, Vision for growth management, Principles, Policies, Indicators and Implementation mechanisms.

b. **Write the Plan in an accessible and understandable manner** for a range of audiences, without compromising the substantive nature of the content.

c. **Use clear language, aided by maps and graphics** to enable consistent interpretation of the Plan’s principles and policies.

d. **Provide all supporting documentation** in an appendix to the Plan.

e. **Include a Growth Plan Glossary** - a regional set of terminology and definitions to enable the clear and consistent interpretation of policies and process.

Define HOW to manage growth over time

Build the constituency that understands and supports growth management.

Building a solid core group of key regional stakeholders who understand the Imperative, scope, principles, policies and mechanisms embedded in the Plan will be important moving forward. There will never be full consensus on the Plan content, however ensuring there is a core group of stakeholders that understands the “why, what and how” of the Plan will increase the likelihood of success. The Growth Plan Update process should consider ways to generate awareness about the Plan, inform decision-making and provide incentives to manage growth to meet the Plan’s objectives.

a. **Create a robust stakeholder and community engagement strategy** for the Plan Update process, focusing on key issues to increase awareness about the Imperative. Tailor the engagement strategy to specific audiences, and invite all key stakeholders to the table through the Plan Update, including businesses, institutions, the agricultural sector/farmers, investors, developers, and the public at large. To build an interested constituency to take ownership and become ‘champions’ of the Plan, provide opportunities for engagement at key stages of the Plan Update. Consider co-hosting public events with member municipalities, and focusing discussion on regional topics and hosting a speaker series to educate and inform the public on the Plan.

b. **Utilize Growth Scenarios** to increase community awareness of the Growth Plan Imperative, mandate and to test potential outcomes.

c. **Work with the development industry** to review and assess financial tools in terms of cost sharing, revenue sharing, and models for efficient provision of infrastructure that can create incentives for intensification and/or more compact forms of development.
Indicators and reporting mechanisms provide important metrics for measuring progress and tracking success. Building on Project 1B work, indicators should be developed alongside Growth Plan policies as part of the Plan Update process.

a Identify indicators for the Plan’s principles and policies to track progress and measure success. The indicators should be developed as part of the Plan Update process, and align with policies and growth targets to effectively monitor current and future growth patterns.

b Continue to advance a regional level database including geo-spatial as a critical input to inform and support decision-making for the Plan Update process, and to monitor implementation.

c Establish the protocols for evaluating progress, gathering information and reporting on the Growth Plan indicators, including frequency of reporting, defined audiences and accountability.

d Within the regular Review process, build in an ability to refine and adjust policies to respond to the Growth Plan progress reports.

Conclusion

The 2009 Growth Plan provided a critical foundation for growth planning and regional collaboration. The Plan Update process is an important opportunity to substantively update the current Plan to address key policy gaps, improve the structure and organization of the Plan, provide a greater level of substance and level of detail, set more progressive targets, and respond to the complexities and diversity of communities within the Capital Region.

The Growth Plan Update is an opportunity to create a Plan authored by and structured to meet the needs of the Capital Region. With a future region of over two million people and one million jobs, a Plan that pro-actively manages growth, coordinates infrastructure investment and enhances the economic competitiveness as of the whole Region will be key to the success and sustainability of the Capital Region.
Update on Economic Development Summit

Status: As of September 1:
- 170 invitations sent: 54 Elected Officials; 24 CAOs, 92 Stakeholders
- 47 registrations
- Agenda distributed and all logistics on track

Background

The Economic Development Summit is scheduled for October 3, 2014. It will be held at the Strathcona Community Centre in the Agora Room from 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., with a hot breakfast available from 7:00 a.m.

It is an invitation-only gathering of CRB members and economic development stakeholders in the region to discuss economic development and what role the CRB could play, if any. Results of the Summit discussions will inform the Capital Region Board.

The Meeting Chair, Mr Don Lowry, and the Guest Speakers, Mr. Gregg Wassmansdorf and Mr. Jeremy Heigh, are confirmed. Opening remarks will be given by Strathcona Mayor Roxanne Carr, Premier or Minister Dave Hancock (to date unconfirmed) and CRB Chair Nolan Crouse.

Updates

Two value-add Roundtables have been arranged on October 2, 2014 for Municipal Economic Development Officers and the regional economic development associations. They will take place at the Strathcona Community Centre at 3:00 p.m. and 4:45 p.m. With these two sessions we will ensure that every community in the region has the opportunity to talk with Mr. Wassmansdorf, and that he will have a good understanding of our region and its economic development organizations and activities before he presents on October 3.

The media will be advised of the opportunity to scrum attendees before this invitation-only event. A statement will be released at the end of the day. CRB Administration will tweet throughout the event, as well as will many participants.
Specialized Transit Needs Assessment Funding

Motion

That the Transit Committee be requested to include for consideration the needs assessment funding for specialized transit in the 2015 Work plan.

Background

- On August 14, 2014, Mayor Hauch of Bruderheim brought forward this as a Notice of Motion.

Attachments:

1. CRB Transportation Needs Assessment for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities: A Pilot Project
CRB Transportation Needs Assessment for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities: A Pilot Project
Proposal Submitted to the Transit Committee of the Capital Region Board
Bonnie M. Dobbs, PhD and Tara Pidborochynski, MSc
Medically At-Risk Driver Centre (MARD)
Department of Family Medicine, University of Alberta

Introduction
Transportation mobility is critical for the safety (Travis et al., 2012; Turcotte, 2012) and mobility of seniors and persons with disabilities (National Organization on Disability Harris Interactive, 2004; Rosenbloom, 2007; Sweeney, 2004; World Health Organization, 2013). The lack of access to responsive forms of transportation often results in an inability to access health care services (Arcury et al., 2005; Crosato & Leipert, 2006; Eberhardt & Pamuk, 2004; Hanson & Hildebrand, 2011; Mattson, 2012; Popplewell et al., 2014; Rosenbloom, 2007; Sweeney, 2004; Syed et al., 2013; Szymczynska et al., 2011; World Health Organization, 2013) and services related to satisfaction of essential, social, and religious needs (Carp, 1988; Hanson & Hildebrand, 2011). Lack of access to responsive transportation also results in decreases in quality of life and reductions in or loss of independence (Kim & Ulfarsson, 2013; Nelson & Gingerich, 2010; Sweeney, 2004) and in social isolation (McCracken et al., 2005). For many seniors, lack of access to responsive transportation also results in an inability to ‘age in place’ (Dye et al., 2010; Mattson, 2012; Turcotte, 2012). As noted in the Capital Region Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan (2009), “municipalities throughout the Region provide specialized public transit services to seniors and persons with disabilities” (p. 58). There also exists “in virtually all municipalities, a range of volunteer driver programs, not-for-profit transportation services as well as some level of program [and client] specific social service transportation” (p. 58). However, in the same report, it is noted that there is a need to improve the regional delivery of specialized intermunicipal transit services, with guiding principles and service attributes articulated to assist in meeting the mobility needs of seniors and persons with disabilities at the present time and in the future (see p. 60). The proposed Needs Assessment is designed to assist the CRB in achieving that goal.

Project Objectives
The objective of the proposed pilot is to conduct a transportation Needs Assessment in a subregion of the Capital Region, with the Needs Assessment focused on two ‘transportation vulnerable’ segments of the population – seniors and persons with disabilities. The subregion identified, in consultation with the members of the CRB Transit Committee, consists of Bruderheim, Lamont, Lamont County, and Redwater. The focus of the Needs Assessment is to assess the need for 1) specialized transportation services for seniors; 2) specialized transit services for persons with disabilities; and 3) the need for intermunicipal transit services to major centres in the Capital Region. The long term goal is to conduct similar Needs Assessments in the remaining subregions of the Capital Region.

Methodology
The MARD Centre will contract the University of Alberta’s Population Research Laboratory (PRL) to conduct the Needs Assessment. The PRL, which was established in 1966, is the largest centre of its kind in Western Canada. The PRL has a history of conducting web-based, paper-based, and telephone-based surveys in a number of areas including social policy, health, education, labour markets, and public opinion. For the proposed pilot, the PRL will assist in the development of the sampling frames, development of the telephone introductory scripts, refinement of the draft survey instruments developed by MARD researchers (with input from CRB Transit Committee members), training of telephone interviewers, piloting the survey instruments [pre-survey], and data collection using the Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) system.

The MARD Center brings considerable expertise on alternate transportation for seniors, expertise that extends to persons with disabilities. Alternate transportation for seniors and for those with medical conditions that affect sensory, motor, and cognitive functions is one of the three pillars of research at the MARD Centre. In addition to local and provincial surveys (see Dobbs & Bhardwaj, 2009; Dobbs, Bhardwaj, Hallett, & Vander Meulen, 2009; Dobbs, Bhardwaj, & Pidborochynski, 2010; Dobbs & Pidborochynski, 2011; Dobbs, Pidborochynski, & Tassone, 2012), the MARD Centre has conducted a national and international scan of existing models of alternate transportation for...
seniors, with identification of unique models and innovative solutions (Dobbs, Lee, & Song, 2011). Recently, MARD has collaborated with Wainwright and District on the development and implementation of alternate transportation for seniors and those with disabilities in Wainwright and area (Dobbs & Linsdell, 2013). Part of that collaboration involved a Needs Assessment for Wainwright and District, with the results of the Needs Assessment foundational to the development of its rural alternate transportation service. Recent work in this area also has included an in-depth analysis of ride-scheduling software programs for use by community based organizations providing alternate transportation services to seniors (Pidborochynski & Dobb, 2014). MARD’s expertise in this area has been recognized through invited speaking engagements locally, provincially, nationally, and internationally. MARD will take the lead role on the proposed Needs Assessment.

Target Populations, Sampling Design, and Survey Instruments

Target Populations
The target populations consist of individuals in the general population aged 45 years and older (Sample 1) and those 18 years of age and older with a disability (Sample 2) living in the identified subregion of the Capital Region. The communities selected for the pilot are the County of Lamont including the communities of Bruderhein, Lamont, Mundare, Andrew, Chipman, Hillard, St. Michael, Star, Whitford, and Wostok. Within Sturgeon County, the town of Redwater has been selected.

Sampling Design
Sample 1 (n = 360)
The target population will be community dwelling individuals 45 years of age and older living in the identified subregion of the Capital Region. Random digit dialing (RDD), using the provincial area codes of 780 and 587 along with the dedicated exchanges for the communities listed above, will be used to generate a telephone sample. Quota sampling will be done for gender (approximately equal numbers of males and females) and for driving status (approximately 20% or greater of non-drivers in the 65 years of age and older group). To enhance response rate, newspaper advertisements will be placed in the four different community papers (Fort Saskatchewan Record; Lamont Farm ‘N’ Friends; Lamont Leader; Redwater Review) to assist with community engagement and participation in the Needs Assessment, with two periods of advertising (one period 2 weeks prior to the start of the Needs Assessment and the second period one week prior to the start of the Needs Assessment) in each of the respective papers.

Sample 2 (n = 40)
The target population will be community dwelling persons with disabilities 18 years of age and older living in the identified subregion of the Capital Region. As opposed to RDD, a more targeted and cost effective approach will be used to generate the sampling frame for Sample 2. Specifically, MARD researchers will make primary contact with organizations providing services to persons with disabilities in the identified subregion of the Capital Region. These primary contacts will assist in recruitment by explaining the study, providing information and sign-up sheets, and forwarding to MARD the contact list of potential participants who have consented to be contacted by the PRL. In appropriate circumstances, proxy interviews will be conducted with knowledgeable family members.

Survey Instruments
Two survey instruments have been drafted by MARD researchers, with input from the PRL and CRB personnel. The first survey instrument is proposed for use in interviewing Sample 1 participants (see Appendix A1), with the second survey instrument proposed for use in interviewing Sample 2 participants (see Appendix A2). Each instrument consists of 1) a standardized introduction with contact information of the Principal Investigator and the PRL; 2) assurance that the information is voluntary, confidential, and anonymous and protected under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIPP) Act; 3) qualifying questions for participants; 4) collection of participant information on transportation needs and deficiencies (e.g., driving status, presence of impairment[s], awareness and use of existing transportation services, satisfaction with those services, ratings of specific features of currently
existing or projected transportation services, costs including willingness to pay for services, etc.); and 5) participant demographics.

**Ethics**
Prior to conducting the *Needs Assessment*, an application for ethics approval will be submitted by MARD to the University of Alberta's Health Research Ethics Board.

**Impact/Relevancy**
There is no doubt about the importance of relevant transportation for seniors and for persons with disabilities. However, the planning and development of transportation that is relevant to meeting the needs of these two important segments of the population in the Capital Region requires knowledge about those needs. Direct knowledge of the needs currently is unavailable but obtainable from the *Needs Assessment* proposed herein. This knowledge can result in relevant transportation planning, which can optimize the mobility of seniors and persons with disabilities in the Capital Region. Results from the *Needs Assessment* also can avoid implementation of costly non-relevant transportation options for these two important segments of the CRB population.

**Timelines**
The proposed *Needs Assessment* can take place as early as the first quarter of 2015. The time period for ‘getting in the field’ will be minimal due to the work completed to date (e.g., identifying sampling frames, drafting the *Needs Assessment*, consultations with the PRL, initial contacts with organizations providing services to persons with disabilities, etc.). As such, it is realistic that the training of interviewers could start in early to mid-January with interviews conducted in February, followed by data cleaning and report generation in March, 2015.
Budget
A costing of the proposed *Needs Assessment* is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRL</td>
<td>Data collection (telephone surveys), data entry, data cleaning (see Appendix B)</td>
<td>$33,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Assistance with project implementation including recruitment of Sample 2 participants, data analyses, and report generation</td>
<td>$5,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA at Grade 6, Step 2 at 12 hours per week x 16 weeks</td>
<td>$5,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate of $26.66/hour ($23.80 per hour plus 12% benefits as per outlined in NASA)</td>
<td>$5,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad</td>
<td>Newspaper advertising in four different community papers (Fort Saskatchewan Record, Lamont Farm 'N' Friends, Lamont Leader, Redwater Review) to assist with community engagement and participation in the <em>Needs Assessment</em></td>
<td>$1,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2, ¼ page ads, in each paper (one ad 2 weeks prior to survey data collection; one ad 1 week prior to survey data collection)</td>
<td>$1,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD</td>
<td>Dissemination of results of the <em>Needs Assessment</em></td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel to Bruderheim, Redwater, Lamont, and other communities in Lamont County</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Alberta reimbursement for mileage is at $0.46/km</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$40,908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 University of Alberta Non-Academic Staff Association.
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## Request

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 14, 2014</td>
<td>Chair, Capital Region Board</td>
<td>How will the Economic Development Summit be communicated to the media?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| September 1, 2014 | Administration (CEO) | The unique nature of the Economic Development Summit requires a level of confidentiality that cannot be attained with full media access.  
This is not a Board meeting and no decisions will be made, so there is no obligation for CRB to provide full media access.  
However it is important that this solutions-based initiative be known and understood by the public, as reported in the media.  
As such, the media will be invited Oct 2 to a pre-Summit media opportunity from 7:15 – 8:00 a.m.  
A news release and backgrounder will be drafted in advance and amended onsite for release and distribution at the end of the day.  
There will be tweets sent throughout the sessions, both by participants and by CRB Administration. |
Housing Task Force

Wednesday, August 20, 2014
9:30 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Edmonton Petroleum Club – Rainbow Room
11110 – 108 Street, Edmonton

Members:
Dwight Ganske, Town of Stony Plain (Chair)
Stew Hennig, City of Fort Saskatchewan (Vice Chair)
Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton
Dan Warawa, Lamont County
Audrey Kelto, Leduc County
Mel Smith, Town of Redwater

Regrets:
Doug Lagore, CEO

Guests:
Lori-Anne St. Arnault, Meridian Foundation
Louise Baxter, City of Spruce Grove
Loretta Bertol, Alberta Municipal Affairs
Daryl Kreuzer, City of Edmonton
Nancy Laing, Leduc Foundation
Lynn Olene, Heartland Housing Foundation
Giri Puligandla, Homeward Trust Edmonton
Lory Scott, City of St. Albert
Yolande Shaw, Strathcona County
Kelly Wagar, CMHC
Tim Ward, Government of Alberta

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager (Acting CEO)
Brendan Pinches, Project Manager
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager

Stephanie Chai, Assistant Project Manager
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant
Gary Gordon, Headwater Consulting
Thom Stubbs, Headwater Consulting

1. Call to Order
Chair, Dwight Ganske called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

2. Chair Opening Remarks

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Housing Task Force agenda be approved.
Moved by: Councillor Dan Warawa, Lamont County
Decision: Carried unanimously
4. Approval of Minutes, May 23, 2014

**Motion:** That the Housing Task Force minutes be approved.

**Moved by:** Councillor Stew Hennig, *City of Fort Saskatchewan*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

5. 2014 – 2018 Housing Task Force Work Plan

**Motion:** That the Housing Task Force approve the proposed 2014-2018 Housing Work Plan and that the Work Plan be forwarded to the Regional Services Committee for consideration in the preparation of the Board’s Business Plan.

**Moved by:** Councillor Ed Gibbons, *City of Edmonton*

**Decision:** Carried

6. Sub-regional Needs Assessment Framework & Pilot Reports

**Motion:** That the Housing Task Force receive the Sub-regional Needs Assessment Framework and pilot reports for information, and forward this information to the Regional Services Committee.

**Moved by:** Mayor Mel Smith, *Town of Redwater*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

7. Project Updates

   a. Needs Assessment Studies

   b. 2014 ReEnvision Housing Symposium

   **Motion:** That the Housing Task Force receive the project updates for information.

   **Moved by:** Councillor Stew Hennig, *City of Fort Saskatchewan*

   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

8. Adjournment

   It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Housing Task Force meeting be adjourned.

   Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

**Next Meeting:** October 24, 2014 at 9:00 a.m., Edmonton Petroleum Club – Rainbow Room

Task Force Chair, Dwight Ganske
Land Use & Planning Committee

Thursday, August 21, 2014
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
Edmonton Petroleum Club – Rainbow Room
11110 – 108 Street, Edmonton

Members:
Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County (Chair)
Rod Shaigec, Parkland County (Vice Chair)
Don Iveson, City of Edmonton
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Clay Stumph, Leduc County
Patricia Lee, Town of Bruderheim (alternate)
Barry Turner, Town of Morinville (alternate)
Dwight Ganske, Town of Stony Plain
Lloyd Jardine, Village of Thorsby

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Leslie Chivers, Sturgeon County
Paresh Dhariya, Town of Devon
Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton
Laurie Johnson, Leduc County
Cory Lebrecque, City of Leduc
Corey Levasseur, City of Spruce Grove
Yolande Shaw, Strathcona County
Janel Smith, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Paul Smith, Strathcona County
Collin Steffes, Sturgeon County
Anton Szabo, City of Edmonton

Regrets:
David MacKenzie, City of Leduc
Doug Horner, Town of Gibbons
Doug Lagore, CEO

Energy Corridors Task Force:
Wayne Woldanski, Lamont County (Chair)
Glen Finstad, City of Leduc

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager (Acting CEO)
Brendan Pinches, Project Manager
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager
Stephanie Chai, Assistant Project Manager

1. **Call to Order**
   Chair, Mayor Flynn, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. **Chair Opening Remarks**

3. **Approval of Agenda**
   
   **Motion:** That the Land Use & Planning Committee agenda be approved.
   **Moved by:** Councillor Dwight Ganske, Town of Stony Plain
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously
4. Approval of Minutes of June 19, 2014

Motion: That the minutes of June 19, 2014 be approved.
Moved by: Councillor Clay Stumph, Leduc County
Decision: Carried unanimously

5. 2014 Work Plan

5.1 Regional Energy Corridors Report

Motion: That the Land Use & Planning Committee recommend approval of the Capital Region Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework Report to the Capital Region Board as recommended by the Energy Corridors Task Force.
Moved by: Mayor Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Decision: Carried unanimously


6.1 Work Plan Review and Approval

Motion: That the proposed 2014-2018 Land Use & Planning Work Plan be referred back to administration for review and revision with the Committee Chair and Vice Chair. Further, that the revised Work Plan be emailed to Committee Members for review and approval prior to referring the Work Plan to the Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee for consideration in the preparation of the Board’s Business Plan.
Moved by: Mayor Rod Shaigec, Parkland County
Decision: Carried unanimously

7. Adjournment

Motion: That the Land Use & Planning Committee meeting be adjourned.
Moved by: Councillor Clay Stumph, Leduc County
Decision: Carried unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Next Meeting: October 23, 2014 at 9:00 a.m., Edmonton Petroleum Club – Rainbow Room

Committee Chair, Tom Flynn
Regional Services Committee

Thursday, August 28, 2014
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Edmonton Petroleum Club – Rainbow Room
11110 – 108 Street, Edmonton

Members:
Mel Smith, Town of Redwater (Chair)
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton (alternate)
Louise Baxter, City of Spruce Grove
Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert
Rick Smith, Leduc County
Darrell Hollands, Parkland County
Brian Botterill, Strathcona County
Ken Baril, Town of Legal
Kevin Maine, Village of Warburg (alternate)

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Leslie Chivers, Sturgeon County
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Mike Pieters, City of Leduc
Yolande Shaw, Strathcona County

Regrets:
Stephen Lindop, Town of Devon (Vice Chair)
Bill Skinner, Town of Lamont
Doug Lagore, CEO

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager (Acting CEO)
Brendan Pinches, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager
Stephanie Chai, Assistant Project Manager

Brandt Denham, GIS Coordinator
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant
Gary Gordon, Headwater Group

1. Call to Order

Chair, Mayor Mel Smith, called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m.

2. Opening Remarks

3. Approval of the Agenda

Motion: That the agenda of August 28, 2014 be approved, as amended to add Agenda Item 10.1 “Regional Services Committee input to the Growth Plan Update”.

Moved by: Councillor Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert

Decision: Unanimously carried
4. Approval of the Minutes, June 19, 2014

Motion: That the minutes of June 19, 2014 be approved.
Moved by: Councillor Brian Botterill, Strathcona County
Decision: Unanimously carried

5. Revised Terms of Reference

Motion: That the Regional Services Committee recommend its Terms of Reference be submitted to the Board for approval.
Moved by: Councillor Michael Walters, City of Edmonton
Decision: Unanimously carried

6. Draft GIS Policy Development

Motion: That the Regional Services Committee receive the Draft Geographic Information Services (GIS) Policy for review and information. Further, that the Draft GIS Policy be referred to the Transit and Land Use & Planning Committees for review and input.
Moved by: Councillor Brian Botterill, Strathcona County
Decision: Unanimously carried

7. GIS Work Plan

Motion: That the Regional Services Committee approve the proposed 2014-2018 GIS Work Plan and that the Work Plan be forwarded to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee for consideration in the preparation of the Board’s Business Plan.
Moved by: Councillor Michael Walters, City of Edmonton
Decision: Unanimously carried

8. Housing Task Force – Sub-regional Needs Assessment Framework

Motion: That the Regional Services Committee receive the Sub-regional Needs Assessment Framework project update for information.
Moved by: Councillor Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert
Decision: Unanimously carried

9. Housing Task Force Work Plan

Motion: That the Regional Services Committee approve the proposed 2014-2018 Housing Work Plan and that the Work Plan be forwarded to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee for consideration in the preparation of the Board’s Business Plan.
Moved by: Alderman Louise Baxter, City of Spruce Grove
Decision: Unanimously carried
10. New Business

10.1 Regional Services Committee input to the Growth Plan Update

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update would be a standing agenda item going forward, and that the Project Manager, Sharon Shuya would provide updates at the appropriate times for the Committee’s information and feedback.

11. Adjournment

Motion: That the Regional Services Committee meeting be adjourned.
Moved by: Councillor Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert
Decision: Unanimously carried

Meeting adjourned at 1:57 p.m.

Next meeting: October 30, 2014 at 1:30 p.m., Edmonton Petroleum Club – Rainbow Room

Committee Chair, Mel Smith
Transit Committee

Thursday, August 28, 2014
9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Edmonton Petroleum Club - Rainbow Room
11110 – 108 Street, Edmonton

Members:
Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert (Chair)
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton (Vice Chair)
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Glen Finstad, City of Leduc (alternate)
Searle Turton, City of Spruce Grove
Brian Botterill, Strathcona County
Alan Windhorst, Government of Alberta

Regrets:
Susan Evans, Sturgeon County
Doug Lagore, CEO

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager (Acting CEO)
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Dave Anderson, Strathcona County
Robin Benoit, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Matt Carpenter, Strathcona County Transit
Leslie Chivers, Sturgeon County
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Alan Harris, Town of Beaumont
Patrick Inglis, City of Spruce Grove
Leanne Labossiere, Town of Beaumont
Bob McDonald, City of St. Albert
Yolande Shaw, Strathcona County
Charlie Stolte, City of Edmonton
Kevin Wenzel, City of Leduc

Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant
Hassan Shaheen, ISL Engineering & Land Services Ltd.

1. Call to Order
Chair, Wes Brodhead called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

2. Chair Opening Remarks
Chair Brodhead welcomed Mr. Alan Windhorst, Senior Manager, Transportation Corridors Strategic Policy Branch, Government of Alberta as a member of the Transit Committee.

3. Approval of Agenda
It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Transit Committee agenda be approved, as amended to add Agenda Item 8.3 “Transit Committee input to the Growth Plan Update”.
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4. Approval of Minutes, July 17, 2014

**Motion:** That the Transit Committee minutes be approved.

**Moved by:** Alderman Searle Turton, *City of Spruce Grove*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

5. Revised Terms of Reference

**Motion:** That the Transit Committee recommends its Terms of Reference be referred back to CRB Administration to identify the criteria and process for amending the voting structure model of the Transit Committee based on input from all members of the Committee.

**Moved by:** Mayor Gale Katchur, *City of Fort Saskatchewan*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

6. Standing Agenda Items

6.1 Transit Advocacy Strategy

6.2 GreenTRIP

6.3 Recap of meeting with Minister Drysdale re: Transit Priorities – Regional Smart Card

6.4 Recap of meeting with Deputy Minister Rob Penny and Assistant Deputy Minister, Transportation on August 13, 2014

7. Project Updates

7.1 Intermunicipal Transit Governance Study

**Motion #1:** That the Transit Committee receive the Intermunicipal Transit Governance Study Municipal Feedback – Administrative Report for information and request CRB Administration refer the Municipal Feedback back to the Consultant, AECOM, to provide a contextual response to the questions and to incorporate the responses into the final report.

**Moved by:** Councillor Brian Botterill, *Strathcona County*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

7.2 2015 Household Travel Study

**Motion:** That the Transit Committee accept the 2015 Regional Household Travel Survey update provided by CRB Administration, as information.

**Moved by:** Councillor Michael Walters, *City of Edmonton*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously
8. New Business

8.1 4 Year Work Plan

Motion: That the Transit Committee approve the proposed 2014-2018 Transit Work Plan and that the Work Plan be forwarded to the Governance, Priorities Finance Committee for consideration in the preparation of the Board’s Business Plan.
Moved by: Mayor Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Decision: Carried unanimously

8.2 Notice of Motion from Board Meeting

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Notice of Motion from the Town of Bruderheim, from the August 14, Board has been addressed by the Transit Committee in its 4 Year Work Plan.

Notice of Motion: That the Transit Committee be requested to include for consideration the needs assessment funding for specialized transit in the 2015 Work Plan.

8.3 Transit Committee input to the Growth Plan Update

It was agreed by unanimous consensus to add this item to the September 19, 2014 Transit Committee Agenda.

9. Adjournment

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Transit Committee meeting be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 11:11 a.m.

Next Meeting: September 19, 2014 at 9:00 a.m., Edmonton Petroleum Club – Valley View Room

Transit Committee Chair, Wes Brodhead