Meeting Agenda
March 13, 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 February 13, 2014

5. REF Applications
   a. REF 2014-001, Sturgeon County, Proposed Municipal Development Plan

   Motion: That the Capital Region Board approves the proposed Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan in accordance with the Regional Evaluation Framework.

6. CRB 2013 Audited Financial Statements

   Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the 2013 calendar year Audited Financial Statements.

7. Regional Services Committee
   a. Letter Regarding Study of High-Speed Rail

   Motion: That the Capital Region Board forward the attached letter of response to the Standing Committee on Alberta’s Economic Future regarding the Study of High-Speed Rail in the Province of Alberta.

8. Other Business
   a. Fort Saskatchewan Motion – Performance Monitoring Committee Terms of Reference Amendment

   Motion: That the Terms of Reference for the Performance Monitoring Committee be amended to increase the membership by one (1) member to provide the City of Edmonton with membership on the Performance Monitoring Committee, thereby increasing the membership to six (6) members.

   b. CEO Administers Selection of Member at Large for the Performance Monitoring Committee – CEO declares successful candidate

   Motion: That the Capital Region Board forward the attached letter of response to the Standing Committee on Alberta’s Economic Future regarding the Study of High-Speed Rail in the Province of Alberta.
c. Spruce Grove Motion – Economic Development Committee

Motion: That the Board direct the CEO to prepare a Terms of Reference, complete with budget, for the establishment of an Economic Development Committee taking into consideration the “Capitalize – The Economic Roadmap for Alberta’s Capital Region” report and report back to the Board within 90 days.

---

d. St. Albert Motion – Revise CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

Motion: That the CRB CEO revises the May 9, 2013 “CRB Administrative Procedure for the Regional Evaluation Framework”, (and any other related policies, procedures and terms of reference) by including clarification in the following four areas:

1. Prior to Step # 1 “Receipt of Application by CRB”, the CRB staff may be consulted by an Applicant for advice relative to submission of a REF application.

2. The best professional advice shall be provided to the Applicant by staff in writing. At this stage there shall be no consultant yet engaged by the CRB.

3. Once Step # 3 “Application Deemed Complete” is achieved, there shall be no further advice given by CRB staff, CRB consultants and no changes made to the application whatsoever.

4. Sending the “Deemed Complete” email verifies the final document to be evaluated. Clarification may be sought but no changes whatsoever may be made to the documents from this point forward until a decision is made by the CRB. If the Third Party Consultant requires clarification regarding an Application, then a supplemental report may be submitted by the Applicant for clarity, but there shall be no alteration made to the original Application.

5. The appeal period be changed from 14 calendar days to 21 calendar days.

---

9. Administrative Items

a. CEO’s update

i. Per Diem Summary (no decision required)

ii. Update on Electronic Voting (verbal; no decision required)

iii. Communications Update (verbal; no decision required)

---

10. Committee/Task Force Minutes

a. Land Use & Planning Committee (Draft Minutes)
b. Regional Services Committee *(Draft Minutes)*  Pg. 72 of 76

c. Energy Corridors Task Force *(Draft Minutes)*  Pg. 75 of 76

11. Adjournment
Minutes of the meeting of the Capital Region Board
held at Grand Ballroom, Chateau Louis Conference Centre
on Thursday, February 13, 2014

Delegates in Attendance:
Mayor Nolan Crouse – St. Albert/Chair
Mayor Camille Berube – Beaumont
Councillor Steven Sharun – Town of Lamont
Mayor Roxanne Carr – Strathcona County
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Mayor Lisa Holmes – Morinville
Councillor Art Erickson – Wabamun
Mayor John Whaley – Leduc County
Mayor Mel Smith – Redwater
Mayor William Choy – Stony Plain
Mayor Ralph van Assen – Warburg
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord

Mayor Stephen Lindop – Devon
Mayor Stuart Houston – Spruce Grove
Mayor Doug Horner – Gibbons
Mayor Barry Rasch – Thorsby
Mayor Karl Hauch – Bruderheim
Mayor Rodney Shaigec – Parkland County
Mayor Ken Baril – Legal
Mayor Tom Flynn – Sturgeon County
Councillor Dana Smith – City of Leduc
Mayor Don Faulkner - Calmar
Reeve Wayne Woldanski – Lamont County
Ivan Moore – Government of Alberta

Absent:
None.

CRB Administration:
Doug Lagore, Chief Executive Officer
Brendan Pinches, Project Manager
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Stephanie Chai, Planning Intern
Courtney Andrews, Executive Assistant
Allyson Jacques, Administrative Assistant
Amanda Borman, Administrative Assistant
1. Call to Order
   Called to order 9:00 a.m.

2. Chair's Opening Remarks
   Chair Crouse advised members that at the Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee meeting on February 10, 2014, Mayor Berube was voted Chair of the Committee and Councillor Kobasiuk as Vice Chair of the Committee. Chair Crouse advised that in a case where he or Mayor Berube, Vice Chair of Board, were unavailable to Chair a Board meeting, the Board would need to have a Board member chair the meeting. Members were asked if there was any opposition to the Mayor from Parkland County chairing the meeting if neither Mayor Crouse or Mayor Berube were able, as Councillor Kobasiuk in the Chair would provide Parkland County with two votes. No opposition was noted.

3. Approval of Agenda
   Moved by Mayor Boyd.

   Motion: To approve the agenda of February 13, 2014.
   Motion carried unanimously.

4. Approval of Minutes of November 14, 2013
   Moved by Mayor Katchur.

   Motion: To approve the minutes of November 14, 2013.
   Motion carried unanimously.

   9:07 a.m. Councillor Dana Smith arrived as the representative for the City of Leduc.

5. Governance, Priorities & Finance
   a. 2013 Annual Report
      Mayor Berube introduced the item. Mr. Doug Lagore noted that following the Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee meeting a few minor changes were made to the Annual Report before redistributing to the members. It was requested that the CRB organizational chart be amended to include CRB municipalities under Municipal Affairs. It was also noted that CRB Administration are in the process of attempting to book a meeting with the Edmonton Caucus to present the 2013 Annual Report.

      Moved by Mayor Berube.

      Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the 2013 Annual Report as approved by the Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee.
      Motion carried unanimously.
b. CRB 2014 Revised Budget

Mayor Berube introduced the item. Members discussed the budget as presented. It was requested that the amounts allocated to Board initiatives ($50,000) and Special Projects ($250,000) come back to the Board for review and approval.

**Moved by** Mayor Berube.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the 2014 revised budget as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Mayor Holmes put forward a motion.

**Moved by** Mayor Holmes.

**Motion:** To postpone the 2014 revised budget until May 2014.

Mayor Holmes requested to withdraw the motion. 1 opposition was noted; members voted on the postponement.

2 in favour, 22 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion failed.**

Mayor Crouse put forward a friendly amendment to add the word “preliminary” to the motion with reference to the budget; 1 opposition to the friendly amendment was noted. Members voted on the original motion.

**Moved by** Mayor Berube.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the 2014 revised budget as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

22 in favour, 2 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion carried.**

6. Other Business

a. St. Albert Motion – Revise CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

Chair Crouse advised that the motion will be brought back to the March 2014 meeting.

**Motion not moved.**

**Motion:** That the CRB CEO revise the May 9, 2013 “CRB Administrative Procedure for the Regional Evaluation Framework”, by including clarification in the following 4 areas:

1. Prior to the Step #1 of “Receipt of Application by CRB”, the CRB staff may be consulted by an Applicant for advice relative to submission of a REF application.
2. The best professional advice shall be provided to the Applicant by staff in writing. At this stage there shall be no consultant yet engaged by the CRB.

3. Once the Step # 3 is achieved titled “Application Deemed Complete”, there shall be no further advice given by CRB staff, CRB consultants and no changes made to the application whatsoever.

4. By sending the “Deemed Complete” email that action clarifies what the final document is that is to be evaluated. Clarification may be sought but no changes are allowed whatsoever to the documents from this point forward until a decision is made by the CRB.

b. Regional Evaluation Framework (Ministerial Order L:270/10) Amendment

Chair Crouse advised that the motion will be brought back after the CRB Strategic Plan is completed.

**Motion not moved.**

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board direct the Board Chair to send a letter to the Minister of Alberta Municipal Affairs requesting that the Regional Evaluation Framework (Ministerial Order L:270/10) be amended by deleting Section 5.4 b) (ii) relating to the consistency of Statutory Plans and Statutory Plan Amendments with the regional population and employment forecasts in the Capital Region Growth Plan as recommended by the Land Use Committee.

c. Selection of Member at Large for Performance Monitoring Committee *(nominations will be accepted up to and including February 28, 2014)*

Mr. Doug Lagore spoke to the item noting that the Performance Monitoring Committee consists of the Chairs of the standing CRB Committees plus one member at large. Nominations for the member at large will be open until February 28, 2014 and will be voted on at the March Board meeting.

d. CRB Policy A001 – Email Distribution Lists

Mr. Doug Lagore noted that following the request of some member municipalities, it is being proposed that Policy A001 be amended to accommodate this request.

**Moved by** Councillor Erickson.

**Motion:** That Policy A001 be amended by adding the following as #6 under guidelines: “All correspondence, including the board, committees and task force agenda packages, will be distributed to all elected officials unless otherwise directed by the municipality mayor or reeve in writing.”

Mayor Choy put forward a friendly amendment to remove the words “unless otherwise directed by the municipality mayor or reeve in writing” to be replaced by "otherwise unsubscribed”. The friendly amendment was not accepted by members.
Mayor Iveson put forward a motion.

**Moved by** Mayor Iveson.

**Motion:** That Policy A001 be referred to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee for further review.

21 in favour, 3 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion carried.**

e. Spruce Grove – Economic Development Committee

Mayor Houston provided an overview of the notice put forward by the City of Spruce Grove.

**Provided by** Mayor Houston.

**Notice of Motion:** That the Board direct the CEO to prepare a Terms of Reference, complete with a budget, for the establishment of an Economic Development Committee taking into consideration the “Capitalize – The Economic Roadmap for Alberta’s Capital Region” report and report back to the Board within 90 days.

7. **Administrative Items**

a. CEO’s update

i. Committee Structure update

Mr. Doug Lagore noted that the information pertaining to the new CRB Committee Structure has been provided for information. He also introduced the CRB’s Communications Manager, Loreen Lennon and Administrative Assistant, Amanda Borman.

ii. Status of Growth Plan update

Ms. Sharon Shuya provided a status update on the Growth Plan update project with reference to the program overview as contained within the Board package.

iii. Strategic Planning – next steps

Mr. Doug Lagore provided information regarding the next steps for the Plan; highlighting the timeline for the planning process. It was noted that the third workshop in the planning process will be rescheduled to June 6th instead of June 13th to accommodate the Alberta Industrial Heartland Association orientation session.

iv. Update on Population and Employment

Mr. Doug Lagore provided a verbal update on the project. He noted that the projections will be updated to reflect the new statistics received from Stats Canada and distributed to the member municipalities.

b. December Quarterly Financial Statement

8. **Committee Minutes**

a. 2013 Committee Minutes

Chair Crouse introduced the item.
Moved by Mayor Berube.
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Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the 2013 Committees’ Minutes.

Motion carried unanimously.

b. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee (Draft Minutes)

The draft Committee minutes were distributed to members for their information.

Mr. Doug Lagore advised members that more copies of the CRB 101 brochure will be available and that if any municipality would like more copies, they can send a request to the CRB staff.

It was also noted that the CRB’s Communication Manager will be contacting each municipality to inquire about the CRB Chair attending and presenting to their municipality in the near future.

9. Adjournment

Moved by Mayor Faulkner.
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Motion: To adjourn the meeting.

Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:44 a.m.

CRB Chair, Nolan Crouse

CRB CEO, Doug Lagore
PURPOSE

To establish the Board meeting procedures for an appealed Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) application.

POLICY

The Capital Region Board (CRB) shall conduct the REF appeal efficiently with a standardized process to manage the appeal. In accordance with Ministerial Order L:270/10 Section 5, at the meeting at which the Board administration report and recommendation are presented, the Board must, by consensus, approve or reject the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment. In the event that consensus is not achieved, a formal vote of the Board must be conducted in accordance with the voting and notification provisions of the Capital Region Board Regulation and Policy G005 Board Meeting Procedures.

GUIDELINES

1. The Board Chair shall introduce the Agenda item.
2. The Board Chair shall acknowledge the member from the applicant municipality.
3. The member from the applicant municipality shall read the motion (the Board Chair does not accept the motion at this point) and present the REF application.
4. CRB administration shall present its recommendation.
5. The Board Chair shall advise that the CRB administration recommendation was appealed by a member municipality or municipalities. The appealing municipality or municipalities shall present the basis for the appeal(s).
6. The Board Chair shall begin an open period of questions and answers for clarification.
7. The member from the applicant municipality may withdraw the REF application or read the motion into the record.
8. Should the applicant wish to proceed, the motion shall be accepted by the Board Chair.
   a. The Board Chair shall open the floor for debate.
   b. Each party shall be given an opportunity to respond once, in accordance with Policy G005 Board Meeting Procedures. The Board Chair may only speak second last and only after relinquishing the Chair to the Vice-Chair.
   c. As mover, the member from the applicant municipality closes the debate.
9. The Board Chair calls the vote.
REF 2014-001, Sturgeon County
Proposed Municipal Development Plan

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves the proposed Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan in accordance with the Regional Evaluation Framework.

Background

On January 2, 2014 the CRB received an application from Sturgeon County (the County) for approval of a proposed new Municipal Development Plan (MDP).

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 January 29, 2014. In accordance with the REF Administration Procedures the CRB Administration recommendation was subject to a 14 day appeal period ending on February 12, 2014.

A Notice of Appeal of the subject REF Application was received on February 7, 2014 from the City of Edmonton (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 Edmonton
REF 2014-001, Sturgeon County
Proposed Municipal Development Plan

Recommendation

CRB Administration recommends that REF application 2014-001 be approved.

Background

On January 2, 2014 the Capital Region Board (CRB) received a Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) application from Sturgeon County (the County) for approval of a proposed new Municipal Development Plan (MDP). The County submitted the application pursuant to the following submission criteria in the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF):

3.1 A Municipality must refer to the Board any proposed new Intermunicipal Development Plan, Municipal Development Plan and any proposed amendment to an Intermunicipal Development Plan or Municipal Development Plan.

CRB Administration deemed the application complete on January 6, 2014.

The Application

The proposed Municipal Development Plan replaces the 1996 Municipal Development Plan as the County’s primary policy document for long range planning, highlighting the community’s needs and directing future growth. The MDP describes the County’s preferred direction with respect to land use, residential and non-residential types, infrastructure investments, service provision and future development zones; guides policy creation and planning tools regarding land use, transportation and infrastructure investment decisions across the County; and, provides an overarching document to assist in the coordination of municipal bylaws, policies, programs and investments.

Evaluation

CRB Administration obtained the assistance of Stantec Consulting Ltd. to evaluate the application with respect to the REF requirements. The Stantec evaluation (attached) reviewed the proposed MDP 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 Stantec evaluation recommends that the proposed MDP be supported by the CRB.

CRB Administration Comments

This application marks the first MDP to be submitted by a County under the Regional Evaluation Framework. Further, Sturgeon County is one of the few municipalities within the Region that must consider every principle and policy within the Growth Plan in their planning. Acknowledging and balancing the various principles in the Growth Plan such as preserving agricultural lands, protecting natural
resources and minimizing the regional footprint, is no simple task when an MDP is based on a “pro-growth development model” as in Sturgeon’s case.

The Integrated Regional Growth Strategy, the model on which MDP is based, is consistent with the integrated and strategic approach to planning contained in the Growth Plan. The MDP and Growth Plan both emphasize regional consultation and collaboration with neighbouring municipalities to coordinate decisions affecting the overall development pattern and future infrastructure investments of the Capital Region.

Further, the MDP is consistent with the six guiding principles of the Growth Plan:

**Protect the Environment and Resources**
The MDP acknowledges the importance of a healthy environment and includes a neighbourhood overlay that supports environmental stewardship. Sturgeon County has abundant natural and agricultural resources. Policies have been established to guide and develop the resources efficiently and with minimal impact on the environment and residential land uses.

**Minimize the Regional Footprint**
The MDP proposes to minimize the regional footprint by maximizing the development potential of Priority Growth Area “B” and Country Cluster Residential Area “O” through the application of Growth Plan density targets. Growth outside of the PGA is limited to the current capacity of existing regional infrastructure.

**Strengthen Communities**
Through Community Guiding Principles: Residential Character and Cultural Vitality, the MDP supports creating attractive and complete communities with access to a diverse array of quality community spaces, amenities and programming.

**Increase Transportation Choice**
The MDP supports the creation of a sustainable transportation system, aligning land use decisions with regional transportation goals. Despite Sturgeon County’s predominately rural nature, the MDP includes policies that support an integrated regional public transportation system and encourage increased public transportation options.

**Ensure Efficient Provision of Services**
The MDP includes policies supporting the coordination of regional infrastructure servicing with municipal neighbours and maximizing the use of existing infrastructure.

**Support Regional Economic Development**
The MDP has multiple policies supporting regional economic development including aligning strategies with the Capital Region Board development strategies that are mutually beneficial and collaborating with regional partners to identify opportunities.

Overall, CRB Administration considers the proposed MDP 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.
CRB Administration recommends that REF 2014-001 be approved.

**Attachments**

**Evaluation**  
Stantec Consulting Ltd.

**REF Documents**  
attachment A-Bylaw131313  
attachment B-Request for Decision  
attachment C01-bylaw131313-preliminary-draft-vII-2013-12-20  
attachment C02-Appendix A-4  
attachment D-Public Engagement Plan  
attachment E-Background Report  
attachment F-Preferred Action Plan  
attachment G-Supplementary Report  
attachment H-Municipal Development Plan 1996  
attachment I-Sturgeon County REF Application Letter May 2013  
attachment J-Sturgeon County REF Application Letter August 2013  
attachment K-Stantec REF 2013-010 Evaluation June 2013  
attachment L-Stantec REF 2013-016 Evaluation September 2013  
attachment M-CRB Administration REF 2013-010 Recommendation June 2013  
attachment N-CRB Administration REF-2013-016 Recommendation Sept 2013
January 23, 2014
File: 116100150-258

Attention: Mr. Nolan Crouse, Chair
Capital Region Board
Suite 1100, Bell Tower
10104 - 103 Ave
Edmonton, AB, T5J 0H8

Dear Mr. Crouse,

Reference: Referral REF# 2014-001 Sturgeon County - Proposed Municipal Development Plan

Attached is our third party evaluation of the above noted referral from Sturgeon County.

It is our opinion that REF# 2014-001 does generally comply with the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan as set out in Section 11 of the Capital Region Board Regulation and is consistent with Section 5.4 of the Schedule A to Ministerial Order No. L:270/10.

We recommend that the Capital Region Board support the proposed Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan (Bylaw 1313/13).

Regards,

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Bonnie McInnis RPP, MCIP, MEDes
Senior Associate, Community Development
Phone: (780) 969-3374
Fax: (780) 917-7179
bonnie.mcinnis@stantec.com

Attachment: Sturgeon County, REF 2014-001 Evaluation
Regional Evaluation Framework: Third Party Evaluation

Sturgeon County
Municipal Development Plan
REF 2014–001
Proposed Municipal Bylaw 1313/13

1 Introduction

The Province has adopted the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) for the Capital Region Board (Board) to ensure consistency with the Capital Region Growth Plan and the Capital Region Board Regulation. Section 3.1 of the Regulation states a municipality must refer to the Board any proposed new intermunicipal development plan, municipal development plan and any proposed amendment to an intermunicipal development plan or municipal development plan. Sturgeon County (Sturgeon) has referred its proposed new municipal development plan (MDP) to the Board as it meets the requirement of REF for submission.

2 Background and Purpose

Status:
The Bylaw received 1st reading on November 12, 2013.
Public Hearings were held November 16, 2013, and December 10, 2013.
The Bylaw received 2nd reading on December 17, 2013.

Purpose:
To adopt a proposed new Municipal Development Plan. The current 1996 MDP does not align with the policies contained within the Capital Region Growth Plan or the Sturgeon County Strategic Plan and, based on new analysis and community consultation, the new plan provides a new long term strategy.

3 Evaluation Criteria

Section 5.4 of REF lists what the Board must consider in its evaluation. These considerations are listed below, with a discussion of each in the context of the MDP.

Section 5.4 a) compatibility of the development with the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan as set out in Section 11 of the Regulation. Section 11 of the Capital Region Board Regulation outlines the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan as being:

Section 11(a) to promote an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Capital Region:

Commentary:
Based on clarifications and refinements to earlier versions of the Municipal Development Plan, the policies in the MDP are consistent with the strategic and integrated planning objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

The MDP provides a high-level planning framework and policy intended to describe and manage the future growth of Sturgeon consistent with the stated development strategy. The MDP divides Sturgeon into ten sub-areas that are referred to as ‘neighbourhoods’ (See Appendix 1). Policies within each
neighborhood provide an additional level of detail to respond to local conditions and opportunities. The general planning context is reflected in Appendix 2.

Consistency with the objectives of the *Capital Region Growth Plan* is demonstrated in the MDP’s Guiding Principles. The Community Guiding Principle, RG1.2 Establishing Effective and Collaborative Processes, states that Sturgeon (1.2.1) *Shall promote intermunicipal dialogue at both the political and administrative levels to facilitate an approved and united vision for the region;* (1.2.2) *Should encourage the coordination of joint municipal processes and Planning Documents that provide agreement for land-use activity along shared municipal boundaries;* (1.2.3) *Should establish infrastructure servicing and joint-use partnership agreements with municipal neighbours and other government agencies that are mutually beneficial and provide for the coordinated distribution of municipal services;* (1.2.4) *Should work with regional and provincial stakeholders to identify and accommodate connectivity for roads of regional significance.*

Section 11(b) to identify the overall development pattern and key future infrastructure investments that would:

(i) best complement existing infrastructure, services and land uses in the Capital Region, and

(ii) maximize benefits to the Capital Region:

**Commentary:** The MDP seeks to attain the density targets appropriate for Priority Growth Area PGA-B, and Cluster Country Residential Area CCRA-O within the context of regional objectives and local desires. The MDP supports and encourages the logical extension of existing local infrastructure and coordination of regional infrastructure and transportation with Capital Region partners. In numerous instances, the MDP calls for further analysis of infrastructure before future development. The MDP does provide some future infrastructure mapping that shows integration of the overall development pattern in the MDP that is generally consistent with key infrastructure identified in the *Growth Plan.*

Section 11(c) coordinate decisions in the Capital Region to sustain economic growth and ensure strong communities and a healthy environment.

**Commentary:** The plan provides a comprehensive strategy with policies addressing economic issues (diversification and growth, as well as identifies specific strategies and general locations for commercial and industrial development including Alberta’s Industrial Heartland, etc.), environmental issues (protecting environmentally significant and natural areas, and natural resource use, etc.), and social issues (establishing complete communities with open spaces, local services and employment opportunities, as well as health, wellness, culture, safety, etc.).

Section 5.4 b) whether the approval and full implementation of the plan would result in a level, type and pattern of development that is consistent with all of the following:

(i) The Land Use Principles and Policies of the *Capital Region Growth Plan* including provisions for:
   i. Buffer area as shown on the Regional Buffers Area Map in the *Capital Region Growth Plan;*
   ii. Priority Growth Areas as shown on the Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas map in the *Capital Region Growth Plan;*
   iii. Cluster Country Residential Areas as shown on the Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas map in the *Capital Region Growth Plan;*
   iv. Density targets as outlined in the *Capital Region Growth Plan; and*
   v. Outside Priority Growth Areas as outlined in the *Capital Region Growth Plan.*
### Commentary:

#### i
The policies in the proposed MDP are consistent with the buffers identified in the Regional Buffer Areas map in the *Capital Region Growth Plan*. Specifically, it includes policies for the Edmonton Garrison Approach Path; Villeneuve Airport; the Conservation Buffer for Big Lake and the various creeks and rivers; and the Safety & Risk Management Buffer around the Alberta Heartland Industrial Area.

#### ii
The MDP Neighbourhood G includes those parts of PGA-B (a priority growth area) and CCRA-O (cluster country residential area) that are within Sturgeon County. The MDP designates approximately 80% of Sturgeon’s residential growth in Neighbourhood G. This includes urban forms of development (Residential Type 01: a range of housing densities from estate residential—not defined—to high-density residential development) are contemplated within the PGA area of Neighbourhood G. All Residential Type 01 development requires municipal infrastructure and services. Residential Type 01 is consistent with the intent of PGAs outlined in the *Capital Region Growth Plan*.

The MDP proposes that the urban development (Type 1) be concentrated in the CCRA-O and a transitional area in PGA-B between the City of St. Albert and Sturgeon’s country residential area to the east (See Appendix 3). The remainder of the PGA (all of Neighbourhood G west of Highway 2 and the City of St. Albert are noted as “being beyond the planning horizon of the CRGP” and interim use of these lands will focus on primary industry (agriculture, etc.).

#### iii
The MDP Policy G 1.2.1 *Shall conform to the total number of residential units in the CCRA-O through the application of the CRGP’s Country Cluster Residential policies*; is consistent with the CRB requirements for Cluster Country Residential Areas.

#### iv
With respect to the PGA, MDP policy G 1.1.1 states, *Shall ensure Residential densification in PGA Developing Growth by requiring applications to adhere to the Residential density targets outlined in the PGA-B of the CRB Growth Plan*. The MDP states that this area shall have a minimum density of 30 dwelling units/net residential hectare—which meets the minimum target from the *CRB Growth Plan* for this PGA. Further, policy G 1.1.2 states Sturgeon *Shall encourage the incorporation of a wide range of housing options (both Market and Non-Market Affordable) and built forms (including single-detached, semi-detached, townhouses and multi-unit housing) in PGA Developing Growth that meet the PGA-B density targets*. These two statements apply only to PGA — Developing Future Growth. The western area, noted as being beyond the time horizon of the plan, provides for Residential Type 04 (four residences to a quarter section).

With respect to the CCRA, MDP policy G 1.2.2 states that the County *should identify, prioritize and establish density ranges in the CCRA-O, to ensure cohesive development patterns between the Cities of Edmonton and St. Albert and Primary Industry activities, in an effort to achieve viable options to support density allocations as outlined in the Capital Region Growth Plan*. This may involve the creation of additional programs or policies that support varying densities from one location within the CCRA-O to strategic locations identified through Sturgeon County’s planning process. This is consistent with the general concept of clustering contemplated in the *Capital Region Growth Plan*. 
Land designations and policies outside of PGA-B and CCRA-O conform to the policies and provisions of the Capital Region Growth Plan, and are consistent with the CRB requirements for allowing growth only to the extent that existing servicing and infrastructure can support and that no expansion to regional infrastructure is contemplated that is not consistent with the Capital Region Growth Plan.

(iii) The regional population and employment forecasts in the Capital Region Growth Plan:

**Commentary:** The CRB’s most recent population forecast identifies a population range of 31,000 to 39,200 for Sturgeon by the year 2044. The MDP has population forecasts allocated for each neighbourhood which total 32,437 by the year 2042. This is near the lower end of the population range and is, therefore, consistent with CRB population forecasts.

The most recent employment forecast by the CRB showed a range of employment, by 2044, from a low of 7,900 to a high of 10,000 by 2044. The MDP was predicated on previous CRB forecasts, done in 2009, which allocated employment of 18,888 for Sturgeon. The recent CRB employment forecasts have reallocated regional employment growth, resulting in a forecast of up to 10,000 jobs by 2044. The MDP allocates percentages of total employment growth by sector as follows, noting that Sturgeon’s planning documents will need to comply with CRB projections:

The employment projections now contemplated by the CRB can be accommodated by the MDP.

(iii) The regional transportation network as shown in the Regional Transportation Infrastructure map in the Capital Region Growth Plan:

**Commentary:** The MDP is consistent with the Regional Transportation Infrastructure map. In Sturgeon, the regional transportation network is primarily the existing highway network (which accommodates some intermunicipal bus routes) and the rail network, all of which is accommodated by the MDP. A future east/west regional road/highway is shown in Sturgeon north of St. Albert as an extension of the West Bypass. Both of these proposed roads are accommodated by planning for Neighbourhood G.

(iv) The Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan of the Capital Region Growth Plan (Figures 8, 9 or 10 of the Capital Region Intermunicipal Network Transit Plan), and a Transportation Master plan as approved by the City of Edmonton:
**Commentary:** All long-term intermunicipal bus routes shown by Capital Region Intermunicipal Network Transit Plan are accommodated by the existing highway network.

**(v)** The regional infrastructure, recreation, transportation and utility corridors identified on the Regional Transportation Infrastructure, Regional Water and Wastewater Infrastructure, Regional Power infrastructure and Regional Corridors maps in the *Capital Region Growth Plan*:

**Commentary:** The proposed MDP is generally consistent with regional infrastructure, recreation, transportation and utility corridors identified in the *Capital Region Growth Plan*.

**(vi)** The boundaries and policies of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Area Structure Plans and the Edmonton International Airport Area Structure Plan:

**Commentary:** A portion of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Area Structure Plan lies within Sturgeon County’s boundaries. This area is consistent and corresponds with Neighbourhood J of the proposed MDP. The policies and objectives of the MDP for Neighbourhood J are consistent with Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Area Structure Plan policies.

Sturgeon County is not within or adjacent the Edmonton International Airport Area Structure Plan and therefore this MDP has no impact on it.

### 4 Opinion

It is recommended that the Capital Region Board support the proposed Municipal Development Plan.

Prepared by:

**Stantec Consulting Ltd.**
John Steil, RPP, FCIP and Bonnie McInnis, RPP, MCIP

Appendix 1: MDP Neighbourhoods
Appendix 2: MDP Growth Strategy Concept Map
Appendix 3: Neighbourhood G
Appendix 1: MDP Neighbourhoods
Appendix 2: Growth Strategy
Appendix 3: Neighbourhood G
The Regional Evaluation Framework includes a NOTICE OF APPEAL section. The table lists an appeal related to the Municipal Development Plan Bylaw No. 1313/13, with the CRB Applicant Municipality being Sturgeon County. The appeal is made during the Appeal Period.

### APPELLANT INFORMATION
- **CRB Appellant Municipality**: City of Edmonton
- **Council Resolution #**: Report CR_870, Attachment 1

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. See attached document for basis of appeal.

---

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](http://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>Data Stamps: Appeal Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 07 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECEIVED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Received By: [Signature]

Attachment 2
Report CR_870
### Regional Evaluation Framework

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT OF APPEAL</th>
<th>CRB Applicant Municipality</th>
<th>Statutory Plan(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REF #</td>
<td>CRB Applicant Municipality</td>
<td>Statutory Plan(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-001</td>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>Municipal Development Plan Bylaw No. 1313/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Administration Recommendation</td>
<td>Appeal Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Edmonton</td>
<td>Report CR_870, Attachment 1</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.

See attached document for basis of appeal.

---

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](http://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.
Summary of Reasons for Appeal to the Capital Region Board of the Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan, Regional Evaluation Framework 2014-001.

The decision to appeal the Capital Region Board Administration’s approval of the Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan (2014-001) is based on the criteria of Section 5.4 of the Regional Evaluation Framework. The main arguments are outlined below:

1. **Sturgeon County MDP does not meet the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan, as defined in Section 11 of the Capital Region Board Regulation (Section 11 (a) and (b) (i)).**

These objectives include promoting an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Capital Region and; identifying the development patterns and key future infrastructure investments that best complement existing infrastructure, services and land uses in the region.

The Sturgeon County MDP does not meet these objectives given the proposed planning and development described in Neighbourhood G for an urban area immediately north of St. Albert within PGA B, a PGA shared by both the City of St. Albert and the City of Edmonton. The area of PGA B to the East of Highway 2 is designated as PGA Developing Growth area. The plan states that development of this area will occur based on Residential Type 1 policies. This residential type contains a range of housing densities (ranging from estate residential to high-density residential development). These policies allow for an urban form of development requiring municipal infrastructure and services. To best complement existing patterns of development and related infrastructure, and to ensure orderly and economic extension of development and related services, development in PGA B should be contiguous with the existing urban area. Sturgeon County’s development of the PGA could lead to parallel infrastructure provision, greenways and parks areas that are not connected and transportation linkages that do not take into account the long term development of PGA B in a strategic and integrated manner.

2. **The Sturgeon County MDP is not consistent with the Capital Region Growth Plan principle of Minimizing Regional Footprint (Capital Region Land Use Plan, Section 2.2 II a., b., and c.).**

Although the lands proposed for urban development in the Sturgeon County MDP are within a PGA, the Capital Region Growth Plan specifies that priority be given to growth in PGAs where three of four criteria are met. In the case of development of PGA B as described in the Sturgeon County MDP, only two of the criteria will be met - the lands are on a proposed multi-mode movement corridor and adjacent to an existing major employment area. The other two
criteria - intensification of an existing urban area and locations that utilize existing infrastructure or logically extend that infrastructure - are not met. Therefore, PGA Developing Growth area should not be given priority for development at this time. There is no commitment within the MDP that the PGA Developing Growth area will meet the density target of 30-45+ dwelling units per net residential hectare. It is noted that Type 1 residential policies allow for a range of housing densities, and therefore it is not clear that minimizing footprint will be achieved. On the other hand, development to densities expected in PGA B will, on its own, result in a population increase that will exceed Sturgeon County’s overall population forecast. This lack of commitment and clarity on how the PGA Developing Growth area is to be planned and developed strongly suggests that designation of these lands for development at this time is pre-mature.

The Plan also identifies the Hamlet of Villeneuve for future growth, with a projected population more than triple its current size, essentially creating a new town, which is in excess of what is appropriate for growth outside of a Priority Growth Area.

3. The Sturgeon County MDP is not consistent with the Capital Region Growth Plan principle to Ensure Efficient Provision of Services (Capital Region Land Use Plan, Section 2.2 V, a., and b.).

Development of PGA Developing Growth area will require the extension of services from St. Albert. There are existing undeveloped areas within the City of St. Albert that should be developed before extension of its infrastructure is considered. The Plan requires that within the PGA Developing Growth area, development applications must “ensure the provisions of municipal infrastructure servicing.” The Plan does not consider how this is to be accomplished in a strategic, integrated and efficient manner. It is noted that there is no agreement between Sturgeon County and the City of St. Albert to extend infrastructure services to PGA Developing Growth area.

The Plan contemplates the Sturgeon Industrial Park becoming a major employment area, an inconsistency with the Growth Plan which does not identify these lands as a major employment area. In order to develop the Park to this extent will require significant infrastructure investment that has not been rationalized in a regional context within the Capital Region Growth Plan.
Actions to be Taken

1. That the Mayor, on behalf of City Council, sign Council's written resolution outlined in Attachment 1 of the January 20, 2014, Sustainable Development report CR_870.

2. That, if the Capital Region Board Administration recommends approval of Regional Evaluation Framework application 2014-001, the Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan, Administration file, at the Capital Region Board, Council's signed written resolution appealing the recommendation on Regional Evaluation Framework application 2014-001, as set out in Attachment 1, and the Notice of Appeal, as set out in Attachment 2 to the January 20, 2014, Sustainable Development report CR_870.
CERTIFICATE

I certify that the attached document, comprised of three pages, is a true copy of January 20, 2014, Special City Council Minutes, Item 3.1, Inter-municipal Update - Capital Region Board, and the corresponding Resolution of Council.

SIGNED AND SEALED

February 6, 2014

Alayne Sinclair
City Clerk
Call to Order

Mayor D. Iveson called the meeting to order at 12:26 p.m.

1.2 Adoption of Agenda

Moved S. McKeen - M. Oshry:
That the January 20, 2014, Special City Council meeting agenda be adopted with the following changes:

Addition:

3.1 Inter-municipal Update - Capital Region Board
PRIVATE
(Sections 21, 24, 25 and 27 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act)

In Favour: Carried
D. Iveson, B. Anderson, B. Esslinger, E. Gibbons,
B. Henderson, A. Knack, D. Loken, S. McKeen, M. Nickel,
M. Oshry, A. Sohi, M. Walters

Absent:
T. Caterina

1.3 Protocol Items

There were no protocol items.

2. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND RELATED BUSINESS

2.1 Requests to Speak

There were no requests to speak.

2.2 Requests for Specific Time on Agenda

There were no requests for any items to be dealt with at a specific time.

3. PRIVATE REPORTS

3.1 Inter-municipal Update - Capital Region Board

Council met in private at 12:28 p.m., pursuant to sections 21, 24, 25 and 27 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Council met in public at 3:39 p.m.
Moved E. Gibbons - M. Nickel:


In Favour:


3.2 Emerging Waste Management Issues - Verbal report

Council met in private at 12:28 p.m., pursuant to sections 21, 24, 25 and 27 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Council met in public at 2:26 p.m.

Moved S. McKeen - B. Henderson:

That Notice of Renewal be dispensed with and that the following motion made at the December 17, 2013, Special City Council motion be renewed:

B. Henderson- D. Loken (made at the December 17, 2013, Special City Council meeting):

1. That the 2014 Waste Management Utility's operating revenues be increased by $500,000.

2. That the 2012 - 2014 Waste Management Capital Equipment Budget be increased by $2 million with funding from the following sources:

   a. a $1 million transfer from the 2013 City Operating Budget contingency to be repaid by the Waste Management Utility over 5 years

   b. $500,000 from the Waste Management Utility Operating Budget from increased operating revenue

   c. $500,000 from the Waste Management Utility's
Resolution of Council

City 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 in Attachment 2 of the January 20, 2014, Sustainable Development report CR_870.

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

Mayor Don Iveson

Date

City Clerk

Date
February 7, 2014

Mr. Doug Lagore
Chief Executive Officer
Capital Region Board
#1100 Bell Tower
10104 – 103 Avenue
Edmonton, AB T5J 0H8

Dear Mr. Lagore:

Please find attached, for service upon you, the Notice of Appeal and a Certified Copy of the Council Motion directing this appeal of the proposed Sturgeon County Municipal Development Plan (MDP), Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) application 2014-001.

The City of Edmonton is filing this appeal on the basis that the above noted application is non-compliant with the approved Growth Plan in three key areas as described in the attached REF Notice of Appeal and companion documents.

Further, we believe that the limits of the CRB Administration’s discretion in recommending approval of REF applications needs to be reviewed.

This appeal ensures that the proposed Sturgeon County MDP will be considered by the CRB Board itself, where the authority to approve a non-compliant plan properly resides.

Yours truly,

S.C. Farbrother, MCIP, RPP, MA
City Manager

SCF/tl

Enclosures: Notice of Appeal Form and Summary of Reasons For Appeal
Certified Copy of the Council Minutes
Singed Copy of the Council Motion
CRB 2013 Audited Financial Statements

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the 2013 calendar year Audited Financial Statements.

Background

- Section 9 of the CRB Regulation requires the Board to submit an annual report on its activities in the preceding year to the Minister of Municipal Affairs by May 31 each year including audited financial statements. The CRB’s 2013 Audited Financial Statements will be included in the 2013 Annual Report document that was approved by the Board at its meeting of February 13, 2014.

Next Steps

- Following approval of the 2013 Audited Financial Statements, CRB administration will add these statements into the 2013 Annual Report to finalize the document. A printed version of the complete Annual Report will be provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in April 2014.

Rationale

- Ensures compliance with section 9 of the CRB Regulation to submit an annual activity report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs by May 1 of each year including audited financial statements.
CAPITAL REGION BOARD
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2013
INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

To the Members of Capital Region Board

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the Capital Region Board, which comprise the statement of financial position as at December 31, 2013 and the statements of operations, changes in net financial assets (debt), and cash flows for the year then ended, and a summary of significant accounting policies and other explanatory information.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

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

Auditors' Responsibility

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

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

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

Opinion

In our opinion, the financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Capital Region Board as at December 31, 2013, the results of its operations, change in its net financial assets and its cash flows for the year then ended in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

Edmonton, Alberta
March 13, 2014

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

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

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

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

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

On behalf of Capital Region Board:

Doug Lagore
Chief Executive Officer

Edmonton, Alberta
March 13, 2014
# CAPITAL REGION BOARD

## STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION

**AS AT DECEMBER 31, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$2,429,229</td>
<td>$134,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax receivable</td>
<td>39,543</td>
<td>48,974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Financial assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,468,772</strong></td>
<td><strong>183,592</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>$246,843</td>
<td>$158,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue (Note 3)</td>
<td>2,220,290</td>
<td>8,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized deferred lease inducement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,467,133</strong></td>
<td><strong>174,513</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net financial assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,639</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,079</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-financial assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible capital assets (Note 4)</td>
<td>230,682</td>
<td>83,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>7,440</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-financial assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>238,122</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,590</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated surplus</strong></td>
<td><strong>$239,761</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92,669</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD:**

_____________________________ Chair

_____________________________ Vice Chair
## CAPITAL REGION BOARD

### STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS AND ACCUMULATED SURPLUS

**FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013 Budget (Note 9)</th>
<th>2013 Actual</th>
<th>2012 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants (Note 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province of Alberta:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
<td>$ 2,316,953</td>
<td>$ 3,242,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Internship</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>22,735</td>
<td>34,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Collaboration</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>185,808</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Municipalities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Collaboration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,352</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and other income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,439</td>
<td>15,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>3,519,000</td>
<td>2,547,287</td>
<td>3,310,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and committee expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>89,067</td>
<td>146,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>91,234</td>
<td>45,813</td>
<td>69,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>38,766</td>
<td>18,388</td>
<td>18,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative expenses:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting fees</td>
<td>1,306,000</td>
<td>625,312</td>
<td>1,254,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,220,766</td>
<td>1,363,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office lease</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>167,483</td>
<td>165,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>34,171</td>
<td>106,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>38,743</td>
<td>38,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,053</td>
<td>35,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>37,807</td>
<td>43,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>19,352</td>
<td>16,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>23,392</td>
<td>19,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>7,797</td>
<td>3,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,895</td>
<td>3,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loss on disposal of tangible capital assets</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,420</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program expenses (Note 3):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Internship</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>22,735</td>
<td>34,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>3,519,000</td>
<td>2,400,196</td>
<td>3,317,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual surplus (deficit)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>147,091</td>
<td>(7,342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated surplus, beginning of year</strong></td>
<td>92,669</td>
<td>92,669</td>
<td>100,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated surplus, end of year</strong></td>
<td>$ 92,669</td>
<td>$ 239,761</td>
<td>$ 92,669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CAPITAL REGION BOARD
### STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET FINANCIAL ASSETS
#### FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013 Budget (Note 9)</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual surplus (deficit)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 147,091</td>
<td>$ (7,342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(192,564)</td>
<td>(18,958)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,053</td>
<td>35,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on write-off of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,420</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(147,091)</td>
<td>16,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of prepaid expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(7,440)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of prepaid expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in net financial assets (debt)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(7,440)</td>
<td>12,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net financial assets (debt), beginning of year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,079</td>
<td>(2,930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net financial assets, end of year</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,639</td>
<td>$ 9,079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CAPITAL REGION BOARD
### STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS
#### FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual surplus (deficit)</td>
<td>$147,091</td>
<td>$(7,342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items not involving cash:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>15,053</td>
<td>35,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>30,420</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in non-cash working capital balances from operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services Tax receivable</td>
<td>9,431</td>
<td>(9,910)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>(7,440)</td>
<td>2,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>88,536</td>
<td>(40,686)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue</td>
<td>2,212,152</td>
<td>(984,082)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized deferred lease inducement</td>
<td>(8,068)</td>
<td>(5,378)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,487,175</td>
<td>(1,009,089)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capital Activities**

| Purchase of tangible capital assets | (192,564) | (18,958) |

**Change in Cash During the Year**

| 2,294,611 | (1,028,047) |

**Cash, Beginning of Year**

| 134,618 | 1,162,665 |

**Cash, End of Year**

| $2,429,229 | $134,618 |

**Additional Cash Flow Information:**

| Interest received during the year | $5,389 | $3,855 |
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1. NATURE OF OPERATIONS

Capital Regional Board (the "Board") was established by the Capital Region Board Regulation 49/2008 (the "Regulation") under the Municipal Government Act of the Province of Alberta on April 15, 2008. On December 11, 2013, the Regulation was updated (38/2012). The updated Regulation is in effect until November 30, 2015. The Board is another government entity and is exempt from income taxes.

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

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

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

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

(a) Revenues

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

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

Interest income is recorded as it is earned.

(b) Expenses

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

(c) Tangible Capital Assets

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and equipment</td>
<td>Declining balance</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>Declining balance</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td>Straight-line</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

(d) Contributed Goods and Services

Contributed goods and services represent goods and services which the organization would normally purchase. The contribution amount is recorded at the fair value of the goods or services received.
2. ACCOUNTING POLICIES (CONT'D)

(e) Prepaid Expenses
Prepaid expenses include deposits and insurance and are charged to expense over the periods expected to benefit from it.

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

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

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

(h) Deferred Lease Inducement
Deferred lease inducement represents the unamortized value of an inducement received when the Board entered into a lease arrangement in 2009 for rental of additional office space. Amortization is provided on a straight-line basis over the 5 year term of the related lease as a reduction in office rent. In 2013 the Board entered into a new lease agreement for rental of a new office space. The remaining amount of the 2009 deferred lease inducement was recorded as a reduction against the office rent.

3. DEFERRED REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deferred revenue beginning of year</th>
<th>Amounts received/receivable</th>
<th>Revenue recognized</th>
<th>Deferred revenue end of year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Province of Alberta:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013 Operations (January 1, 2013 - March 31, 2013)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 750,000</td>
<td>$ 750,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014 Operations (April 1, 2013 - December 31, 2013)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,250,000</td>
<td>1,566,953</td>
<td>683,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014 Operations (January 1, 2014 - March 31, 2014)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Internship</td>
<td>8,138</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>22,735</td>
<td>4,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Collaboration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>895,000</td>
<td>185,808</td>
<td>709,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,138</td>
<td>4,664,000</td>
<td>2,525,496</td>
<td>2,146,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Municipalities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Collaboration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>11,352</td>
<td>73,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 8,138</td>
<td>$ 4,749,000</td>
<td>$ 2,536,848</td>
<td>$ 2,220,290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. DEFERRED REVENUE (CONT'D)

Operations:
An updated 2013/2014 conditional operating grant agreement between the Province of Alberta and the Board was signed on April 23, 2013. The Agreement provides a conditional contribution in the amount of $3,000,000 (2012 - $3,000,000) to the Board. The contribution, including any income earned thereon, is to be used to fund the Board's operations and to allow it to carry out its mandated responsibilities for the period from April 1, 2013 to March 31, 2014 unless an extension is agreed to by the Minister.

During 2013, the Board received a $750,000 instalment related to the 4th quarter (January 1, 2013 - March 31, 2013) of the 2012/2013 conditional operating grant agreement.

In addition, the Board received $2,250,000 related to April 1, 2013 - December 31, 2013 and $750,000 related to January 1, 2014 - March 31, 2014 funding.

There was an amount of $8,138 being carried forward from 2012, which was recorded as revenue for the December 31, 2013 year end.

Municipal Internship:
During the year, Alberta Municipal Affairs provided $19,000 in supplemental funding to the Board for the Municipal Internship Program (the "Program"). The Program is intended to strengthen the municipal planning field in Alberta by attracting recent graduates and providing them with a two year training opportunity. To December 31, 2013, eligible expenditures for salaries and benefits of $22,735 have been incurred (2012 - $34,862).

Regional Collaboration:
During the year, Alberta Municipal Affairs provided four one-time conditional grants to the Board for a total value of $895,000. The first of which is for a $500,000 Capital Region Growth Plan Update. The purpose of this grant is to support the Board with completing a comprehensive review of the Capital Region Growth Plan and is to be used by June 1, 2015.

The second is a $100,000 grant with the purpose of supporting the Board with the costs of conducting a Capital Region energy corridor study which is to be completed by June 30, 2015. The third is a $165,000 grant to support the Capital Region Intermunicipal Transit Governance Study. This grant was submitted by the City of St. Albert on behalf of the Board. An additional $85,000, required to implement the Capital Region Intermunicipal Transit Governance Study, was cost shared among 12 Capital Region Board member municipalities.

The fourth and final grant is a $130,000 payment with the purpose of supporting the Board with the costs to develop and pilot a regional housing assessment framework which is to be completed by December 31, 2015.
4. TANGIBLE CAPITAL ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Furniture and Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>$28,219</td>
<td>$98,034</td>
<td>$87,404</td>
<td>$213,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>2,539</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>190,025</td>
<td>192,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write-offs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(87,404)</td>
<td>(87,404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>30,758</td>
<td>98,034</td>
<td>190,025</td>
<td>318,817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Accumulated amortization |                         |          |                        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------|------------------------|        |
| Opening balance          | 16,699                  | 56,385   | 56,983                 | 130,067|
| Amortization             | 2,558                   | 12,494   | -                      | 15,053 |
| Write-offs               | -                       | -        | (56,983)               | (56,983)|
| Closing balance          | 19,257                  | 68,879   | -                      | 88,135 |

| **Net book value**       | $11,501                 | $29,155  | $190,025               | $230,682|

|                    |                         |          |                        |        |
| **Furniture and Equipment** | **Computer** | **Leasehold Improvements** | **2012** |
| **Cost**           |                         |          |                        |        |
| Opening balance    | $28,219                 | $79,076  | $87,404                | $194,699|
| Additions          | -                       | 18,958   | -                      | 18,958 |
| Closing balance    | 28,219                  | 98,034   | 87,404                 | 213,657|

| Accumulated amortization |                         |          |                        |        |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------|------------------------|        |
| Opening balance          | 13,819                  | 42,597   | 38,272                 | 94,688 |
| Amortization             | 2,880                   | 13,788   | 18,711                 | 35,379 |
| Closing balance          | 16,699                  | 56,385   | 56,983                 | 130,067|

| **Net book value**       | $11,520                 | $41,649  | $30,421                | $83,590|

5. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants from the Province (Note 3)</td>
<td>$4,664,000</td>
<td>$2,310,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. COMMITMENTS
The Board has entered into a new ten year lease which begins February 1, 2014. Under the terms of the lease arrangement, the Board is responsible for the following annual payments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$163,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$149,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$149,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$149,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$149,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereafter</td>
<td>$999,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,762,126</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

10. SUBSEQUENT EVENT
On July 4, 2013, the Board entered into a 10 year term agreement with the existing landlord for the rental of new office space. The lease term commences February 1, 2014. The period for construction of leasehold improvements is scheduled to run from September 1, 2013 to January 31, 2014.

The existing leases, dated April 29, 2009 (Suite 1405) and May 14, 2009 (Suite 1450) will be surrendered to the landlord on January 31, 2014.

During 2013, the Board spent $190,025 on leasehold improvements for the new office. Those leasehold improvements have been capitalized in 2013.

The landlord is to provide the Board with a one-time leasehold improvement allowance of up to $230,160. It will be paid 30 days after all of the conditions outlined in the lease agreement are met. This allowance has not yet been recorded.
Letter Regarding Study of High-Speed Rail

Motion

That the Capital Region Board forward the attached letter of response to the Standing Committee on Alberta’s Economic Future regarding the Study of High-Speed Rail in the Province of Alberta.

Background

- On December 23, 2013, Mr. Doug Lagore received a letter from the Standing Committee on Alberta’s Economic Future “seeking input from stakeholders by January 31, 2014, with respect to the feasibility of establishing a high-speed rail system, to be built in phases, the first phase of which would be a line between City of Edmonton and the City of Calgary”.

- Mr. Lagore advised the Chair, Moe Amery, MLA, Calgary East that the CRB would provide a response after its Regional Services Committee had an opportunity to review the request at its first meeting in February.

- On February 20th, 2014, the Regional Services Committee provided direction to CRB Administration to prepare a response to the letter.

Rationale

- To ensure the Province remains committed to supporting the regional infrastructure needs to support growth within one of the fastest growth regions in the province.
March 13, 2014

Moe Amery, MLA, Calgary East  
Chair, Standing Committee on Alberta’s Economic Future  
Room 801 Legislature Annex, 9718-107 Street  
Edmonton AB T5K 1E4

RE: Study of High-Speed Rail (HSR) in the Province of Alberta

Dear Mr. Amery:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to the feasibility study to explore the establishment of a high-speed rail system between the City of Edmonton and the City of Calgary. The Capital Region Board is supportive of long range planning for infrastructure and maintains that the regional infrastructure should be the priority and that GreenTRIP Program funds should not be redirected towards a provincial infrastructure project of this nature.

The Capital Region Board is very appreciative of the Province’s commitment to funding GreenTRIP Projects for Edmonton (NAIT LRT), Strathcona County (transit terminal and park and ride) and the City of Leduc (new buses, transit terminals, and park and ride lots) and a conditional approval for St. Albert (transit terminal and park and ride lot). These projects, as well as those on the Board’s updated project list, are the priorities identified to support population growth in the region, which we maintain is important to the region’s long term sustainability.

Sincerely,

Nolan Crouse  
Chair

cc: Honourable Ken Hughes, Minister, Municipal Affairs  
Honourable Wayne Drysdale, Minister, Transportation  
Capital Region Board Members  
Paul Whittaker, Deputy Minister, Municipal Affairs  
Rob Penny, Deputy Minister, Transportation  
Doug Lagore, Chief Executive Officer, Capital Region Board
Fort Saskatchewan Motion – Performance Monitoring Committee Terms of Reference Amendment

Motion

That the Terms of Reference for the Performance Monitoring Committee be amended to increase the membership by one (1) member to provide the City of Edmonton with membership on the Performance Monitoring Committee, thereby increasing the membership to six (6) members.

Background

- At the November 2013 Board meeting, the new Committee Structure Implementation Plan was approved by the Board. This Plan included Terms of Reference for each of the four standing Committees, Task Forces and the CAO Advisory Committee.

- At the February 13, 2014 Board meeting, there was some discussion about the inclusion of the City of Edmonton to the Performance Monitoring Committee Membership.

Rationale

- The City of Edmonton currently sits on three of the four standing Committees. In order to align the Performance Monitoring Committee with all other standing Committees, the City of Edmonton should be added as a standing member. This addition will require that the Performance Monitoring Committee Terms of Reference be amended to increase the membership to six members.
BACKGROUND

This committee provides the leadership for monitoring and reporting, which was referred to as the Agendas Committee in the Cuff Report (pg 62), is tasked with monitoring the Board’s progress towards its stated goals (Business and Strategic Plans, and Growth Plan), assessing the alignment of the Board’s activities in meeting its stated objectives, and making recommendations to the Board to improve its performance.

MANDATE

Reporting to the Board, this committee’s mandate is to:

- Monitor and report on the Board’s progress as set out in its approved business, strategic and Growth plans;
- Identify risks and issues that may be inhibiting the Board’s progress and propose solutions;
- Identify emerging issues and opportunities to the Board; and
- Identify where changes are needed or enhancements can be applied to further reinforce the progress of the Board’s collective efforts.

MEMBERSHIP

This committee will consist of 5 members: the Board Chair, the Chairs from the three standing committees of Governance, Priorities & Finance, Land Use & Planning and Regional Services, and a member at large. 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. 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. The Board Chair will not be eligible to Chair this committee.

SUPPORT/RESOURCES

The CEO will support this Committee drawing upon CRB staff as required.

MEETING FREQUENCY

The Committee will meet quarterly after a Board meeting 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.
DECEISION-MAKING

Decisions, recommendations and actions determined by each this committee/task force will be driven by the desired outcome to do what is in the best interests of the Capital Region. Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of a-the committee or 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 a motion (fifty percent plus one).

QUORUM

Quorum is defined as fifty 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 the Board 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 and 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. The committees and task forces may invite individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/committee members to participate in specific agenda items. Committee and 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

The committees and task forces are 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 & 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.

All the committees and task forces will include their meeting minutes with the next Board meeting agenda package.

Doug Lagore, Chief Executive Officer
BACKGROUND

This committee provides the leadership for monitoring and reporting the Board’s progress towards its stated goals (Business and Strategic Plans, and Growth Plan), and making recommendations to the Board to improve its performance.

MANDATE

Reporting to the Board, this standing committee’s mandate is to:

• Monitor and report on the Board’s progress as set out in its approved business, strategic and growth plans
• Identify risks and issues that may be inhibiting the Board’s progress and propose solutions
• Identify emerging issues and opportunities to the Board
• Identify where changes are needed or enhancements can be applied to further reinforce the progress of the Board’s collective efforts

MEMBERSHIP

Membership for this committee will consist of five members: the Board Chair, the Chairs from the three standing committees of Governance, Priorities & Finance, Land Use & Planning and Regional Services, and a member at large. 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. 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. The Board Chair will not be eligible to Chair this committee.

SUPPORT/RESOURCES

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

MEETING FREQUENCY

This committee will meet quarterly after a Board meeting 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.
**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.

__________________________________________
Doug Lagore, Chief Executive Officer
PURPOSE

To establish the procedures for selecting the Member at Large for the Capital Region Board Performance Monitoring Committee.

GUIDELINES

1. Elections for the Member at Large for the Performance Monitoring Committee held at a Capital Region Board (CRB) meeting shall be held by secret ballot. The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) shall conduct the selection process for the Member at Large.

2. Each nominee shall be allowed to speak for up to two minutes.

3. The CEO shall facilitate the vote for the Member at Large and each member municipality shall have one vote.

4. The CEO and one other CRB administration member shall count the votes. The actual vote count shall remain confidential. The CEO shall announce the successful candidate.

5. The candidate with the most votes shall be declared the successful candidate.

6. In cases of a tie for the most votes, a second ballot shall be created for candidates with a tie.
   a. The CEO shall facilitate the second ballot vote for the Member at Large and each member municipality shall have one vote.
   b. The CEO and one other CRB administration member shall count the second ballot votes. The actual vote count shall remain confidential.
   c. The candidate with the most votes of the second ballot shall declare the successful candidate.
   d. Should the second ballot remain a tie for the most votes, the names shall be placed in a draw to determine the successful candidate.
   e. The CEO shall announce the successful candidate.

7. The ballots shall be destroyed after the election.
Spruce Grove Motion – Economic Development Committee

Motion

That the Board direct the CEO to prepare a Terms of Reference, complete with budget, for the establishment of an Economic Development Committee taking into consideration the “Capitalize – The Economic Roadmap for Alberta’s Capital Region” report and report back to the Board within 90 days.

Background

- In early 2010, Alberta Finance and Enterprise contacted the CRB about the possibility of developing an economic strategy for the Capital Region. The Board subsequently agreed to sponsor the Economic Roadmap project with funding from the Province.

- In June 2011, the Board was presented the final Economic Roadmap titled “Capitalize – The Economic Roadmap for Alberta’s Capital Region”. The Board passed a Motion: “That the Capital Region Board accepts the Final Report of the Steering Committee for the Capital Region Economic Roadmap for information. The Final Report is referred to the Governance Committee for review”; 23 in favour, 1 opposed.

- The Board then provided the Economic Roadmap Final Report to Alberta Finance and Enterprise in fulfillment of the grant agreement.

- Since this date the Board has not taken any further steps or follow-ups regarding economic development.

Rationale

- The Regulation establishes the CRB’s mandate to develop and oversee the implementation of a proposed Regional Growth Plan based on an integrated and strategic approach to planning the future growth of the Region for the next 35 years and to coordinate decisions in the Capital Region to support economic growth and strong communities and a healthy environment.

The Growth Plan is an important step in ensuring that the Region remains globally competitive. Its directives provide a path toward sustainable growth and improved quality of life for the Region’s citizens. To ensure that the Capital Region fulfills its goal to remain globally competitive, the Board should consider taking the next steps in looking at economic development, by considering the establishment of a Economic Development Committee to start discussions on how to achieve this goal for future prosperity of the region.
Revise CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

Motion
That the CRB CEO revises the May 9, 2013 “CRB Administrative Procedure for the Regional Evaluation Framework”, (and any other related policies, procedures and terms of reference) by including clarification in the following four areas:

1. Prior to Step # 1“Receipt of Application by CRB”, the CRB staff may be consulted by an Applicant for advice relative to submission of a REF application.
2. The best professional advice shall be provided to the Applicant by staff in writing. At this stage there shall be no consultant yet engaged by the CRB.
3. Once Step # 3 “Application Deemed Complete” is achieved, there shall be no further advice given by CRB staff, CRB consultants and no changes made to the application whatsoever.
4. Sending the “Deemed Complete” email verifies the final document to be evaluated. Clarification may be sought but no changes whatsoever may be made to the documents from this point forward until a decision is made by the CRB. If the Third Party Consultant requires clarification regarding an Application, then a supplemental report may be submitted by the Applicant for clarity, but there shall be no alteration made to the original Application.
5. The appeal period be changed from 14 calendar days to 21 calendar days.

Background

• On April 8, 2010 the Board approved the Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).

• The REF Administrative Procedures were amended on January 13, 2011 and May 9, 2013.

Administration Recommendation

1. CRB Administration recommends approval of the proposed amendments #1-5 to the REF Administrative Procedures.

• The first four proposed amendments to the Administrative Procedures provide additional clarification of the REF application process. However, the proposed 5th amendment is not a clarification, but a change to the actual REF process. The length of the appeal is part of the six-month REF process review currently being undertaken by CRB Administration and Administration will include in the review the impact of the change on the appeal process.

Attachments:
1. Existing REF Administrative Procedures
2. Amended REF Administrative Procedures
CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

**Purpose:** To clarify the CRB’s Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Receipt of Application by CRB</strong> An application is received by the CRB. CRB Administration date stamps the documents. If the application is submitted in paper only, CRB Administration requests an electronic copy from the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Preliminary CRB Administration Review</strong> The application is reviewed by CRB Administration to determine if all required documents have been received in accordance with Section 3.5 of the REF. Applications do not proceed until an electronic copy of all required documents have been received. If all required documents have not been received, CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality. CRB Administration reviews the Application to determine whether or not the Application relates to a statutory plan that must be referred to the CRB under Section 3 of the REF. If yes, then the Application is referred for Third Party review. If the Application does not appear to relate to a condition under Section 3 of the REF, then CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Application Deemed Complete</strong> When all required documents are received, and it is determined that the Application meets conditions required for referral to the Board for review under Section 3 of the REF, the Application is assigned a REF number (e.g. REF 2010-000). An email is sent to the Applicant Municipality noting the date the Application is deemed to be complete and the date by which a CRB Administration Recommendation must be issued (within 25 working days from date Application is deemed complete). This email is copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CRB Chief Officer and CAOs. The Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Referral for Third Party Evaluation</strong> CRB Administration sends an email to the Third Party reviewer asking for an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days. The email, which is copied to the CAOs, advises that the Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted and available on the CRB website. The Third Party Evaluation is prepared with reference to the criteria set out in Section 5.4 of the REF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>If a Third Party reviewer advises that they have a conflict of interest, CRB Administration actions the review with another Third Party reviewer with an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days. On receipt of a Third Party Evaluation, CRB Administration reviews the Evaluation for completeness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>CRB Administration Recommendation</strong>&lt;br&gt;CRB Administration reviews the Application and the Third Party Evaluation in accordance with the evaluation criteria in Section 5.4 of the REF and prepares a CRB Administration Recommendation on or before the 25 working days. The Third Party Evaluation and CRB Administration Recommendation are posted to the website as soon as available and the Applicant Municipality, CRB Members, and CAOs are notified.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Approve Recommendation:</strong>&lt;br&gt;A CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application will stand as the final decision on a REF Application after a 14 calendar days appeal period, unless a member municipality appeals the recommendation to the Board. If no appeal is received within the appeal period the application is Deemed Approved and CRB Administration will confirm in writing to the applicant municipality, Board members, and CAOs of the disposition of the REF within one week after the appeal period expires.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Reject Recommendation:</strong>&lt;br&gt;If a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve an Application, CRB Administration notifies the Applicant Municipality, Board members, CAOs and indicates that the Application will be brought to the next Board meeting for disposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Appeals</strong>&lt;br&gt;1. Any CRB member municipality may appeal the CRB Administration recommendation to approve a REF application.&lt;br&gt;2. An appeal may be commenced by submitting a notice of appeal within 14 calendar days after the CRB Administration recommendation is posted to the CRB website. Note that the date of the recommendation and posting of the recommendation may be different due to the logistics of posting the recommendation to the website.&lt;br&gt;3. The notice of appeal must be accompanied by a resolution of Council in support of the appeal.&lt;br&gt;4. The reasons for the appeal must be included in the resolution and shall reference the section(s) of the CRB Regulation and/or the Capital Region Growth Plan that the submitted statutory plan does not conform.&lt;br&gt;5. All appeals must be submitted by 4:30 pm at the CRB offices on or before the 14th day of the appeal period. If the 14th day falls on a weekend or statutory holiday, the appeal deadline is extended to the end of the next business day at 4:30 pm. A notice of appeal will be accepted by email at <a href="mailto:info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca">info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca</a> provided it includes a record of the Council resolution with the reasons for the appeal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step Description of CRB Administrative Procedures

6. If a notice of appeal is received within the appeal period CRB administration shall send the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, by email to the applicant municipality, CRB members, and CAOs, within one business day of receipt the appeal. Further, the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, will be posted to the CRB website.

7. An appeal period does not end with the submission of a notice of appeal. Appeals will continue to be accepted until the final day of the appeal period.

8. If a REF application is appealed and the appeal period ends within 10 working days of an upcoming Board meeting, the REF will be added to the agenda of the following Board meeting.

9. CRB Administration will present the appeal(s) at the Board meeting the REF application is presented. The municipality(ies) that submitted the appeal will be identified by CRB Administration, however, they are under no obligation to speak to the appeal at the Board meeting.

### Capital Region Board Review and Decision

An Application is considered by the Board if a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve the Application or if a member municipality appeals the CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application.

At a Board meeting, the Applicant Municipality and CRB Administration are offered an opportunity to inform the Board (Section 5.3 REF). The Board must, by consensus, approve or reject the Application. If consensus is not reached, a formal vote of the Board must be conducted in accordance with the Capital Region Board Regulation (Section 5.2 REF).

If an Application is reviewed by the Board, following a decision, CRB Administration will issue a letter to the Applicant Municipality indicating approval or rejection of the Application (copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CAOs and the Third Party reviewer).

Decisions of the Board taken under Section 22 of the Capital Region Board Regulation (approval of statutory plans) are final and not subject to appeal.
CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework

**Purpose:** To clarify the CRB’s Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td><strong>Pre-Application Consultation</strong>&lt;br&gt;CRB staff may be consulted by an Applicant for advice relative to submission of a REF application. The best professional advice shall be provided to the Applicant by staff in writing. At this stage there shall be no consultant yet engaged by the CRB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Receipt of Application by CRB</strong>&lt;br&gt;An application is received by the CRB. CRB Administration date stamps the documents. If the application is submitted in paper only, CRB Administration requests an electronic copy from the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Preliminary CRB Administration Review</strong>&lt;br&gt;The application is reviewed by CRB Administration to determine if all required documents have been received in accordance with Section 3.5 of the REF. Applications do not proceed until an electronic copy of all required documents have been received. If all required documents have not been received, CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality. CRB Administration reviews the Application to determine whether or not the Application relates to a statutory plan that must be referred to the CRB under Section 3 of the REF. If yes, then the Application is referred for Third Party review. If the Application does not appear to relate to a condition under Section 3 of the REF, then CRB Administration contacts the Applicant Municipality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Application Deemed Complete</strong>&lt;br&gt;When all required documents are received, and it is determined that the Application meets conditions required for referral to the Board for review under Section 3 of the REF, the Application is assigned a REF number (e.g. REF 2010-000). An email is sent to the Applicant Municipality noting the date the Application is deemed to be complete and the date by which a CRB Administration Recommendation must be issued (within 25 working days from date Application is deemed complete). This email is copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CRB Chief Officer and CAOs. The Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted to the CRB website. After an application is deemed complete no further advice will be given by CRB staff and/or CRB consultants, and no changes may be made to the application whatsoever. By sending the “Deemed Complete” email that action clarifies what the final document is that is to be evaluated. Clarification may be sought but no changes are allowed whatsoever to the documents from this point forward until a decision is made by the CRB. If the Third Party Consultant requires clarification regarding an Application, a supplemental report may be submitted by the Applicant for clarity, but there shall be no alteration made to the original Application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of CRB Administrative Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Referral for Third Party Evaluation</strong>  &lt;br&gt; CRB Administration sends an email to the Third Party reviewer asking for an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days. The email, which is copied to the CAOs, advises that the Applicant Municipality’s documentation is posted and available on the CRB website. The Third Party Evaluation is prepared with reference to the criteria set out in Section 5.4 of the REF.  &lt;br&gt; If a Third Party reviewer advises that they have a conflict of interest, CRB Administration actions the review with another Third Party reviewer with an Evaluation to be prepared within 14 working days.  &lt;br&gt; On receipt of a Third Party Evaluation, CRB Administration reviews the Evaluation for completeness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>CRB Administration Recommendation</strong>  &lt;br&gt; CRB Administration reviews the Application and the Third Party Evaluation in accordance with the evaluation criteria in Section 5.4 of the REF and prepares a CRB Administration Recommendation on or before the 25 working days. The Third Party Evaluation and CRB Administration Recommendation are posted to the website as soon as available and the Applicant Municipality, CRB Members, and CAOs are notified.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Approve Recommendation:</strong>  &lt;br&gt; A CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application will stand as the final decision on a REF Application after a 14 21 calendar days appeal period, unless a member municipality appeals the recommendation to the Board. If no appeal is received within the appeal period the application is Deemed Approved and CRB Administration will confirm in writing to the applicant municipality, Board members, and CAOs of the disposition of the REF within one week after the appeal period expires.  &lt;br&gt; <strong>Reject Recommendation:</strong>  &lt;br&gt; If a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve an Application, CRB Administration notifies the Applicant Municipality, Board members, CAOs and indicates that the Application will be brought to the next Board meeting for disposition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Appeals</strong>  &lt;br&gt; 1. Any CRB member municipality may appeal the CRB Administration recommendation to approve a REF application.  &lt;br&gt; 2. An appeal may be commenced by submitting a notice of appeal within 14 21 calendar days after the CRB Administration recommendation is posted to the CRB website. Note that the date of the recommendation and posting of the recommendation may be different due to the logistics of posting the recommendation to the website.  &lt;br&gt; 3. The notice of appeal must be accompanied by a resolution of Council in support of the appeal.  &lt;br&gt; 4. The reasons for the appeal must be included in the resolution and shall reference the section(s) of the CRB Regulation and/or the Capital Region Growth Plan that the submitted statutory plan does not conform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>Description of CRB Administrative Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>All appeals must be submitted by 4:30 pm at the CRB offices on or before the 14th 21st day of the appeal period. If the 14th 21st day falls on a weekend or statutory holiday, the appeal deadline is extended to the end of the next business day at 4:30 pm. A notice of appeal will be accepted by email at <a href="mailto:info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca">info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca</a> provided it includes a record of the Council resolution with the reasons for the appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>If a notice of appeal is received within the appeal period CRB administration shall send the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, by email to the applicant municipality, CRB members, and CAOs, within one business day of receipt the appeal. Further, the notice of appeal, including the Council resolution, will be posted to the CRB website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>An appeal period does not end with the submission of a notice of appeal. Appeals will continue to be accepted until the final day of the appeal period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>If a REF application is appealed and the appeal period ends within 10 working days of an upcoming Board meeting, the REF will be added to the agenda of the following Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>CRB Administration will present the appeal(s) at the Board meeting the REF application is presented. The municipality(s) that submitted the appeal will be identified by CRB Administration, however, they are under no obligation to speak to the appeal at the Board meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th><strong>Capital Region Board Review and Decision</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An Application is considered by the Board if a CRB Administration Recommendation is to not approve the Application or if a member municipality appeals the CRB Administration Recommendation to approve an Application.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At a Board meeting, the Applicant Municipality and CRB Administration are offered an opportunity to inform the Board (Section 5.3 REF). The Board must, by consensus, approve or reject the Application. If consensus is not reached, a formal vote of the Board must be conducted in accordance with the Capital Region Board Regulation (Section 5.2 REF).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an Application is reviewed by the Board, following a decision, CRB Administration will issue a letter to the Applicant Municipality indicating approval or rejection of the Application (copied to Board members, CRB Chair, CAOs and the Third Party reviewer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions of the Board taken under Section 22 of the Capital Region Board Regulation (approval of statutory plans) are final and not subject to appeal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2013 Per Diem Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,827.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>Ed</td>
<td>$3,353.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iveson</td>
<td>Don</td>
<td>$1,840.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandel</td>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>$1,632.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,133.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katchur</td>
<td>Gale</td>
<td>$5,133.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Leduc</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,098.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krischke</td>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>$2,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKenzie</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>$1,360.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishio</td>
<td>Dominic</td>
<td>$1,207.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Dana</td>
<td>$929.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spruce Grove</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,112.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acker</td>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>$2,579.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>$1,532.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,840.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracko</td>
<td>Len</td>
<td>$1,755.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brodhead</td>
<td>Wes</td>
<td>$224.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heron</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>$1,533.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKay</td>
<td>Cam</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>$1,126.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,999.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warawa</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>$602.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woldanski</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>$5,397.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,082.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doblanko</td>
<td>Tanni</td>
<td>$268.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glassman</td>
<td>Betty</td>
<td>$1,578.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKay</td>
<td>Jocelyn</td>
<td>$3,995.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schonewille</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>$240.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2013 Per Diem Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>Kobasiuk Phyllis</td>
<td>$ 510.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaigec Rodney</td>
<td>$ 2,854.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Szady Jo</td>
<td>$ 233.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>Bidzinski Vic</td>
<td>$ 212.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carr Roxanne</td>
<td>$ 215.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Osinchuk Linda</td>
<td>$ 3,446.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riddell Bonnie</td>
<td>$ 1,275.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wlodarczak Peter</td>
<td>$ 1,937.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>Flynn Tom</td>
<td>$ 424.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shaw Karen</td>
<td>$ 2,709.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Beaumont</td>
<td>Berube Camille</td>
<td>$ 3,332.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biollo Jacqueline</td>
<td>$ 457.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stewart John</td>
<td>$ 240.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodhope Larry</td>
<td>$ 2,042.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Bon Accord</td>
<td>Boyd Randolph</td>
<td>$ 2,143.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Bruderheim</td>
<td>Hauch Karl</td>
<td>$ 1,824.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ross Shelley</td>
<td>$ 521.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Calmar</td>
<td>Faulkner Don</td>
<td>$ 1,790.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wiancko Scotty</td>
<td>$ 255.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Devon</td>
<td>Fisher Anita</td>
<td>$ 3,157.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Gibbons</td>
<td>Horner Doug</td>
<td>$ 955.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nimmo William H.</td>
<td>$ 1,902.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Lamont</td>
<td>Skinner Bill</td>
<td>$ 1,871.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared: February 19, 2014
## 2013 Per Diem Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Legal</th>
<th>$2,235.78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baril Ken</td>
<td>$250.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Trina</td>
<td>$496.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magera Lisa</td>
<td>$1,488.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Morinville</th>
<th>$5,246.43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Lisa</td>
<td>$3,148.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krauskopf Paul</td>
<td>$2,098.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Redwater</th>
<th>$6,415.92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith Mel</td>
<td>$6,415.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Stony Plain</th>
<th>$4,162.32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choy William</td>
<td>$970.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganske Dwight</td>
<td>$3,192.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Wabamun</th>
<th>$4,036.42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay Fred</td>
<td>$267.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay Joanne</td>
<td>$267.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdy Bill</td>
<td>$3,501.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village of Thorsby</th>
<th>$2,510.86</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pharis Cathryne</td>
<td>$272.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rasch Barry</td>
<td>$2,238.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village of Warburg</th>
<th>$2,648.41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kohl Dawson</td>
<td>$2,361.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Assen Ralph</td>
<td>$286.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL                          |   $100,666.44 |
Land Use & Planning Committee

Thursday, February 20, 2014
8:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
Edmonton Petroleum Club – Rainbow Room
11110 – 108 Street Edmonton, AB

Members:
Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County (Chair)
Don Iveson, City of Edmonton
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
David MacKenzie, City of Leduc
Clay Stumph, Leduc County
Rod Shaigec, Parkland County
Wayne Olechow, Town of Bruderheim
Doug Horner, Town of Gibbons
Lisa Holmes, Town of Morinville
Dwight Ganske, Town of Stony Plain
Lloyd Jardine, Village of Thorsby

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, City of St. Albert
Leslie Chivers, Sturgeon County
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Colton Kirsop, City of Edmonton
Corey Levasseur, City of Spruce Grove
Sylvain Losier, City of Leduc
Ivan Moore, Alberta Municipal Affairs
Gilles Prefontaine, City of St. Albert
Yolande Shaw, Strathcona County
Janel Smith, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Colin Steffes, Sturgeon County
Barry Turner, Town of Morinville

Regrets:

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Doug Lagore, CEO
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager

Stephanie Chai, Planning Intern
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Amanda Borman, Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER
   
   Doug Lagore, CEO, called the meeting to order at 8:04 a.m.

2. Roundtable Introduction

3. Terms of Reference/Orientation
   
   That the reviewed Terms of Reference were approved by unanimous consensus.

4. Selection of Chair
   
   Mayor Tom Flynn and Mayor Rod Shaigec were nominated for Chair of the Committee. Following a secret ballot vote by members, Mayor Tom Flynn was declared the committee Chair.
5. **Selection of Vice Chair**

Following the nomination of Mayor Rod Shaigec and no additional nominations, Mayor Rod Shaigec was declared the committee Vice-Chair.

Motion: That administration destroy all ballots from the election of Chair of the Land Use & Planning Committee.
Moved by: Mayor Rod Shaigec, *Parkland County*  
Decision: Carried

6. **Meeting Schedule**

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the meeting schedule be accepted as proposed for 2014.

7. **2014 CRB Workplan**

The committee will review the 2014 Workplan at the next committee meeting. The CEO informed the committee there is a total of $300,000 available for new initiatives under the 2014 Workplan.

8. **Old Business**

8.1 **REF Report Implementation**

a. **REF Consultant Terms of Reference**  
b. **REF Consultant Performance Review**

Motion: That the Land Use & Planning Committee approve the Third Party Consultant Terms of Reference and Third Party Consultant Performance Reviews, as amended.
Moved by: Mayor Don Iveson, *City of Edmonton*  
Decision: Carried

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion: That the Land Use & Planning Committee meeting be adjourned.
Moved by: Mayor Don Iveson, *City of Edmonton*  
Decision: Carried

Meeting adjourned at 8:58 a.m.

Committee Chair, Tom Flynn
Regional Services Committee

Thursday, February 20, 2014
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Edmonton Petroleum Club – Rainbow Room
11110 – 108 Street Edmonton, AB

Members:
Mel Smith, Town of Redwater (Chair)
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton
Louise Baxter, City of Spruce Grove
Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert
Darrell Hollands, Parkland County
Brian Botterill, Strathcona County
Stephen Lindop, Town of Devon
Bill Skinner, Town of Lamont
Ken Baril, Town of Legal
Ralph van Assen, Village of Warburg

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, City of St. Albert
Dave Anderson, Strathcona County
Matt Carpenter, Strathcona County
Leslie Chivers, Sturgeon County
Kevin Cole, City of Leduc
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County
Colton Kirsop, City of Edmonton
Bob McDonald, City of St. Albert
Tim Osborne, City of St. Albert
Dorothy Roberts, City of Edmonton
Yolande Shaw, Strathcona County

Regrets:
Rick Smith, Leduc County

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Doug Lagore, CEO
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager

Brendan Pinches, Project Manager
Stephanie Chai, Project Intern
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Amanda Borman, Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

CEO, Doug Lagore, called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m.

2. Roundtable Introduction

3. Committee Terms of Reference/Orientation

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Terms of Reference be reviewed on an annual basis by the committee and that the Regional Services Committee Terms of Reference be amended to include the following under “Decision-Making”: 

2014-1
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.

4. **Selection of Chair**

Following the nominations of Mayor Mel Smith and Mayor Stephen Lindop, Mayor Mel Smith was declared the committee Chair.

5. **Selection of Vice Chair**

Following the nomination of Mayor Stephen Lindop with no additional nominations, Mayor Stephen Lindop was declared the committee Vice-Chair.

**Motion:** That the administration destroy the ballots for the election of Chair of the Regional Services Committee.  
**Moved by:** Councillor Michael Walters, *City of Edmonton*  
**Decision:** Carried

6. **Housing Task Force Terms of Reference – Information item**

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Housing Task Force Terms of Reference be amended to include the Housing Symposium event.

7. **Transit Task Force Terms of Reference – Information item**

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Transit Task Force Terms of Reference be amended to include GreenTRIP prioritization, Regional Fare Strategy, Regional Smart Card and Specialized Transit.

8. **2014 CRB Workplan**

The committee will review the 2014 Workplan at the next committee meeting. The CEO informed the committee there is a total of $300,000 available for new initiatives under the 2014 Workplan.

9. **Study of High-Speed Rail in the Province of Alberta**

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Committee recommend to the Capital Region Board that a letter of response be forwarded to the Standing Committee on Alberta’s Economic Future regarding the Study of High-Speed Rail in the Province of Alberta.
10. Meeting Schedule

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Regional Services Committee meeting dates be tentatively booked for the months of March, May, July, September and November; proceeding only if required.

11. ADJOURNMENT

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Regional Services Committee meeting be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 2:31 p.m.

______________________________
Committee Chair, Mel Smith
Energy Corridors Task Force

Monday, February 24, 2014
9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
CRB Office – Large Boardroom
1100 Bell Tower, 10104-103 Avenue, Edmonton

Members:
Wayne Woldanski, Lamont County (Chair)
Glen Finstad, City of Leduc
Wayne Olechow, Town of Bruderheim

Regrets:

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Doug Lagore, CEO
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager
Stephanie Chai, Project Intern

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Leslie Chivers, Sturgeon County
Mark Knibbs, ISL Engineering and Land Services
Shavna Kuiper, ISL Engineering and Land Services
Sylvain Losier, City of Leduc
Ron McGaffin, Opus Stewart Weir
Yolande Shaw, Strathcona County
Thom Stubbs, Headwater Group
Allyson Jacques, Administrative Assistant
Amanda Borman, Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

CEO, Doug Lagore called the meeting to order at 8:59 a.m.

2. Roundtable Introduction

3. Terms of Reference/Orientation

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Energy Corridors Task Force approves the Terms of Reference.

4. Selection of Chair

Following the nomination of Reeve Wayne Woldanski and no additional nominations, Reeve Wayne Woldanski was declared the Task Force Chair.
5. Selection of Vice Chair

Following the nomination of Councillor Glen Finstad and no additional nominations, Councillor Glen Finstad was declared the Task Force Vice-Chair.

6. Meeting Schedule

2014-2

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Energy Corridors Task Force’s next meeting will be held May 15, 2014 at the Capital Region Board office.

7. Project Overview

2014-3

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Energy Corridors Task Force accept the Project Overview as delivered.

8. Project Status & Review of Initial Findings

2014-4

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the consultant team be directed 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.

9. ADJOURNMENT

2014-5

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Energy Corridors Task Force meeting be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 10:24 a.m.

Task Force Chair, Wayne Woldanski