Board Meeting Agenda
June 11, 2015 – 9:00 – 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 May 14, 2015

5. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee
   a. Audited Financial Statements (Jan 1/15 – Mar 31/15)
      
      **Recommended Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the Audited Financial Statements for the year ended March 31, 2015, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

   b. Annual Report
      
      **Recommended Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the 2014/2015 Annual Report as presented, including the Audited Financial Statements for 2014 and for January 1 – March 31, 2015 as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

6. Economic Development Presentation

   **Recommended Motion:**
   
   1. That the Capital Region Board approve the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Strategy as recommended, in principle, by the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee.
   
   2. That the Capital Region Board approve the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework as recommended, in principle, by the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee.

7. Land Use & Planning Committee
   a. Density Targets
      
      **Recommended Motion:** That the Capital Region Board direct CRB Administration to work with all CRB Member Administrations to refine the density targets and related policies as part of the Growth Plan Update, as recommended by Land Use & Planning Committee.
8. Transit Committee
   a. Transportation Needs Assessment Report – NE Sub-Region

   **Recommended Motion**: That the Capital Region Board receive the Capital Region Board Transportation Needs Assessment 2015 Report for information, as recommended by the Transit Committee.

9. Growth Plan Update Task Force
   a. Growth Plan Update Vision and Principles

   **Recommended Motion**: That the Capital Region Board approve the Growth Plan Update Vision and Principles as recommended by the Growth Plan Update Task Force.

   b. Schedule & Workplan

   **Recommended Motion**: That the Capital Region Board approves the Growth Plan Update 2.0 work plan extension request as recommended by the Task Force and authorizes the Board Chair to write a letter to the Province seeking approval of a 10 month extension, to October 2016, to submit an updated Growth Plan for the Capital Region.

c. Engagement Strategy

d. Comprehensive Update

e. Towns, Villages and County Consultation

10. Capital Region Geographic Information Services (CRGIS) Website Launch

   **Recommended Motion**: That the Capital Region Board receive the launch information and demonstration of the CRGIS website for information.

11. Board Information Requests Update

12. Committee/Task Force Minutes
   a. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee – *Draft Minutes, Chair Update*
   b. Transit Committee – *Draft Minutes*
   c. Growth Plan Update Task Force – *Draft Minutes, Chair Update*

13. Administrative Items
   a. CEO’s Update

14. Adjournment
Minutes of the meeting of the Capital Region Board held at Grand Ballroom, Chateau Louis Conference Centre on Thursday, May 14, 2015

Delegates in Attendance:

Mayor Nolan Crouse – St. Albert/Chair
Mayor Camille Berube – Beaumont
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord
Councillor Virginia Differenz – Bruderheim (alternate)
Mayor Wally Yachimetz – Calmar
Mayor Stephen Lindop – Devon
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Councillor Amber Harris – Gibbons
Mayor Bill Skinner – Lamont
Reeve Wayne Woldanski – Lamont County
Councillor Dana Smith – Leduc (alternate)
Mayor John Whaley – Leduc County

Councillor Carol Tremblay – Legal (alternate)
Mayor Lisa Holmes – Morinville
Mayor Rod Shaigec – Parkland County
Mayo Mel Smith – Redwater
Alderman Wayne Rothe – Spruce Grove (alternate)
Mayor William Choy – Stony Plain
Mayor Roxanne Carr – Strathcona County
Councillor Karen Shaw – Sturgeon County (alternate)
Mayor Barry Rasch – Thorsby
Councillor Art Erickson – Wabamun (alternate)
Mayor Ralph van Assen – Warburg
Bruce McDonald – Government of Alberta

Absent:

CRB Administration:

Neal Sarnecki, Acting CEO
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Leslie Chivers, Operations Manager
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager

Brandt Denham, GIS Coordinator
Amanda Borman, Executive Assistant
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant
1. Call to Order
   Called to order 9:00 a.m.

2. Chair’s Opening Remarks
   Chair Crouse reminded members that CEO, Malcolm Bruce, is away on vacation and confirmed that Mr. Neal Sarnecki is the Acting CEO until his return May 25, 2015. Chair Crouse welcomed both newcomers Councillor Virginia Differenz, Town of Bruderheim and Mr. Bruce McDonald, Government of Alberta representative to the table. Chair Crouse announced that Mayor Fred Lindsay, Village of Wabamun resigned from council on May 13, 2015 and identified Alternate Councillor Art Erickson as being the Board representative until further notice. Chair Crouse once again announced that we are still awaiting response from the Province regarding the Matching Funding and identified the impact the election may have on the timing of approval for the provincial budget. Chair Crouse advised members that Alberta Health Services will once again host a Capital Region Elected Officials Information Breakfast. Administration provided the key details and noted that an invitation would be sent out in the coming days with all germane facts. Chair Crouse shared that the Province extended grant funding of $340,000 to the Wainwright Public Transit program and reiterated the importance of Regional Collaboration.

3. Approval of Agenda

   **Motion:** To approve the Agenda of May 14, 2015 with the withdrawal of item 8a – Growth Plan Update Vision and Principles.

   **Motion carried unanimously.**

4. Approval of Minutes

   **Motion:** To approve the Minutes of April 9, 2015.

   **Motion carried unanimously.**

5. Regional Services Committee

   a. Change in Status – Housing Task Force

   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board revert the Housing Task Force back to a Standing Committee of the Board effective immediately, as recommended by the Regional Services Committee.

   **Motion carried unanimously.**
b. Disband the Regional Services Committee

**Moved by** Mayor Smith, **Accepted by** Chair.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board disband the Regional Services Committee effective immediately and that its mandate and authorities be terminated, as recommended by the Regional Services Committee.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**Information Request:** Members request administration report to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee the impact disbanding the Regional Services Committee will have on the Financials and how the funds if any will be allocated.

6. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee

a. Membership Review Process

**Moved by** Mayor Berube. **Accepted by** Chair.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the proposed process timeline for CRB membership review and direct the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee to bring back a recommendation to the September 2015 Board meeting, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Councillor Shaw, Sturgeon County, moved to postpone the membership Review Process matter for six months. **Accepted by** Chair.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board postpone the membership Review Process matter for six months.

1 in favour, 23 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion failed.**

Chair Crouse relinquished the Chair position to CRB Vice-Chair Mayor Berube.

CRB Vice-Chair Berube, relinquished the Chair position back to Chair Mayor Crouse.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the proposed process timeline for CRB membership review and direct the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee to bring back a recommendation to the September 2015 Board meeting, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.
23 in favour, 1 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion carried.**

7. Land Use & Planning Committee

a. **Outer Regional Transportation Corridor**

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

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board direct CRB administration to work with Alberta Transportation to consider options for an outer regional transportation corridor while giving consideration to the creation of Transportation and/or Utility Corridors that would be outside of existing Priority Growth Areas, as recommended by the Land Use & Planning Committee.

Mayor Iveson, Edmonton, put forward a friendly amendment to replace “corridor with network” both within the title and motion. The friendly amendment was accepted.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board direct CRB administration to work with Alberta Transportation to consider options for an outer regional transportation network while giving consideration to the creation of Transportation and/or Utility Corridors that would be outside of existing Priority Growth Areas, as recommended by the Land Use & Planning Committee.

Mayor Smith, Redwater, put forward a further friendly amendment to remove “Utility” from the motion. The friendly amendment was not accepted.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board direct CRB administration to work with Alberta Transportation to consider options for an outer regional transportation network while giving consideration to the creation of Transportation and/or Utility Corridors that would be outside of existing Priority Growth Areas, as recommended by the Land Use & Planning Committee.

23 in favour, 1 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion carried.**

8. Growth Plan Update Task Force

a. **Growth Plan Update Vision and Principles**

**Motion withdrawn by** Mayor Carr during the approval of the agenda, item 3.

b. **Revised Population Forecast**

**Moved by** Mayor Carr. **Accepted by** Chair.
Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the revised Population forecast that includes 2014 Municipal Census data as of March 1, 2015, for the purpose of updating the 2015 Growth Plan.

Motion carried unanimously.

9. Other Business

a. Edmonton Motion – GreenTRIP Program – Round 2 Funding

Moved by Mayor Iveson. Accepted by Chair.

Motion:

1. That the Capital Region Board support the City of Edmonton’s request to:

   a. Reduce the amount of the $60 million in Metro Line cost savings allocated to the Valley Line LRT by the amount required to fund the Capital Region Board’s above-the-line priority projects for Round 2 of the GreenTRIP applications, subject to provincial approval of these projects.

   b. Apply any remaining funds from the Capital Region’s $800 million GreenTRIP allocation to the Valley Line LRT.

2. That the Chair of the Capital Region Board write to the Minister of Transportation to confirm the Board’s support for the City of Edmonton’s request.

Chair Crouse relinquished the Chair position to CRB Vice-Chair Mayor Berube.

CRB Vice-Chair Berube, returned the Chair position back to Chair Mayor Crouse.

Motion carried unanimously.

10. Board Information Requests Update

Information Request: Clarification on what constitutes a meeting of the Board, its Committees and/or Task Forces?

11. Committee/Task Force Minutes

a. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee – draft minutes and Chair update provided
b. Land Use & Planning Committee – draft minutes
c. Regional Services Committee – draft minutes and Chair comments provided
d. Transit Committee – draft minutes
e. Growth Plan Update Task Force – draft minutes and Chair update provided
12. Administrative Items

a. Acting CEO’s Update

Mr. Sarnecki welcomed Leslie Chivers to CRB Administration as the Operations Manager, providing support on the coordination of Board operations as well as assisting with the development of the Business Plan, administration tools and to measurement of progress of the Board strategies and objectives.

i. Matching Funding

Mr. Sarnecki advised members that further to Chair Crouse’s comments on the Matching Funding the CRB has not yet received its operational funding and at this time administration will not be starting any new projects.

ii. Bill 20

Information Request: Members request administration ask Alberta Transportation if they are willing to buy the right away if an outer corridor was identified to everyone’s satisfaction?

Chair Crouse expressed his willingness to continue as the Board Chair for the remainder of the terms to members.

13. Adjournment

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 10:47 a.m.

CRB Chair, Nolan Crouse  CRB CEO, Malcolm Bruce
CRB Audited Financial Statements

Recommended Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the Audited Financial Statements for the year ended March 31, 2015 as recommenced by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Background

At the request of the Capital Region Board, the Province modified the CRB regulation to allow for the alignment of its financial year-end with that of the Province in 2015/16, changing the CRB’s existing year-end from December 31 to March 31. In order to transition to this new financial year-end, the three month period January 1, 2015 to March 31, 2015 was to be treated as a financial year.

The Conditional Grant Agreement between the Province of Alberta and the Board is to be used to fund the Board’s operations for the period from April 1 to March 31.
March 12, 2015

Capital Region Board
Suite 1100, Bell Tower
10104-103 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H8

Attention: Board of Directors

Dear Board Members:

RE: 2014 AUDIT FINDINGS LETTER

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

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

AUDIT FINDINGS

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

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

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

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

MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES

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

AUDIT APPROACH

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

MATERIALITY

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

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

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

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

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

Significant Deficiencies in Internal Control

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

Significant Qualitative Aspects of Accounting Practices

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

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

Uncorrected Misstatements

There were no uncorrected misstatements aggregated by our Firm, for the year ended December 31, 2014.

Significant Difficulties Encountered During the Audit

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

OTHER MATTERS

Change of year-end

Effective January 1, 2015 the Capital Region Board was approved by Alberta Municipal Affairs to change its financial year-end from December 31 to March 31 in order to align its fiscal year-end with the Province’s fiscal year-end. This will benefit the Capital Region Board because it will be able to align its financial and budget platform with the funder.

To transition to this new financial year-end, the three month period January 1, 2015 to March 31, 2015 is to be treated as a financial year. An audit report will be issued on this 3 months stub period.
Management Representations

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

AUDITOR INDEPENDENCE

We have been engaged to audit the financial statements of Capital Region Board for the year ended December 31, 2014.

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

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

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

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

We are not aware of any relationships between Capital Region Board and ourselves that, in our professional judgment, may reasonably be thought to bear on our independence that have occurred from January 1, 2014 to March 12, 2015.

In our proposal of June 09, 2014, we quoted our fees to the Capital Region Board for audit services during the year from January 1, 2014 to December 31, 2014 at $11,300. Non-audit fees amounted to $2,000 during 2014.
We wish to thank Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager for her assistance during our audit work. We appreciate the opportunity to provide audit services to Capital Region Board and we extend our best wishes for a successful 2015.

Yours very truly,

HAWKINGS EPP DUMONT LLP

Michael H. Epp, CA, CMA
Partner

MHE/law

cc: Malcolm Bruce, Chief Executive Officer;
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
CAPITAL REGION BOARD
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
FOR THE 3 MONTH PERIOD ENDED MARCH 31, 2015
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 March 31, 2015 and the statements of operations, changes in net financial assets, and cash flows for the 3 month period ended March 31, 2015, 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 March 31, 2015, the results of its operations, change in its net financial assets and its cash flows for the 3 month period ended March 31, 2015 in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

Edmonton, Alberta Hawkings Epp Dumont LLP
June 11, 2015 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:

Malcolm Bruce, MSM  
Chief Executive Officer  
Edmonton, Alberta  
June 11, 2015
CAPITAL REGION BOARD
STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION
AS AT MARCH 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (March 31)</th>
<th>2014 (December 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents (Note 3)</td>
<td>$ 2,585,531</td>
<td>$ 2,479,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and services tax receivable</td>
<td>27,507</td>
<td>96,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,613,038</td>
<td>2,575,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>181,097</td>
<td>135,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue (Note 4)</td>
<td>2,207,417</td>
<td>2,219,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred lease inducement (Note 5)</td>
<td>193,231</td>
<td>198,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,581,745</td>
<td>2,553,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net financial assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-financial assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible capital assets (Note 6)</td>
<td>252,952</td>
<td>262,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accumulated surplus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 284,245</td>
<td>$ 284,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ON BEHALF OF THE BOARD:

__________________________________________ Chair

__________________________________________ Vice Chair

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

**STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS AND ACCUMULATED SURPLUS**

**FOR THE PERIOD ENDED MARCH 31, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (3 months)</th>
<th>2014 (12 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants (Note 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province of Alberta:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$443,916</td>
<td>$2,629,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Internship</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Community Partnership</td>
<td>443,006</td>
<td>916,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Municipalities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Community Partnership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest and other income</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>26,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td>887,963</td>
<td>3,641,975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (3 months)</th>
<th>2014 (12 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and committee expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>26,400</td>
<td>122,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>18,208</td>
<td>74,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>4,976</td>
<td>26,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td>887,963</td>
<td>3,597,490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (3 months)</th>
<th>2014 (12 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated surplus, beginning of period</td>
<td>284,245</td>
<td>239,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated surplus, end of period</td>
<td>$284,245</td>
<td>$284,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET FINANCIAL ASSETS

#### FOR THE PERIOD ENDED MARCH 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2015 (3 months)</th>
<th>2014 (12 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 44,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(66,570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>9,133</td>
<td>35,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,133</td>
<td>(31,404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of prepaid expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in net financial assets</td>
<td>9,133</td>
<td>20,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net financial assets, beginning of period</td>
<td>22,160</td>
<td>1,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net financial assets, end of period</td>
<td>$ 31,293</td>
<td>$ 22,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS

**FOR THE PERIOD ENDED MARCH 31, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (3 months)</th>
<th>2014 (12 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(March 31)</td>
<td>(December 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 44,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items not involving cash:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>9,133</td>
<td>35,166</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>68,566</td>
<td>(56,530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>46,017</td>
<td>(111,764)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue</td>
<td>(11,922)</td>
<td>(951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized deferred lease inducement</td>
<td>(5,521)</td>
<td>198,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106,273</td>
<td>116,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(66,569)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in Cash and Cash Equivalents During the Period</strong></td>
<td>106,273</td>
<td>50,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash and Cash Equivalents, Beginning of Period</strong></td>
<td>2,479,258</td>
<td>2,429,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash and Cash Equivalents, End of Period</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,585,531</td>
<td>$ 2,479,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Cash Flow Information:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest received during the period</td>
<td>$ 1,041</td>
<td>$ 6,888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
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, 2018. The Board is an other government entity and is exempt from income taxes.

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

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

In June 2009, the Minister requested that the Board complete additional work on the Growth Plan including land use, a cost allocation formula for the 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.

Effective January 1, 2015 the Capital Region Board was approved by Alberta Municipal Affairs to change its financial year-end from December 31 to March 31. In order to transition to this new financial year-end, the three month period January 1, 2015 to March 31, 2015 is to be treated as a financial year.
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.

(CONT'D)
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 these expenditures.

(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 new ten year lease arrangement for rental of the new office space which commenced on February 1, 2014. Amortization is provided on a straight-line basis over the 10 year term of the related lease as a reduction in office rent.

3. CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(March 31)</td>
<td>(December 31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$ 585,531</td>
<td>$ 479,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary investments</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,585,531</td>
<td>$ 2,479,258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Temporary investments are guaranteed investment certificates bearing interest of 1.05% maturing from May 2015 to July 2015.
4. DEFERRED REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province of Alberta:</th>
<th>Deferred revenue</th>
<th>Amounts received/ receivable</th>
<th>Revenue recognized</th>
<th>Deferred revenue end of period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015 Operations</td>
<td>$1,428,993</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>$443,916</td>
<td>$1,860,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Community Partnership</td>
<td>782,579</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>443,006</td>
<td>339,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Municipalities:</th>
<th>Deferred revenue</th>
<th>Amounts received/ receivable</th>
<th>Revenue recognized</th>
<th>Deferred revenue end of period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Community Partnership</td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$2,219,339 $875,000 $886,922 $2,207,417

Operations:
An updated 2014/2015 conditional operating grant agreement between the Province of Alberta and the Board was signed on June 3, 2014. The Agreement provides a conditional contribution in the amount of $3,500,000 (2013/2014 - $3,000,000). 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, 2014 to March 31, 2015, unless an extension is agreed to by the Minister. The Board received $2,625,000 of this grant in 2014 and $875,000 in 2015.

Alberta Community Partnership (replaced Regional Collaboration Program in July 7, 2014):
Alberta Municipal Affairs provided the Board with total grant funding of $895,000 in 2013 and $990,000 in 2014. The Board recognized $185,808 of the grants in 2013 and $916,613 in 2014. The Board recognized $443,006 during the 3 month period ended March 31, 2015.

5. DEFERRED LEASE INDUCEMENT
Pursuant to a premises lease agreement for the new office, the landlord provided the Board with a total inducement of $220,835 to be used for leasehold improvements. The inducement has been deferred and is being applied as a reduction of rent expense over the term of the lease as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Deferred Lease Inducement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>16,567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total deferred lease inducement $193,231
## 6. TANGIBLE CAPITAL ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Furniture and Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 (March 31)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$66,517</td>
<td>$98,034</td>
<td>$220,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>$66,517</td>
<td>$98,034</td>
<td>$220,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated amortization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>25,133</td>
<td>77,626</td>
<td>20,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>5,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>27,215</td>
<td>79,157</td>
<td>26,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net book value</td>
<td>$39,302</td>
<td>$18,877</td>
<td>$194,772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Furniture and Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2014 (December 31)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$30,758</td>
<td>$98,034</td>
<td>$190,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>$30,758</td>
<td>$98,034</td>
<td>$190,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>35,759</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>66,517</td>
<td>$98,034</td>
<td>$220,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated amortization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>19,257</td>
<td>68,879</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>5,876</td>
<td>8,747</td>
<td>20,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>25,133</td>
<td>77,626</td>
<td>20,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net book value</td>
<td>$41,384</td>
<td>$20,408</td>
<td>$200,292</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS
The Board's financial instruments consist of cash and temporary investments, 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.

8. 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.

9. RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS
Capital Region Board has the following transactions with Province of Alberta:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (3 months)</th>
<th>2014 (12 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants received from Province of Alberta (Note 4)</td>
<td>$ 875,000</td>
<td>$ 3,615,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. COMMITMENTS
The Board has entered into a new ten year lease agreement which commenced on 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>Annual Lease</th>
<th>Lease Inducement</th>
<th>Net Lease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$ 263,015</td>
<td>(22,083)</td>
<td>$ 240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>263,015</td>
<td>(22,083)</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>263,015</td>
<td>(22,083)</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>263,015</td>
<td>(22,083)</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>263,015</td>
<td>(22,083)</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereafter</td>
<td>1,008,228</td>
<td>(82,816)</td>
<td>925,412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$ 2,323,303  $ (193,231)  $ 2,130,072

In addition to the above payments, the Board is also responsible to pay a proportionate share of operating expenses.

11. BUDGET
January 1, 2015 - March 31, 2015 is a transition period and therefore the budget figures are not available nor included for the three month period ended March 31, 2015 as they were part of the 2014/2015 15 month budget.

12. COMPARATIVE FIGURES
The comparative statement of financial position as at March 31, 2014, and the statement of operations, changes in net financial assets, and cash flows for the period then ended, were not readily available. As a result, comparative figures are for the year ended December 31, 2014, the last set of audited financial statements.
CRB 2014/15 Annual Report

Recommended Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the 2014/2015 Annual Report as presented, including the Audited Financial Statements for 2014 and for January 1 – March 31, 2015 as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Background

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

- Alignment of the Capital Region Board financial year end with the Province’s March 31 date was approved to begin in the 2015/16 fiscal year. That resulted in a transitional year - January 1 to March 31, 2015 - being included as part of the 2014 Annual Report, and the date for its submission to the Province of Alberta being moved forward via Ministerial Order MSL: 040/15 (March 26, 2015) from May 1 to June 30, 2015.

- The CRB’s 2014/15 Audited Financial Statements were approved by the GPF and are now incorporated into the Annual Report.

Next Steps

- Following Board approval of the Annual Report including the two sets of Audited Financial Statements, CRB administration will be provide the 2014/15 Annual Report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs by the end of June and distribute in print form to the Board and stakeholders.
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MESSAGE FROM THE BOARD CHAIR AND CEO

In its sixth year, fresh from a structural reorganization and a municipal election that brought new regional voices to the table, the Capital Region Board began 2014 with a new outlook on its mandate, and evidence of an evolving maturity as an organization.

ACCOMPLISHMENT

No longer framing our purpose as potential, we recognized the real accomplishments of 2013 as platforms to build upon. We sensed a growing connection between our vision for growth and our activities, and between our diversity and our experience of prosperity in the region. As a first order of business, the new Board...
developed a Strategic Plan to guide decision-making. To boost member engagement, we also quickly embarked on a Road Show tour of all 24 members to connect the Capital Region Board directly with our member council colleagues.

RENEWED SPIRIT OF COLLABORATION

Also evident from the beginning of 2014 was a renewed spirit of collaboration. We witnessed high levels of Board unanimity and cooperation between members, for example to resolve Regional Economic Framework issues without Board intervention. New initiatives thrived, such as the return of the popular Housing Symposium, and agreement for a cutting-edge Economic Development Summit. The Summit blossomed into the entity that may well deliver in 2015 the “global competitiveness” referenced in the Board’s Statement of Accountability, supporting “economic growth” as envisioned in the 2011 report Capitalize – The Economic Roadmap for Alberta’s Capital Region.

UPDATING THE REGIONAL GROWTH PLAN

The background work to support the Board’s first substantive five-year review of the regional Growth Plan, Growing Forward, operated as the foundational link to all activities during the year. From a regional competitive analysis report to the initiation of specialized transit and housing needs assessments; from the hiring of a GIS Coordinator to a study on energy corridors – all roads led to the Growth Plan Update. The plan update is likely to further demonstrate how each member belongs to the Capital Region. Lead by a representative Growth Plan Update Task Force, the project was launched in the fall and will again dominate Board activity through the next year.

MATURING RELATIONSHIPS

Alignment of the Capital Region Board financial year end with the Province’s March 31 date was approved to begin in the 2015/16 fiscal year. That has resulted in the financial statements for the transitional year - January 1 to March 31, 2015 - being included as part of this 2014/15 Annual Report. Another first in 2014 was the Province’s offer of matching funding to supplement the Board’s annual budget of $3 million. In February 2015, the Board approved a request for matching funding, which could result in an additional $315,000 for the new fiscal year, 2015/16.

The tremendous growth we are experiencing in the Capital Region and the significant change it requires is not easy. In 2014 we renewed commitment to the prosperity of our region. We recognized our challenges but remained pragmatic, and optimistic. Each of us understands that, as part of the Capital Region, and in our own ways, we all connect, we all thrive and we all belong.
THE CAPITAL REGION IS A FAMILY OF DIVERSE, INTERDEPENDENT COMMUNITIES WHOSE ENERGY, TALENT AND RESOURCES ARE COMBINED WITH INSIGHTFUL PLANNING PROCESSES, SOUND FISCAL AND REGULATORY PRACTICES, ENVIRONMENTAL SENSITIVITY AND EMPATHY FOR THE UNDERPRIVILEGED. STRONG EXPRESSIONS OF REGIONAL PURPOSE AND THE ABILITY TO EMBRACE CHANGE ENSURE THAT THE SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL WELL-BEING OF THE REGION’S CURRENT AND FUTURE RESIDENTS AND COMMUNITIES IS RESPECTED AND SUSTAINED.
First completed in 2010, the Capital Region Growth Plan: *Growing Forward* was the landmark agreement between the Board’s 24 member municipalities in support of a new pattern for future development. It represented a shift in approach to integrated land use and transportation planning aimed at minimizing the Region’s development footprint. This included guidelines for a broader mix of housing types and densities in more compact communities supported by a range of transportation modes, including public transit, cycling and walking.

While the Plan recognizes that growth occurs at varying rates throughout the region, the intention was that all municipalities in the Capital Region would benefit. Included were comprehensive principles and policies addressing the inter-relationships between the four strategic priority areas of the Growth Plan:

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

In 2014 the first of required five-year reviews of the Growth Plan was launched. The Growth Plan Update project is being overseen by a Task Force, which reports directly to the Board, and is expected to deliver its results to the Province by the end of 2015. The current plan is in effect until the updated version is approved by the Government of Alberta.
Waldo Tobler’s first law of geography expresses the essence of Region:

“EVERYTHING IS RELATED TO EVERYTHING ELSE, BUT NEAR THINGS ARE MORE RELATED THAN DISTANT THINGS.”
REGULATORY & LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

With the approval of the Capital Region Growth Plan and the establishment of the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF), both in effect since April 1, 2010, the ensuing activities of the Board have largely focused on satisfying the regulatory and legislative requirements of the Board. To this end, the Board has continued implementing the Growth Plan, as well as reviewing and approving municipal statutory plans through the REF process.

REGIONAL EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

The Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) is the primary tool for the Capital Region Board to implement the Capital Region Growth Plan. The REF outlines submission and review criteria that the Board uses to evaluate proposed municipal statutory plans and amendments to ensure their consistency with the Capital Region Growth Plan.

In 2014 a minor change increased the period during which a member municipality may appeal a REF to the Board from 14 to 28 calendar days. The change was initiated after a six month review of the REF process found that member municipalities needed more than the 14 day appeal period to adequately review an administration recommendation and then advise their councils if an appeal was warranted.

Between January 1, 2014, and March 31, 2015, 12 municipal statutory plans and plan amendments were approved under the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF). Of the 12 proposals, two approval recommendations were appealed to the Board. However, both appeals were withdrawn before being considered by the Board.

Fully implementing the Growth Plan, including the outcome of its periodic updates, is a long-range and comprehensive endeavor expected to proceed over a number of years. The ongoing fiscal commitment from the Province will allow this implementation to proceed, and for the Board to continue to build upon its successes.
The Capital Region Board is a non-profit corporation consisting of 24 member municipalities from within the Region. Each member municipality is represented by an elected official appointed by its local council. The CRB members and their respective representatives are listed on the following page.

In addition to the elected officials, a non-voting Government of Alberta appointee, Mr. Gary Sandburg, of Alberta Municipal Affairs was the non-voting member of the Board until the end of March 2015. The Government of Alberta has also appointed representatives to the committees of the Board to enhance communication and cooperation between the Board and province.
The Capital Region Board coordinates long range planning and decision-making among the Region’s municipalities. Effective planning and implementation of the four strategic priority areas identified in the Regulation engages the member municipalities to:

- Plan and assist in administering regional projects designed to improve the quality of life for Capital Region citizens, and to act as a monitoring body for those projects;
- Establish land use practices that benefit the region while respecting and supporting the diversity that exists within the individual municipalities – their people, culture and natural environments;
- Plan and oversee regional inter-municipal transit services that also provide special services for persons with disabilities;
- Plan and support programs and practices which increase the availability of affordable and market affordable-housing throughout the Region;
- Expand regional capacity to deliver geographic information services that support regional decisions on sustainable land use, transit, and affordable and market-affordable housing;
- Assist in coordinating the efforts and energies of the member municipalities where applicable;
- Share the knowledge and insight gathered by the Board with member municipalities;
- Liaise and advocate with the provincial and federal governments on issues and projects related to the Capital Region;
- Provide the public with a comprehensive single source to access information on regional projects.
CAPITAL REGION BOARD MEMBERS
(AS OF MARCH 31, 2015)

**STURGEON COUNTY**
- Mayor Tom Flynn
- **Town of Legal**
  - Mayor Ken Baril
- **Town of Morinville**
  - Mayor Lisa Holmes
- **City of St. Albert**
  - Mayor Nolan Crouse
- **Parkland County**
  - Mayor Rodney Shaigec
- **Village of Wabamun**
  - Mayor Fred Lindsay
- **Town of Stony Plain**
  - Mayor William Choy
- **City of Spruce Grove**
  - Mayor Stuart Houston
- **Village of Warburg**
  - Mayor Ralph van Assen
- **Village of Thorsby**
  - Mayor Barry Rasch
- **Town of Calmar**
  - Mayor Wally Yachimetz
- **Town of Devon**
  - Mayor Stephen Lindop
Town of Bon Accord
Mayor Randolph Boyd

Town of Redwater
Mayor Mel Smith

Town of Gibbons
Councillor Amber Harris

Lamont County
Reeve Wayne Woldanski

Town of Bruderheim
Mayor Karl Hauch

Town of Lamont
Mayor Bill Skinner

Strathcona County
Mayor Roxanne Carr

City of Fort Saskatchewan
Mayor Gale Katchur

City of Edmonton
Mayor Don Iveson

Leduc County
Mayor John Whaley

Town of Beaumont
Mayor Camille Bérubé

City of Leduc
Mayor Greg Krischke
ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ALBERTA

Importantly the Government of Alberta is the enabling authority for the Capital Region Board.

The Board operates under the Capital Region Board Regulation, originally effective April 15, 2008, and now consolidated as Alberta Regulation 38/2012, with amendments up to and including Alberta Regulation 39/2015.

The Board is deemed to be a regional services commission for the purposes of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, and the Alberta Capital Finance Authority Act.

The Capital Region Board Regulation identifies the Board’s 24 member municipalities and sets out its accountability, voting structure, powers and duties and establishes the CRB’s mandate, that is, to develop and oversee the implementation of a Regional Growth Plan based on an integrated and strategic approach to planning the future growth of the Region through 2044 and to coordinate decisions in the Capital Region to support economic growth, strong communities and a healthy environment.

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

Since the Board’s inception, the Government of Alberta has provided a core operating grant for each of the Board’s fiscal years. For the first time in 2014 the Province offered the Capital Region Board an additional matching grant of up to $600,000 for 2015/16, potentially supplementing the annual core operating grant by $1.2 million.

Also this year the Board applied for and received additional grant funding through the Regional Collaboration Program (RCP) and the subsequent Alberta Community Partnership (ACP). The RCP and ACP grants provide support for activities that improve the viability and long-term sustainability of municipalities through regional collaboration and capacity building.

In 2014, the Board continued to administer the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF), a responsibility charged to the Board under Section 21 of the Capital Region Board Regulation and established under Ministerial Order L:270/10. Under the REF, the Board reviews and approves municipal statutory plans to ensure their consistency with the Capital Region Growth Plan.
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTABILITY

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

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

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

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

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD

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

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

COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Decision-making in the Capital Region is done at the Board level with input from committees and, in 2014, the formation of new task forces. The committee and task force structure confirms the connection between members and the Board to ensure decisions are grounded and understood by all as in the best interests of the Region as a whole.

Comprised of elected officials appointed by the 24 member municipalities, each new committee and task force in 2014 operated within a Terms of Reference approved by the Board. According to these terms of reference, the Board reviews and approves the committee priorities on a yearly basis, and committee and task force chairs and vice-chairs are elected from within their membership at the first, or organizational, meetings.
ORGANIZATION STRUCTURE
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### 2014-15 CAPITAL REGION BOARD COMMITTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE</th>
<th>Governance, Priorities and Finance</th>
<th>Land Use and Planning</th>
<th>Advocacy and Monitoring</th>
<th>Regional Services</th>
<th>Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAIR</td>
<td>Mayor Camille Bérubé</td>
<td>Mayor Tom Flynn</td>
<td>Mayor Greg Krischke</td>
<td>Mayor Mel Smith</td>
<td>Councillor Wes Brodhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE-CHAIR</td>
<td>Councillor Phyllis Kobasiuk</td>
<td>Mayor Rod Shaigec</td>
<td>Mayor Don Iveson</td>
<td>Mayor Stephen Lindop</td>
<td>Councillor Michael Walters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2014 CAPITAL REGION BOARD TASK FORCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK FORCE</th>
<th>Energy Corridors</th>
<th>Growth Plan Update</th>
<th>Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAIR</td>
<td>Reeve Wayne Woldanski</td>
<td>Mayor Roxanne Carr</td>
<td>Councillor Dwight Ganske</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICE-CHAIR</td>
<td>Councillor Glen Finstad</td>
<td>Mayor Lisa Holmes</td>
<td>Councillor Stew Hennig</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Chief Executive Officer also established working groups and advisory committees to provide advice and technical expertise, where relevant, to support the work of these standing committees and task forces.

**VOTING STRUCTURE**

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

**DELEGATION**

The Board may delegate some of its authority, with the exception of its authority to adopt bylaws, borrow money, adopt budgets and approve financial statements.

**BYLAWS AND POLICIES**

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

The Board has not established any bylaws as of March 31, 2015; however, it has established and followed policies associated with human resources management, administrative and financial standards, remuneration, Board member code of conduct and ethics, and governance direction for its activities.

**MANAGEMENT & ADMINISTRATION**

Key to the connection between Capital Region Board and its members are Management and Administration teams.

In 2014, the Board was supported by a professional staff of nine full-time positions led by Mr. Doug Lagore as CEO, and included three new positions: Communications Manager; Director, Special Projects; and GIS Coordinator. With Mr. Lagore’s retirement announcement on September 11, 2014, the Capital Region Board launched an executive search that culminated in the selection and appointment on December 12, 2014 of Mr. Malcolm Bruce as the new Chief Executive Officer of the Capital Region Board. The appointment became effective January 19, 2015.
REPORT ON ACTIVITIES

For the purposes of this report, the planned activities of Board in 2014 are categorized under its Standing Committees and Task Forces, with new initiatives noted under Other Activities. Ongoing and further strategic work planned for 2015/16 and beyond is detailed under Future Direction.

The work undertaken by the Board in 2014 was guided by the Board’s 2012-2014 Business Plan. The Board experienced a number of significant changes, including the implementation of the new committee structure, the development and first work of the Growth Plan Update Task Force, and the transition of a new Capital Region Board. Board members completed a strategic planning process to determine a vision for its business and work plans for 2014-2018. In addition, the Board was represented by a member of CRB Administration on the Regional Advisory Council of the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan.

The Board and its committees continued the long-term task of implementing the Growth Plan in 2014, while at the same time beginning to lay the foundation for a five-year update to the Plan. The Growth Plan is the Capital Region’s roadmap for collaboration and coordination of growth in the Region. It recognizes the need for the efficient use of regional infrastructure, land and other resources. Successful implementation of this strategy will result in an improved quality of life for residents, more regional cooperation amongst municipalities and regional stakeholders, a strong economy and a healthy environment.

A successful update of the Growth Plan will build on current strengths as well as address the gaps within the existing Plan framework, resulting in a more integrated, accessible and influential document. Additionally the updated plan will continue to connect the residents of the Capital Region, and tell the story of the future, that is, how we can continue to thrive as a Region and how our history reflects a sense of belonging, as a Region.
ADVOCACY & MONITORING COMMITTEE

ADVOCACY, COMMUNICATIONS AND PERFORMANCE MONITORING

Monitoring Board activities, telling the regional story and making connections with the membership, the Government of Alberta and the key regional stakeholders as defined in the Three-Year Advocacy and Communications Strategic Plan make up the primary functions of this Committee.

In 2014, the Advocacy & Monitoring (A&M) Committee took over the functions of the previous the Advocacy and Communications Committee and added a new oversight role for the Board in performance monitoring, including implementation of Board monitoring and reporting indicators. The Committee also advanced the priorities identified in the Three-Year Advocacy and Communications Strategic Plan, and accepted the Government Relations Action Plan.

In addition, two new initiatives for improved communications were introduced with a focus on better informing members of Board activities and successes. A regular newsletter entitled reCAP was launched in March and distributed directly to all Board members, member Councils and administrations. In the same month the Board Chair and CEO embarked on a Road Show to personally visit and update each member Council on Board activities through 2014.

An update of Advocacy and Communications Strategic Plan in 2014 will require the Board to take a more focused approach in future to its engagement activities with the Government of Alberta and key stakeholders than it has in the past. The Board will identify and employ new advocacy tactics, strategies and initiatives following the election of new provincial government in May 2015.

In an effort to continue building awareness and understanding of the Capital Region Board and the Growth Plan, Board members and administration met with a number of organizations and made presentations at various events during this reporting period. Presentations were made to a diverse range of audiences and stakeholders, including: the Urban Development Institute, the City-Region Studies Centre, and the Calgary Regional Partnership.
GOVERNANCE, PRIORITIES & FINANCE

This new Committee focuses on maintaining the connection between a thriving Region and the sound internal operations at the Capital Region Board.

In 2014, the new Governance, Priorities, & Finance (GPF) Committee carried out the activities associated with its terms of reference: the Board’s Business Plan, financial monitoring and audits, policy advice, and succession planning.

Priorities in 2014 included the 2014-2018 Budget and Work Plan, a complete corporate policy review, approval of the 2013 Audited Financial Statements, the preparation of the 2013 Annual Report, other financial and activity reporting to the Government of Alberta, and the recruitment of a new CEO. The 2013 Annual Report was approved by the Capital Region Board and provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs on May 1, 2014.

In September, the Committee recommended to the Board a 2014 – 2018 Budget and Work Plan that included membership financial support to take advantage of an offer of matching funding for 2015/16 by the Government of Alberta. The budget and work plan were reviewed and revised by the Committee and subsequently approved by the Board in 2015, including the membership contribution.

The Committee directed the recruitment and hiring of the Capital Region Board’s Chief Executive Officer, Mr. Malcolm Bruce.
BECAUSE WE SHARE RESIDENTS, ROOTS, AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR ENSURING PROSPERITY FOR THE FUTURE, WE ARE CONNECTED AS THE CAPITAL REGION
GROWTH PLAN UPDATE TASK FORCE

UPDATING THE CURRENT GROWTH PLAN

This special Task Force of the Board connects the Region’s future prosperity to the establishment and functioning of the Capital Region Board.

No plan is a static document. It must evolve with the times. That is why the required five-year update of the Board’s Growth Plan, Growing Forward, is an opportunity to revisit and revitalize the Growth Plan.

The formation of the Capital Region Board by the Government of Alberta in 2008 was accompanied with a mandate to guide the municipalities of the Capital Region in developing a long-term, integrated management plan to support the tremendous growth in the Region, with particular attention to the economic, social and environmental impacts of growth. Growing Forward was approved by the province in 2010 and since then the Board has been focused on its implementation. In 2014 the Growth Plan Update Task Force continued to oversee the Growth Plan update project.

After a year of consultation among the member municipalities in 2013, the Task Force completed a comprehensive review and evaluation of the existing Growth Plan in 2014. The review and evaluation identified the Plan’s strengths, areas for improvement, and key gaps, which were used to inform the scope and mandate of the Update.

Managing growth as one region is key to realizing the full potential of this Region in a global context. To better understand the Region’s strengths and economic potential, the Task Force completed an Economic Competitive Analysis of the Region. The Analysis revealed that a more collaborative and coordinated approach - among municipalities, the province and industry – is necessary to building our regional economic capacity to compete globally. The report: Choose to Lead: Building on our Competitive Advantages had broad circulation among the numerous economic development agencies in the Region and within the Province.

Leveraging the Plan Review and Policy Evaluation Report and the Economic Competitive Analysis, the Task Force began the work of updating the Growth Plan in the fall of 2014. The Board has received more than one million dollars in Regional Collaboration Grants from the Province to complete this work.
LAND USE PLANNING

The focus of this foundational Committee is connecting the use of the 12,384 km² (roughly 1.3 million ha) of land that comprises the Capital Region with the integrated policies and planning that will ensure regional prosperity, particularly as our population grows and doubles in the next 30 years.

The Land Use & Planning (LUP) Committee priorities in 2014 consisted of four major projects: the Prioritization of Regional Transportation Projects, the delivery of the CRGIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project Report, the development of a Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework, and the initiation of the Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan.

The Land Use & Planning Committee began the process of developing a short-term regional transportation project priority list to support the implementation of the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP), when it became an addendum to the Growth Plan in June 2013. Carrying out this prioritization exercise enables the Region to work directly with Alberta Transportation and champion Capital Region transportation initiatives in the Government of Alberta’s three-year Capital Planning process. The first priority list was completed in July 2014 and was referred to Alberta Transportation for provincial planning consideration. The priority list is to be reviewed annually.

In 2014, the Committee completed a pilot project to develop a subset of spatial data needed to support the Board’s planning role, especially with respect to the regional Growth Plan. As a result of the Capital Region GIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project report a GIS coordinator was hired in
BECAUSE WE COLLABORATE TO
CAPITALIZE ON OUR STRENGTHS
AND CREATE REGIONAL ASSETS,
WE HAVE CAPTURED THE
WORLD’S ATTENTION AND
THRIVE AS THE CAPITAL REGION
May 2014 to operationalize the GIS component of the Growth Plan and to support other regional initiatives.

The Board received a Regional Collaboration Grant for a Regional Energy Corridors Study to develop a policy framework for energy corridors in the Capital Region. The Growth Plan currently depicts the location of existing power and pipeline corridors in the Capital Region. The Regional Energy Corridors Study defined a framework for accommodating future corridors within the Capital Region, in a manner consistent and compatible with the principles and policies of the Growth Plan.

The study, completed in 2014, recommended that the Capital Region Board develop a Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan that would identify policy and criteria for the location of future energy corridors within the Capital Region, and further, recommend a preferred management model for the corridors. The master plan project began late in 2014 and is expected to be completed in the second quarter of 2015.

REGIONAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

This Committee’s original terms of reference in 2014 envisioned oversight of regional services and non-land use projects, specifically the projects of the Housing and Transit Task Forces. However, by the end of the fiscal year 2015, two changes were implemented: the Transit Task Force reverted to a Standing Committee, and oversight of policies and activities related to the new Geographic Information Services branch of the Board was added.

GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SERVICES (GIS)

The report of the Capital Region GIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project was delivered to the Land Use & Planning Committee in early 2014 and led to the hiring of a GIS coordinator in May 2014. The role of the GIS Coordinator is to support the operationalization of the GIS component of the regional Growth Plan and other regional projects. The Board later approved a GIS Policy to give administrative direction to the GIS program.

To date, an in-house server has been installed and a regional GIS database created. All datasets from previous work have been collected, organized and standardized. This has enabled internal GIS and mapping support
for Capital Region Board projects and initiatives including the Growth Plan Update, the Monitoring and Reporting Project, and other on-going committee work.

A regional GIS technical advisory group was formed in early 2015 to give feedback on regional GIS initiatives and to collaborate on regional GIS solutions. With the support of this group, a Capital Region GIS website is currently under development to enable easy access to maps and data. The GIS website will also act as a platform for ongoing sharing and collaboration between and amongst member municipalities.

**HOUSING TASK FORCE**

Housing Task Force priorities for 2014 focused on developing an understanding of the non market and market affordable housing needs on a sub-regional basis. The development of a sub-regional planning process was identified in the Board’s Housing Plan in 2010 as the recommended method to guide provincial funding and regional priority setting. Preliminary work started in 2013 with the completion of an Environmental Scan. The Scan identified that sub-regional planning efforts would benefit from the use of standard planning and needs assessment tools.

The development of a Housing Needs Assessment Framework began in early 2014 and will provide the Capital Region Board with a comprehensive, standardized, consistent method for analyzing current and future housing needs, and the necessary information to develop effective policy options to address the identified housing gaps.

**Accomplished by the Task Force since its inception in April 2014:**

- Two of six Sub Regional needs assessments have been completed and accepted by the Board as information.
  - The Leduc Sub Region includes the municipalities of the Town of Beaumont, the City of Leduc, the Town of Devon, the Town of Calmar, the Village of Thorsby, the Village of Warburg and Leduc County
  - The Strathcona Sub Region includes the specialized municipality of Sherwood Park and the City of Fort Saskatchewan
  - The remaining four needs assessments will be completed in 2015 pending funding
- The development of a Housing Assessment Tool and User Guide to support future planning.
- Annual ReEnvision Housing Symposium. A sold out event with more than 200 delegates attending. The delegates included representatives from all orders of government, Non Government Organizations, Not for Profit Housing Organizations and private sector home builders and developers, and supporting organizations. The theme “Our Affordable Future” was in support of providing municipalities with tools and information about ways to increase the range of housing offered in each community: by considering affordable (entry level) housing design options; streamlining regulatory processes; and learning about the relationship between housing, the built environment and quality of life.

The Capital Region Board received $190,000 in Regional Collaboration Grants to support the work of the Housing Task Force. The Task Force is working closely with the Province in developing a standardized approach to understanding the housing needs in the Region.
REGIONAL TRANSIT

Inter-municipal transit is the lifeblood of successful growth and regional prosperity, connecting the Region’s vital employment, services and housing options for a growing population.

The priorities and focus of the Transit Committee in 2014 included continuing discussions on regional transit governance, specialized transit needs and support for regional GreenTRIP projects as part of the implementation of the Board’s 30 year Regional Transit Services Plan.

Through a restructuring initiative of the Board’s committees, the Transit Committee was established as a Task Force reporting to the Regional Service Committee in early 2014. After further review, it was determined that the mandate for Transit was much broader, and therefore it was reconstituted as a Standing Committee of the Board in the fall of 2014.

Accomplished as a Task Force and as a Standing Committee in 2014:

- Received the final Transit Governance Study report as information and continued to explore operational and political considerations associated with the report recommendations.
- Successfully advocated to the Province to change the GreenTRIP program criteria to recognize regional projects such as the Regional Smart Card.
- Prepared a new GreenTRIP Priorities list in collaboration with the regional transit providers to support Round 2 applications for GreenTRIP funding to the Province.
- Held first joint workshop with the Province and Calgary Regional Partnership to discuss the development of a Provincial Transit Policy.
- Entered into a partnership with the City of Edmonton and Alberta Transportation to undertake a regional Household Travel Survey, which will provide travel pattern data and information for the entire Capital Region to support regional transportation planning.
- Completed a review of the Transit Committee membership at the request of the Board, and recommended the membership remain unchanged.
• Commenced a pilot project to assess regional specialized transportation needs to understand the transportation needs of persons in rural and urban municipalities not currently served by existing conventional transit service.
• Participated in the development of the prioritization of regional transportation projects in conjunction with the Land Use & Planning Committee.
• Convened a joint Capital Region Board/Calgary Regional Partnership Transit workshop for the organizations’ transit-related committees.

In September 2014, the Capital Region saw the addition of the fourth service provider – the Leduc C Line, offering regularly scheduled bus service between the City of Leduc, Nisku, Edmonton International Airport and Edmonton. The expansion of service was made possible through GreenTRIP funding from the Province. The new Bethel Transit Terminal Park & Ride centre in Strathcona County also benefitted from GreenTRIP funding.
OTHER ACTIVITIES

In reaching out in new ways to connect with ongoing and emerging regional issues, the Board continues to mature as a true regional leader. In 2014 the Board was represented in key provincial consultations. The genesis of the Capital Region’s first real economic development collaboration was met with high praise from regional players. The outcome of this initiative, and the precedent it sets for further cooperative endeavors, could prove to be a game changer for the Region.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

In the spring of 2014, the Board received and considered a motion to create a committee to study the Board’s role, if any, in regional economic development. In June, further internal deliberations were put on hold pending the organization of a regional economic development Summit for all regional economic development stakeholders in order to provide background for the Board’s decision. Invited to participate in the Summit were leaders from regional organizations such as: regional Chambers of Commerce; regional Economic Development Agencies; those performing economic development functions in member municipalities; business and industrial associations, as well as Capital Region Board Mayors and CAOs.

The Regional Economic Development Summit was held October 3, 2014 in Strathcona County. About 130 leaders from the Region shared their views and developed an initial consensus around what should be done next. The Economic Development Summit report was received and the following motion approved unanimously by the Board on November 13, 2014:

“Motion: That the Capital Region Board facilitates collaboration with existing organizations and key stakeholders to develop a member/stakeholder based non-political entity to expedite framework development, collective marketing, economic development planning, and continuing advocacy; and present their finding to the Regional Services Committee and the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Action: Capital Region Board CEO to facilitate discussion with organizations and key stakeholders to explore next steps.

Proposed Collaborators: Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Association, Capital Region Board, Edmonton Economic Development Corporation, Edmonton International Airport, Greater Edmonton Regional Chambers of Commerce, Edmonton Chamber of Commerce, Greater Edmonton Economic Development Team, the Leduc Nisku Business Association, and the Province"

The Capital Region Board has continued to move forward on the economic development initiative, with a report on developments expected in September 2015.

PROVINCIAL CONSULTATIONS

• Province appointed Capital Region Board Regional Project Manager Neal Sarnecki to the Regional Advisory Council for North Saskatchewan Regional Plan on behalf of the Capital Region Board.
• Capital Region Board hosted a Transportation Strategy of Alberta consultation session by Alberta Transportation in spring 2014.
• Capital Region Board hosted a North Saskatchewan Regional Plan workshop in fall 2014.
The proposed actions of the Board outlined here represent a combination of continuity, stemming from the existing Growth Plan and Board operations, and reinvention, linked to the information gathering and critical assessment involved with the Growth Plan Update.

The Board moved through the work of Phase 1 of the Growth Plan Update in 2014, toward completion of Growth Plan 2.0 and final delivery to the Province.

The significance of the emerging interrelation between the comprehensive update of the Growth Plan and some form of coordinated economic development initiative in the Capital Region is the driving force behind planning for 2015/16 and beyond.

**FUTURE CAPITAL REGION BOARD DIRECTIVES FOR 2015/16 AND BEYOND INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:**

- Completion and implementation of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Strategy
- Implementation of the Board’s 2014-2018 Strategic Plan and Work Plan
- Completion and delivery of the five-year Growth Plan Update to the Province
- Implementation of the Growth Plan Update Advocacy/Communications Plan
- Completion of the Integrated Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan
- Completion of the Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments
- Completion of the Regional Transportation Needs Assessment Pilot Study
- Annual update of the CRB’s Regional Transportation Priorities
- Implementation of the recommendations contained in the Our Affordable Future Market Affordable Housing Policy Framework report
- A Regional Household Travel Survey
- Annual Housing Symposium
- A Regional High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Study
BECAUSE WE ARE A NETWORK OF MANY CULTURES AND RELATIONSHIPS FORGED IN HISTORY, STRENGTHENED BY COMMON INTERESTS, AND SHARING IN MUTUAL SUCCESS, WE BELONG TOGETHER AS THE CAPITAL REGION
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INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S 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, 2014 and the statements of operations, changes in net financial assets, 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, 2014, 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 12, 2015

Hawkings Epp Dumont LLP
Chartered Accountants
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:

Malcolm Bruce, MSM  
Chief Executive Officer  
Edmonton, Alberta  
March 12, 2015
**STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION**

As At December 31, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCIAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents (Note 3)</td>
<td>$2,479,258</td>
<td>$2,429,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and services tax receivable</td>
<td>$96,073</td>
<td>$39,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total financial assets</td>
<td>$2,575,331</td>
<td>$2,468,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>135,080</td>
<td>246,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue (Note 4)</td>
<td>2,219,339</td>
<td>2,220,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred lease inducement (Note 5)</td>
<td>198,752</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities</td>
<td>2,553,171</td>
<td>2,467,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET FINANCIAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>22,160</td>
<td>1,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-FINANCIAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible capital assets (Note 6)</td>
<td>262,085</td>
<td>230,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-financial assets</td>
<td>262,085</td>
<td>238,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCUMULATED SURPLUS</strong></td>
<td>$284,245</td>
<td>$239,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

On behalf of the Board:

Mayor Nolan Crousse  
Chair

Mayor Camille Berube  
Vice-chair
STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS AND ACCUMULATED SURPLUS
For the year ended December 31, 2014

REVENUES

**GRANTS (NOTE 4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUDGET 2014</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2014</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Province of Alberta:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$3,092,669</td>
<td>$2,629,054</td>
<td>$2,316,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Internship</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>4,403</td>
<td>22,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Community Partnership</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>916,613</td>
<td>185,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Municipalities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Community Partnership</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>65,881</td>
<td>11,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEREST AND OTHER INCOME</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>26,024</td>
<td>10,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>3,961,669</td>
<td>3,641,975</td>
<td>2,547,287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENSES

**BOARD AND COMMITTEE EXPENSES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUDGET 2014</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2014</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>190,883</td>
<td>122,195</td>
<td>89,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>89,900</td>
<td>74,778</td>
<td>45,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>31,766</td>
<td>26,536</td>
<td>18,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board initiatives</td>
<td>465,170</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BOARD AND COMMITTEE EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>777,669</td>
<td>223,509</td>
<td>153,268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUDGET 2014</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2014</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consulting fees</td>
<td>1,306,000</td>
<td>1,514,177</td>
<td>625,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>1,430,000</td>
<td>1,328,919</td>
<td>1,220,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office lease</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>233,921</td>
<td>167,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>57,492</td>
<td>34,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>51,842</td>
<td>38,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>35,166</td>
<td>15,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>56,557</td>
<td>37,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>20,572</td>
<td>19,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>25,213</td>
<td>23,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>3,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>3,173,000</td>
<td>3,351,906</td>
<td>2,224,193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM EXPENSES (NOTE 4):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUDGET 2014</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2014</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Internship</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>22,075</td>
<td>22,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>3,961,669</td>
<td>3,597,490</td>
<td>2,400,196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANNUAL SURPLUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUDGET 2014</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2014</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL SURPLUS</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>44,485</td>
<td>147,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACCUMULATED SURPLUS, BEGINNING OF YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BUDGET 2014</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2014</th>
<th>ACTUAL 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCUMULATED SURPLUS, END OF PERIOD</strong></td>
<td>$ –</td>
<td>$284,245</td>
<td>$239,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
## STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET FINANCIAL ASSETS

For the year ended December 31, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Surplus</td>
<td>$44,485</td>
<td>$147,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>(66,570)</td>
<td>(192,564)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>35,166</td>
<td>15,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on write-off of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(31,404)</td>
<td>(147,091)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of prepaid expense</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(7,440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of prepaid expense</td>
<td>7,440</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,440</td>
<td>(7,440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Increase) decrease in net financial assets</td>
<td>20,521</td>
<td>(7,440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net financial assets, beginning of year</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>9,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$22,160</td>
<td>$1,639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### NET FINANCIAL ASSETS, END OF PERIOD

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
# STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS

For the period ended March 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPERATING ACTIVITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Surplus</td>
<td>$44,485</td>
<td>$147,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items not involving cash:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>35,166</td>
<td>15,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on disposal of tangible capital</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,420</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>(56,530)</td>
<td>9,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>7,440</td>
<td>(7,440)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>(111,764)</td>
<td>88,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue</td>
<td>(951)</td>
<td>2,212,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized deferred lease inducement</td>
<td>198,752</td>
<td>(8,068)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>116,598</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,487,175</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **CAPITAL ACTIVITIES** |                      |                      |
| Purchase of tangible capital assets | (66,569) | (192,564) |

**CHANGE IN CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS DURING THE YEAR**  
50,029  
2,294,611

**CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS, BEGINNING OF YEAR**  
2,429,229  
134,618

**CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS, END OF YEAR**  
$2,479,258  
$2,429,229

**ADDITIONAL CASH FLOW INFORMATION**  
Interest received during the period | $6,888 | $5,389

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
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, 2018. 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.
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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.

E. PREPAID EXPENSES
Prepaid expenses include deposits and insurance and are charged to expense over the periods expected to benefit from these expenditures.

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 new ten year lease arrangement for rental of the new office space which commenced on February 1, 2014. Amortization is provided on a straight-line basis over the 10 year term of the related lease as a reduction in office rent.

3. CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (MARCH 31)</th>
<th>2014 (DECEMBER 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$ 479,258</td>
<td>$ 2,429,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Investments</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,479,258</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,429,229</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Temporary investments are guaranteed investment certificates bearing interest of 1.05% maturing from May 2015 to July 2015.
4. DEFERRED REVENUE

An updated 2014/2015 conditional operating grant agreement between the Province of Alberta and the Board was signed on June 3, 2014. The Agreement provides a conditional contribution in the amount of $3,500,000 (2013 - $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, 2014 to March 31, 2015, unless an extension is agreed to by the Minister. The Board received $2,625,000 of this grant in 2014 related to April 1, 2014 - December 31, 2014.

There was an amount of $1,433,047 being carried forward from 2013, which was recorded as revenue for the December 31, 2014 year end.
MUNICIPAL INTERNSHIP

During the year, the Board recognized the remainder of the balance of the Municipal Internship grant that was received in 2013. 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, 2014, eligible expenditures for salaries and benefits of $22,075 have been incurred (2013 - $22,735). No additional funding has been received in 2014.

ALBERTA COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP (REPLACED REGIONAL COLLABORATION PROGRAM IN JULY 7, 2014):

During the year, Alberta Municipal Affairs provided four conditional grants to the Board for a total amount of $990,000. The first was for an additional $500,000 Capital Region Growth Plan Update project. The purpose of this grant was to support the Board with completing a comprehensive review of the Capital Region Growth Plan and to be completed by December 31, 2015.

The second was an $180,000 grant with the purpose of supporting the Board with the costs to develop a Regional Geographic Information System Evaluation Plan and policy framework with related equipment and tools, to be completed by July 31, 2015.

The third was a $250,000 grant to support the Board with the costs of a Global Economic Position Analysis and identification of impacts to infrastructure and growth policy development, to be completed by June 30, 2015. There was an amount of $709,192 being carried forward from 2013, which was recorded as revenue for the December 31, 2014 year end.

The fourth was a $60,000 Housing Symposium grant. The purpose of the grant was to assist the Board with the catering, educational materials, website, and speaker costs of the Capital Region Board 2014 Housing Symposium.
5. DEFERRED LEASE INDUCEMENT

Pursuant to a premises lease agreement for the new office, the landlord has provided the Board with a total inducement of $220,835 to be used for leasehold improvements. The inducement has been deferred and is being applied as a reduction of rent expense over the term of the lease as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reduction of Rent Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$22,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL DEFERRED LEASE INDUCEMENT** $198,752

6. TANGIBLE CAPITAL ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Furniture &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>2014</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>$30,758</td>
<td>$98,034</td>
<td>$190,025</td>
<td>$318,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>35,759</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>30,810</td>
<td>66,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>66,517</td>
<td>98,034</td>
<td>220,835</td>
<td>385,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCUMULATED AMORTIZATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>19,257</td>
<td>68,879</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>88,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>5,876</td>
<td>8,747</td>
<td>20,543</td>
<td>35,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>25,133</td>
<td>77,626</td>
<td>20,543</td>
<td>123,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET BOOK VALUE</strong></td>
<td>$41,384</td>
<td>$20,408</td>
<td>$200,292</td>
<td>$262,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Furniture &amp; 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>Disposals</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCUMULATED AMORTIZATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>16,669</td>
<td>56,385</td>
<td>56,983</td>
<td>130,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>2,558</td>
<td>12,494</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write-downs</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(56,983)</td>
<td>(56,983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>19,257</td>
<td>68,879</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>88,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET BOOK VALUE</strong></td>
<td>$11,501</td>
<td>$29,155</td>
<td>$190,025</td>
<td>$230,681</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS**

The Board’s financial instruments consist of cash and temporary investments, 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.

8. **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.

9. **RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS**

Capital Region Board has the following transactions with Province of Alberta:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANTS FROM THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA (NOTE 4)</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,615,000</td>
<td>$4,664,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. COMMITMENTS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ANNUAL LEASE</th>
<th>LEASE INDUCEMENT</th>
<th>NET LEASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$263,015</td>
<td>$(22,083)</td>
<td>$240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>263,015</td>
<td>(22,083)</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>263,015</td>
<td>(22,083)</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>263,015</td>
<td>(22,083)</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>263,015</td>
<td>(22,083)</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereafter</td>
<td>1,315,077</td>
<td>(88,337)</td>
<td>1,226,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above payments, the Board is also responsible to pay a proportionate share of operating expenses.

11. BUDGET

Budget figures are presented for information purposes only and are unaudited. The Board budgeted for Board Initiatives to ensure any arising projects could be sustained.

12. SUBSEQUENT EVENT

Effective January 1, 2015 the Capital Region Board was approved by Alberta Municipal Affairs to change its financial year-end from December 31 to March 31. In order to transition to this new financial year-end, the three month period January 1, 2015 to March 31, 2015 is to be treated as a financial year.
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INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S 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 March 31, 2015 and the statements of operations, changes in net financial assets, and cash flows for the 3 month period ended March 31, 2015, 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 March 31, 2015, the results of its operations, change in its net financial assets and its cash flows for the 3 month period ended March 31, 2015 in accordance with Canadian public sector accounting standards.

Edmonton, Alberta
June 11, 2015

Hawkings Epp Dumont LLP
Chartered Accountants
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:

Malcolm Bruce, MSM  
Chief Executive Officer  
Edmonton, Alberta  
June 11, 2015
## STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION

**As At March 31, 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(MARCH 31)</td>
<td>(DECEMBER 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCIAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Cash Equivalents (Note 3)</td>
<td>$2,585,531</td>
<td>$2,479,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and services receivable</td>
<td>$27,507</td>
<td>$96,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Financial Assets</strong></td>
<td>$2,613,038</td>
<td>$2,575,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>181,097</td>
<td>135,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue (Note 4)</td>
<td>2,207,417</td>
<td>2,219,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred lease inducement (Note 5)</td>
<td>193,231</td>
<td>198,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>2,581,745</td>
<td>2,553,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET FINANCIAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td>31,293</td>
<td>22,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-FINANCIAL ASSETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible capital assets (Note 6)</td>
<td>252,952</td>
<td>262,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCUMULATED SURPLUS</strong></td>
<td>$284,245</td>
<td>$284,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

On behalf of the Board:

Mayor Nolan Crouse  
Chair

Mayor Camille Berube  
Vice-chair
## STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS AND ACCUMULATED SURPLUS

For the period ended March 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (3 MONTHS) (MARCH 31)</th>
<th>2014 (12 MONTHS) (DECEMBER 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANTS</strong> (NOTE 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province of Alberta:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>$ 443,916</td>
<td>$ 2,629,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Internship</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Community Partnership</td>
<td>443,006</td>
<td>916,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Municipalities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Community Partnership</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>65,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTEREST AND OTHER INCOME</strong></td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>26,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>887,963</td>
<td>3,641,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOARD AND COMMITTEE EXPENSES:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>26,400</td>
<td>122,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>18,208</td>
<td>74,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>4,976</td>
<td>26,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting fees</td>
<td>373,591</td>
<td>1,514,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and benefits</td>
<td>334,727</td>
<td>1,328,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office lease</td>
<td>58,137</td>
<td>233,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fees</td>
<td>33,417</td>
<td>57,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>6,075</td>
<td>51,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>9,133</td>
<td>35,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>8,565</td>
<td>56,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>3,666</td>
<td>20,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>5,734</td>
<td>25,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>24,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>4,259</td>
<td>4,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENSES</strong></td>
<td>838,379</td>
<td>3,351,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURPLUS</strong></td>
<td>–</td>
<td>44,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCUMULATED SURPLUS, BEGINNING OF PERIOD</strong></td>
<td>284,245</td>
<td>239,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCUMULATED SURPLUS, END OF PERIOD</strong></td>
<td>$ 239,760</td>
<td>$ 92,669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET FINANCIAL ASSETS

For the period ended
March 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2015 (3 MONTHS)</th>
<th>2014 (12 MONTHS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(66,570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>9,133</td>
<td>35,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,133</td>
<td>(31,404)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of prepaid expense</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in net financial assets</td>
<td>9,133</td>
<td>20,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net financial assets, beginning of period</td>
<td>22,160</td>
<td>1,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$31,293</td>
<td>$22,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NET FINANCIAL ASSETS, END OF PERIOD**

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
## STATEMENT OF CASH FLOWS
For the period ended March 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (3 MONTHS) (MARCH 31)</th>
<th>2014 (12 MONTHS) (DECEMBER 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$ 44,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items not involving cash:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>9,133</td>
<td>35,166</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>68,566</td>
<td>(56,530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>7,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued liabilities</td>
<td>46,017</td>
<td>(111,764)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue</td>
<td>(11,922)</td>
<td>(951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized deferred lease inducement</td>
<td>(5,521)</td>
<td>(198,752)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of tangible capital assets</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>(66,569)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change in Cash and Cash Equivalents During the Period</strong></td>
<td>106,273</td>
<td>50,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash and Cash Equivalents, Beginning of Period</strong></td>
<td>2,479,258</td>
<td>2,429,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash and Cash Equivalents, End of Period</strong></td>
<td>$ 2,585,531</td>
<td>$ 134,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Cash Flow Information:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest received during the period</td>
<td>$ 1,041</td>
<td>$ 6,888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of these financial statements.
13. 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, 2018. The Board is an other government entity and is exempt from income taxes.

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

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

In June 2009, the Minister requested that the Board complete additional work on the Growth Plan including land use, a cost allocation formula for the 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.
Effective January 1, 2015 the Capital Region Board was approved by Alberta Municipal Affairs to change its financial year-end from December 31 to March 31. In order to transition to this new financial year-end, the three month period January 1, 2015 to March 31, 2015 is to be treated as a financial year.

14. 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.
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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 Category</th>
<th>Amortization 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.

E. PREPAID EXPENSES
Prepaid expenses include deposits and insurance and are charged to expense over the periods expected to benefit from these expenditures.

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 new ten year lease arrangement for rental of the new office space which commenced on February 1, 2014. Amortization is provided on a straight-line basis over the 10 year term of the related lease as a reduction in office rent.

15. CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015 (MARCH 31)</th>
<th>2014 (DECEMBER 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>585,531</td>
<td>479,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Investments</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,585,531</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 2,479,258</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Temporary investments are guaranteed investment certificates bearing interest of 1.05% maturing from May 2015 to July 2015.
16. DEFERRED REVENUE

PROVINCE OF ALBERTA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deferred Revenues Beginning of Period</th>
<th>Amounts Received/Receivable</th>
<th>Revenue Recognized</th>
<th>Deferred Revenue End of Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015 Operations</td>
<td>$1,428,993</td>
<td>$875,000</td>
<td>$443,916</td>
<td>$1,860,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Community Partnership</td>
<td>782,579</td>
<td></td>
<td>443,006</td>
<td>339,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEMBER MUNICIPALITIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amounts Received/Receivable</th>
<th>Deferred Revenue End of Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Collaboration</td>
<td>7,767</td>
<td>7,767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPERATIONS:

An updated 2014/2015 conditional operating grant agreement between the Province of Alberta and the Board was signed on June 3, 2014. The Agreement provides a conditional contribution in the amount of $3,500,000 (2013/2014 - $3,000,000). 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, 2014 to March 31, 2015, unless an extension is agreed to by the Minister. The Board received $2,625,000 of this grant in 2014 and $875,000 in 2015.

ALBERTA COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP (REPLACED REGIONAL COLLABORATION PROGRAM IN JULY 7, 2014):

Alberta Municipal Affairs provided the Board with total grant funding of $895,000 in 2013 and $990,000 in 2014. The Board recognized $185,808 of the grants in 2013 and $916,613 in 2014. The Board recognized $443,006 during the 3 month period ended March 31, 2015.
17. DEFERRED LEASE INDUCEMENT

Pursuant to a premises lease agreement for the new office, the landlord provided the Board with a total inducement of $220,835 to be used for leasehold improvements. The inducement has been deferred and is being applied as a reduction of rent expense over the term of the lease as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>22,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>16,567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL DEFERRED LEASE INDUCEMENT $193,231

18. TANGIBLE CAPITAL ASSETS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Furniture &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>2015 (Mar. 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>$66,517</td>
<td>$98,034</td>
<td>$220,835</td>
<td>$385,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>$66,517</td>
<td>$98,034</td>
<td>$220,835</td>
<td>$385,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACCUMULATED AMORTIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Furniture &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>2015 (Mar. 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>25,133</td>
<td>77,626</td>
<td>20,543</td>
<td>123,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>5,520</td>
<td>9,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>27,215</td>
<td>79,157</td>
<td>26,063</td>
<td>132,435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NET BOOK VALUE $39,302 $18,887 $194,772 $252,952

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Furniture &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>2014 (Dec. 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>$30,758</td>
<td>$98,034</td>
<td>$190,025</td>
<td>$318,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>35,759</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,810</td>
<td>66,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>$66,517</td>
<td>$98,034</td>
<td>$220,835</td>
<td>$385,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACCUMULATED AMORTIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Furniture &amp; Equipment</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Leasehold Improvements</th>
<th>2014 (Dec. 31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening balance</td>
<td>19,257</td>
<td>68,879</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization</td>
<td>5,876</td>
<td>8,747</td>
<td>20,543</td>
<td>35,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing balance</td>
<td>25,133</td>
<td>77,626</td>
<td>20,543</td>
<td>123,302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NET BOOK VALUE $41,384 $20,408 $200,292 $262,085
19. FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS

The Board’s financial instruments consist of cash and temporary investments, 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.

20. 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.

21. RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS

Capital Region Board has the following transactions with Province of Alberta:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRANTS FROM THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA (NOTE 4)</th>
<th>2015 (3 months)</th>
<th>2014 (12 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>December 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants from Province of Alberta</td>
<td>$ 4,664,000</td>
<td>$ 2,310,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. COMMITMENTS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANNUAL LEASE</th>
<th>LEASE INDUCEMENT</th>
<th>NET LEASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$263,015</td>
<td>$240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>263,015</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>263,015</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>263,015</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>263,015</td>
<td>240,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thereafter</td>
<td>1,008,228</td>
<td>925,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,585,531</td>
<td>$2,130,072</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above payments, the Board is also responsible to pay a proportionate share of operating expenses.
23. **BUDGET**

 January 1, 2015 - March 31, 2015 is a transition period and therefore the budget figures are not available nor included for the three month period ended March 31, 2015 as they were part of the 2014/2015 15 month budget.

24. **COMPARATIVE FIGURES**

 The comparative statement of financial position as at March 31, 2014, and the statement of operations, changes in net financial assets, and cash flows for the period then ended, were not readily available. As a result, comparative figures are for the year ended December 31, 2014, the last set of audited financial statements.
CRB Economic Development Initiative

Recommended Motion:

1. That the Capital Region Board approve the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Strategy, as recommended, in principle, by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

2. That the Capital Region Board approve the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework, as recommended, in principle, by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Background:

The Capital Region Board (CRB), through its Strategic Plan, recognizes the benefits of regional action to positively impact our global opportunity and has identified economic competitiveness as a principle in the Growth Plan Update. On October 3, 2014, CRB hosted an inaugural regional economic development summit, attended by one-hundred-and-thirty regional stakeholders. The stakeholders considered three major areas in their workshop discussions:

- What does success look like?
- What are the opportunities and challenges for the Capital Region?
- What actions should take place, who should lead, and what is the role (if any) for CRB?

It became apparent that regional collaboration is needed, but any movement forward by the CRB in economic development should not impact local municipal or organizational autonomy. The summary of information collected at the Economic Development Summit lead to the creation of the Summit Report, which detailed options for moving forward.

On November 13, 2014, the Board received The Summit Report along with four recommended options on how to proceed. Due to the desire for a regional economic development initiative, the Board selected Option 3, which directed administration to facilitate collaboration between industry leaders to move the regional economic development initiative forward.

Option 3) That the Capital Region Board facilitate collaboration with existing organizations and key stakeholders to develop a member/stakeholder-based non-political entity to expedite framework development, collective marketing, economic development planning, and continuing advocacy; and present their finding to the Regional Services Committee and the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Starting with an introductory meeting on December 3, 2014, leaders of existing regional organizations (Attachment 4) met to discuss various approaches to organizing the non-political entity and managing the work. This group became the Economic Development Steering Committee, composed of the following members:

- Alberta Industrial Heartland Association - Neil Shelly, Executive Director
- Edmonton Chamber of Commerce - Janet Riopel, President & CEO
- Edmonton Economic Development Corporation - Brad Ferguson, President & CEO
- Edmonton International Airport - Tom Ruth, President & CEO
The Steering Committee determined the Economic Development Initiative should complete the following objectives:

1) Prepare a Project Charter;
2) Develop a Greater Edmonton Region Economic Development Framework; and

An established governance structure supported the completion of these objectives and led to the creation of two additional groups; the Regional Economic Development TEAM, and the TEAM Workgroup, consisting of a subset of the 28 TEAM members (Attachment 4). The Steering Committee developed the Project Charter and Framework; The TEAM Workgroup developed the Strategy with input from the TEAM members.

On May 28, the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee (GPF) recommended, in principle, the Strategy and Framework to the Board for approval. To help answer some questions raised at GPF further clarity was added in regards to accountability and funding. These changes have been highlighted in the Strategy (Attachment 2), and Framework (Attachment 3) documents.

Next Steps:

The Steering Committee recognizes the need for further work on the funding model and marketing plan. It is anticipated that the process could continue over the summer months and be complete in the fall. Upon completion, it would come back to the Board for further discussion.

Rationale:

The proposed Economic Development Strategy, and Framework support the continued collaboration and discussion between the region's leading economic development groups, industry, associations, and local economic development officers. Moreover, the cooperation between these stakeholders will lead to an improved ability to capitalize on global opportunities and react to global challenges.

It is the recommendation of CRB Administration that the CRB approve both the Strategy and Framework, and allow the Steering Committee, TEAM, and TEAM Working Group to continue through the summer and come back with a Funding Model and a Marketing Plan in Q4 2015.

Attachments:

1. Preamble - Economic Development Initiative
2. Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Strategy
3. Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework
4. IR.2015.05 Who is involved in the Economic Development Initiative
PREAMBLE: Economic Development Initiative

It took Denver 40 years.
Almost every region in the world is addressing it.
And in less than a year the Edmonton Metropolitan Region has already made a significant start...
because the Capital Region Board had the foresight to initiate a collaboration
that is the key to success.
A collaboration that only the CRB could initiate.

Talking about regional economic development.
Regional Action.
    Toward
Global Opportunity.

In a unanimous decision November 13, 2014, the Capital Region Board (CRB) agreed to coordinate the facilitation of the region’s first collaborative economic development strategy.

The Board instructed management to facilitate “a member/stakeholder-based, non-political entity” with the goal of preparing a regional economic development strategy.

CRB invited the senior leadership of major economic development organizations to lead this preparation...to identify just how to achieve the best outcome for the region.

These leaders enthusiastically volunteered their time and invested their effort in first preparing the Framework.

They agreed that the municipal economic development officers on the ground throughout the region were the best group to form a team to address the nuts and bolts of an economic development Strategy.

Thus, a strategy TEAM of 28 municipal EDOs and a subset Working Group of 7 professional economic development leaders worked together to address the strategic priorities and key results for the region - as advice to CRB today.

The role of CRB is to assess whether this advice and these recommendations will accomplish two things:
  1. the outcomes identified in the CRB strategic plan and
  2. the aspirations identified in the economic development Summit sponsored by CRB October, 2014.
If so, then we will take the **next steps** in this broad framework.

First, a Regional Economic Development “Entity” will work to determine in the detailed structure, and method of achieving these outcomes.

**Importantly the role of CRB as a stakeholder Board would be to review the overall approach and maintain accountability through an annual reporting cycle from the “Entity” to the owner, the CRB.**

**Further, this “Entity” would not be a committee of the CRB nor a municipal body.** It would be a stand-alone arms-length organization focused on outcomes established by, and accountable to, the CRB. It would be an **economic development and business organization** that would foster collaboration and marketing for the benefit of the whole region.

To sum up:

- While the CRB is facilitating the work on this Framework and Strategy, the “Entity” is conceived as an arms-length organization quite apart from the CRB.
- The “Entity” would flesh out the details of its own structure, organization and funding, with clear reporting back to the CRB for approval.
- The Framework and Strategy ensure a continuous connection between participating municipal organizations and the major players in economic development in the region.
- These multiple municipal and partner linkages create a network of communications. Municipal Councils, because of the direct participation of their EDOs and/or CAOs, would always be aware of and able to influence activities in the region.
- There would also be regular formal reporting to the CRB.
- Other models suggest that a meaningful start-up office budget would be in the range of $600,000 per annum.

With this initiative the CRB has again demonstrated its commitment to its mandate and innovation, leveraging its strong connection to member municipalities. **Not only is this initiative a major step forward for our region** – it is a step forward that our own economic development professionals have urged us to take.

With it the Board continues a new pattern of collaboration, with a growing foresight and maturity as a Board on behalf of a thriving region.

**This work is only beginning.**

The key marketing and funding models are still to be developed.

However, with the Board’s leadership and approval today, we take the first steps towards greater regional prosperity through this critical, first ever, regional economic development strategy.
Volume 2: Edmonton Metropolitan Region
Economic Development Strategy 2015-2018

May 21, 2015
Chair, Steering Committee
CRB Regional Economic Development Initiative

Dear Chairman Bruce:

**RE: Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Strategy**

In January, 2015 the Steering Committee invited economic development professionals from the Edmonton Metropolitan Region to work together to prepare a regional economic development strategy. A working group, mandated by the regional economic development professionals drafted the attached regional economic development strategy. It is concise, and it focuses on those things that need to be done as priority efforts in the first few years of our work together. It addresses the fundamental priorities we will accomplish in the next few years to set the base for our collaboration over the coming decades.

The undersigned members of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region economic development working group recommend the attached strategy to the Steering Committee and the Capital Region Board.

Barbara McKenzie, Chair

Per: Guy Boston, City of St. Albert
    Gerry Gabinet, Strathcona County
    Tom Koep, Parkland County
    Jordan Rumohr, Sturgeon County
    Glen Vanstone, Edmonton Economic Development Corporation
    Dave Walker, City of Spruce Grove
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Strategy reflects the insight of regional economic development professionals and their recommendations to the Steering Committee providing oversight of this Strategy for the Capital Region Board.

The strategy provides the foundational elements that will prepare the region to win in the globally competitive environment of metropolitan economic development. We will present our region with a single voice. We will plan economic development and marketing together, for the whole region. We will position the region to win at a level that reflects our global ambition.

The Strategy focuses on the priorities for action in economic development in the region over the coming five years. The Economic Development Framework, sister document to the Strategy, outlines the framework for collaboration, the organization and the funding model for the initiative over the coming decade or more. The two documents should be reviewed together. The strategy is founded on the framework’s vision, mission and values and responds to core critical success factors:

- **Vision for Economic Development** – “To be a business location of choice for global investment, by collaboratively building on regional assets”.

- **Our Economic Development Mission** – “Together, we strengthen the Edmonton Metropolitan Region’s global competitiveness, growth and innovation”.

- **Our Values** – In the Edmonton Metropolitan Region, we value:
  - Innovation
  - Collaboration
  - Sustainability
  - Excellence
  - Respect

- **Critical Success Factors** – There are key factors that must be right in order to succeed. Summarized, these are:
  - **Collaboration** – A strong and ongoing commitment to collaboration principles.
  - **Value for all** – Stakeholders trust each other and anticipate beneficial outcomes from their participation.
  - **Government Participation** – Federal and Provincial governments have shared interest in the success of the Strategy.
  - **Resourcing** – Resources must be found and resources must be pooled to succeed.
- **Communication/Visibility** – Successes must be highly visible to all stakeholders in the region.

- **Shared Performance Metrics** – Participating stakeholders will define success using a common language of performance measurement.

### Strategic Priorities and Key Results

In this first economic development strategy, the focus is on foundational elements that underpin successful regional economic development organizations. The focus is on building shared data bases, on developing shared lead protocols, on fostering site selection tools and on preparing detailed plans together in three areas:

- **Industry**
- **Marketing**
- **Talent**

A commitment to collaboration is the core value underpinning the three pronged strategy.

Strategic Priorities are not listed in order of importance. Rather, **ALL strategic priorities are critical to the success** of the economic development strategy and all must be addressed in the course of the work.

1. **Marketing**: Edmonton’s Metropolitan Region Strategic Marketing Plan aligns efforts around unified and coherent messaging to affect economic growth initiatives and increase exposure of the regional brand.

2. **Talent**: Edmonton Metropolitan Region supports attraction and activation of people with the skills and talent to strengthen the growth opportunities in our regional economy.
3. **Industry**: Partners identify opportunities and collaborate to grow and diversify strategic sectors of the regional economy to the benefit of all players.

**Key Results (Objectives) for Regional Economic Development**

**Key Results** or objectives are identified for each strategic priority as follows.

**Strategic Priority 1: Marketing**: Edmonton’s Metropolitan Region Strategic Marketing Plan aligns efforts around unified and coherent messaging to affect economic growth initiatives and increase exposure of the regional brand.

**Key Results**

**KR 1.1**: A successful mechanism to communicate openly with regional marketing partners is in place.

**KR 1.2**: A unified regional brand is collaboratively developed and consistently used to market the region.

**KR 1.3**: A comprehensive, regional Strategic Marketing Plan is collaboratively developed and executed under the regional brand.

**Strategic Priority 2: Talent**: Edmonton Metropolitan Region supports attraction and activation of people with the skills and talent to strengthen the growth opportunities in our regional economy.

**Key Results**

**KR 2.1**: “**Ignite Edmonton**” is enhanced, expanded and accessible across the Edmonton Metropolitan Region.

**KR 2.2**: A regional workforce advocacy task force, inclusive of education institutions, influences workforce strategy and outcomes.

**KR 2.3**: A regional workforce strategy is collaboratively developed.

**Strategic Priority 3: Industry**: Partners identify opportunities and collaborate to grow and diversify strategic sectors of the regional economy to the benefit of all players.

**Key Results**

**KR 3.1**: A protocol for identifying and sharing economic development opportunities across the region is established and applied.

**KR 3.2**: A comprehensive baseline of regional economic development information and definitions is established and updated regularly.
KR 3.3: A regional database of projects, which is updatable and accessible, allows regional businesses to share information, prospects and opportunities.

KR 3.4: A uniform site selection information system is created based on best practices for site selection standards and a regional GIS data platform in an open data environment is established.

KR 3.5: An economic diversification strategy for the region is in place, with particular focus on key industries such as Agri-Business, Energy, Health, Cold Climate Technologies and Transportation.

Detailed strategies and tactics and implementation timelines and GANTT have been prepared as advice to the economic development organization that is established to execute the strategy.

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Strategy 2015-2018 is the first collaborative effort of CRB specifically mandated by the Board on economic development. Future updates will refine and focus the strategy to our collective regional objectives.
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Appendix 1: Detailed Environmental Scan
1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROCESS: A REGIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

The Capital Region Board (CRB) made a unanimous decision to undertake facilitation of the region’s first collaborative economic development strategy in November, 2014. Instructions to CRB management were to facilitate “a member/stakeholder based non-political entity” which would collaborate to prepare a regional economic development strategy.

The CRB, through its motion, has emphatically stated that that status quo approach to economic development needs to change. Going forward we will work together to tell our story of a great, sophisticated and growing metropolitan region that is ready to embrace new investment, new business and new creativity.

Our economic development collaboration will aggressively act to win more business and more investment in the competitive world of metropolitan development by presenting our region together, by presenting a singular message of welcome and interest, and by working under a regional brand and marketing that differentiates our region from the competition.

It is clear that the Edmonton region is in a global competition for growth and the Team is committed to success; however, success will not be achieved by incrementalism. Regional stakeholders must be committed to winning at a level that reflects a global ambition.

1.1 Background

A Steering Committee comprising the region’s largest economic development non-political investment organizations was convened and initially met on December 3rd, 2014. Key decisions made at that meeting:

- **Prepare a Project Charter** defining relationships and responsibilities of key players for the duration of the project would be developed by the Steering Committee.

- **Develop a Greater Edmonton Region Economic Development Framework** addressing the long term relationships and responsibilities of the collaboration would be developed by the Steering Committee.

- **Prepare a Greater Edmonton Region Economic Development Strategy.** A high level economic development strategy based primarily on existing data and research of regional partners would be drafted by the regional economic development professionals and recommended to the Steering Committee for approval.

The first Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Strategy has been drafted by a working group of seven recognized professionals (the Working Group WG) and refined and finalized by the full team of some 30 economic development professionals (the Team) for approval of the Steering Committee. It defines the necessary components of a “high level”
economic development strategy and speaks to the sources of input to that strategy.

For the purpose of the following report, the key groups referenced are as follows:

**Steering Committee (SC)** – refers to the Steering Committee responsible for the overall execution of the CRB Economic Development Initiative.

**The SC Chair** – refers to the Chair of the Steering Committee.

**The TEAM (TEAM)** – refers to the group of 30 economic development professionals from the region who will collectively oversee the development of the strategy.

**The Chair (Chair)** – refers to the Chair of the economic development TEAM, who is appointed by the Steering Committee.

**The Working Group (WG)** – refers to a subset of seven economic development professionals who have prepared the draft economic development strategy for review by the TEAM and for recommendation to the Steering Committee.

**Western Management Consultants (WMC)** – refers to the consultants who facilitated the process.

### 1.2 Components of the Economic Development Strategy

Core components of an economic development strategy for the region were addressed as follows:

- Economic Base and Situation Assessment
- Analysis and Regional SWOT Assessment
- Regional Economic Development Mission, Vision, Values, Operating Principles (MVVOP)
- Strategic Priorities for Regional Economic Development
- Key Results (Objectives) for Regional Economic Development
- Strategies and Actions Plans
- Implementation Timing, Performance Measurement, Realignment of Strategy

The components of economic development strategy align very closely to the key elements of strategic planning for organizations as illustrated in the “hourglass” graphic. At the highest level, Vision, Values, Operating Principles, and Mission/Mandate are determined by the governing group. For the purpose of this strategy, that group is the Steering Committee.
The Operating Environment comprises the economic base and situation assessment and the analysis and SWOT assessments for the region.

Strategic Priorities are those few areas of concerted focus at the regional level that will ensure our success. Key Results, or objectives, are identified for each Strategic Priority. And finally Strategies, Actions and Implementation Plans determine how we will go about achieving the objectives. Specific measurement of results and regular reviews of those measures and adjustment of strategies if required will ensure that the overall strategy remains on track.

### 1.3 Organization of the Economic Development Initiative and Team

Composition of the economic development TEAM and the Working Group (WG) included the professionals listed below. All professionals listed were invited to participate in the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WG</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Barbara McKenzie</td>
<td>Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leduc Nisku Economic Development Assoc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bert Roach</td>
<td>Beaumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patrick Earl</td>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doug Sullivan</td>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milad Asdaghi</td>
<td>Devon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brenda Otto</td>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lanny Boutin</td>
<td>Gibbons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schaun Goodeve</td>
<td>Morinville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pat Nicol</td>
<td>Redwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Jordan Rumohr</td>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Tom Koep</td>
<td>Parkland County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Newman</td>
<td>Lamont County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jordan Evans</td>
<td>Leduc County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Gerry Gabinet</td>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Guy Boston</td>
<td>St. Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Dave Walker</td>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luke Pantin</td>
<td>Leduc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Morrissey</td>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Ross</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Glen Vanstone</td>
<td>Edmonton Economic Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neil Shelly</td>
<td>Alberta’s Industrial Heartland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doug Sullivan</td>
<td>Lamont Region Economic Development Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathy Rodberg, CAO</td>
<td>Calmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaine Milliken, Deputy CAO</td>
<td>Lamont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Proulx, CAO</td>
<td>Legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Burke, CAO</td>
<td>Thorsby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shawn Patience, CAO</td>
<td>Wabamun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christine Pankewitz, CAO</td>
<td>Warburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chair of this group, Barbara McKenzie, CEO of the Leduc Nisku Economic Development Association was appointed by the Steering Committee (SC) and sits as a member of that group. She keeps the Steering Committee updated on the activities of the TEAM and the WG, and ultimately presents and recommends the completed strategy to the Steering Committee. The overall structure of the organization recommending to the Capital Region Board is illustrated following.
The Chair led the Economic Development Working Group and TEAM through the strategy-making and approval processes, facilitated by WMC. The Working Group (WG) worked with WMC to develop the material and “recommendations”, essentially the content of the strategy between meetings of the TEAM. TEAM provided input to the WG during its work and by way of review of the draft final strategy.

The Chair will take the draft Strategy to the Steering Committee for review and approval. The Steering Committee worked with WMC to prepare the Mission, Vision, Values and Operating Principles that guided the strategy process. These were shared with the WG early in the process and the WG and the TEAM had the opportunity to suggest changes as the process unfolds.

### 1.4 Process and Schedule of Meetings

The Strategy was prepared in a facilitated process of six milestone meetings of the Working Group/TEAM. The process and timing of these meetings was as follows.
The Chair kept the Steering Committee informed throughout the process. The Steering Committee contributed the following:

- Prepared Mission, Vision, Values, and Operating Principles for the economic development strategy; and

- Finalized and approved the Strategic Priorities as drafted by the Working Group, and ultimately approved the strategy internally and recommend it to the Capital Region Board.
2.0 EDMONTON METROPOLITAN REGION VISION AND MISSION FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Vision for Economic Development

The vision for the Edmonton Metropolitan Region for economic development describes a realistic future and suggests how we will get there.

To be a business location of choice for global investment, by collaboratively building on regional assets.

2.2 Economic Development Mission

Together, we strengthen the Edmonton Metropolitan Region’s global competitiveness, growth and innovation.

2.3 Values

In the Edmonton Metropolitan Region, we value:

- **Innovation** – The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework values courageous and bold new development and growth. Members embody a “can do” attitude.

- **Collaboration** – “If one wins, we all win”. The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework strength lies in its emphasis on collaboration and transparency.

- **Sustainability**

- **Excellence**

- **Respect**
between all members of economic development in both the public and private sectors to grow one of Canada’s largest economic engines.

- **Sustainability** – The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework will strive to incorporate current practices to economic development that improve the triple bottom line (economy, environment, social).

- **Excellence** – Members strive to provide quality services and programs to all stakeholders by maintaining the highest standards of skills and knowledge.

- **Respect** – The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework and its leaders treat each other with respect and professionalism.

### 2.4 Operating Principles

Operating principles are the code of conduct that guides the face-to-face relationships of the members of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework.

- We are inclusive in all our activities and decision making, and seek to enhance collaboration among stakeholders.

- We respect local autonomy and understand the roles and responsibilities of our colleagues.

- Once a consensus based, collaborative decision is made, we will each represent that decision and speak with one voice.
2.5 Regional Areas of Influence

The Steering Committee made a significant contribution to the Framework and Strategy by identifying the six areas of influence that must be addressed regionally to realize the vision.
The working group determined that three areas of this concept can be addressed directly by the economic development strategy.

- Marketing
- Talent
- Industry

The areas of infrastructure, Innovation and collaboration must be addressed by regional stakeholders outside the specific areas of focus of the economic development strategy. They are foundational and critical to success.
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN AND STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT

The objective of this section is to characterize the situation and future prospects for the Edmonton Metropolitan Region at a high level and based on secondary materials. The environmental scan sets the base, at a very fundamental level, for regional economic development planning in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region.

The following section provides a high level summary of the economy of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region. A detailed analysis of the Region can be found in Appendix 1 and addresses:

- Gross Domestic Product
- Industry Sectors
- Industrial Land Supply
- Infrastructure
- Demographics
- Labour Force
- Business Characteristics
- Institutional Characteristics

This information was used by the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development working group to help in the development of a SWOT analysis and inform the development of strategic priorities for the region.

Information was synthesized from Statistics Canada, Avison Young, the Province of Alberta, the Conference Board of Canada, and individual economic development reports provided by each of the 24 member municipalities of the Capital Region Board. Past consultant reports commissioned by the Capital Region Board were also referenced.

Whenever possible, current information on the Capital Region municipalities was used for the analysis. However, for most available data the Edmonton Census Metropolitan Area is the official geographical area encompassing ‘Greater Edmonton’ used by Statistics Canada. It contains all of the municipalities of the Capital Region Board with the exception of Lamont County. This document references several economic forecasts and projections. In all cases, these forecasts have not been updated to fully reflect the impact of low oil prices on the Edmonton CMA’s economy in the short term. The focus of the plan is longer term, and it is assumed that the region will recover from the immediate short cycle issues.

3.1 Summary and Conclusions from the Environmental Scan

The conclusions we would make from the environmental scan work can be summarized as follows:

- The Edmonton Metropolitan Region has performed very strongly as an economic region in Canada, at or near the top in most economic indicators for the last two decades.
- Despite the present oil and gas cyclical downturn, forecasters see a future of growth and prosperity for the region and for Alberta.

### Average Annual Real GDP Growth

#### Historical Estimates and Forecasts, Major Canadian Cities

**Source:** Conference Board of Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>2004 - 2014 Est.</th>
<th>2015 - 2019 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa-Gatineau</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Edmonton Metropolitan regional population will remain among the younger metro populations in Canada. The regional population is anticipated to grow to just under 2.24 million by 2044, building on its high growth rates of past decades and increasing its share of the total Alberta population.

### Median Age in 2011 Largest Metropolitan Areas

**Source:** Statistics Canada

- Calgary: 36.4
- Edmonton: 36.5
- Toronto: 38.6
- Ottawa - Gatineau: 39.1
- Montreal: 39.7
- Vancouver: 40.2
The regional labour force is educated, particularly in technical certifications, demonstrates high participation rates, experiences low unemployment, and has among the highest average household income and personal disposable incomes in Canada. Labour force growth rates have been among the highest in the country.

### Median Family Income in 2012 Largest Metropolitan Areas (dollars)

**Source:** Statistics Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Median Family Income 2012 (dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>98,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>96,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa - Gatineau</td>
<td>94,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>71,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>71,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>71,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional businesses are primarily smaller business, and these businesses are the focus of much of the entrepreneurial and scale up support offered in the region.
Regional costs are among the highest in Canada, based on the CPI index.
Higher education is a regional strength, with six highly regarded and recognized educational institutions.

3.2 SWOT Assessment for the Edmonton Metropolitan Region

Strengths and Weaknesses in relation to economic strategy are considered to be “inside” our regional system and are generally matters that we can address or leverage to our advantage. Opportunities and Threats are usually thought of as coming from “outside” our system or region. In some cases we can capitalize on them (e.g. a market opportunity) and in other cases our region would have little ability to control or influence the matter (e.g. value of the Canadian dollar).

Identified below is a short list of those elements of the SWOT that are considered most important to consider as we prepare the economic development strategy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to nearby natural resources</td>
<td>High cost environment in the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality education system that supports industry</td>
<td>Low productivity/improvement environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An entrepreneurial ecosystem in the region</td>
<td>Business complacency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern infrastructure</td>
<td>Excess reliance on oil and gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong logistics network</td>
<td>Incentive and policy environment is not as competitive as global competitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable and safe geo-political and environmental climate</td>
<td>Import and export imbalance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade agreement and legal/commercial system maturity. Agreements can be trusted.</td>
<td>Historic reliance on major projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High disposable income and strong consumer spending</td>
<td>Communication bandwidth limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to tide waters (distance to ocean ports and international markets)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Opportunities**

- Infrastructure enhancements to support growth
- Ancillary business around our core industries and major projects
- A leader in sustainable solid waste management and recycling
- Cost sharing from other levels of government for new industries
- The region positioned as THE place for investment to access Northern Canada, Energy Tech, Health Technology, Agri-Tech, Value added petrochemicals
- Regional Brand established

**Threats**

- Exposure to resource price fluctuations
- Fluctuating value of Canadian dollar
- Changing policy decisions by other orders of government
- Increasing focus on environment, greenhouse gas emissions, and contribution to climate change requires a concerted effort

These key issues and opportunities for the region, once agreed by the regional partners, are the key drivers of the economic development strategy.

### 3.3 Strategic Assumptions

Strategic plans are forward-looking, strategic documents which are based in no small part on the assumptions one makes about the future. The assumptions that underpin the Edmonton Metropolitan Region are identified following.

#### 3.3.1 Funding and Government

- No significant reduction in municipal funding from the Province.
- The Federal election does not change the policy landscape for energy dramatically; only minor changes in carbon policy is assumed.
- Neutral or minor impacts affecting municipalities are expected as a result of Provincial legislative change.
- The economic development strategy is compatible with other initiatives of the CRB.
- Post-secondary funding reductions by the Provincial and Federal governments will limit the ability of higher education institutions to act aggressively in R & D and as partners in commercialization of ideas.
- Interprovincial trade and mobility is improved through policy and regulatory changes. Common platforms and standards for education, training and certification improve labour mobility across Canadian provinces.
The region continues to pursue trade corridor relationships within Alberta and beyond.

A shared regional Framework and funding mechanism to support this strategy is in place.

### 3.3.2 Economic Assumptions

- Oil prices stabilize in the $60-70 range by 2018.
- The Canadian dollar stabilizes in the range of $.75 - $.85 US.
- Interest rates will rise modestly over the next three years.
- That oil and gas markets stabilize in the coming three years.
- That physical access to markets with capacity to handle our resources is put in place.
- US economic growth will continue to provide opportunities for economic development in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region.
- Investment interest in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region continues to be high for the coming 3-7 years as a result of continued economic activity and market interest.
- The Edmonton Metropolitan Region improves and expands its relationship to the North and its role as an economic gateway to Northern activity.
- Small to medium enterprises continue to dominate the regional economy.
- Economic activity continues to be incorrectly reported by being over-represented in Calgary Head Offices rather than where it is generated regionally. Edmonton region GDP is under-reported by over $21 billion annually as a result.

### 3.3.3 Major Projects

- Current or planned investments in major projects in the region are expected to continue.
- A number of major projects in oil and gas will be approved and continue to move into development, generating jobs and economic growth in the region during the period of this strategic plan.
- Shale gas development in the USA trails off to some extent because of lower oil prices, and then stabilizes at this lower level of activity.
- Oil by rail continues to be a dominant means of responding to present demand levels until major pipelines are approved and constructed.
3.3.4 Technology

- Technological improvements in oil and gas continue to improve the viability of conventional and unconventional recovery in Alberta.
- Green technology at the local plant level is translated to international opportunities.
- Carbon capture technologies are leading edge and internationally known.
- Technological innovation in all sectors and the region’s economic clusters provide opportunity for reduced input costs, commercialization of new ideas, and economic diversification.

3.3.5 Regional Image

- That the movement attempting to stop oil sands extraction remains active.
- Awareness of the Edmonton region remains low.

3.4 Critical Success Factors

Critical Success Factors are characteristics, conditions or variables that have a direct and serious impact on the effectiveness, efficiency and viability of any particular initiative. They must be reflected in the economic development strategy.

- **Collaboration** – A strong and ongoing commitment to collaboration principles including awareness of shared purpose, reciprocity, and engagement is critical to success. Openness, transparency, focus, and accountability are required of stakeholders. Effective collaborative governance structures must be established to plan, assess, execute and evaluate economic development strategy. Industry must be involved meaningfully as a collaborative partner in the strategy.

- **Value for all** – Stakeholders trust each other and anticipate beneficial outcomes from their participation. Their meaningful participation must produce a meaningful return of value for each participant.

- **Government Participation** – Federal and Provincial governments have shared interest in the success of the Strategy and each assumes an active role in supporting this initiative. Key results and tactics are compatible with Provincial and Federal objectives and include opportunities for multi-level participation. Regional partners work with provincial, national and international economic development organizations to advance the region.

- **Resourcing** – Achieving successful outcomes through this strategy will depend on an effective allocation of resources, both human and capital, on key initiatives, programs and
projects. Resources must be found and resources must be pooled to succeed. The potential for participation of senior governments, municipalities, institutions and industry must be explored.

- **Communication/Visibility** – It is critical that the accomplishment of Key Results demonstrate a reasonable rate of return to participating stakeholders. Equally critical is that successes are highly visible to all stakeholders in the region. Sub-regional initiatives and successes must be promoted and celebrated. Publicly celebrating prosperity and benefits to public and private sector interests is key to success in the longer term.

- **Shared Performance Metrics** – Participating stakeholders will define success using a common language of performance measurement. These measures will be incorporated into regular and frequent reports on the achievement of outcomes.

The economic development strategy includes Strategic Priorities and Key Results that speak directly to the above critical success factors. However, these critical success factors are also embedded in the very fabric of the approach to all elements of the strategy.
4.0 STRATEGIC PRIORITIES AND KEY RESULTS FOR EDMONTON METROPOLITAN REGION ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

This section addresses the few, critical priorities that must be the focus for economic development at the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional level as we collectively move toward greater collaboration and presentation of our region to our markets.

4.1 Focus on Foundational Elements

In this first economic development strategy, the focus is on foundational elements that underpin successful regional economic development organizations. The focus is on building shared data bases, on developing shared lead protocols, on fostering site selection tools and on preparing detailed plans together.

The Working Group has taken the view that we are setting the stage for decades of collaboration among our many economic development organizations. Together we are building a foundation that will provide solid, ongoing support for our collective planning and our marketing efforts.

The Steering Committee has addressed the question of what organization structure will oversee execution of this plan, and ultimately that group will address funding requirements.

The Working Group has focused on those foundational strategic priorities that will move our region forward in economic development in the coming three to five years. They focus our collective economic development efforts on Marketing, Industry, and Talent.
4.2 Support for the Strategy

There are many other areas of focus that require attention. The Working Group considers some of these to be critical support elements underpinning the strategy.

A new collaborative model ensures that local, sub-region, regional and extra-regional economic development professionals are empowered to work more closely together toward the success of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region. Focusing on building our experience with collaboration through successively more challenging initiatives is one of these elements. Economic development professionals empowered and supported to work together, will build collaboration as they experience successful outcomes.

Infrastructure provides the base for growth, and it must be planned and developed in a strategic fashion to support growth. Economic development professionals will provide input on regional infrastructure priorities for economic development in order to support growth.

Innovation is also a key element in regional economic development. The regional collaboration will increasingly foster business innovation, incubation, commercialization and promotion of success in support of the strategic plan.

4.3 Strategic Priorities

Strategic Priorities are the critical area of focus for regional partners. They are the most important areas of collaborative focus to drive success. Three areas of focus will drive the economic development strategy to 2019 and beyond.

Strategic Priorities are not listed in order of importance. Rather, ALL strategic priorities are critical to the success of the economic development strategy and all must be addressed in the course of the work.

1. Marketing: Edmonton’s Metropolitan Region Strategic Marketing Plan aligns efforts around unified and coherent messaging to affect economic growth initiatives and increase exposure of the regional brand.

2. Talent: Edmonton Metropolitan Region supports attraction and activation of people with the skills and talent to strengthen the growth opportunities in our regional economy.

3. Industry: Partners identify opportunities and collaborate to grow and diversify strategic sectors of the regional economy to the benefit of all players.

4.4 Key Results (Objectives) for Regional Economic Development

Key Results reflect what the region will accomplish in economic development during a specific time period. The key results for each Strategic Priority are identified following, for the reference period to the end of 2018.
Strategic Priority 1: Marketing

Edmonton’s Metropolitan Region Strategic Marketing Plan aligns efforts around unified and coherent messaging to affect economic growth initiatives and increase exposure of the regional brand.

Key Results

KR 1.1: A successful mechanism to communicate openly with regional marketing partners is in place.

KR 1.2: A unified regional brand is collaboratively developed and consistently used to market the region.

KR 1.3: A comprehensive, regional Strategic Marketing Plan is collaboratively developed and executed under the regional brand.

Strategic Priority 2: Talent

Edmonton Metropolitan Region supports attraction and activation of people with the skills and talent to strengthen the growth opportunities in our regional economy.

Key Results

KR 2.1: “Ignite Edmonton” is enhanced, expanded and accessible across the Edmonton Metropolitan Region.

KR 2.2: A regional workforce advocacy task force, inclusive of education institutions, influences workforce strategy and outcomes.

KR 2.3: A regional workforce strategy is collaboratively developed.

Strategic Priority 3: Industry

Partners identify opportunities and collaborate to grow and diversify strategic sectors of the regional economy to the benefit of all players.

Key Results

KR 3.1: A protocol for identifying and sharing economic development opportunities across the region is established and applied.

KR 3.2: A comprehensive baseline of regional economic development information and
definitions is established and updated regularly.

**KR 3.3:** A regional database of projects, which is updatable and accessible, allows regional businesses to share information, prospects and opportunities.

**KR 3.4:** A uniform site selection information system is created based on best practices for site selection standards and a regional GIS data platform in an open data environment is established.

**KR 3.5:** An economic diversification strategy for the region is in place, with particular focus on key industries such as Agri-Business, Energy, Health, Cold Climate Technologies and Transportation.

### 4.5 Strategies and Tactics

The Working Group prepared high level strategies and tactics in support of each Key Result. They prioritized and ranked key results. They used this information to re-order key results and ultimately to inform the implementation timing and plan.

The strategies and tactics are included in a separate background document. Tactics will change over time and as circumstances change. Once the organization that will execute this strategy is put in place, its management team will review the tactics document and revise tactics to those most appropriate to their situation at that time. Those implementing the strategy will also expand the tactics to much more detailed and granular work plans, with more refined timing, performance measures and costing.

### 4.6 Implementation Timing and Priorities

The overall implementation GANTT chart following describes all key results in relation to timing and priorities. At key milestones of strategy execution, the economic development entity will review performance against agreed measures. Realignment of the strategy will occur if we are not meeting anticipated performance indicators. It is recommended that the strategy be a rolling three year strategy with an annual review and update.

The GANTT chart for strategy purposes describes activities at a high level. Those implementing the strategy will refine and detail these GANTT charts as each Key Result is being executed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priorities and Key Results</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Mechanism to communicate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 A unified regional brand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Regional strategic marketing plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Talent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Ignite Edmonton as regional hub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Regional workforce advocacy task force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Regional workforce strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Protocol for identifying and sharing opps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Comprehensive baseline information compiled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Regional database of projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Site selection and regional GIS platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Economic diversification strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 **Next Steps**

This is the first strategy based on a regional collaborative model for economic development. Much of the strategy focuses on establishing basic tools and structures that will increase the potential for collaboration in an open environment where opportunities are shared. The Strategy is conservative in the sense that it supports taking the time to set the base for the next fifty years of collaboration between our 24 municipal partners and their respective economic development aspirations.

This Strategy does not address organization for execution. Rather, organization is considered within the overall Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework. This Framework addresses the long term memorandum of understanding which will guide the partnership in the future execution of economic strategies and tactics.

The next step following the Economic Development Strategy is to develop the Regional Strategic Marketing Plan, which can be found in Appendix 2.

The Edmonton Metropolitan Economic Development Strategy addresses strategic priorities, key results and tactics to be accomplished in the next four years. It should be reviewed on a regular basis, and if its underlying assumptions or critical success factors are observed to change, the strategy should be updated. In the Edmonton Metropolitan Region environment, such changes could easily occur within the period of the strategy.

Finally, the partners in economic development should celebrate their successes along the way, building momentum in support of future collaboration and success.
Appendix 1:
Detailed Environmental Scan
1.1 Gross Domestic Product

Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is a reflection of corporate revenue as it is driven by revenue generated by companies headquartered in that region, rather than business actually occurring in that region. As a result, GDP tends to be an unreliable indicator of true economic activity in the region. For instance, Refinery Monthly Sales is captured under the GDP growth of the head office for major companies, instead of where the plant is located. In Strathcona County alone, 21.2 Billion in GDP is recorded elsewhere and not in the region. The total GDP of the region therefore, is expected to be higher than officially recorded because bigger drivers, such as petroleum manufacturing, are not represented in the official number.

Knowing this limitation, the following summary is useful as a high-level indicator but should not be taken as granular fact, knowing that the Edmonton Metropolitan Region is likely doing better in terms of GDP than officially stated.

Highest GDP growth among major Canadian cities since 2009

As of 2014, the Edmonton CMA’s inflation-adjusted GDP was estimated at $88 billion (2007 dollars). Since the last recession (2008-2009), the Edmonton CMA’s GDP growth has been among the highest in Canada. Compared to Canada’s six largest metropolitan areas (Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, and Ottawa-Gatineau), the Edmonton CMA saw the highest annual GDP growth rate in each year from 2010 to 2014, and has had the highest average annual GDP growth rate over the past decade at 4.5%.

The Edmonton area GDP, although understated by up to 25%, has been and is one of the stronger metropolitan regions in the country.
Growth at or above the Canadian average in all industries

The region’s three largest industries by GDP are primary industries and utilities (16.9% of GDP), finance, insurance, and real estate (15.6%) and construction (12.2%). Over the past decade, the region’s three fastest-growing industries in terms of average annual real GDP have been construction (7.3%), wholesale and retail trade (5.6%), and primary and utilities (5.4%). The slowest-growing sectors over the same time period were public administration (2.7%), information and cultural industries (2.8%), and education and healthcare (2.9%).

Forecasts predict slower growth for Edmonton in the short and longer term.

Estimates and forecasts of the Edmonton CMA’s GDP growth are produced by the Conference Board of Canada and the City of Edmonton. Both sources are currently predicting that Edmonton’s GDP growth will slow beginning in 2015 and will remain modest and near the Canadian average during their forecast periods. From 2015 to 2019, the current Conference Board forecast is for Edmonton to average 2.7% annual GDP growth. The City of Edmonton predicts the Edmonton CMA will average 3.3% annual growth between 2015 and 2024. It’s important to note that both forecasts have not yet been updated to reflect the impacts of current low oil prices.

Regional costs are amongst the highest in Canada, based on the CPI Index.

The Edmonton CMA experiences higher consumer prices based on the Government of Canada’s standard basket of goods. CPI contains goods and services of unchanging quality and quantity and thus, reflects pure price increases. The CPI Index is set at 100 in 2002. In March 2015, the Edmonton CMA was at 132.6.
1.2 Industry Sectors

This section provides an overview of the Edmonton CMA’s industry specialization using Location Quotients. Location Quotients are a measure of how concentrated an industry is in a given geographic area (e.g. the Edmonton CMA), relative to another geographic area (e.g. Alberta or Canada). In this analysis, Location Quotients are calculated using industry employment.

Based on these findings:

**Areas of Concentration**

Relative to Alberta, the Edmonton CMA is specialized in public administration, utilities (although this is the second-smallest sector in Edmonton with only 6,700 employees), and wholesale and retail trade.
Growing Concentration

Since 2004, industries with increasing levels specialization include resource extraction, transportation and warehousing, construction, and manufacturing. This reflects the past decade’s rapid oil sands development and the region’s supporting role in this economic hub.
1.3 Industrial Land Supply

Currently the Capital Region Board is preparing a Growth Plan update in part to review the Land Supply Profile of the municipalities in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region.
With strong demand over the past 5 years, Edmonton’s industrial market has seen high levels of absorption and a corresponding decline in both available land and vacant warehouse space. Though development has by and large kept up with the market’s desire for new high quality space, some parts of the region (such as Northwest Edmonton) have been rapidly approaching saturation.
1.4 Infrastructure in the Region

Alberta’s infrastructure spending is three times the average of other Canadian provinces. According to the 2014-17 Capital Plan and Strategic Partnership of the Government of Alberta, $19.2 billion will be invested in public infrastructure. Alberta’s infrastructure spending is in line with international standards. The following depicts infrastructure characteristics in the region:

- **Power:** The Edmonton Metropolitan Region has excess generation capacity, which is expected to continue until 2041. The Western Alberta Transmission Line ($1.65 B), Fort McMurray West Transmission Project (1.6 B) and the Sundance 7 Gas Fire Power Plant ($1.6B) are all based in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region.

- **Water:** Water and wastewater agreements are working well in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region. The region relies on water from the North Saskatchewan. There are 7 water treatment plants, with EPCOR supplying a majority of municipalities.

- **Roads:** The road system is well connected in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region. There is north access to oil and gas operations in Fort McMurray (highway 63) and Grande Prairie (highway 43). There is access east and west via the Yellowhead highway (highway 16), and south (QEII) to the United States and Mexico via the Canamex Highway. The Anthony Henday Ring Road also increases connectivity. There can be bottlenecks in provincial corridors such as: Highway 16, Highway 43 north and west, Highway 28 and 28A, 63 north and QEII from Edmonton to Leduc.

- **Rails:** The Edmonton Metropolitan Region has the distinct advantage of direct rail access, via CN and CP rail, to both the Port of Vancouver and the Port of Prince Rupert. There are 16 rail intermodal and storage facilities operated. Rail traffic is expected to significantly increase, related to activities in the Industrial Heartland and increased use of rail for energy exports, with specific advantages related to the ability to ship raw bitumen.

- **Air:** Airports are nodes of opportunity in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region and not a limiter to growth in the region. There are 14 certified airports and registered aerodromes in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region, with 5 airports in the region that have significant infrastructure to meet expanding air traffic demand. The Edmonton Metropolitan Region is closer geographically to many Asian destinations when compared with other competing

---

### Industrial Land Supply: City of Edmonton and Surrounding Districts

Source: Avison Young Industrial Market Report Q4 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Inventory</th>
<th>Direct Vacancy</th>
<th>Sublease Vacancy</th>
<th>Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>Vacancy Direct</th>
<th>Vacancy Sublease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>102,932,804</td>
<td>2,595,837</td>
<td>453,806</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Districts</td>
<td>15,961,302</td>
<td>741,694</td>
<td>15,440</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>118,894,106</td>
<td>3,337,531</td>
<td>469,246</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
city-regions in North America. Plans have also been developed for significant expansion at the EIA including the launch of the Foreign Trade Zone and increased capacity in the cargo village under Port Alberta.

- **Pipeline:** The Edmonton Metropolitan Region has a vast pipeline network throughout, with connections to the Pacific, Gulf Coast, eastern Canada and eastern United States. The current capacity of the pipelines does not meet future demand projections. Currently there is a challenge of setting aside surface land area for future pipelines. Land fragmentation and bottlenecks can restrict development especially in congested areas of Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan and the Industrial Heartland.

There is a Master Transportation and Corridor Plan for the Edmonton Metropolitan Region in place, and it is reviewed annually as input into government’s capital programs. There is a need to increasingly focus these updates on planning for multi-use corridors, transportation and logistics links. The Edmonton Metropolitan Region needs to look at streamlining infrastructure regulatory approvals.

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region is serviced by modern, well maintained infrastructure to support its economic growth prospects. The region will continue to focus on maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure to keep pace with growth.

### 1.5 Regional Socio-Demographic Characteristics

The following demographic information compares six major Canadian metropolitan areas: Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton and Ottawa-Gatineau.

**Edmonton CMA: Second-fastest growing population & highest net in-migration**

Since 2006 the Edmonton CMA has been among the fastest growing metropolitan areas by population in Canada. Between 2006 and 2011 (the last two Census years) the region’s population grew by 12.1%, second-highest among major Canadian cities after Calgary (12.6%). Growth has been driven by high net in-migration, individuals coming from outside of Alberta and Canada, which reached nearly 40,000 individuals in 2013.
Migration and population growth will peak in 2013, but will remain relatively high

According to historical data and the most recent available forecasts, 2013 was the short-term peak for net migration and population growth in the Edmonton CMA. Edmonton is still expected to be the second-fastest growing major Canadian metropolitan area over this time period.

Population Forecast

By 2044, the Edmonton Metropolitan Region will need to accommodate over 50% more residents with the population reaching a potential peak of 2,235,100 residents by 2044, according to the CRB Growth Plan forecast.

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region is expected to be approximately 2,125,455 people by 2041.
according to the Province of Alberta’s Medium Growth Scenario, accounting for 34.20% of the province’s population, a slight proportional increase from 2013. The Province is estimating an average annual population growth for the Edmonton area at 1.5% or higher annually.

**Edmonton CMA Population Forecast 2013 - 2041**

*Source: Government of Alberta*

Second-youngest population among major Canadian cities; not immune to long-term aging population

In 2011 the median age of the Edmonton CMA’s population was 36.5 years, second-youngest among major Canadian metropolitan areas after Calgary (36.4). Like the rest of Canada, longer-term projections predict that the share of Edmonton’s population age 65 and over will continue to grow, from 11.7% in 2012 to 15.7% in 2041.

**Median Age in 2011 Largest Metropolitan Areas**

*Source: Statistics Canada*

- Calgary: 36.4
- Edmonton: 36.5
- Toronto: 38.6
- Ottawa - Gatineau: 39.1
- Montreal: 39.7
- Vancouver: 40.2
Edmonton CMA: Second-highest median incomes in Canada, with a high percentage of apprenticeship, trades or college training

Edmonton region has the second-highest median income among major Canadian cities. As of 2012 the region’s median family income from all sources was $96,030, second to Calgary at $98,300. This can likely be attributed to high wages for trade occupations in manufacturing, transportation, and construction industries servicing the oil sands, as Edmonton is able to sustain a high median income despite relatively lower levels of university education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Family Income in 2012 Largest Metropolitan Areas (dollars)</th>
<th>Source: Statistics Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>98,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>96,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa - Gatineau</td>
<td>94,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>71,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>71,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>71,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share of Population 15 and Over with Bachelor’s Degree or Higher, Largest Metropolitan Areas (%)</th>
<th>Source: Statistics Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa - Gatineau</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgary</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6 Regional Labour Force Characteristics

In 2044 the region will see demand for 1,000,000 jobs, an increase of 13,000 jobs a year to the area.

Overall, the Edmonton CMA’s recent labour force statistics indicate relatively high demand and supply of labour - individuals appear to be moving to the region looking for employment and finding jobs. Projections from before the recent decrease in oil prices predict an overall labour shortage for Alberta.

Labour force growth highest in Canada 2004-2014

Between 2004 and 2014 the Edmonton CMA’s labour force grew on average by 2.8% per year, the highest average growth rate among Canada’s six largest metropolitan areas. High labour force growth can be attributed to high net in-migration and the strength of the regional job market. Current forecasts expect that over the short-term Edmonton’s labour force growth will slow from 2015 to 2019, with average annual growth of 1.5%. This growth rate is roughly in line with forecasts for other major cities over the same time period. Our labour force relative to population will decline over the period to 2044, as is the case in many Canadian metropolitan areas.

![Average Annual Labour Force Growth Historical and Forecasts, Major Canadian Cities](source: Conference Board of Canada)

Labour force participation rates among the highest in Canada

The Edmonton CMA’s 2014 labour force participation rate of 73.3% is also among the highest in Canada. High participation rates are indicative of a relatively strong job market and young demographics. Long-term projections are currently predicting that the region’s participation rate will decline slightly over the next decade, to 72.7% by 2024. This forecast leaves the labour force participation rate well above the current rates of other metropolitan regions, with the
exception of Calgary.

**Skill profile reflects the Edmonton CMA’s economic structure**

The Edmonton CMA’s labour force has the lowest percentage of individuals having earned a bachelor’s degree or higher among major Canadian cities, at 24.6%. In contrast, 32.0% of the labour force holds an apprenticeship, trades certificate or college diploma, the second-highest share in Canada after Montreal. The labour force’s skill profile reflects the relative strengths of Edmonton’s economy: manufacturing, transportation and logistics, and construction.

**Employed Labour Force by Educational Attainment**

2011 Major Canadian Cities  
Source: Statistics Canada

- No certificate, diploma or degree
- High school diploma or equivalent
- Apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma
- College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma
- University certificate or diploma below bachelor level
- University certificate, diploma or degree at bachelor level or above

**Edmonton CMA wages are relatively high, and high-wage industries have been growing rapidly**

Comparable hourly wage data by occupation is not available across Canada at the city level. However, in 2013, Alberta as a whole has the highest average wage among provinces at $28.12 per hour, with Edmonton wages at $26.68 per hour and Calgary wages at $27.64 per hour. Several of Edmonton’s fastest-growing occupational categories, such as natural and applied sciences and related occupations, trades, transport and equipment operators and related occupations, and health occupations, have high average wages.
1.7 Regional Business Characteristics

For the purpose of this analysis, business counts are being used as a method of regional analysis. Note that business counts by industry do not account for employment or GDP contribution. For this reason, business location counts can be a misleading method of regional analysis. Solely looking at business counts does not give a full picture of a region’s economy, because some industries naturally have more business locations with a small number of employees.
Industries with the highest number of business locations

The three largest industries in the Edmonton CMA by the number of business locations are construction (6,856 locations), professional, scientific and technical services (6,797 locations), and retail trade (5,385 locations).

The majority of the Edmonton CMA’s businesses are small

As of December 2013, 97.8% of business locations are considered small, with fewer than 100 employees, and 56.5% are micro businesses with fewer than 5 employees. Small businesses in the region earn (collectively) very significant revenue, and are a leader in creating employment growth opportunities.

Business Growth Opportunities

There are opportunities for growth in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region to expand on existing strengths. The following are a few potential opportunities profiled multiple times in different Capital Region Board strategy documents:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing, Engineering and Construction</td>
<td>Opportunity to innovate, be productive, export &amp; highlight expertise in cold climate design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>Opportunity to enable industry growth and increase employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Energy, Clean Technology, Environmental Products &amp; Services</td>
<td>Opportunity to build on water and waste management strength, capture market share for carbon capture and storage technology, and to export second generation biofuels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refined Petroleum Products</td>
<td>Opportunity to capture chemical manufacturing, fabrication and processing sales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Opportunity to profile expertise in biotechnology &amp; expertise in medical devises and components of ICT (health information.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8 Institutional Characteristics in the Region

Post-secondary educational Institutions

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region is home to six publicly funded post-secondary institutions and a host of private training schools, offering full range of training and educational options to over 180,000 full- and part-time students in the area. The quality of educational institutions in the region is exceptional.

University of Alberta is leading the way in research and innovation. It is ranked 4\textsuperscript{th} in Canada in the list of research universities. It received a combined $417,757,000 in 2013 in total external funding, down 7.7% from the previous year. The Northern Alberta Institute of Technology (NAIT) is largest trainer of apprentices within Alberta and Canada, accounting for 17 percent of national apprenticeships and more than half of all Alberta apprenticeships.

Research and Development (R&D)

Over the past few years, Edmonton region has seen increased collaboration between institutions with R&D capacity. Edmonton is also home to an array of biotechnology research centres. Edmonton maintains 3\textsuperscript{rd} lowest cost for providing Service Sector R&D, amongst major comparable cities of Western Canada and Mid-Western U.S., according to 2014 KMPG Competitive Alternatives.

Research and innovation is already putting the Edmonton Metropolitan Region on global map. For example, TEC Edmonton, which was ranked 3\textsuperscript{rd} top North American incubator in 2014 by UBI Index – Benchmarking Incubation Globally, has helped raise $120 million for companies since 2008, placing it 10\textsuperscript{th} worldwide.

Despite having a significant number of R&D bodies in the region, it remains somewhat challenging for small and medium scale business to draw venture capital to invest in R&D. According to PricewaterhouseCoopers, there are a high number of small businesses in the region who do not feel motivated to invest in product improvement since they lack access to
Capital funds.

**Commercialization**

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region has been strengthening its capacity to improve research commercialization and product development. The Government of Alberta has introduced the Scientific Research and Experimental Development Tax Credit, which funds 10% of a company’s R&D expenditure up to $400,000, and the $100 million Alberta Enterprise Corporation has been established to “help alleviate Alberta’s venture capital shortfall and improve rates of technology commercialization”.

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region hosts business incubators with focus on Information and Communications technology (ICT), agriculture, biotechnology, agricultural biotechnology, health, clean technology, and industrial product development. For example, Agri-value Processing Business Incubator in Leduc is a food development and business commercialization campus, which has led to over 80% of incubator graduates surviving beyond the first 5 years of their business’ existence.
Appendix 2:
Regional Strategic Marketing Plan
Regional Strategic Marketing Plan

To be developed.
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Framework Approach

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework represents a long-term agreement between parties in the region relative to:

- Roles and responsibilities of local and regional stakeholders;
- The activities they will pursue together;
- The major areas of regional focus they will pursue together;
- The Mission, Vision, Values and Operating Principles for the collaboration;
- The governance, organization, financing, budget and accountability of the collaboration; and
- A written Memorandum of Understanding or Agreement.

Vision

To be a business location of choice for global investment, by collaboratively building on regional assets

Mission

Together, we strengthen the Edmonton Metropolitan Region’s global competitiveness, growth and innovation

Values

Innovation  
Collaboration  
Sustainability  
Excellence  
Respect
- **Innovation** - The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework values courageous and bold new development, and growth. Members embody a "can do" attitude.

- **Collaboration** – “If one wins we all win." The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework strength lies in its emphasis on collaboration and transparency between all members of economic development in both the public and private sectors to grow one of Canada’s largest economic engines.

- **Sustainability** – The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework will strive to incorporate current practices to economic development that improve the triple bottom line.

- **Excellence** – Members strive to provide quality services and programs to stakeholders and developers by maintaining the highest standards of skills and knowledge.

- **Respect** – The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework and its leaders treat each other with respect and professionalism.

### Operating Principles

Operating principles are the code of conduct which guides the face-to-face relationships of the members of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework.

Operating principles are as follows:

- We are inclusive in all our activities and decision making, and seek to enhance collaboration among stakeholders;

- We respect local autonomy and understand the roles and responsibilities of our colleagues; and

- Once a consensus based, collaborative decision is made, we will each represent that decision and speak with one voice.
Economic Development Roles

Local Level

- **Infrastructure**: Local governments, associations and organizations are responsible for developing and maintaining municipal infrastructure, such as roads.

- **Quality of Life**: Local governments, associations and organizations are responsible for offering residents a strong community culture, enviable social footprint and recreational activities to enhance quality of life in their municipalities.

- **Services and Amenities**: Local governments, associations and organizations are responsible for providing residents with basic services and amenities in their municipalities related to their health, safety, and education (K-12).

- **Marketing**: Local governments, associations and organizations advertise and promote their communities.

- **Strategic and Community Planning**: Through priority setting exercises, local governments, associations and organizations determine what key strategic priorities and focus areas their municipal planning will concentrate on.
- **Land Use Planning**: Local governments, associations and organizations are responsible for the management and development of land within their municipalities.

- **Business Attraction, Retention and Expansion**: The role of local governments, associations and organizations is to: plan for and draw in new businesses to their community; assess emerging opportunities; support businesses in their communities; and, work to attract new investment opportunities.

- **Advocacy**: Local governments, associations and organizations work to promote their communities.

- **Create a Business Friendly Environment**: Associations and organizations identify and eliminate policy barriers in order to foster a business friendly environment in the local area.

**Sub-Regional Level**

There are sub-regional associations and organizations that support and provide economic development functions to multiple municipalities. Sub-regional associations and organizations share not only the benefits, but also the costs of sub-regional economic development activities. Sub-regional associations and organizations collaborate in order to enhance planning and operational decision making. They link businesses with available programs and services in their sub-regions.

**Regional Level**

- **Coordinated Infrastructure**: Associations and organizations coordinate regional infrastructure such as major transportation corridors.

- **Talent Attraction and Training**: Associations and organizations provide training opportunities in order to build workforce capacity, and are responsible for attracting new talent to the region.

- **Post-Secondary Education**: Associations and organizations are responsible for promoting and supporting regional post-secondary institutions.

- **Marketing**: Associations and organizations are responsible for business attraction and provide business information and triage services to potential investors.

- **Destination Awareness**: Associations and organizations identify market opportunities, and strategically position the regional brand.

- **Manage Relationships**: Associations and organizations manage relationships with the province and promote intergovernmental collaboration on behalf of the region.


Regional Integration: Associations and organizations assist with regional integration at the
operational level in order to maximize local benefits, such as economies of scale.



Coordinated Planning and Development: Associations and organizations are the trusted
“funnel process” for economic development opportunities, and coordinate regional
planning and development initiatives.



Capacity Development: Associations and organizations facilitate a one-window approach
to regional economic development. For example, developing regional site selection
protocols and asset mapping.



Create a Business Friendly Environment: Associations and organizations identify and
eliminate policy barriers in order to foster a business friendly environment in the region.



Develop Shared Value: Associations and organizations create a shared value proposition for
local and sub-regional partners as well as potential investors.



Business Attraction, Retention and Expansion: Associations and organizations support and
nurture businesses in the region, and work to attract new investment opportunities.



Advocacy: Associations and organizations work to promote the region.
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Regional Influence Areas

Regional influence areas are the priority areas that the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework will focus on over the next planning period. The top three areas are the particular focus of the Economic Development Strategy. The bottom three areas are the on-going support activities for success in the region. They are the functional requirements of the Capital Region Board.
Governance

Business Model

The business model for the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework will be a new entity, referred to as the ‘Entity’. The Entity contracts services to service providers with existing capacity in the region. If the capacity does not already exist, the Entity will develop it.

The Entity is established by the initiative of the Capital Region Board, and reports to the CRB annually to account on progress and funding for CRB approval. However, as long as the intent and authorities outlined in this Framework document are respected, the Entity will make the final decision on the details of its organizational structure. Structure options include a Part IX company, a Regional Services Commission or any other appropriate form.

Clients

The Entity will be customer service oriented. Service offerings will be based on feedback from clients and could be delivered through service level agreements. The primary client groups include:

- Municipalities
- Industry
- Institutions
- Sub-regional economic development organizations

Management Structure

The Entity will be managed by a professional team, selected by the CEO. The CEO is the key enabler and will work with EDOs, EDAs, and others on strategic and tactical collaboration in the region.

The CEO will report to an independent Board of Directors. The Board of Directors will report provide a report card to the Capital Regional Board annually to review progress and funding.

The Board of Directors and the CEO will seek guidance from a Business Advisory Council, which will include sector representatives.
The Board of Directors will consist of 12 members. The CEO and a provincial representative, will attend Board meetings but are non-voting. All board members represent the region, not their local context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Board Representatives</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Municipally appointed representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Councillors or employees of the municipality are not eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Represent municipalities of varying population size (Counties, Towns, Cities, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Competency based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The City of Edmonton will have a permanent seat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The remaining 3 seats will rotate (staggered 3 year rotation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Industry representatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Industry leaders with subject matter expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Edmonton International Airport (EIA) will have a permanent seat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ The remaining 3 seats will rotate (staggered 3 year rotation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Board Representatives</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2      | Associations representatives | ▪ The 2 seats will rotate (staggered 3 year rotation)  
▪ E.g.: Chambers, Urban Development Institute (UDI) or Building Owners and Managers Association (BOMA), and National Association for Industrial and Office Parks (NAIOP), Canadian Home Builders Association (CHBA), and regional economic development associations (Alberta Industrial Heartland Association — AIHA; Leduc-Nisku Economic Development Association) |
| 2      | Institutions representatives | ▪ The 2 seats will rotate (staggered 3 year rotation)  
▪ E.g.: Universities, Tech, Health and Social |

Total Representatives 12

The initial transition board will be selected by the Steering Committee and will be approved by the Capital Region Board in place for one year. Once the initial board is in place, it will on an ongoing basis recommend, decide, future board selections to the CRB for approval, selection processes.

**Business Advisory Council**

The Board of Directors will meet with a Business Advisory Council twice annually. The CEO may seek the Council’s advice at any time considered necessary. The Business Advisory Council will consist of approximately 20 to 25 individuals. Business Advisory Council seats will rotate every two years (staggered rotation). Representatives will be sector based, and will represent their local context. Potential representative include:

1. Agriculture
2. Air
3. Construction
4. Energy
5. First Nations
6. Health
7. Heavy Industrial
8. Hospitality
9. Logistics
10. Manufacturing
11. Rail
12. Real Estate Development
13. Retail
14. Roads
15. Small Businesses
16. Science and Engineering Technology
17. Upgrading and Refining
18. Education

In addition to sector representatives, the Business Advisory Council may include geographical representation beyond the region.

**Decision Making**

As a matter of course, decisions will be made on a consensus basis. When consensus cannot be reached, each of the 12 members may cast one vote and the decision will be made by simple majority. Quorum is set at seven and the Board will meet at least quarterly. The founding board will establish the bylaws.

**Funding (Potential Model)**

Funding will be reviewed on an annual basis and based on the following sources:

- Initial core funding will be provided primarily by municipalities and is anticipated to be additional funding, not a re-allocation of existing Economic Development resources. Municipal contributions will be based on assessment tax base and population; however, small municipalities will not be required to pay;

- Continuing and project based funding will be mixed source and rely on an ongoing provincial contributions, as well as contributions from industry and institutions;

- Annual federal contributions are anticipated through Western Economic Diversification Canada (WD); and,

- Alternate sources of sustainable funding will need to be considered in the long-term.
The next step following the Economic Development Framework is to develop the Funding Model, which can be found in Appendix 2.
Appendix 1:

Memorandum of Understanding
Memorandum of Understanding
Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework

Wikipedia defines a memorandum of understanding as (amended):

“A multilateral agreement between two or more parties. It expresses a convergence of will amongst the parties, indicates an intended common line of action. It is often used in cases where parties either do not imply a legal commitment or in situations where the parties cannot create a legally enforceable agreement. It is a more formal alternative to a handshake."

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Among the Capital Region Board; The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Entity (the Entity); And the participating municipalities

Covering the period from September, 2015 to September, 2020

The objective is to make the Edmonton Metropolitan Region a business location of choice for global investment, by collaboratively building on regional assets.

To support this objective, the parties agree to enact the Framework document titled “Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework, May 12, 2015”.

The Capital Region Board agrees to:

1. Respect the integrity and intent of the Framework and provide ongoing support to the Entity in the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

2. Receive the Economic Development Framework progress report every 2 years at a regularly scheduled CRB meeting, and provide feedback to the Entity.

3. Advocate as requested by the Entity, with other orders of government to seek resources or support.

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Entity agrees to:

1. Enact the Framework including the governance structure, focus on regional influence areas, and operating principles.
2. Actively work with the identified client groups, and provide quality service offerings that meet their needs.

3. Recruit and be guided by a representative Board of Directors, in the execution of the work of the Entity.

4. Structure and actively engage with its Business Advisory Council and EDO/EDA group.

5. Provide Economic Development services that:
   a. Are focused on the regional economic development areas identified in the framework;
   OR
   b. Are local / sub-regional in scope but are provided, at cost, at the request of a municipality (municipalities) or association(s).

6. Provide a progress report to the Capital Region Board annually, and attend a board meeting to discuss the report contents.

7. Operate with a funding structure as outlined in the Framework document.

The **signing municipalities** agree to:

1. Support the Economic Development Framework and the role and integrity of the Entity as described above.

2. Provide core funding to support the administrative costs of the Entity if required and agreed to.

3. Advocate as requested by the Entity, with other orders of government to seek resources or support.

4. Carry out the local responsibilities as outlined in the Framework, for the local municipal area.

This agreement may be amended at any time with the mutual consent of the parties.

Capital Region Board Signature  
Date  

Entity Signature  
Date  

Municipal Signature  
Date  
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Appendix 2: Funding Model
Regional Economic Development Funding Model

To be developed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 9, 2015</td>
<td>Sturgeon County, Leduc County</td>
<td>Who is involved in the Economic Development Initiative?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apr 30, 2015</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>As per the Nov. 2014 motion, the Economic Development Initiative is led by a Steering Committee consisting of leading organizations that are investing significantly in business retention and attraction, and have professional staff involved in doing so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Motion named Steering Committee members to be:
- Alberta Industrial Heartland Association – Neil Shelly, Executive Director
- Edmonton Chamber of Commerce – Janet Riopel, President & CEO
- Edmonton Economic Development Corporation – Brad Ferguson, President & CEO
- Edmonton International Airport – Tom Ruth, President & CEO
- Greater Edmonton Economic Development Team – Jonathan Saah, Chair
- Greater Edmonton Regional Chambers of Commerce – Rick Hersack, Executive Director
- Leduc-Nisku Economic Development Association / Alberta’s International Region – Barbara McKenzie, Executive Director
- Capital Region Board – Malcolm Bruce, CEO and Steering Committee Chair

As per the Project Charter, the Steering Committee provides guidance to the Project including establishing focus for the Working Group, assessment of the work products, liaison with key stakeholder groups, and facilitation of approval processes with CRB Administration.

The Working Group is comprised of municipal economic development specialists from across the region, who work
with the consultants to draft the economic development strategy primarily using existing plans and documentation. The WG members bring a regional perspective to this work, and ensure the issues and concerns of all members of the Capital Region are reflected in the final results.

The **Working Group** members are:
- Barbara McKenzie, Chair
- Dave Walker
- Glen Vanstone
- Jordan Rumohr
- Tom Koep
- Gerald Gabinet
- Guy Boston

An Economic Development **TEAM** is made up of 28 economic development professionals OR CAOs (in the absence of an economic development staff in a municipality) from the region. The TEAM provides input and advice to the WG, ensuring that regional issues are well articulated and understood.

Density Targets

Recommended Motion:

*That the Capital Region Board direct CRB Administration to work with all CRB Member Administrations to refine the density targets and related policies as part of the Growth Plan Update, as recommended by Land Use & Planning Committee.*

Background

- At the March 12, 2015 Board meeting an Information Request was directed to CRB Administration and the Land Use & Planning Committee to clarify the rural and urban densities.

- On April 16, 2015, CRB Administration provided the Land Use & Planning Committee with a review of the density target provisions within the Capital Region Growth Plan, the Regional Evaluation Framework, and the Municipal Planning Toolkit (Attachment 1).

- The Land Use & Planning Committee approved a motion recommending the Board direct CRB Administration to work with all CRB Member Administrations to refine the density targets and related policies as part of the Growth Plan Update.

Attachments:

1. Land Use & Planning Motion Brief – April 16, 2015
Density Targets

For Committee Discussion

Background and History

The original Growth Plan was submitted to Municipal Affairs for approval on March 31, 2009. Following a multi-ministerial review the Minister of Municipal Affairs issued a response to the Growth Plan on June 11, 2009 which requested additional work to complete the mandate contained in the Capital Region Board Regulation.

The additional work to be completed by October 31, 2009 included:

COMPREHENSIVE INTEGRATED REGIONAL LAND USE PLAN

- Articulate clear criteria to ensure that the objectives of increased density in priority growth areas and a minimal footprint for development in the balance of the region are met, which should include density targets or other standards for proposed transit and node development, such as transit-oriented design or form based codes.

To develop residential density targets for Priority Growth Areas within the Capital Region, the CRB’s Land Use Committee established the following approach:

- A common measurement approach for densities in the Capital Region (e.g. dwelling unit per net residential hectare);
- A hierarchy of density targets across the Capital Region; and,
- Appropriate population to employment ratios for Priority Growth Areas recognizing unique characteristics within each Priority Growth Area.

Density targets have been established for each of the Priority Growth Areas (see Table 3 next page and Figure 1 attached). These targets reflect a hierarchy, with the highest residential density target in the central or core area of the Region. Moving outward from the core, the density targets transition from higher to lower recognizing changes in land use context, overall development pattern, and the existing residential development densities.

The density targets are intended to lay the foundation for the development of a new regional footprint, to take advantage of existing employment areas, maximize the utility of existing infrastructure and transportation networks, and intensify underutilized sites. The targets will also create a varied urban pattern that distinguishes the differences between low, medium and high density PGAs, and provides opportunities for the creation of amenity areas and the preservation of natural areas.
Table 3 outlines the density target by PGA and Cluster Country Residential Area:

It is the intent of the Capital Region Growth Plan that every municipal statutory development plan over time will meet the density target assigned to its respective PGA. Each plan must demonstrate how it will achieve the target.

Definitions

- **DENSITY**
  Means a measure of the ratio of dwelling units per Net Residential Area.

- **DENSITY TARGET**
  Means a minimum to a maximum density target assigned to PGAs; a maximum density target assigned to CRAs, and a maximum density target assigned to Traditional Country Residential development outside of PGAs and urban municipalities.

- **NET RESIDENTIAL AREA (NRA)**
  Means the land required for residential purposes within a residential neighborhood. This excludes Environmental and Municipal Reserve, roadways (including local, collector and arterial), public utilities, stormwater management facilities, and commercial, industrial, and institutional lands.
Regional Evaluation Framework

- When evaluating a statutory plan or statutory plan amendment under the Regional Evaluation Framework, the following must be considered:

  b) Whether approval and full implementation of the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment would result in development that is consistent with all of the following:

    (i) The Land Use Principles and Policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan including the provisions for:

    iv. Density targets as outlined in Capital Region Growth Plan;

Monitoring and Reporting

- An important component of Growth Plan implementation is monitoring the success of the outcomes of the Plan based on specific measurable policies in the plan. The Monitoring and Reporting program of the Board includes an indicator that measures dwelling unit density (see Attachment 2). Since the indicator is based on 2011 census information, which was collected only 1 year after approval of the Growth Plan, the results can only be used as a baseline at this time. However, CRB administration researched the area structure plans and outline plans approved within the region since the Growth Plan was approved in March of 2010. The attached table of Densities of Planned Residential Areas (Attachment 3) demonstrates that planned development is achieving the target densities.

Municipal Planning Toolkit

- The Municipal Planning Toolkit was developed to help member municipalities and stakeholders navigate the regional planning process by:

  o providing the information necessary to implement the Land Use Policies and Principles of the Growth Plan consistently at the local level through municipal planning processes across the Capital Region; and
  o assisting in knowing how and when Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) applications are required and what information is required for an application.

Ultimately, the desired result is the consistent interpretation and application of the Land Use Principles and Policies of the Growth Plan, and strong regional cooperation and collaboration.

Accordingly, a fact sheet on Residential Density Targets is included in the Municipal Planning Toolkit (see Attachment 4).

Attachments:

1. Figure 1: Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas Map
2. Monitoring and Report Indicators: Indicator 4 – Dwelling Unit Density
3. Densities of Planned Residential Areas Since March 2010 (Post Growth Plan)
4. Fact Sheet: Residential Density Targets
FIGURE 1: PRIORITY GROWTH AREAS AND CLUSTER COUNTRY RESIDENTIAL AREAS

Allow Growth Outside of PGAs

Member Municipalities
- Bon Accord
- Bruderheim
- Calmar
- Devon
- Gibbons
- Lamont
- Lamont County
- Leduc County
- Legal
- Morinville
- Parkland County
- Redwater
- Strathcona County
- Sturgeon County
- Thorsby
- Wabamun
- Warburg

Rural Communities *
- Alcomdale
- Ardrossan
- Calahoo
- Cardiff
- Duffield
- Enwisile
- Josephburg
- Namao
- New Sarepta
- Pigeon Lake
- Rivière Qui Barre
- South Cooking Lake
- Tomahawk
- Villeneuve
- Wizard Lake

* Rural communities are County hamlets and residential areas identified in MDPs for growth.
Indicator 4 - Dwelling Unit Density

Description

This indicator measures the number of dwellings per net residential hectare within municipalities, and within PGAs, as reported by Statistics Canada, every 5 years.

Why is this Indicator Important?

Knowing the dwelling unit density in PGAs will show how concentrated the growth is. Comparing these results over time will demonstrate how density is changing in each PGA relative to other areas.

Table 4.1: Dwelling Unit Density by PGA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGA</th>
<th>Dwelling Count (2011)</th>
<th>Residential Area (ha)</th>
<th>Du/Nrha*</th>
<th>Density Target (Du/NRha*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>368,290</td>
<td>22162.588</td>
<td>16.618</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>8,821</td>
<td>556.73</td>
<td>15.844</td>
<td>25-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>7,444</td>
<td>813.264</td>
<td>9.153</td>
<td>25-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>15,361</td>
<td>2034.388</td>
<td>7.551</td>
<td>25-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>217.076</td>
<td>6.376</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>5,779</td>
<td>1405.992</td>
<td>4.110</td>
<td>25-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cw</td>
<td>2,563</td>
<td>1239.797</td>
<td>2.067</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Dwelling Unit Density by CCRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCRA</th>
<th>Dwelling Count (2011)</th>
<th>Gross Area (ha)</th>
<th>Du/Gha**</th>
<th>Density Target (Du/Gha**)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>1409.77</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1,790</td>
<td>5759.288</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>4538.751</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>5282.698</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Du/Nrha = Dwelling Units per Net Residential Hectare
**Du/Gha = Dwelling Units per Gross Hectare

Sorted in Descending Order
Figure 4.1: Map of Dwelling Unit Density
### Table 4.3: Dwelling Unit Density by Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Dwelling Count (2011)</th>
<th>Residential Area (ha)</th>
<th>Du/Nrha* ↓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Leduc</td>
<td>9,290</td>
<td>508.113</td>
<td>18.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County: Sherwood Park</td>
<td>24,942 (2012**)</td>
<td>1456.21</td>
<td>17.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>324,750</td>
<td>19701.695</td>
<td>16.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spruce Grove</td>
<td>9,620</td>
<td>644.411</td>
<td>14.928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Albert</td>
<td>22,515</td>
<td>2036.068</td>
<td>11.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Stony Plain</td>
<td>5,820</td>
<td>592.458</td>
<td>9.823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Beaumont</td>
<td>4,375</td>
<td>465.551</td>
<td>9.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>7,335</td>
<td>802.15</td>
<td>9.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>6,550</td>
<td>3843.442</td>
<td>1.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>4,965</td>
<td>3703.519</td>
<td>1.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County: Rural Service Area</td>
<td>9,920 (2012**)</td>
<td>9092.723</td>
<td>1.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>10,940</td>
<td>40179.817</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Du/Nrha = Dwelling Units per Net Residential Hectare
** 2012 Strathcona Municipal Census used for breakdown of Sherwood Park and Rural Service Area

Sorted in Descending Order

** Data Source**: Statistics Canada, Member Municipalities

**Method of Measurement**

a) Municipalities – Collect ‘Private dwellings occupied by usual residents’ from federal census data. Collect Land Use Zoning data in spatial format from each municipality. Filter out net residential zoning area (in hectares) for each municipality. Divide dwelling counts by net residential hectares.

b) PGAs/CCRAs – Collect ‘Private dwellings occupied by usual residents’ by dissemination area from federal census data. Download dissemination area boundaries in spatial format and link to dwelling counts. Assign each dissemination area into one of the PGAs or CCRAs. Calculate the sum total of dwellings for each PGA and CCRA. Aggregate residential zoning area (from above) for each PGA and total area for CCRA. Divide dwelling counts by area.
## Densities of Planned Residential Areas Since March 2010 (Post Growth Plan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>PGA</th>
<th>Planned Residential Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planned Dwelling Units</th>
<th>Planned Density (Du/Nrha*)</th>
<th>Density Target (Du/Nrha*)</th>
<th>Within Density Target Range?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>Dansereau Meadows</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>35.23</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>27.79</td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>Ruisseau</td>
<td>Ce</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>26.63</td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>City Centre Redevelopment</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10,980</td>
<td>156.86</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Goodridge Corners</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>81.01</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>41.78</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Maple</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>36.64</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Crystallina Nera East</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>41.92</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>34.97</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Joviz</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>41.92</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>34.97</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Cy Becker</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>58.18</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Hawks Ridge</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>65.81</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>33.67</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Starling</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>58.42</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>33.58</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Desrochers</td>
<td>Cw</td>
<td>46.51</td>
<td>2,067</td>
<td>44.44</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Cavanagh</td>
<td>Cw</td>
<td>59.45</td>
<td>2,209</td>
<td>37.16</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Hays Ridge</td>
<td>Cw</td>
<td>62.31</td>
<td>2,199</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Heritage Valley</td>
<td>Cw</td>
<td>36.67</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Graydon Hill</td>
<td>Cw</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>34.81</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Keswick</td>
<td>Cw</td>
<td>188.35</td>
<td>6,299</td>
<td>33.44</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Edgemont</td>
<td>Cw</td>
<td>180.04</td>
<td>5,950</td>
<td>33.05</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Glenridding Heights</td>
<td>Cw</td>
<td>60.46</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>32.67</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Riverview</td>
<td>Cw</td>
<td>611.18</td>
<td>18,730</td>
<td>30.65</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Horse Hill</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>890.3</td>
<td>27,599</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Southfort</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>322.64</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>26.97</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>East Vistas</td>
<td>Cw</td>
<td>317.5</td>
<td>8,673</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>East Pioneer</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>85.06</td>
<td>2,904</td>
<td>34.14</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>Shiloh</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>50.04</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>28.78</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>183.32</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>28.37</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>Heritage Estates</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>44.01</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Downtown Area Redevelopment</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>184.21</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Ville Giroux</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>51.95</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Avenir</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>41.75</td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>41.44</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Jensen Lakes</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>70.49</td>
<td>2,119</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County: Sherwood Park</td>
<td>Salisbury Village</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>67.44</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County: Sherwood Park</td>
<td>Emerald Hills</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>31.05</td>
<td>1,935</td>
<td>62.32</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County: Sherwood Park</td>
<td>Cambrian Crossing</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>87.27</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>30-45+</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Du/Nrha = Dwelling Units per Net Residential Hectare
HIGHLIGHTS:

- The October 2009 Addendum to the Capital Region Growth Plan (Section 2: Land Use) establishes residential density targets for each Priority Growth Area (PGA), as well as a single target for all Cluster Country Residential Areas (CCRA) and a target for Traditional Country Residential Areas.

- It is the intent of the Growth Plan that residential growth within PGAs and CCRAs occurs at a density that achieves the approved density target over the 35-year horizon of the Growth Plan.

- Member municipalities will achieve over the plan horizon the density target assigned to PGAs and CCRAs located within their boundaries through the adoption and implementation of statutory plans.

- Density targets for PGAs, CCRAs and Traditional Country Residential Areas are listed in Table 3: Capital Region Density Targets of the October 2009 Addendum to the Growth Plan (Section 2: Land Use).

- In general, the density targets for PGAs range from the highest residential density target, which is located in the central area of the Capital Region, to decreasing targets as the distance from the centre increases.

- The density targets for PGAs are intended to establish a more compact regional development footprint by planning for intensive forms of new residential development that significantly exceed existing development patterns.

- The density target for CCRAs reflects current cluster residential development trends within the Capital Region and best planning practices for cluster residential development.

- In order to establish a common unit of measurement across the Region, density targets for PGAs are expressed as dwelling units per net residential hectare (du/NRha), and for CCRAs it is dwelling units per gross hectare (du/GRha).

- Net residential area is defined as the land required for residential purposes within a residential neighbourhood. This excludes environmental and municipal reserve, roadways (including local, collector and arterial), public utilities, stormwater management facilities, and commercial, industrial and institutional lands.

- Planned future densities in municipal statutory plans, as presented in Appendix B (Table 2: Existing and Planned Future Densities by Priority Growth Areas) of the October 2009 Addendum of the Growth Plan (Section 2: Land Use), will be considered a benchmark from which to move forward for PGAs.
The application of density targets will be monitored by the CRB to assess the extent to which the density targets are being implemented. The 5-year review of the Growth Plan will assess and review the application of density targets.

The Regional Evaluation Framework identifies referral criteria which includes screening for statutory plans and statutory plan amendments that would result in a residential density that differs by 10% or more from the assigned density target for the corresponding PGA or CCRA.

The Growth Plan and its Addenda are available through the Capital Region Board and its website www.capitalregionboard.ab.ca

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Capital Region Board  
Web: www.capitalregionboard.ab.ca  
Phone: (780) 638-6000  
Email: info@capitalregionboard.ab.ca

**DISCLAIMER:** This Planning Toolkit is a guide to aid understanding of the Land Use Principles and Policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan. It is not a substitute for reading and understanding the Growth Plan. For certainty, the reader is advised to refer to the Growth Plan and related legislation available through the Capital Region Board.
Capital Region Board Transportation Needs Assessment 2015 Report

Recommended Motion:

That the Capital Region Board receive the Capital Region Board Transportation Needs Assessment 2015 Report for information, as recommended by the Transit Committee.

Background

- On June 20, 2014, Dr. Bonnie Dobbs, Professor, Department of Family Medicine, and Director, Medically At-Risk Driver Centre at the University of Alberta gave a presentation to the Transit Committee – “Exploring the Need for Alternate Transportation for Seniors in the Capital Region” – to create awareness of the issue of transportation services for rural and urban municipalities.

- On September 19, 2014, the Transit Committee approved the following motion:

  “That the Transit Committee approve the proposal for conducting a Needs Assessment Pilot for Specialized Transit for implementation in 2015, subject to budget approval.”

  The objectives of the Pilot were to assess the need for 1) specialized transportation services for seniors; 2) specialized transit services for persons with disabilities; and 3) the need for intermunicipal transit services to major centres in the Capital Region.

- On October 9, 2014, the Board approved a revised 2014 Business Plan and Budget, which was extended to March 31, 2015, including allocation of funding for a study – “Needs Assessment – Specialized Transit”.

- On March 13, 2015, Dr. Bonnie Dobbs presented the preliminary survey results of the CRB Transportation Need Assessment for the northeast sub-region consisting of Bruderheim, Lamont, Lamont County and Redwater for the Committee's information.

- On May 28, 2015, Dr. Bonnie Dobbs presented the final CRB Transportation Need Assessment Report to the Transit Committee. The Committee approved a motion recommending the Board receive the Report for information.

Rationale

- The Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan includes the following guiding principles for Specialized Services for persons with disabilities:
  - Enables equitable, barrier-free access to mass transit for persons with disabilities.
  - Available to persons with disabilities, where warranted and practical.
The Transportation Needs Assessment Report is the first step in evaluating the need for specialized transportation services in the Capital Region. Based on the information presented in the Report the CRB can begin exploring the range of possible service options that provide a level of intermunicipal specialized transit service that satisfies community requirements and expectations in a cost effective manner.

Next Steps

- It is proposed that Dr. Dobbs present the Report information to each of the communities surveyed in the northeast sub-region: Bruderheim, Lamont, Lamont County and Redwater.

- The approved 2015/16 Business Plan and Budget includes funding to carry out transportation needs assessments for the remaining sub-regions of the Capital Region. However, the project was included in the Priority “B” Project list which is dependent on matching funding from the Province. At this time, the status of the matching funding is unknown.
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Executive Summary

Introduction

- Transportation is critical for the health and mobility of seniors and persons with disabilities (PWD).
- Lack of access to responsive forms of transportation often results in an inability to access health care services and essential services such as grocery shopping, as well as an inability to meet social and religious needs.
- Canada’s population is aging, with the percentage of seniors projected to increase from 15.3% in 2013 to 24.2% by 2040. The proportion of seniors aged 80 years of age among the total senior population aged 65 years and over also is projected to increase from 26.6% in 2013 to 35.9% by 2040.
- The percentage of individuals with a disability also is increasing, in part because of the strong association between disability and age. In Canada, the percentage of individuals with a disability increases from 4.4% for those 15–24 years of age to 16.1% for those aged 45–64, with a further increase to 26.3% for those aged 65–74.
- Similar demographic changes are occurring in the Capital Region.
- The aging of the population, accompanied by the ‘aging in place’ movement, have widespread implications in many areas of service delivery, including transportation to seniors and PWD.
- Within Alberta’s Capital Region, the 2009 Intermunicipal Network Plan has identified the provision of “specialized public transit services to seniors and persons with disabilities” as one of its mandates (p. 58), as well as the provision of “special transit for persons with disabilities” (p. 15). Improvement of regional delivery of specialized intermunicipal transit (IMT) services also has been identified as a need within the Capital Region.

Objective of this Study

- To assess the transportation needs for two vulnerable segments of the population – seniors and PWD – in a sub-region of the Alberta Capital Region. The targeted sub-region for the Transportation Needs Assessment was Lamont County and the Town of Redwater.

---

1 Specifically, Lamont County includes the communities of Andrew, Bruderheim, Chipman, Hilliard, Lamont, Mundare, Star, St. Michael, Whitford, and Wostok.
Three areas of transportation were targeted: 1) alternate transportation for seniors (ATS) services; 2) specialized transit (ST) services for PWD, and; 3) intermunicipal transit (IMT) service to major centres in the Capital Region.

**Methodology**

- Survey methodology with Random digit dialing (RDD).
- The data were collected by the Population Research Laboratory (PRL) at the University of Alberta, under contract to the Medically At-Risk Driver (MARD) Centre.
- Trained PRL interviewers conducted interviews with: 1) individuals in the general population; 2) living in the identified sub-region of the Capital Region; 3) 45 years of age and older without a disability (Sample One), and; 4) those 18 years of age and older with a disability (Sample Two).
- The Health Research Ethics Board at the University of Alberta approved the study questionnaires and procedures.
- Two survey instruments were developed:
  - Survey Instrument One was used for data collection on ATS services. ATS services were defined as *modes of transportation that exist outside of public transportation programs and include both for-profit and not-for-profit transportation by a service provider* (i.e., private vehicles, buses, handivans, minivans).
  - Survey Instrument Two was used for data collection on ST services for PWD. ST services were defined as *transportation services designed to accommodate individuals with mobility restrictions that make it difficult or impossible to take conventional transit service; this type of service is typically equipped to accommodate persons with disabilities*.
  - Both survey instruments included questions related to the need for IMT service to major centres in the Capital Region. IMT service was defined as *transit service that operates between municipalities or across municipal boundaries*.
- Data collection for the main survey started January 29, 2015, with data collection completed February 25, 2015 (27 days).
- The overall response rate was 35.9%.
- For data analyses purposes, three ‘sub-samples’ were created.
  - Sample One consisted of 379 participants aged 45–64 and 65+ without a disability who completed the ATS services survey.
Sample Two consisted of 30 PWD participants aged 27–98 who completed the ST services survey.
Sample Three consisted of 40 non-drivers (6 aged 45–64, 4 aged 65+, and 30 aged 27+ [PWD]) who completed the ATS service survey and/or the ST services for PWD survey.

Results
Sample as a Whole
- Overall, 413 individuals aged 27 to 98 were interviewed, with an average age of 65 years. Two-thirds of those interviewed were female.
- All participants were living in the community, with one-third living on a farm or in Lamont County, with the remainder living in towns, villages, or hamlets.
- 90.0% of participants were currently driving, with the remaining 10.0% non-drivers.

Sample One (ATS Services)
- A total of 379 individuals participated in the ATS services survey.
  - 181 (47.8%) were 45–64 years of age (i.e., adult children of seniors).
  - 198 (52.2%) were 65 years of age and older.
- The average age of participants aged 45–64 was 56.3 (SD = 5.6), with 65.2% female.
- The average age of the 65+ participants was 73.1 (SD = 6.4), with 61.6% female.
- A high percentage of participants aged 45–64 (45.8%) and 65+ (52.5%) indicated that their physical health interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities (i.e., shopping, dressing, preparing meals) ‘sometimes’ or ‘all the time’.
- The majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ currently drove.
  - Participants aged 45–64 indicated that they drove 5.1 (SD = 2.0) days per week compared to 3.9 (SD = 2.2) days per week for those aged 65+.
- Despite the high percentage of drivers in both samples, from 8.0% to 16.0% of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that they had unmet transportation needs (i.e., unable to go to medical appointments, shop for groceries, get together with family, or attend social functions or religious activities in the last six months because they did not have a ride).
- Approximately one-third to one-half of participants aged 45–65+ indicated that the transportation needs of seniors in their community were being met ‘not at all well’ for different types of trips (i.e., trips for health-related appointments, essential services such
as grocery shopping and banking, visiting with family and friends, social activities, and for religious activities).

- Less than 10.0% of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that the transportation needs of seniors in the community were being met ‘very well’, overall.
  - More than one-third (39.5%) of participants aged 45–64 indicated that seniors transportation needs were being met ‘not at all well’.
  - Almost one-third (31.1%) of participants aged 65+ indicated that seniors transportation needs were being met ‘not at all well’.

- In terms of availability, importance, and use of ATS for seniors in the community:
  - 40.3% of participants aged 45–64 and 44.9% of participants aged 65+ indicated that there were ATS services available, with community buses and/or vans for seniors, volunteer drivers, handivan services, for-profit transportation services such as Driving Miss Daisy, and services offered by community organizations such as the Lions Club and Pioneer Club identified as being available.
  - The majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ rated the availability of ATS services for seniors as ‘very important’ (84.4% and 81.1%, respectively).
  - The majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that, if ATS services were available in their community, that seniors would be ‘very likely’ to use those services (71.6% and 66.8%, respectively).
  - In terms of time of use, a majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that the most likely time periods of use by seniors would be Weekday mornings (93.9% and 87.9%, respectively) and Weekday afternoons (87.8% and 76.3%, respectively).

- Participants also were asked about the importance of different features of ATS services if those services were to be made available for seniors in the community (i.e., booking rides, multiple stops, and knowledgeable drivers).
  - The vast majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that having to book a ride at least 24 hours in advance was ‘somewhat/very reasonable’ (95.0% and 94.4%, respectively).
  - The majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ also indicated that having ATS services that allow for multiple stops during the trip was ‘somewhat/very important’ for seniors in the community (93.9% and 86.3%, respectively).
• Having a driver who was knowledgeable on health issues of seniors was deemed as ‘somewhat/very important’ by the vast majority of participants aged 45–65 and 65+ (97.8% and 96.9%, respectively).

• In terms of the importance of ATS services for different types of trips (i.e., health-related trips such as medical appointments, essential trips such as grocery shopping and banking, social activities, visiting with family and friends, and for religious activities), all trip purposes were rated highly.
  ▪ Transportation for health-related and essential services were rated by a higher percentage of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ as ‘somewhat/very important’ (92.9% or higher).
  ▪ Transportation for visiting with family and friends and for social and religious activities also were deemed to be important but the percentage of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ rating these as ‘somewhat/very important’ was slightly lower (84.8% to 91.2%).

• In relation to paying for services, participants were asked how much they thought seniors in their community could afford to pay and how much seniors in the community were willing to pay for a one-way ride of approximately 10.0 km.
  ▪ Both the 45–64 and the 65+ participants thought that seniors could afford to pay more than they were willing to pay, with all estimates under $10.00.

• The preferred method of payment for ATS services was ‘pay per ride’, with approximately half of the 45–64 and the 65+ participants identifying this as the preferred method (52.4% and 58.0%, respectively).

• Participants also were asked how they would prefer to find out about transportation services in their community. The top two preferences amongst participants aged 45–64 and 65+ were the community newspaper (54.7% and 59.6%, respectively) and by mail (14.5% and 12.3%, respectively).

• Finally, all participants were asked how important it was to have municipal funding available for ATS services in their community. The vast majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ (97.2% and 97.5%, respectively) indicated that it was ‘somewhat/very important’ to have this type of funding available to offset the cost of providing ATS services in the community.

Sample Two (ST Services for PWD)
• Thirty individuals participated in the ST services survey.
• The average age of PWD participants was 64.9 years (SD = 18.4), with 66.7% female.
• More than three-quarters (85.7%) of PWD participants indicated that their physical health interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities (i.e., shopping, dressing, preparing meals) ‘sometimes’ or ‘all the time’.
• All PWD participants were non-drivers.
• Overall, almost half of the PWD participants indicated that in the last six months they had been unable to go to medical appointments, shop for groceries, get together with family, or attend social functions or religious activities ‘sometimes/often’ because they did not have a ride.
• One-half or more of PWD participants indicated that their transportation needs for health-related services, visiting with family and friends, and for social and religious activities were being met ‘not at all well’, with more than one-third indicating that their transportation needs for essential services were being met ‘not at all well’.
• Less than 10.0% of PWD participants indicated that the transportation needs of PWD in their community were being met ‘very well’, overall.
• In relation to availability, importance, and use of ST services for PWD in the community,
  ▪ 80.0% of PWD participants indicated that there were no ST services for PWD available in the community.
  ▪ All PWD participants indicated that it was important to have ST services available in the community, with 76.7% of PWD participants rating the availability of these services as ‘very important’.
  ▪ The same percentage of PWD participants (76.7%) indicated that they would be ‘very likely’ to use these services.
  ▪ The majority of PWD participants indicated that the ‘most likely’ time periods that they would use ST services would be Weekday mornings and afternoons (76.7% and 60.0%, respectively).
• PWD participants also were asked about the importance of different features of ST services if those services were to be made available in the community (i.e., booking rides, multiple stops, and knowledgeable drivers).
  ▪ The vast majority (89.6%) of PWD participants indicated that having to book a ride at least 24 hours in advance was ‘somewhat/very reasonable’.
  ▪ The majority (83.4%) of PWD participants indicated that having ST services that allowed for multiple stops during the trip was ‘somewhat/very important’.
Having a driver who was knowledgeable about health issues (i.e., disabilities, illnesses) was deemed as ‘somewhat/very important’ by the vast majority (90.0%) of PWD participants.

With respect to the importance of ST services for PWD for different types of transportation needs (i.e., health-related trips, essential trips, and for social and religious activities), all trip purposes were rated as important by a high percentage of participants.

- A higher percentage of PWD participants (93.3% and 86.6%, respectively) rated trips for health-related services and trips for essential services as ‘somewhat/very important’.
- About two-thirds of PWD participants rated trips for visiting with family and friends, for social activities, and for attending religious activities as being ‘somewhat/very important’.

In relation to paying for rides, PWD participants indicated that they could afford to pay $10.10 but were willing to pay $13.13.

The preferred method of payment identified by PWD participants was ‘pay per ride’, with approximately 41.0% identifying this as the preferred method.

The top two preferences for finding out about transportation services in their community identified by PWD participants were the community newspaper (40.0%) and by mail (24.0%).

Finally, all PWD participants were asked how important it was to have municipal funding available for ST services for PWD in their community. The vast majority (89.6%) indicated that this type of funding was ‘somewhat/very important’ to offset the cost of providing ST services for PWD in the community.

Sample Three (Non-Drivers)

- Sample Three consisted of 34 individuals who indicated that they did not drive. Thirty of the 34 non-drivers (88.2%) were PWD, with the remaining four non-drivers (11.8%) aged 65 and older.
- The average age of the 34 non-driving participants was 66.4 years (SD = 18.0), with 67.6% female.
- More than three-quarters (81.3%) of the non-driver participants indicated that their physical health interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities (i.e., shopping, dressing, preparing meals) ‘sometimes’ or ‘all the time’.
• Because the vast majority of non-drivers were PWD, the pattern of results for this sample of 34 non-drivers was very similar to the results from the 30 PWD participants presented above. As such, we have elected not to duplicate the presentation of those findings here or in the body of the report.

Intermunicipal Transit (IMT) Service
• All 413 participants responded to questions related to the importance and use of IMT service and the importance of funding for IMT service.
• Overall, 93.1% of the Sample as a Whole (n = 413) indicated that having IMT service available in the Capital Region was ‘somewhat/very important’.
• In terms of likelihood of using IMT service if that service was in place in their community, more than half (59.2%) of the Sample as a Whole indicated that they would be ‘somewhat/very likely’ to use IMT service if it was available.
• In relation to time of use, the majority indicated that they would mostly likely use IMT service Weekday mornings (> 80.0%) and Weekday afternoons (between 70.0%–80.0%) followed by Weekend mornings (between 30.0%–45.0%) and Weekend afternoons (between 30.0%–45.0%).
• The vast majority (95.0%) of participants indicated that having municipal funding available for IMT service in their community was ‘somewhat/very important’.

Discussion
• The primary objective of the study was to assess the transportation needs of two vulnerable segments of the population – seniors and PWD – in a sub-region of the Alberta Capital Region. Overall, the results from this Transportation Needs Assessment provide further evidence of these unmet needs. Specifically, although the vast majority of seniors that we interviewed indicated that they drove, about one-quarter (23.2%) of seniors who drove indicated that they relied on family members and about one in six (14.1%) relied on friends for transportation one or more times a week to ‘get to where they wanted to go’. Not surprisingly, these percentages increase for seniors who do not drive, with almost 40.0% of seniors who did not drive indicating that they relied on family members and almost 29.0% relied on friends one or more times a week to ‘get to where they wanted to go’. A high number of PWD participants (one in three or 30.0%) indicated that, in a typical week, they received rides from family members at least once a week.
and 20.0% of PWD participants indicated that they received rides from friends at least once per week to ‘get to where they wanted to go’. Of interest, the percentage of PWD relying on transportation from family or friends differs as a function of age. That is, a higher percentage of PWD participants 65 years of age and older relied on family members (40.2%) and friends (29.3%) at least once per week to ‘get to where they wanted to go’ as compared to PWD participants below 65 years of age (23.1% and 15.4%, respectively).

When asked about unmet transportation needs, less than 15.0% of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that they were unable to meet their transportation needs for medical appointments, shopping for groceries, visiting with family, or for social or religious activities because they did not have a ride. These results are not surprising, given the combination of the high percentage of driver and reliance on family and friends for rides. However, about half of PWD in our study (57.0% of whom were seniors) indicated that they ‘sometimes’ or ‘all the time’ were unable to access community services (medical, groceries, etc.) because they did not have a ride. These results indicate that a significant percentage of PWD participants, and to a lesser extent, participants aged 45–64 and 65+ who drive are at-risk in terms of satisfaction of both basic and higher order needs.

In contrast to responses on their own unmet transportation needs, less than 10.0% of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that the transportation needs of seniors in the community were being met ‘very well’ overall. A similar pattern of results was evident for PWD participants, with only 9.5% of PWD participants indicating that the transportation needs of PWD in the community were being met ‘very well’ overall.

To assess the ‘validity’ of the responses from the participants in our sample who drove and who answered questions on transportation needs from the perspective of seniors in their community, we compared responses from the two samples of drivers (i.e., drivers aged 45–64 and 65+) to responses from the non-drivers (who answered the questions from their own perspective). First, we compared the responses from drivers aged 45–64 and 65+ and non-drivers 65+ on how well the transportation needs of seniors are being met for different trip purposes, followed by a comparison across these same groups on how well the transportation needs of seniors are being met overall. Results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in the ratings from participants aged 45–64 and from drivers 65+ versus the 65+ non-drivers for both comparisons. As such, the ratings from drivers aged 45–64, from drivers aged 65+, and from non-drivers on unmet...
transportation needs can be considered to be reasonable ‘proxies’ in the assessment of the unmet transportation needs of seniors in their community. However, further research, with a larger sample size of 65+ non-drivers is important to see if these same pattern of results hold.

- In terms of availability of specialized transportation (i.e., ATS services or ST services for PWD), a high percentage of participants indicated that there were no services available in their community (41.4% of participants 45–64; 41.9% of participants 65+; and 80.0% of PWD participants). Services that were identified included a senior’s van or bus, a community van, volunteer driver, taxi, or transportation from for-profit organizations. Given the pattern of findings described above, it is not surprising that the majority of participants surveyed rated the availability of ATS services and ST services for PWD as important. Specifically, 81.0% or more of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ rated having ATS services for seniors available in the community as ‘very important’, with the remaining 19.0% rating them as ‘somewhat important’. Similarly, 76.7% of PWD participants rated the availability of ST services for PWD in the community as ‘very important’, with the remaining 23.3% rating these services as ‘somewhat important’. What these results suggest is that there not only is awareness of the lack of transportation services outside of the private vehicle for seniors and PWD in these rural communities, but there also is recognition of the unmet transportation needs of these two segments of the population.

- An unexpected finding was the high percentage of participants overall (51.8%) who reported that their physical health interfered with their abilities to carry out everyday activities. These results are a concern, particularly given that having a ‘disability’ has been identified as the most important individual characteristic influencing mobility, travel behavior, and difficulties with transportation.

- In addition to furthering our understanding of the transportation needs of seniors and PWD in a sub-region of the Alberta Capital Region, we also obtained feedback on features of specialized transportation service delivery if those services were to be made available for seniors and PWD (i.e., time that services would most likely be used, the type of transportation the service would be used for, preferences for booking and paying for the service, and the importance of other features of service delivery such as multiple stops and knowledgeable drivers). The results provide insights on features of service delivery that are deemed to be responsive to seniors and PWD, with these results useful
to organizations and/or service providers who are wishing to deliver or who are delivering transportation services to these two segments of the population.

- The cost of delivering specialized transportation services is an important consideration, with cost often a barrier to implementation of these services. Results from this Transportation Needs Assessment indicate that few participants thought that specialized transportation services should be ‘free’. Rather, most participants thought that seniors and PWD could afford and would be willing to pay for the services. On average, participants aged 45–64 thought that the amount that seniors could afford to pay was more than they would be willing to pay ($7.18 vs. $6.88). A similar pattern of findings was evident for participants aged 65+ in that they thought seniors could afford to pay $8.87 but would be willing to pay $8.08. On the other hand, PWD participants indicated that they could afford to pay $10.10 but they would be willing to pay $13.13. These findings have important implications for the design and delivery of specialized transportation services for seniors and PWD in that, often, the prevailing belief is that these transportation services should be available at no charge.

- Finally, all participants were asked about the importance of having municipal funding available for ATS services or ST services in their community. The vast majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ (97.4%) indicated that it was ‘somewhat/very important’ to have this type of funding available to offset the cost of providing ATS services in the community. The vast majority (89.6%) of PWD participants also indicated that having municipal funding available for ST services in their community was ‘somewhat/very important’. These results, as well as the results on the ability and willingness to pay for rides, are informative in that options for implementation or expansion of rural transportation services for seniors and PWD include user-pay programs, funding from local or provincial governments, or a combination of the two.

- With respect to funding for IMT services, overall, 95.0% of participants rated the availability of municipal funding for this service as ‘somewhat/very important’.

**Conclusion**

- Canada’s population is aging, as is the population of the Capital Region. The percentage of PWD also is increasing. The desire to ‘age in place’, combined with the regionalization of many services, means that residents in rural communities are required to travel to urban centres. However, for those who do not drive, access to those services is hampered by the lack of alternate forms of transportation.
In this research, three groups were administered questionnaires about the transportation needs of seniors and PWD. The large majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ (without disabilities) responded that they perceived the transportation needs of seniors were not being met. Those 45–64 and those 65+ also responded that it was important to meet those needs with additional services, and if those services were available, they would be used. A similar pattern of findings was found for PWD participants.

Overall, the results from this study provide an important step toward understanding the adequacy and needs of relevant transportation services for seniors and PWD. That is, knowledge about the adequacy of current transportation services, and, if inadequate, knowledge about the perceived transportation needs is requisite to meeting the mobility needs of these vulnerable populations.

A limitation of the Transportation Needs Assessment is the small sample of seniors who do not drive as well as the small sample of PWD. A larger sample of non-driving seniors and PWD is needed to determine if the pattern of results from these larger samples of these populations is consistent with the results presented.

Expansion of the Transportation Needs Assessment throughout the Alberta Capital Region would address the major limitations associated with the current needs assessment. Results of an expanded Transportation Needs Assessment could then be used to inform on policy and planning initiatives related to the transportation needs of seniors who voluntarily or involuntarily stop driving and to PWD of any age in a rural setting.
SECTION A. INTRODUCTION, PROJECT OBJECTIVES, AND METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

Transportation is critical for the health and mobility of seniors and persons with disabilities (1-5). The lack of access to responsive forms of transportation often results in an inability to access health care services (1,2,5-13). Lack of access to responsive transportation services also results in reduction of access to essential services and an inability to meet social and religious needs (9,14). Not surprisingly, these unmet transportation needs often are associated with decreases in quality of life, reductions in or loss of independence, and social isolation (2,15-17).

Canada, like other developed countries, is undergoing a number of demographic shifts. The shift most relevant to this study is the aging of the population. Based on the medium growth scenario, the Canadian population 65 years of age and older will increase from 15.3% in 2013 to 24.2% by 2040 (18). It also is the case that the senior population itself is aging. That is, the proportion of seniors aged 80 years of age and older among the total senior population aged 65 years of age and over is projected to increase from 26.6% in 2013 to 35.9% by 2040 (18). In Alberta, the proportion of seniors also is expected to increase significantly, from 11.2% in 2013 to 18.5% by 2038. The proportion of seniors aged 80 and older among the total senior population also is projected to increase from 26.0% in 2013 to 31.9% by 2038 (18). A similar change in demographics is occurring within the Capital Region. Based on Edmonton Census data, the population 65 years of age and older is projected to increase from 11.5% in 2013 to 18.2% by 2041, but unfortunately, data on the change in the proportion of older seniors (i.e., 80 years of age and older) between the two identified time periods in the Capital Region are unavailable.

The disabled population is aging as well. In 2012, almost 14.0% of Canadians reported living with a hearing, vision, speech, cognitive, and/or motor disability (20). The percentage of individuals with a disability increases dramatically with age, from 4.4% for Canadians 15–24 years of age, to 16.1% for those aged 45–64, with a further increase to 26.3% for those aged 65–74 (21). Almost half (42.5%) of Canadians 75 years of age and older are living with a disability (21).

2 Projections for 2040 are not available, hence the inconsistent comparison time periods.
Results from a recent survey by Mattson and colleagues indicate that disability is “the most important individual characteristic influencing travel behavior, mobility, and problems with transportation” (p. 3) (22). The results from this same survey also indicate that persons with disabilities (PWD) are less likely to drive themselves, are more likely to say that transportation is a limiting factor for trip making ability, and are less likely to indicate that there are adequate transportation options available in the community. Given the results above, it is not surprising that PWD “fare far worse than their nondisabled counterparts across a broad range of health indicators” (p. S201), including delays in or failure to receive health care as well as access to other needed services (23). Research also indicates that PWD often have reductions in transportation mobility due to increased difficulties with public transportation when it is available and to a decreased likelihood of appropriate transportation options (1). As with seniors, responsive transportation options for PWD often are limited or absent, and particularly so in rural areas. For PWD, accessible forms of transportation serve to facilitate access to health care services, access to essential services, and promote socialization and engagement in other community activities.

The rapid aging of the senior and disabled populations has resulted in an increased awareness of and need for the provision of ‘age-friendly’ services that will allow seniors and PWD to ‘age in place’ (i.e., receive access to home-based medical equipment, home care, caregiver support). Discussions on ‘aging in place’ have resulted in recognition of the need for creation of supportive environments at the community level (i.e., accessible and affordable housing, safe and walkable neighbourhoods, and access to services). Building and maintaining ‘age-friendly communities’ increasingly is regarded as core to addressing the challenges associated with the aging of the population (24,25).

The aging of the population will have widespread implications in many areas of service delivery, including transportation. Although the majority of seniors drive, licensing rates and driving status (driver/non-driver) are affected by many factors including age, gender, place of residence, and the presence of illnesses and disabilities. In terms of licensing rates, the probability of holding a valid driver’s license decreases significantly with age. In Canada, almost 80.0% of seniors 65 to 74 years of age hold a valid driver’s license, with this percentage decreasing to less than 20.0% for those aged 90 and older (4). Gender also affects licensing rates in the senior population, with men 65 years of age and older more likely to have a valid driver’s license than are same-aged women. Older men also are more likely to be active drivers as compared to their same-aged female counterparts. Of older participants who held a driver’s license, 86.4% of men aged
65 and older drove in the last month compared to only 56.1% of same-aged women (4). What this means is that overall, as one gets older, the probability of having to rely on other forms of transportation (i.e., being driven by someone else, relying on public transportation) increases significantly, with older women more vulnerable to being transportation dependent than older men of the same age. Of interest, older women often are in ‘double jeopardy’ in that they are not only more likely to ‘not drive’, but also are more likely to be widowed than their same-aged male counterparts. Specifically, based on 2011 Census data, more than 70.0% of senior men in Canada lived ‘as a couple’ while only 44.0% of senior women ‘lived as a couple’ (26). The primary reason for this difference is that, on average, women live longer than men, and as such are more likely to outlive their spouses.

The decline in licensing rates with age (and corresponding increase in reliance on other forms of transportation) also is due to the presence of one or more medical conditions. A number of chronic illnesses, many of them age-associated, negatively impact the functional abilities (i.e., sensory, motor, cognitive) needed for driving. In Canada, 89.0% of seniors have one chronic illness, with 37.0% having four or more chronic illnesses (27). Medications also are an important consideration. Two-thirds of Canadian seniors are taking five or more medications for their illnesses, with more than a quarter of seniors taking 10 or more medications (28). Often, these drugs have side effects that affect functional abilities needed for driving. Unfortunately, many individuals 65 years of age and older continue to drive past their ‘safe’ driving years. Results from a study published by Statistics Canada in 2012 indicated that 10.0% of seniors who were ‘unable to see’ and 27.0% of seniors who were ‘very forgetful or couldn’t remember anything at all’ drove in the previous month (4). Similar to seniors, many persons with disabilities often are not licensed to drive and as such, are transportation dependent. Based on a 2006 report, 16.0% of adult Albertans have a disability, with a significant percentage of this population 65 years of age and older (29).

The aging of the population, accompanied by the ‘aging in place’ movement, have widespread implications in many areas of service delivery, including transportation for seniors and PWD. Within Alberta’s Capital Region, the 2009 Intermunicipal Network Plan has identified the provision of “specialized public transit services to seniors and persons with disabilities” as one of its mandates (p. 58) (30). In addition, the Capital Region Board (CRB) Regulation, created by the Province of Alberta, mandates “the provision for special transit for persons with disabilities” (p. 15) (31). In this same report, the authors note the need to improve the regional delivery of specialized intermunicipal transit services, with guiding principles and service attributes.
articulated to assist in meeting the mobility needs of seniors and PWD at the present time and in
the future (see p. 60). This Transportation Needs Assessment was designed to assist the CRB in achieving that goal.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of the study was to assess the transportation needs of two vulnerable segments of the population – seniors and PWD – in a sub-region of the Alberta Capital Region. The Alberta Capital Region is a conglomerate of 24 municipalities that surround the provincial capital (Edmonton) of Alberta. The targeted sub-region for the Transportation Needs Assessment, identified in consultation with the members of the CRB Transit Committee, was Lamont County and the Town of Redwater. Lamont County, which consists of 3 towns, 2 villages, 5 hamlets, and surrounding farms, is situated 62 kilometers (38 miles) northeast of Edmonton. Based on Census data, Lamont County has a population of 3,872, with 18.5% of the population 65 years of age and older. The Town of Redwater, which borders Lamont County to the northwest, has a population of 2,116, with 16.0% of its population 65 years of age and older. Census data on PWD in Lamont County and in the Town of Redwater are lacking. Provincial data indicate that 12.5% of Alberta’s population 15 years of age and older have a disability, with the prevalence increasing from 9.4% for those 15 to 64 years of age to 35.7% for those 65 years of age and older.

For this Transportation Needs Assessment, we focused on 3 targeted areas:

a. Alternate transportation for seniors (ATS) services;

b. Specialized transit (ST) services for PWD;

c. Intermunicipal transit (IMT) service to major centres in the Capital Region.

METHODOLOGY

Target Populations

The target populations for the Transportation Needs Assessment consisted of: 1) Individuals in the general population; 2) Living in the identified sub-region of the Capital Region; 3) 45 years of age and older without a disability (Sample One), and; 4) Those 18 years of age and older with a disability (Sample Two). Disability, for the purposes of this Transportation Needs Assessment,

3 Specifically, Lamont County includes the communities of Bruderheim, Lamont, Mundare, Andrew, Chipman, Hilliard, St. Michael, Star, Whitford, and Wostok.
was defined as a long-term or recurring impairment (i.e., physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric, or learning) that limits the individual’s ability to get around out of their home (35) and having to rely on others for their transportation. Relying on others for their transportation was operationalized as having never driven or currently not driving.

**Survey Design**

Two survey instruments were developed by research staff at the University of Alberta’s Medically At-Risk Driver (MARD) Centre. The first survey instrument was used for data collection on ATS services. ATS services were defined as *modes of transportation that exist outside of public transportation programs and include both for-profit and not-for-profit transportation by a service provider (i.e., private vehicles, buses, handivans, minivans)* (36). The ATS services survey was administered to individuals in the general population aged 45 years and older living in the target region (Sample One). Individuals who provided responses to this survey included adult children of seniors (individuals aged 45–64) and seniors (individuals aged 65 and older) who were currently driving. The second survey instrument was used for data collection on specialized transit (ST) services. ST services were defined as *transportation services designed to accommodate individuals with mobility restrictions that make it difficult or impossible to take conventional transit service; this type of service is typically equipped to accommodate persons with disabilities* (30, p. 100). There also were questions related to the need for intermunicipal transit (IMT) service to major centres in the Capital Region. IMT service was defined as *transit service that operates between municipalities or across municipal boundaries* (30, p. 99). The questions on IMT service were embedded in each of the two survey instruments identified above (i.e., all participants in the study answered the questions on IMT service).

Each final survey instrument consisted of the following sections: 1) A standardized introduction with contact information of the Principal Investigator and the PRL at the University of Alberta; 2) Assurance that the information was voluntary, confidential, and anonymous and protected under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIPP) Act; 3) Eligibility questions for participation; 4) Collection of participant information on transportation needs and deficiencies (including driving status, presence of impairment[s], awareness and use of existing transportation services, satisfaction with those services, ratings of specific features of currently existing or projected transportation services, costs such as willingness to pay for transportation.
services, need for IMT service, and general questions about transportation; and 5) Participant demographics.

Data Collection

The data were collected by the PRL at the University of Alberta, under contract to the MARD Centre. The PRL is a research centre specializing in survey research in areas including social policy, health, education, labour markets, and public opinion. PRL staff assisted in the development of the sampling frames and telephone introductory scripts, refinement of the draft survey instruments developed by MARD Centre researchers (with input from CRB Transit Committee members), general training of telephone interviewers, piloting the survey instruments, and training on data collection using the Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) system. With the CATI system, each question appears on the screen of the interviewer’s computer and the interviewer keys in the answer. PRL interviewers also were trained on FOIPP requirements, general guidelines related to data collection, overarching ethical considerations, as well as the objectives of the survey and survey content.

Before data collection for the main survey began, piloting of the survey was conducted by PRL interviewers using a sample of 12 household participants in Lamont County and the Town of Redwater. Minor revisions were made to the survey based on the pilot data collected. To promote engagement and encourage participation in the Transportation Needs Assessment, one-quarter page newspaper advertisements were placed in the Fort Saskatchewan Record, the Lamont Farm ‘N’ Friends, the Lamont Leader, and the Redwater Review two weeks and one week prior to initiation of data collection for the main survey.

Main survey data collection started on January 29, 2015, with data collection completed February 25, 2015 for a total of 27 days ‘in the field’. Interviews were conducted between 0900 to 1400 hours and 1630 to 2000 hours Monday through Friday; 1000 to 1400 hours on Saturdays; and 1400 to 2000 hours on Sundays. If the interviewers were unsuccessful in establishing contact on their first call, a maximum of eight call-back attempts were made before declaring a telephone number as ‘no contact’.

Upon making contact, interviewers identified themselves, verified the telephone number, and asked the screening questions to confirm eligibility. Only one eligible adult per household was selected as a potential respondent. Before administering the survey, interviewers informed individuals that their participation was entirely voluntary, their responses would be kept...
completely confidential, that they could terminate the interview at any time, and that the information was being collected in conformity with the FOIPP Act. In total, 413 telephone interviews were completed. The average length of the interview after screening was 22.0 minutes (Standard Deviation [SD] = 8.3).

**Ethics**

The Health Research Ethics Board (Panel B) at the University of Alberta approved the study questionnaires and procedures.

**Generating the Samples and Sample Criteria**

**Sample One (ATS Services)**

Random digit dialing (RDD) methodology was used to generate the sampling frame for Sample One participants. Specifically, telephone numbers were generated using a telephone landlines databank with the last two digits randomly generated by computer for those who resided in one of the areas: Town, village, hamlet, or farm in Lamont County; or in the Town of Redwater. All respondents were initially screened by PRL interviewers for eligibility in the study. Specifically, interviewers asked structured questions from their script to determine an individual’s eligibility based on pre-defined criteria.

To be eligible for participation for the ATS services survey, an individual had to be 45 years of age and older, English speaking, and a resident of either Lamont County or the Town of Redwater. The rationale for including individuals 45 years of age and older was that many adult children become transportation service providers to their parents and, as such, have insight into the transportation needs of seniors. All individuals eligible for participation in the ATS services survey responded to questions related to ATS services as well as questions related to IMT service. In terms of quota sampling for this segment of the study, the intent was to recruit approximately 20.0% or greater of individuals aged 65 and older who did not drive. Despite focused attempts by PRL staff, they were successful in recruiting only four individuals 65 years of age and older without a disability who did not drive.

**Sample Two (ST Services for PWD)**

To be eligible for the ST services for PWD survey, an individual had to be 18 years of age or older, have a long-term or recurring impairment (i.e., physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric, or learning) that limited their ability to get around outside of their home, and be a non-driver. With the exception of one individual, the methodology for developing the sampling frame for ST
services for PWD was identical to that for Sample One (i.e., RDD). In one instance, the contact information of a PWD who did not drive and who had volunteered his/her information was provided to PRL staff by the study team. That person was screened as eligible to participate and completed the telephone survey. As with Sample One, all individuals who were eligible and who responded to the questions related to ST services also completed the questions on IMT service.

**Response Rate**

The response rate was calculated by using the number of individuals who participated in the survey divided by the number of completed interviews, refusals, incompletes, and language problems.

As shown below, the overall response rate was 35.9%.

\[
\text{Response Rate} = \frac{\text{Number of complete interviews}}{\text{Number of completed interviews} + \text{Incomplete Interviews}} \times 100
\]

\[
= \frac{\text{Number of completed interviews} + \text{Incomplete Interviews}}{(\text{refusals} + \text{incomplete} + \text{language problems})} \times 100
\]

\[
= \frac{413}{(413 + [716 + 15 + 6])} \times 100
\]

\[
= 35.9\%
\]

On average, two call attempts were needed to obtain the final sample of 413 participants.
Overview of the Sample as a Whole

Four hundred and thirteen (N = 413) individuals participated in the Transportation Needs Assessment. As shown in Table A1-1, the average age of the Sample as a Whole was 65.1 years (SD = 11.1). Two-thirds (63.7%) of these participants were female. Slightly more than three-quarters (85.7%) of participants in the overall sample lived either in Lamont County, Mundare, Bruderheim, Town of Lamont, Town of Redwater, or on a farm. The remaining participants resided in Andrew, Chipman, Hilliard, Star, or St. Michael. Two-thirds (66.7%) of participants were married or living common-law, with the remainder single/never married (8.3%), separated or divorced (8.0%), or widowed (17.0%). Almost three-quarters (71.8%) of participants indicated that they lived with family or friends, one-quarter (24.8%) lived alone, and 3.4% reported living in a group setting (i.e., seniors lodge, group home). The vast majority (91.3%) of participants lived in a single detached or mobile home, with the rest indicating that they lived in an apartment, townhouse, or semi-detached home (2.9%), lodge or apartment for seniors (4.9%), or assisted living facility (1.0%). Slightly more than half (51.1%) of participants indicated that they were retired, 4.4% were on long-term disability, 2.0% were unemployed and not looking for work, 1.0% were unemployed and looking for work, 10.0% were employed part-time (less than 30 hours per week), 18.3% were employed full-time, 4.2% selected homemaker as an employment status, and 9.0% reported ‘other’ in terms of employment status (i.e., contract or seasonal employment, self-employed, etc.). The majority (85.8%) of participants indicated that their annual household income was equal to or greater than $20,000. In terms of driving status, 90.3% of participants indicated that they drove.

---

4 See Table AB-1 in Appendix B for a more detailed breakdown of place of residence for the Sample as a Whole.
Table A1-1. **Demographics of the Sample as a Whole**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Total Sample (N = 413)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Age</strong></td>
<td>65.1 (SD = 11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>263 (63.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>150 (36.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Residence</strong></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>218 (52.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>53 (12.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>6 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>85 (20.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>51 (12.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/common-law</td>
<td>274 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/divorced</td>
<td>33 (8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>70 (17.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married)</td>
<td>34 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Arrangements</strong></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live alone</td>
<td>102 (24.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family/friends</td>
<td>296 (71.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group setting (lodge/group home)</td>
<td>14 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwelling</strong></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single detached/mobile home</td>
<td>376 (91.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment/townhouse/semi-detached condominium</td>
<td>12 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodge/apartment for seniors</td>
<td>20 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted living facility</td>
<td>4 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>209 (51.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (full-time)</td>
<td>75 (18.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (part-time)</td>
<td>41 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed looking for work</td>
<td>4 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed not looking for work</td>
<td>8 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term disability/disability leave</td>
<td>18 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>17 (4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37 (9.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $20,000</td>
<td>48 (14.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ $20,000</td>
<td>289 (85.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driving Status</strong></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>373 (90.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-_driver</td>
<td>40 (9.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 The total n of the category does not always match the n for the total sample due to missing data in selected instances (i.e., non-responses).

6 Percentages within each category do not always total 100% due to rounding.
Breakdown of the Sample as a Whole

The breakdown of the Sample as a Whole is provided in Figure A1-1. Of the 413 individuals who participated in the Transportation Needs Assessment, 383 completed the ATS services survey and 30 completed the ST services for PWD survey. Of the 383 completing the ATS services survey, one hundred and eighty-one (n = 181) were 45–64 years of age, with the remaining 202 participants 65 years of age and older (65+).

Because of the relevance of driving in this study, we also stratified participants on the basis of driving status (drivers vs. non-drivers). As shown in Figure A1-1, of the 181 participants aged 45–64, 175 (96.7%) indicated that they currently drove. Of the 202 participants aged 65+, all but four (98.0%) indicated that they currently drove. All 30 of the PWD participants were non-drivers.

Figure A1-1. Overview and breakdown (Sample as a Whole).
Creation and Description of the Three Sub-Samples

For data analyses purposes, three ‘sub-samples’ were created. Sample One consisted of 379 participants aged 45–64 and 65+ without a disability and who completed the ATS services survey. Sample Two consisted of 30 PWD participants who completed the ST services survey. Sample Three consisted of 40 non-drivers (6 aged 45–64, 4 aged 65+, and the 30 PWD). Ten of these 40 participants completed the ATS services survey, with the remaining 30 participants answering the ST services for PWD survey (see Figure A1-1). Importantly, for the most part, questions on the ATS services survey paralleled those on the ST services for PWD survey.

Sample One (ATS Services)

All 181 participants aged 45–64, irrespective of driving status (driver/non-driver), answered questions related to seniors’ transportation needs in terms of the seniors in their community (i.e., How important is it for seniors in your community to…). For the participants aged 65+, 198 of the 202 participants who currently drove also answered the questions related to seniors' transportation needs in terms of the seniors in their community (i.e., How important is it for seniors in your community to…). The four participants aged 65+ who did not drive answered the questions related to seniors’ transportation needs from their own perspective (i.e., How important is it to you…).

Our rationale for structuring the ATS survey in this way was based on responses to a previous survey on seniors’ transportation needs. Specifically, results from a provincial survey of 901 seniors in rural and urban Alberta in 2011 indicated that when participants 65 years of age and older were asked about how well their transportation needs were being met, 14.0% responded ‘not at all’ or ‘somewhat’ well. However, when asked how well the transportation needs of seniors in the community were being met overall, 60.9% of participants responded ‘not at all’ or ‘somewhat’ well (37). In this same provincial survey, a similar pattern of results was found when comparing drivers versus non-drivers. That is, a lower percentage of drivers (12.6%) indicated that their transportation needs were being met ‘not at all’ or ‘somewhat’ well compared to non-drivers (24.0%). When asked how well the transportation needs of seniors in the community were being met overall, a high percentage (≥ 58.0%) of both drivers and non-drivers responded ‘not at all’ or ‘somewhat’ well. Because one the goals of this Transportation Needs Assessment was to better understand the transportation needs of seniors in the community, we asked the participants aged 45–64 (drivers and non-drivers) and participants aged 65+ who drove to respond from the perspective of ‘seniors in the community’.
As noted above, the participants aged 65+ who did not drive (n = 4) responded from their own perspective. Because of the small number of these non-drivers and because they answered the questions differently (i.e., from their own perspective), we elected to remove them from Sample One, with their results included in the sample of non-drivers (Sample Three). Thus, Sample One consisted of 379 participants. The demographics and overall results for Sample One participants are presented in Section B.1 of this report.

**Sample Two (ST Services for PWD)**

Thirty individuals 18 years of age and older met our criteria for PWD and participated in the ST services survey. Specifically, 30 individuals indicated that they had a long-term or recurring disability (i.e., physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric, or learning) that limited their ability to get around outside of their home and they did not drive. The demographics and overall results for Sample Two are presented in Section B.2 of this report.

**Sample Three (Non-Drivers)**

Forty of the 413 participants (9.7%) indicated that they did not drive. Thirty of the 40 non-drivers (75.0%) were PWD. Of the remaining 10 non-drivers, six were aged 45–64 years and four were 65 years of age and older. All six of the non-drivers in the 45–64 age range answered the questions from the perspective of seniors in the community, with the remaining 34 of the 40 non-drivers answering questions from their own perspective. It is reasonable to assume that there may be differences in responses from the participants aged 45–64 who did not drive (and who answered ‘in thinking about seniors…’) as compared to participants aged 65+ and PWD participants who did not drive (and who answered from their own perspective). For this reason, we elected not to include the six participants aged 45–64 in the analyses of non-drivers, leaving a sample of 34 non-drivers. This left a small sample size of non-drivers within each of these sub-samples (i.e., 30 PWD and 4 non-drivers aged 65+). Because of these two small samples, we elected to combine the two samples, with the results for all of the non-drivers presented for Non-Drivers as a Whole in Section B.3 of this report.

**Statistical Analyses**

Data analyses were done by MARD Centre researchers. Descriptive statistics (means [averages], standard deviations, frequencies) were used to describe the samples and the ratings on different features of the transportation service under investigation. In terms of inferential statistics, we were selective in the number of overall comparisons that were done because, as the number of comparisons increase, there is an increased probability of making
what is called a ‘Type 1’ error. A Type 1 error, which also is known as a ‘false positive’, is
‘finding that there is a difference between two groups when in fact no statistically significant
difference exists’ on your measure of interest. That is, Type 1 errors lead to the rejection of the
null hypothesis that posits that there is no difference between your two groups on your measure
of interest when the null hypothesis is true. For the comparisons that were done, a Chi-square
or t-test was used, with the level of statistical significance set at $p < .05$. 
SECTION B. RESULTS

SECTION B.1: ATS Services (Sample One)

B.1.1. Demographics

A total of 379 individuals participated in the ATS services survey\(^7\). One hundred and eighty-one (47.8%) of the participants were 45–64 years of age (i.e., adult children of seniors) and 198 (52.2%) were participants 65 years of age and older. The average age of participants aged 45–64 was 56.3 (SD = 5.6; Range = 44–64 years), with 65.2% of this sample female (see Table B1-1). The average age of the 65+ participants was 73.1 (SD = 6.4; Range = 65–95 years), with 61.6% of this sample female. Almost two-thirds (65.8%) of participants aged 45–64 resided in either in a town (52.5%), village (11.6%), or hamlet (1.7%), with the remaining one-third residing on a farm (16.6%) or in Lamont County (17.7%). For participants aged 65+, almost two-thirds (64.6%) resided in a town (50.5%), village (13.1%), or hamlet (1.0%), with these percentages similar to participants aged 45–64. However, compared to participants aged 45–64, a greater percentage of participants 65+ resided on a farm (26.8%) with a lower percentage (8.6%) of 65+ participants residing in Lamont County. In terms of marital status, over three-quarters (77.2%) of participants aged 45–64 were married or living common-law, with slightly fewer (62.9%) of the 65+ participants married or living common-law. Few of the participants were separated/divorced (8.9% of participants aged 45–64 and 4.6% of participants aged 65+, respectively). Not unexpectedly, a greater percentage of participants aged 65+ were widowed (26.9%) compared to participants aged 45–64 (2.8%). A greater percentage of participants aged 45–64 were single (11.1%), compared to only 5.6% of those participants aged 65+.

There also were differences in living arrangements between the two groups, with a greater percentage of participants aged 65+ living alone (29.9%) compared to of participants aged 45–64 (17.1%). Conversely, a greater percentage of participants aged 45–64 were living with family or friends compared to participants aged 65+ (81.8% vs. 66.5%, respectively). In terms of dwelling, almost all of the participants aged 45–64 lived in a single detached or mobile home (96.1%) with fewer, but still the majority, of participants aged 65+ living in this same type of

\(^7\) Recall that 4 participants aged 65+ who were non-drivers and answered the questions differently were removed from the analyses.

\(^8\) On initial recruitment, one individual indicated that he met the age criteria (i.e., aged 45 years of age or older). At the end of the interview, individual participants were asked to provide their exact age. At this time, the individual indicated that he was 44 years of age. Given the participant’s closeness of age to our age criterion, we elected to include this participant’s data.
dwelling (89.8%). A similar percentage of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ lived in a
townhouse, semi-detached condominium, or apartment (2.2% and 2.5%, respectively). Not
unexpectedly, a greater percentage of participants aged 65+ lived in a lodge or apartment for
seniors (7.6%) versus those aged 45–64 (1.1%). Only one participant lived in an assisted living
facility and that participant was in the 45–64 age category.

There also were differences in employment status and income between the two age groups.
Few of the participants aged 45–64 were retired (20.0%) compared to the vast majority (77.9%)
of participants aged 65+. Conversely, slightly more than half (51.1%) of participants aged 45–64
were either employed full- or part-time compared to only 11.8% for those aged 65+. Few
(10.6%) participants aged 45–64 were either unemployed and looking for work, unemployed but
not looking for work, or on long-term disability, with no participants aged 65+ indicating these
choices as an employment category. Few participants from either age grouping selected
‘homemaker’ as an employment category (6.7% of participants aged 45–64 and 2.1% of
participants aged 65+). The majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that their
annual household income was greater than or equal to $20,000 (91.9% and 85.2%,
respectively) (See Table B1-1).
# Demographics of Participants Aged 45–64 and Aged 65+\(^9,10\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>45–64 Age Group (n = 181)</th>
<th>65+ Age Group (n = 198)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Age</strong></td>
<td>56.3 (SD = 5.6)</td>
<td>73.1 (SD = 6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>118 (65.2)</td>
<td>122 (61.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>63 (34.8)</td>
<td>76 (38.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>95 (52.5)</td>
<td>100 (50.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>21 (11.6)</td>
<td>26 (13.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>3 (1.7)</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>30 (16.6)</td>
<td>53 (26.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>32 (17.7)</td>
<td>17 (8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/common-law</td>
<td>139 (77.2)</td>
<td>124 (62.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/divorced</td>
<td>16 (8.9)</td>
<td>9 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>5 (2.8)</td>
<td>53 (26.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married)</td>
<td>20 (11.1)</td>
<td>11 (5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Arrangements</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live alone</td>
<td>31 (17.1)</td>
<td>59 (29.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family/friends</td>
<td>148 (81.8)</td>
<td>131 (66.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group setting (lodge/group home)</td>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
<td>7 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwelling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single detached/mobile home</td>
<td>174 (96.1)</td>
<td>177 (89.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment/townhouse/semi-detached condominium</td>
<td>4 (2.2)</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodge/apartment for seniors</td>
<td>2 (1.1)</td>
<td>15 (7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted living facility</td>
<td>1 (0.6)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>36 (20.0)</td>
<td>152 (77.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (full-time)</td>
<td>67 (37.2)</td>
<td>7 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (part-time)</td>
<td>25 (13.9)</td>
<td>16 (8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed looking for work</td>
<td>4 (2.2)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed not looking for work</td>
<td>5 (2.8)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term disability/disability leave</td>
<td>10 (5.6)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>12 (6.7)</td>
<td>4 (2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21 (11.7)</td>
<td>16 (8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $20,000</td>
<td>12 (8.1)</td>
<td>24 (12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ $20,000</td>
<td>137 (91.9)</td>
<td>138 (87.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driving Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>175 (96.7)</td>
<td>198 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-driver</td>
<td>6 (3.3)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^9\) The total n of the category does not always match the total n for each of the 45–64 and 65+ samples due to missing data in selected instances (i.e., non-responses).

\(^10\) Percentages within each category do not always total 100% due to rounding.
Physical Health and Mobility

When asked about their physical health and mobility:

- 54.1% of participants aged 45–64 and almost half (47.5%) of participants aged 65+ indicated that their physical health ‘never’ interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities (i.e., shopping, dressing, preparing meals);
- 35.9% of participants aged 45–64 and 41.4% of participants aged 65+ indicated that their physical health interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities ‘sometimes’;
- 9.9% of participants 45–64 and 11.1% of participants aged 65+ indicated that their physical health interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities ‘all the time’ (see Figure B1-1).

![Figure B1-1. Ratings on interference of physical health on ability to carry out everyday activities (45–64 and 65+).](image)

In terms of use of mobility aids, less than one-quarter (10.5%) of participants aged 45–64 used any form of mobility aid (i.e., walker, cane, wheelchair, electric scooter, and/or crutches). In contrast, more than one-quarter (27.2%) of participants aged 65+ indicated that they used some form of mobility aid, a difference that was statistically significant ($p < .000$). A cane was the most common form of mobility aid used for both participants aged 45–64 and 65+. As shown in Figure B1-2:

- Less than 10.0% of participants in either age group used a walker as a mobility aid, with 2.8% of participants aged 45–64 and 7.6% of participants aged 65+ indicating that they used this mobility aid ($p = .04$);
A greater percentage (25.8%) of participants aged 65+ indicated that they used a cane to assist with their mobility, compared to 9.4% of participants aged 45–64, a difference that was statistically significant ($p < .000$);

Few participants in either age category used a wheelchair, electric scooter, or crutches.

![Figure B1-2. Use of mobility aids (45–64 and 65+).](image)

**B.1.2. Getting Around**

Participants also were asked how they ‘get around’ in a typical week. As noted earlier, the vast majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that they currently drove (96.7% and 100%, respectively). Results indicated that:

- On average, participants aged 45–64 drove 5.1 (SD = 2.0) days per week compared to 3.9 (SD = 2.2) days per week for those aged 65+, with this difference not statistically significant ($p = < .000$).

When asked about the number of days that they relied on *family members* to ‘get to where they wanted to go’:

- Less than one-quarter of participants aged 45–64 (21.5%) and 65+ (23.2%) indicated that they relied on family members for transportation one or more times per week, a difference that was not statistically significant ($p > .05$).
Similarly, when asked about the number of days that they relied on friends to ‘get to where they wanted to go’:

- 13.8% of participants aged 45–64 and 14.1% of participants aged 65+ indicated that they relied on friends for transportation one or more times per week, with this difference not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

### B.1.3. Unmet Transportation Needs

All participants were asked how often in the last six months they were unable to go to medical appointments, shop for groceries, get together with family, or attend social functions or religious activities because they did not have a ride. As shown in Figure B1-3:

- 15.8% of participants aged 45–64 and 12.2% of participants 65+ indicated that they had ‘sometimes/often’ been unable to get to medical appointments in their community because they did not have a ride;
- 16.1% of participants of aged 45–64 and 12.1% of participants aged 65+ indicated that they had ‘sometimes/often’ been unable to get to medical appointments outside of their community because they did not have a ride;
- 13.0% of participants aged 45–64 indicated that within the last six months they had ‘sometimes/often’ been unable to shop for groceries because they did not have a ride compared to 7.7% of participants aged 65+;
- A similar percentage of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that in the last six months they had ‘sometimes/often’ been unable to get together with family because they did not have a ride (10.0% and 10.2%, respectively);
- A similar percentage of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that they had ‘sometimes/often’ been unable to attend social functions because they did not have a ride (13.8% and 12.4%, respectively);
- 14.8% of participants aged 45–64 indicated that they had ‘sometimes/often’ been unable to attend religious activities because they did not have a ride compared to 8.6% of participants aged 65+. 
B.1.4. Current Satisfaction of Transportation Needs of Seniors

Satisfaction of Transportation Needs of Seniors for Different Types of Trips

Participants also were asked how well the transportation needs of seniors in their community were being met for different types of trips (i.e., health-related appointments, essential trips such as grocery shopping and banking, visiting with family and friends, social activities, and for religious activities). As can be seen in Figure B1-4, compared to participants aged 65+, a higher percentage of participants aged 45–64 responded that the transportation needs of seniors in their community were being met ‘not at all well’ across all five trip categories (i.e., health-related, essential, visits with family/friends, social, and religious).

Specifically:

• More than one-third (38.9%) of participants aged 45–64 indicated that the health-related transportation needs of seniors in their community were being met ‘not at all well’ whereas 28.1% of participants aged 65+ rated these transportation needs as being met ‘not at all well’ ($p = .04$);

• Almost half (42.7%) of participants aged 45–64 indicated the transportation needs of seniors in their community for essential services (i.e., grocery shopping, banking) were being met ‘not at all well’ compared to 31.0% of participants aged 65+ ($p = .03$);

• Over half (51.4%) of participants aged 45–64 indicated that the transportation needs of seniors in their community for visiting with family/friends were being met ‘not at all well’
whereas less than half (39.8%) of participants aged 65+ rated these transportation needs as being met 'not at all well' ($p = .04$);

- A greater percentage of participants aged 45–64 indicated that the transportation needs of seniors in their community for social activities were being met 'not at all well' compared to participants aged 65+ (44.5% and 30.6%, respectively) ($p = .01$);

- Almost half (47.3%) of participants aged 45–64 indicated that the transportation needs of seniors in their community for religious activities were being met 'not at all well' compared to 28.7% of participants aged 65+ ($p = .001$).

![Figure B1-4. Ratings on transportation needs of seniors being met ('Not at all Well') for various appointments or activities (45–64 and 65+).](image)

**Satisfaction of Transportation Needs of Seniors Overall**

Participants also were asked how well the transportation needs of seniors in their community were being met overall. As can be seen in Figure B1-5:

- More than one-third (39.5%) of participants aged 45–64 and almost one-third (31.1%) of participants aged 65+ indicated that the transportation needs of seniors in their community were being met 'not at all well';

- 56.8% of participants aged 45–64 and 60.5% of participants aged 65+ indicated that the transportation needs of seniors were being met 'somewhat well';

- Less than 10.0% of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ (3.7% and 8.4%, respectively) indicated that the transportation needs of seniors in the community were being met ‘very well’.

---
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B.1.5. ATS Services in the Community – Availability, Importance, and Use

Participants aged 45–64 and participants aged 65+ were asked if there were ATS services in their community and whether seniors in their community used those services. ATS service was defined as modes of transportation that exist outside of public transportation programs and include both for-profit and not-for-profit transportation by a service provider (i.e., private vehicles, buses, handivans, minivans) (36). When asked if there were any ATS services provided in the participant’s community, 40.3% of participants aged 45–64 and 44.9% of participants aged 65+ responded ‘yes’. Some of the ATS services identified included community buses and/or vans for seniors, volunteer drivers, handivan services, Driving Miss Daisy, and services offered by community organizations such as the Lion’s Club and Pioneer Club.

Importance of ATS Services in the Community

When asked about the importance of having ATS services available for seniors in their community:

- Very few (2.3%) of the participants aged 45–64 and none of the participants aged 65+ rated the availability of these services as ‘not at all important’;
- Few participants aged 45–64 and 65+ rated the availability of these services as ‘somewhat important’ (13.3% and 18.9%, respectively);
• The majority of participants aged 45–64 rated the availability of these services as ‘very important’ (84.4%) with a similar percentage of participants aged 65+ rating the availability of these services as ‘very important’ (81.1%) (see Figure B1-6).

![Figure B1-6. Ratings on importance of ATS services in the community (45–64 and 65+).](image)

**Use of ATS Services**

When asked about the likelihood of use of ATS services by seniors in their community if those services were available:

• Few participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that seniors would be ‘not at all likely’ (2.3% and 1.5%, respectively) to use the services;

• 26.1% of participants aged 45–64 and 31.6% of participants 65+ indicated that seniors would be ‘somewhat likely’ to use the service;

• The majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that seniors would be ‘very likely’ to use the service (71.6% and 66.8%, respectively) (see Figure B1-7).
Times Most Likely to Use ATS Services

The final question in this section of the survey pertained to times when seniors in the community would most likely use ATS services if those services were available. As can be seen in Figure B1-8:

- A majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that the most likely time periods of use by seniors would be Weekday mornings (93.9% and 87.9%, respectively) and Weekday afternoons (87.8% and 76.3%, respectively);
- Less than one-quarter of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that seniors would most likely to use ATS services on Weekday evenings (23.2% and 17.2%, respectively);
- Fewer participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that ATS services would be used on the weekend, with Weekend mornings and afternoons identified by participants aged 45–64 and 65+ as the time periods that seniors would be most likely to use these services (56.9% and 44.9% for Weekend mornings, respectively and 59.7% and 49.0% for Weekend afternoons, respectively);
- Less than one-quarter of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that ATS services would be used Weekend evenings (23.2% and 19.2%, respectively).
B.1.6. Importance of Different Features of ATS Service Provision

In the final section of the survey, participants were asked to rate the importance of different features of ATS services for seniors if those services were available in their community. Specifically, participants were asked to provide input on booking rides, the availability of ATS services for different types of transportation needs, costs, willingness to pay for ATS services, as well as mode of payment for ATS services.

Booking Rides and Multiple Stops

In terms of thinking about seniors in their community and options for booking rides:

- The vast majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that having to book a ride at least 24 hours in advance was ‘somewhat/very reasonable’ (95.0% and 94.4%, respectively);
- The majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ (77.2% and 74.5%, respectively) also indicated that having to book a ride at least 48 hours in advance was ‘somewhat/very reasonable’;
- Less than half of participants aged 45–65 and 65+, however, indicated that having to book a ride more than 48 hours in advance was ‘somewhat/very reasonable’ (42.5% and 44.7%, respectively);
- Almost two-thirds of participants aged 45–64 (65.9%) and 65+ (63.5%) indicated that not having to book a ride in advance was ‘somewhat/very reasonable’ (see Figure B1-9).

Figure B1-8. Ratings on the times seniors would use ATS services (45–64 and 65+).
Participants also were asked about how important it was for seniors in their community to have ATS services that allow for multiple stops during the trip (i.e., stopping at the bank and then the grocery store on the way home from doctor’s office). As can be seen in Figure B1-10:

- Few participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that having this type of service was ‘not at all important’ (6.1% and 13.7%, respectively);
- The majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that having ATS services that allow for multiple stops during the trip was ‘somewhat/very important’ for seniors in the community (93.9% and 86.3%, respectively).
Knowledgeable Drivers

Participants also were asked about how important it was for seniors in their community to have drivers who were knowledgeable about health issues (i.e., disabilities, illnesses that affect mental functioning such as dementia). The vast majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ (97.8% and 96.9%, respectively) indicated that having drivers who were knowledgeable on these issues was ‘somewhat/very important’.

Importance of ATS Services for Different Types of Transportation Needs

Participants next were asked about how important it was for seniors in their community to have ATS services available for different types of transportation needs (i.e., health-related trips such as medical appointments, essential services such as grocery shopping and banking, visiting with family and friends, social activities, and for religious activities). All types of transportation needs were rated as being important, with a trend for higher ratings for health-related and essential trips. As shown in Figure B1-11:

- The vast majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that having ATS services available for seniors in the community for health-related appointments was ‘somewhat/very important’ (100% and 99.5%, respectively);
- The vast majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ also indicated that having ATS services available for trips to essential services was ‘somewhat/very important’ (98.3% and 92.9%, respectively);
• The majority of participants aged 45–64 (86.7%) and participants aged 65+ (74.7%) indicated that having ATS services available to provide rides to seniors in their community for visiting with family and friends was ‘somewhat/very important’;

• The majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that having ATS services available for seniors in the community for attending social activities was ‘somewhat/very important’ (91.2% and 84.8%, respectively);

• The majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ also indicated that having ATS services available for attending religious activities was ‘somewhat/very important’ (88.9% and 86.2%, respectively).

![Figure B1-11. Ratings on importance of ATS services for different appointments/activities (45–64 and 65+).](image)

**Paying for Services**

Participants were asked how much they thought seniors in their community could *afford* to pay and how much seniors in the community were *willing* to pay for a one-way ride of approximately 10.0 km. On average:

• Participants aged 45–64 indicated that they thought seniors could *afford* to pay $7.18 (SD = $4.82) but they would be *willing* to pay $6.88 (SD = $6.04);

• Participants aged 65+ indicated that they thought seniors could *afford* to pay $8.87 (SD = $7.03) and would be *willing* to pay $8.08 (SD = $6.79).
In terms of method of payment:

- ‘Pay per ride’ was identified as the preferred method with this option identified by participants aged 45–64 and 65+ (52.4% and 58.0%, respectively);
- ‘Purchasing a book of passes in advance’ was the second most preferred method of payment, with 25.8% of participants aged 45–64 and 26.8% of the participants aged 65+ responding in this fashion;
- The least preferred options for payment of services identified by participants aged 45–64 and 65+ consisted of ‘setting up an account with the service provider with an automatic deduction of the cost of the ride’ (19.1% and 12.6%, respectively) and ‘being invoiced for your ride’ (2.7% and 2.6%, respectively).

Finding out About Transportation Services

Participants also were asked how they would prefer to find out about transportation services in their community. In terms of preference:

- The top two preferences amongst participants aged 45–64 and 65+ were the community newspaper (54.7% and 59.6%, respectively) and by mail (i.e., Canada Post) (14.5% and 12.3%, respectively);
- Fewer participants aged 45–64 and 65+ identified health care referral (6.4% and 4.1%), family (1.9% and 2.3%), radio (1.0% and 1.8%), television (1.0% and 2.3%), senior’s centre (4.1% and 8.2%), friends (2.3% and 2.9%), or the internet (14.1% and 6.5%) as preferred sources for finding out about transportation services in their community.

B.1.7. Importance of Municipal Funding for ATS Services

All participants were asked about how important it was to have municipal funding available for ATS services in their community. The vast majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ (97.2% and 97.5%, respectively) indicated that it was ‘somewhat/very important’ to have this type of funding available to offset the cost of providing ATS services in the community. As shown in Figure B1-12:

- Few participants aged 45–64 and 65+ rated the availability of municipal funding for ATS services as ‘not at all important’ (2.8% and 2.5%, respectively);
- 27.8% of participants aged 45–64 and 37.6% of participants aged 65+ rated the availability of this type of funding as ‘somewhat important’;
69.4% of participants aged 45–64 and 59.9% of participants aged 65+ rated the availability of municipal funding for ATS services as ‘very important’, with this difference not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

Figure B1-12. Ratings on importance of municipal funding for ATS services (45–64 and 65+).
SECTION B.2: ST Services for PWD (Sample Two)

B.2.1. Demographics

Thirty individuals 18 years of age and older met our criteria for PWD. Specifically, 30 individuals indicated that they had a long-term or recurring disability (i.e., physical, mental, sensory, psychiatric, or learning) that limited their ability to get around outside of their home and they did not drive. As shown in Table B2-1, the average age of PWD participants was 64.9 years (SD = 18.4; Range 27 to 98 years), with 66.7% female. The vast majority (93.2%) of PWD participants lived in a town, village, hamlet, or on a farm (see Table B2-1 for individual percentages), with the remaining participants (6.7%) residing in Lamont County.

Overall, one-third (33.3%) of PWD participants were married or living common-law, with the remainder separated or divorced (23.3%), widowed (33.3%), or single/never married (10.0%). In terms of living arrangements, one-third (33.3%) of PWD participants indicated that they lived alone, 50.0% indicated that they lived with a family member (i.e., spouse/partner, children) or friends, and 16.7% lived in a group setting (i.e., a lodge, group home). With respect to dwelling, 73.3% lived in a single detached or mobile home, 10.0% lived in an apartment, townhouse, or semi-detached condominium, 10.0% lived in a lodge or apartment for seniors, and 6.7% lived in an assisted living facility. Slightly more than half (56.7%) of the PWD participants were retired, 3.3% were employed full-time, with 10.0% unemployed and not looking for work. Slightly more than one-quarter (26.7%) were on long-term disability. One person (3.3%) selected ‘homemaker’ as an employment category. Twenty-two of the 30 (73.3%) PWD participants responded to the question on income. For those responding, 45.5% indicated that their annual household income was less than $20,000 with the remaining participants (54.5%) indicating that their annual household income was equal to or greater than $20,000. By definition, none of the PWD participants drove.
Table B2-1. **Demographics of PWD Participants** \(^{12,13}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Sample (N = 30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Age</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.9 (SD =18.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Residence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 (73.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/common-law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Arrangements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family/friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group setting (lodge/group home)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwelling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single detached/mobile home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 (73.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment/townhouse/semi-detached condominium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodge/apartment for seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted living facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 (56.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (full-time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (part-time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed looking for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed not looking for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term disability/disability leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (26.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (45.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ $20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (54.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driving Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{12}\) The total n of the category does not always match the n for the total sample due to missing data in selected instances (i.e., non-responses).

\(^{13}\) Percentages within each category do not always total 100% due to rounding.
Physical Health and Mobility

When asked about their physical health and mobility:

- 14.3% of the PWD participants indicated that their physical health ‘never’ interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities (i.e., shopping, dressing, preparing meals);
- 35.7% indicated that their physical health interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities ‘sometimes’;
- 50.0% indicated that their physical health interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities ‘all the time’ (see Figure B2-1).

![Figure B2-1](image)

*Figure B2-1. Ratings on interference of physical health on ability to carry out everyday activities (PWD).*

In relation to use of mobility aids, 8 of the 30 PWD participants (26.7%) indicated that they did not use a mobility aid. As shown in Figure B2-2, for the 22 who indicated that they used a mobility aid:\footnote{Percentages total more than 100% in that some participants use more than one mobility aid.}

- 50.0% indicated that they used a walker;
- 36.7% indicated that they used a cane;
- 20.0% indicated that they used a wheelchair;
- 10.0% indicated that they used a scooter;
- 6.7% indicated that they used crutches.

\footnote{Percentages total more than 100% in that some participants use more than one mobility aid.}
B.2.2. Getting Around

PWD participants were asked how they ‘get around’ in a typical week. None of the PWD participants drove which meant that they were reliant on others for meeting their transportation needs. Thirty percent of the 30 PWD participants indicated that, in a typical week, they received rides from family members at least once a week and 20.0% of PWD participants indicated that they received rides from friends at least once per week to ‘get to where they wanted to go’.

B.2.3. Unmet Transportation Needs

PWD participants were asked how often in the last six months they were unable to go to medical appointments, shop for groceries (essential), get together with family, or attend social functions or religious activities because they did not have a ride. As shown in Figure B2-3:

- One-half (50.0%) of PWD participants indicated that they ‘sometimes/often’ had been unable to go to a medical appointment in their community, with 51.8% indicating that they had ‘sometimes/often’ been unable to go to a medical appointment outside their community;
- Almost half of PWD participants indicated they had ‘sometimes/often’ been unable to shop for groceries (47.8%) or get together with family (48.0%) because they did not have a ride;
More than one-half of PWD participants indicated that they ‘sometimes/often’ were unable to attend social functions (56.5%) or religious activities (47.8%) because they did not have a ride.

Figure B2-3. Ratings on inability to go to different appointments/activities because of not having a ride (PWD).

B.2.4. Current Satisfaction of Transportation Needs

Satisfaction of Transportation Needs of PWD for Different Types of Trips

PWD participants next were asked how well their transportation needs were being met for different types of trips (i.e., health-related appointments, essential services such as grocery shopping and banking, visiting with family and friends, social activities, and for religious activities). As shown in Figure B2-4:

- Almost half (46.4%) of PWD participants indicated that their health-related transportation needs were being met ‘not at all well’;
- Almost one-third (32.0%) of PWD participants indicated that their transportation needs for essential services such as grocery shopping and banking were being met ‘not at all well’;
- One-half or more of PWD participants indicated that their transportation needs for visiting with family and friends (53.8%), social activities (50.0%), and for attending religious activities (52.2%) were being met ‘not at all well’.
Satisfaction of Transportation Needs of PWD Overall

PWD participants also were asked how well the transportation needs of PWD in their community were being met overall. As shown in Figure B2-5:

- More than three-quarters (76.2%) indicated that the transportation needs for PWD overall were being met ‘not at all well’;
- An additional 14.3% responded that the transportation needs for PWD overall were being met ‘somewhat well’;
- Few (9.5%) indicated that, overall the transportation needs of PWD in their community were being ‘very well’.

*Figure B2-4.* Ratings on transportation needs of PWD being met ‘Not at all Well’ for various appointments or activities (PWD).
B.2.5. ST Services in the Community – Availability, Importance, and Use

In this section of the survey, PWD participants were asked if there were ST services in their community and whether they used those services. ST services were defined as transportation services that are designed to accommodate individuals with mobility restrictions that make it difficult or impossible to take conventional transit services, with this type of service typically equipped to accommodate persons with disabilities (38).

When asked if there were ST services for PWD provided in the participant’s community, the majority (80.0%) indicated that there were no ST services for PWD available in their community. For those responding other than 'no':

- Few (3.3%) PWD participants responded 'yes';
- 16.7% of PWD participants indicated that they ‘did not know’.

Importance of ST Services for PWD in the Community

When asked about the importance of having ST services for PWD available in the community, 100% of PWD participants indicated that it was important, with:

- 23.3% having rated it as 'somewhat important';
- 76.7% having rated it as 'very important' (see Figure B2-6).
Use of ST Services for PWD

When asked about the *likelihood use* of ST services *by PWD in the community* if those services were available in the community:

- Few (3.3%) PWD participants responded that they would be ‘not at all likely’ to use ST services if those services were available;
- 16.7% of PWD participants indicated that they would be ‘somewhat likely’ to use ST services;
- Slightly more than three-quarters (76.7%) of PWD participants indicated that they would be ‘very likely’ to use ST services (see Figure B2-7).
The final question in this section pertained to times that PWD would be most likely to use ST services if those services were available in the community. As can be seen in Figure B2-8:

- PWD participants indicated they would be most likely to use ST services during Weekday mornings (76.7%) and Weekday afternoons (60.0%);
- Fewer PWD participants indicated that they would be most likely to use ST services during the Weekday in the evening (16.7%);
- Fewer PWD participants indicated that they would most likely use ST services during Weekend mornings (33.3%), afternoons (20.0%), or evenings (16.7%).
B.2.6. Importance of Different Features of ST Service Provision

In the final section of the survey, PWD participants were asked to rate the importance of different features of ST services for PWD if those services were available in their community. Specifically, PWD participants were asked to provide input on booking rides, the availability of ST services for different types of transportation needs, costs, willingness to pay, as well as mode of payment for ST services.

Booking Rides and Multiple Stops

In terms of options for booking rides, and as can be seen in Figure B2-9:

- The majority (89.6%) of PWD participants indicated that having to book a ride at least 24 hours in advance was ‘somewhat/very reasonable’;
- The majority (82.1%) also indicated that having to book a ride at least 48 hours in advance was ‘somewhat/very reasonable’;
- Slightly more than half (51.8%) indicated that having to book a ride more than 48 hours in advance was ‘somewhat/very reasonable’;
- Close to two-thirds (65.5%) indicated that not having to book a ride in advance was ‘somewhat/very reasonable’.

Figure B2-8. Ratings on the times of use of ST services (PWD).
PWD participants also were asked about how important it was to them to have ST services that allow for multiple stops during the trip (i.e., stopping at the grocery store and then the bank on the way home from doctor's office). The majority (83.4%) of PWD participants indicated that having ST services that allowed for multiple stops was 'somewhat/very important'. As shown in Figure B2-10:

- Less than 20.0% of PWD participants indicated that having ST services that allow for multiple stops during the trips was 'not at all important';
- More than one third (36.7%) of PWD participants indicated that this type of ST service was 'somewhat important';
- Almost half (46.7%) of PWD participants indicated that this type of service was 'very important'.

*Figure B2-9.* Ratings on the reasonableness of booking rides with/without advance notice (PWD).
Figure B2-10. Ratings on the importance of ST services that allow for multiple stops (PWD).

**Knowledgeable Drivers**

PWD participants also were asked about how important it was to them to have drivers who were knowledgeable about health issues (i.e., disabilities, illnesses that affect mental functioning such as dementia). Ninety percent of PWD participants indicated that having drivers who were knowledgeable on these issues was ‘somewhat/very important’, with the majority (70.0%) rating it as ‘very important’.

**Importance of ST Services for Different Types of Transportation Needs**

PWD participants next were asked about the importance of ST services for different types of transportation needs (i.e., health-related trips such as medical appointments, essential services, visiting with family and friends, social activities, and for religious activities). As shown in Figure B2-11, all types of transportation needs were rated as being important, with:

- 93.3% of PWD participants indicated that having ST services available for health-related trips such as medical appointments was ‘somewhat/very important’;
- A high percentage (86.6%) of PWD participants also indicated that having ST services available for trips to essential services was ‘somewhat/very important’;
- 66.7% and 69.0% of PWD participants indicated that having ST services for visiting with family and friends and for social activities, respectively, was ‘somewhat/very important’;
- Finally, 60.7% of PWD participants indicated that having ST services for attending religious activities was ‘somewhat/very important’.
Paying for Services

PWD participants were asked how much they could afford to pay and how much they were willing to pay for a one-way ride of approximately 10.0 km. On average, participants indicated that:

- They could afford to pay $10.10 (SD = $7.83), but were willing to pay $13.13 (SD = $11.26).

In terms of method of payment:

- ‘Paying per ride’ was the preferred method of payment (40.7%);
- ‘Purchasing a book of passes in advance’ (25.9%) and ‘being invoiced for the ride’ (18.5%) were the second and third most preferred methods of payment;
- ‘Setting up an account with the service provider with an automatic deduction of the cost of the ride’ was the least preferred payment option (14.8%).

Finding out About Transportation Services

PWD participants also were asked how they would prefer to find out about transportation services in their community. In terms of preference, PWD participants indicated that:

- The community newspaper (40.0%) and mail (i.e., Canada Post) (24.0%) were the top two preferences;
- Health care referral (12.0%), family (8.0%), radio (4.0%), senior’s centre (4.0%), friends (4.0%), or the internet (4.0%) were identified by fewer participants as a preferred source for finding out about transportation services in their community.
B.2.7 Importance of Municipal Funding for ST Services

All PWD participants were asked about how important it was to have municipal funding available for ST services in their community:

- Few (10.3%) PWD participants indicated that having municipal funding available for ST services was 'not at all important';
- 17.2% of PWD participants rated the availability of this type of funding as 'somewhat important';
- Almost three-quarters (72.4%) of PWD participants rated the availability of this type of funding as 'very important' (see Figure B2-12).

Figure B2-12. Ratings on the importance of municipal funding for ST services (PWD).
SECTION B.3: Non-Drivers as a Whole (Sample Three)

B.3.1. Demographics

Sample Three consisted of 34 individuals who indicated that they did not drive (representing 8.2% of the Sample as a Whole). Thirty of the 34 non-drivers (88.2%) were PWD. The remaining four non-drivers (11.8%) were 65 years of age and older. As shown in Table B3-1, the average age of the 34 non-driving participants was 66.4 years (SD = 18.0; Range 27 to 98 years), with 67.6% female. Overall, the vast majority (94.0%) of non-drivers lived in a town, village, hamlet, or on a farm, with the remainder (5.9%) residing in Lamont County. Specifically, more than two-thirds (67.6%) lived in a town, 17.6% lived in a village, and 2.9% lived in hamlet. Of the remaining 11.8%, 5.9% lived on a farm and 5.9% lived in the County. One-third (32.3%) of the non-drivers were married or living common-law, with the remainder separated or divorced (23.6%), widowed (35.3%), or single/never married (8.8%). In terms of living arrangements, over one-third (35.3%) reported living alone, 50.0% indicated that they lived with family (i.e., spouse/partner, children) or friends, and 14.7% lived in a group setting (i.e., a lodge, group home). With respect to dwelling, 73.5% of the non-drivers lived in a single detached or mobile home, 8.8% lived in a townhouse, semi-detached condominium, or apartment, 8.8% lived in a lodge or apartment for seniors, and 8.8% lived in an assisted living facility. Almost two-thirds (61.8%) of the non-drivers were retired. Few (2.9%) were employed full-time, 8.8% were unemployed and not looking for work, and 23.5% were on long-term disability. One person (2.9%) selected ‘homemaker’ as an employment category. Twenty-six of the 34 (76.5%) non-driver participants responded to the question on income. For those responding, 46.2% indicated that their annual household income was less than $20,000 with the remaining participants (53.8%) indicating that their annual household income was equal to or greater than $20,000.
Table B3-1. Demographics of Non-Driver Participants $^{15,16}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N = 34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Age</strong></td>
<td>66.4 (SD = 18.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23 (67.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1 (32.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>23 (67.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>6 (17.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>1 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>2 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2 (5.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/common-law</td>
<td>11 (32.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/divorced</td>
<td>8 (23.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>12 (35.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (never married)</td>
<td>3 (8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Living Arrangements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live alone</td>
<td>12 (35.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with family/friends</td>
<td>17 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group setting (lodge/group home)</td>
<td>5 (14.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwelling</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single detached/mobile home</td>
<td>25 (73.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment/townhouse/semi-detached condominium</td>
<td>3 (8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodge/apartment for seniors</td>
<td>3 (8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted living facility</td>
<td>3 (8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>21 (61.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (full-time)</td>
<td>1 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed (part-time)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed looking for work</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed not looking for work</td>
<td>3 (8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term disability/disability leave</td>
<td>8 (23.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>1 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $20,000</td>
<td>12 (46.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ $20,000</td>
<td>14 (53.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driving Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-driver</td>
<td>34 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{15}$ The total n of the category does not always match the n for the total sample due to missing data in selected instances (i.e., non-responses).

$^{16}$ Percentages within each category do not always total 100% due to rounding.
Physical Health and Mobility

In terms of physical health and mobility:

- 18.8% of non-drivers indicated that their physical health ‘never’ interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities (i.e., shopping, dressing, preparing meals);
- 37.5% indicated that their physical health interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities ‘sometimes’;
- 43.8% indicated that their physical health interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities ‘all the time’ (see Figure B3-1).

Figure B3-1. Ratings on interference of physical health on ability to carry out everyday activities (Non-drivers).

In relation to use of mobility aids, 12 of the 34 non-drivers (35.3%) indicated that they did not use any mobility aid. As can be seen in Figure B3-2, of the 22 participants who did use a mobility aid:

- 44.1% indicated that they used a walker;
- 32.4% used a cane;
- 17.6% used a wheelchair and 8.8% used a scooter;
- 5.9% indicated that they used crutches.
In terms of results from the non-drivers on getting around, unmet transportation needs, features of service provision, etc., the probability of the pattern of results for this sample of 34 non-drivers being different from the 30 PWD participants who all were non-drivers is very low. A cursory examination of the data indicated that this was the case. What this indicates is that the data that are presented in Section B.2. of this report are representative of the sample of the 34 non-drivers being discussed in this section. As such, we have elected not to duplicate the presentation of those findings by re-presenting those data here.

*Figure B3-2. Use of mobility aids (Non-drivers).*
SECTION B.4: Intermunicipal Transit (IMT) Service

B.4.1. Demographics

All participants (n = 413) responded to questions related to the importance and use of IMT service and the importance of funding for IMT service. As such, the demographics for participants responding to IMT service questions are identical to the demographics of the Sample as a Whole presented in Table A1-1 (see page 10 of this report).

B.4.2. Importance of IMT Service in the Community

All 413 participants were asked questions about the importance of having IMT service available in their community. IMT service was defined as a transit service that operates between municipalities, or across municipal boundaries (i.e., transit service between the participant’s community to a major centre such as Edmonton) (30). Overall, 93.1% of the Sample as a Whole indicated that having IMT service available in the Capital Region was ‘somewhat/very important’. The results in Figure B4-1 are presented for Sample One (participants aged 45–64 and 65+) and Sample Two (PWD participants). In terms of ratings for Sample One and Sample Two:

- The percentage of participants who indicated that having IMT service available in the Capital Region as being ‘not at all important’ was low for both Sample One and Sample Two (6.9% and 6.9%, respectively);
- The percentage of participants who indicated that having IMT service available in the Capital Region was ‘somewhat important’ was 31.6% of participants from Sample One and 24.1% of Sample Two participants;
- Finally, the percentage of Sample One and Sample Two participants who indicated that having IMT service available in the Capital Region was ‘very important’ was 61.4% and 69.0%, respectively.
B.4.3. Likelihood of and Time Preference for Use of IMT Service

Participants also were asked about their likelihood of using IMT service if that service was in place in their community. More than half (59.2%) of the Sample as a Whole indicated that they would ‘somewhat/very likely’ use IMT service if it was available. With respect to Sample One and Sample Two and shown in Figure B4-2:

- Almost half (42.4%) of Sample One participants indicated that they would be ‘not at all likely’ to use the service, with fewer (20.0%) of the Sample Two participants responding in this fashion;
- Less than one-third of Sample One and Two participants indicated that they would be ‘somewhat’ likely to use this IMT service (29.1% and 23.3%, respectively);
- 28.5% of Sample One and 56.7% of Sample Two participants indicated that they would be ‘very likely’ to use IMT service if it was available in their community.

Figure B4-1. Ratings on importance of IMT service (Sample One and Two).
The final question in this section pertained to participants’ feedback on times when they would most likely use IMT service if that service was available in the community. Overall, participants indicated that they would mostly likely use IMT service Weekday mornings and Weekday afternoons followed by Weekend mornings and afternoons. In terms of the likelihood of use of IMT services as a function of sample:

- The majority of Sample One and Two participants indicated that they would most likely use IMT services Weekday mornings (80.7% and 83.3%, respectively) and Weekday afternoons (70.2% and 76.7%, respectively);
- Fewer participants from Sample One and Two indicated that they would mostly likely use IMT service Weekday evenings (21.7% and 16.7%, respectively);
- In terms of Weekend service, fewer participants from Sample One and Two indicated that they would most likely use IMT service Weekend mornings (44.6% and 30.0%) as compared to Weekday mornings;
- A similar percentage of participants from both Sample One and Two indicated that they would use Weekend IMT service during the afternoon as well (42.3% and 33.3%, respectively);
- However, fewer participants in both Sample One and Two indicated that they would use IMT services during the evening on Weekends (19.8% and 13.3%, respectively) (see Figure B4-3).
B.4.4. Importance of Municipal Funding for IMT Service

All participants were asked about how important it was to have municipal funding available for IMT service in their community. Overall, the vast majority of participants interviewed (95.0% of the Sample as a Whole) indicated that having municipal funding available for IMT was ‘somewhat/very important’. As shown in Figure B4-4:

- Few Sample One and Two participants indicated that it was ‘not at all important’ to have municipal funding available for IMT service (4.8% and 9.5%, respectively);
- 26.6% of Sample One participants and 4.8% of Sample Two participants indicated that having municipal funding available for IMT service was ‘somewhat important’;
- The majority of Sample One and Two participants indicated that having municipal funding available for IMT was ‘very important’ (68.6% and 85.7%, respectively).
Figure B4-4. Ratings on the importance of municipal funding for IMT service (Sample One and Two).
SECTION B.5: Validity and Generalizability of the Results

An important question is how well the responses from participants aged 45–64 and 65+ (all who drove) correspond to the responses from non-drivers aged 65+ and the non-driver PWD participants. That is, what is the ‘validity’ of the responses from the participants in our samples who drove and who answered questions on transportation needs from the perspective of seniors in their community? To assess this validity, we compared responses from the two samples of drivers (i.e., drivers aged 45–64 and 65+) to responses from the non-drivers (who answered the questions from their own perspective) in the following areas:

- How well the transportation needs of seniors are being met for the different trip purposes (i.e., health-related trips such as medical appointments, essential services, visiting with family and friends, social activities, and religious activities);
- How well the transportation needs of seniors are being met overall.

The results of these comparisons are presented in Section B.5.1 and Section B.5.2. The results for how well the transportation needs of seniors are being met for different trip purposes are presented first (Comparison One), followed by how well the transportation needs of seniors are being met overall (Comparison Two).

B.5.1. Transportation Needs of Seniors for Different Trip Purposes (Comparison One)

For Comparison One, we examined the responses from the two samples of drivers (i.e., drivers aged 45–64 and 65+) across the five types transportation needs (health-related trips such as medical appointments, essential trips such as grocery shopping and banking, visiting with family and friends, social activities, and religious activities) to responses from 65+ non-drivers (four who participated in the ATS services survey and 17 PWD who were aged 65+ in our sample). As can be seen in Figure B5-1:

- The responses from participants aged 45–64 and from the 65+ non-drivers are very similar across 4 of the 5 categories in comparison to the 65+ drivers. That is, a higher percentage of participants aged 45–64 (i.e., adult children of seniors) and 65+ non-driver participants rated the health-related transportation needs for seniors, as well as transportation for visiting with family and friends, for social activities, and for religious activities as being met ‘not at all well’ as compared to drivers aged 65+;
- The exception to the pattern of ratings described on the previous page was for transportation for seniors for essential services (i.e., shopping, banking, etc.). That is,
the ratings for this category of trips across the three groups (drivers aged 45–64 and 65+ drivers, and 65+ non-drivers) are such that a greater percentage of the 65+ drivers rated transportation for seniors for essential trips as being met ‘not at all well’ as compared to the 65+ non-driver participants. As compared to the 65+ drivers and the 65+ non-drivers, a higher percentage of the 45–64 drivers rated transportation for seniors for essential trips as being met ‘not at all well’, with this trend relatively consistent across all the five trip purposes.

Figure B5-1. Ratings on transportation needs of seniors for various appointments or activities being met ‘Not at all Well’.

A statistical comparison of the results presented in Figure B5-1 indicates that the differences in ratings between drivers aged 45–64 and non-drivers are not significant (all \( p \) values > .05), with the differences in ratings between the drivers aged 65+ and the non-drivers also not statistically significant (all \( p \) values > .05). Thus, despite the apparent differences in ratings, this indicates that the ratings from drivers aged 45–64, from drivers aged 65+, and from non-drivers on unmet transportation needs can be considered to be the same. That is, their ratings are similar estimates of the unmet transportation needs of seniors in the community. As such, based on these data, the ratings from participants aged 45–64, with many of them likely to be adult children, and from drivers 65+ can be considered as ‘proxies’ in terms of their assessment of unmet transportation needs of seniors in their community. Having said that, further research, with a larger sample size of senior non-drivers, as well as paired ratings from adult children and their parent on unmet transportation needs, would be important to see if these trends continue to hold.
B.5.2. How Well Transportation Needs of Seniors are Met (Comparison Two)

For Comparison Two, we again compared the responses from the two samples of drivers (i.e., drivers aged 45–64 and 65+) to those from the 65+ non-drivers on how well, overall, the transportation needs of seniors in the community were being met. As can be seen in Figure B5-2:

- The pattern of results across the three groups is similar, with a higher percentage of participants in all three groups indicating that the transportation needs of seniors were being met ‘somewhat/very well’;
- It also is evident that a higher percentage of the 65+ non-drivers rated the transportation needs of seniors as being met being met ‘not at all well’ as compared to the 45–64 and 65+ drivers.

An analysis indicates that the differences in ratings across the three groups are not statistically significant ($p > .05$). Thus, as with Comparison One, despite the apparent visual differences in ratings across the three groups, we can interpret these results as an indication that the ratings from drivers aged 45–64, from drivers aged 65+, and from 65+ non-drivers on unmet transportation needs of seniors overall can be considered to be the same. That is, the ratings from the three groups are similar estimates of the overall unmet transportation needs of seniors.

Figure B5-2. Overall transportation needs of seniors being met ‘Not at all Well’.
in the community. As such, ratings of unmet transportation needs of seniors in the community from participants who are aged 45–64 and from drivers aged 65+ can be considered as ‘proxies’ in terms of the assessment of the overall unmet transportation needs of seniors in their community. Again, further research, with a larger sample size of 65+ non-drivers would be important to see if this trend continues to hold.
SECTION C. DISCUSSION and CONCLUSION

SECTION C.1: Discussion

The primary objective of the study was to assess the transportation needs of two vulnerable segments of the population – seniors and persons with disabilities – in a sub-region of the Alberta Capital Region. Although limited, existing literature indicates that seniors and PWD are two segments of the population with unmet transportation needs (1-6,9,14). The results from this Transportation Needs Assessment provide further evidence of these unmet needs.

In terms of transportation mobility, the majority (90.3%; n = 373) of the participants interviewed indicated that they were currently driving, with the remaining 40 participants indicating that they did not drive. Of the 40 non-drivers, 30 self-identified as having a disability. Of interest, half of the participants aged 45–64 and 65+ who did not self-identify as having a disability and who were all active drivers indicated that their physical health interfered with their ability to carry out everyday activities such as shopping, dressing, or preparing meals ‘sometimes’ or ‘all the time’. Not surprisingly, the majority (86.0%) of PWD participants indicated that their physical health interfered ‘sometimes’ or ‘all the time’ with their ability to carry out everyday activities such as those described above. The high percentage of participants overall in this study reporting that their physical health interfered with their abilities to carry out everyday activities is a concern, particularly given that having a ‘disability’ has been identified as the most important individual characteristic influencing mobility, travel behavior, and difficulties with transportation (39).

Results from this Transportation Needs Assessment indicated that less than 25.0% of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ relied on family members to ‘get to where they want to go’. Less than 15.0% of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ relied on friends to ‘get to where they want to go’. These results are not surprising given the high percentage of drivers in these two groups. However, for PWD, reliance on others for transportation was more common with 30.0% of participants relying on family members and 20.0% relying on friends ‘to get to where they want to go’. The differences in driving status between the 45–64 and 65+ participants and the PWD participants likely accounts for this pattern of findings.

In terms of unmet transportation needs, less than 15.0% of the participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that they were unable to meet their transportation needs for medical appointments, shopping for groceries, visits with family, or for social or religious activities because they did not have a ride. Again, this is not surprising, given the combination of the high percentage of
drivers, as well as reliance on family and friends for rides. A high percentage of PWD relied on family members and friends to get to where they wanted to go. Yet, about half of PWD in our study (57.0% of whom were seniors) indicated that they ‘sometimes’ or ‘all the time’ were unable to access community services (medical, groceries, etc.) because they did not have a ride. In a landmark paper, Carp argued that well-being among older adults (and PWD) depends on the satisfaction of basic needs (i.e., food, clothing, etc.), as well as higher-order needs such as socializing, recreation, worship, and maintaining feelings of usefulness (14). Success in satisfaction of these basic and higher order needs ultimately enables independent living, which in turn, positively influences well-being. The results presented here indicate that a significant percentage of PWD participants, and to a lesser extent, participants aged 45–64 and 65+ who drive are at-risk in terms of satisfaction of both basic and higher order needs.

One of the main objectives of this Transportation Needs Assessment was to better understand the unmet transportation needs of seniors and PWD. As such, participants aged 45–64 and 65+, were asked how well the transportation needs of seniors in their community were being met overall. The pattern of results is informative in that less than 10.0% of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that the transportation needs of seniors in the community were being met ‘very well’ overall. A similar pattern of results was evident for PWD, with only 9.5% of PWD participants indicating that the transportation needs of PWD in the community were being met ‘very well’. Of interest, when asked about the availability of specialized transportation (i.e., ATS services or ST services for PWD), 41.4% of participants 45–64; 41.9% of participants 65+; and 90.0% of PWD participants indicated that there were no services. Services that were identified included a senior’s van or bus, a community van, volunteer driver, taxi, or transportation from for-profit organizations. Given the pattern of findings described above, it is not surprising that the majority of participants surveyed rated the availability of ATS services and ST services for PWD as important. Specifically, 81.0% or more of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ rated having ATS services for seniors available in the community as ‘very important’, with the remaining 19.0% rating them as ‘somewhat important’. Similarly, 76.7% of PWD participants rated the availability of ST services for PWD in the community as ‘very important’, with the remaining 23.3% rating these services as ‘somewhat important'. What these results suggest is that there not only is awareness of the lack of transportation services outside of the private vehicle for seniors and PWD in these rural communities, but there also is recognition of the unmet transportation needs of these two segments of the population.
It also is interesting to note that the majority of participants indicated that, if specialized transportation services were available in the community, seniors and PWD would use those services. That is, the majority (98.2%) of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ indicated that if ATS services were available in the community, that seniors would be ‘somewhat/very likely’ to use those services. Eighty percent of PWD participants indicated that they would be ‘somewhat/very likely’ to use ST services.

As identified above, a primary objective of this *Transportation Needs Assessment* was to further our understanding of the transportation needs of seniors and PWD in a sub-region of the Capital Region. Another primary objective was to obtain feedback on features of specialized transportation service delivery if those services were to be made available for seniors and PWD in the sub-region. Specifically, participants were asked about the time that services would most likely to be used, the type of transportation the service would be used for, preferences for booking and paying for the service, and the importance of other features of service delivery such as multiple stops and knowledgeable drivers. Notably, many of the features described above fall within the 5 A’s of Senior Friendly Transportation (Availability, Acceptability, Accessibility, Adaptability, and Affordability) (40). That is, to be considered as ‘senior friendly’, service must be available when needed (i.e., days, evenings; weekdays, weekends), be acceptable (i.e., scheduling times acceptable, drivers knowledgeable on senior’s issues), be accessible (i.e., provide rides to essential and non-essential services), accommodate the needs of seniors in the community), be adaptable (i.e., accommodate multiple stops), and be affordable (i.e., options for payment methods; fares that are acceptable to seniors). A similar conceptualization of supplemental transportation programs for seniors and PWD has been developed by the Beverly Foundation in 2001 based on these same 5 A’s (41).

Results from this *Transportation Needs Assessment* related to each of the 5 A’s are discussed below. In terms of *Availability*, the majority of participants indicated that ‘Weekday’ mornings and ‘Weekday’ afternoons were the times that seniors and PWD would be most likely to use the identified transportation services (i.e., ATS services and ST services for PWD) if those services were available in the communities. With respect to *Acceptability*, the vast majority of participants aged 45–64, 65+, and PWD (76.0% and 82.1%, respectively) indicated that having to book rides at least 48 hours or less in advance was more reasonable, with having to book more than 48 hours in advance less reasonable. When asked about the importance of having drivers who are knowledgeable about health issues (i.e., disabilities, illnesses that affect mental health functioning such as dementia), the vast majority (97.4%) of participants aged 45–64 and 65+
indicated that having drivers who were knowledgeable on these issues were ‘somewhat/very important’. This pattern of ratings is consistent with the ratings from PWD in that 90.0% indicated that having drivers who were knowledgeable on these issues was ‘somewhat/very important’. These results are useful to organizations and/or service providers who are wishing to deliver or who are delivering transportation services to these two segments of the population. Specifically, the results underscore the need for the implementation of a training program for volunteer and paid drivers in order to better meet the needs of these two segments population.

Participants also were asked about the importance of multiple stops (Adaptability) during the trip (i.e., stopping at the grocery store and bank on the way home from doctor’s office). This feature of service provision was rated as ‘somewhat/very important’ by the majority (90.1%) of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ with 83.4% of PWD participants rating this feature as ‘somewhat/very important’ for ST services for PWD.

When asked about paying for transportation services (Affordability), few participants indicated that that service should be ‘free’. Rather, most participants thought that seniors could afford and would be willing to pay for the services. On average, participants aged 45–64 thought that the amount that seniors could afford to pay was more than they would be willing to pay ($7.18 vs. $6.88). A similar pattern of findings was evident for participants aged 65+ in that they thought seniors could afford to pay $8.87 but would be willing to pay $8.08. On the other hand, PWD participants indicated that they could afford to pay $10.10 but they would be willing to pay $13.13. These findings have important implications for the design and delivery of transportation services for seniors in that, often, the prevailing belief is that these transportation services should be available at no charge. Results from this Transportation Needs Assessment are consistent with the results from our previous provincial Transportation Needs Assessment (37) indicating that, in general, there is support for charging a modest price for the services. Importantly, having users pay at least some of the cost of these transportation services facilitates both the availability and sustainability of transportation services for seniors and PWD in the community. When asked about method of payment, the preferred method of payment identified by participants aged 45–64, 65+, and PWD was ‘pay per ride’. The second most preferred method of payment identified by participants aged 45–64 and 65+ and PWD was ‘purchasing a book of passes in advance’.

All participants were asked about the importance of having municipal funding available for ATS services or ST services in their community. The vast majority of participants aged 45–64 and
65+ (97.4%) indicated that it was ‘somewhat/very important’ to have this type of funding available to offset the cost of providing ATS services in the community. The vast majority (89.6%) of PWD also indicated that having municipal funding available for ST services in their community was ‘somewhat/very important’ in offsetting the cost of ST services. These results, as well as the results on the ability and willingness to pay for rides, are informative in that options for implementation or expansion of rural transportation services for seniors and PWD often include user-pay programs, through funding from local or provincial governments, or a combination of the two. With respect to funding for IMT services, overall, 95.0% of participants rated the availability of municipal funding for this service as ‘somewhat/very important’.

One feature of specialized transportation services that is not identified in the 5 A’s of Senior Friendly Transportation or Supplemental Transportation (40,41) is awareness of the services in the community. When asked about the availability of ATS services or ST services in the community, 20.0% of participants indicated that they ‘didn’t know’. When asked about ‘finding out about services’, the top two preferences amongst participants aged 45–64, 65+, and PWD were the community newspaper (54.7%, 59.6%, and 40.0%, respectively) and by mail (i.e., Canada Post) (14.5%, 12.3%, and 24.0%, respectively). These results are informative in that despite the ubiquitous use of the technology (i.e., internet, cell phones), conventional forms of communication were identified as the preferred source for finding out about transportation services in the community.

A limitation of this Transportation Needs Assessment is the small sample of seniors who do not drive as well as the small sample of PWD. The small sample of seniors who did not drive is important from three perspectives. First, the under-representation of the sample of non-drivers may mean that the findings presented herein are an under-representation of the transportation needs in this segment of the population. A larger sample size of non-driving seniors and PWD is needed to determine if the pattern of results from larger samples of these populations is consistent with the results presented. Second, many of the results presented in this report are based on responses from drivers aged 45–64 and drivers aged 65+. As such, it is reasonable to wonder about the ‘validity’ of the responses from these two segments of the population in relation to the unmet transportation needs of seniors who do not drive. To assess this validity, we compared responses from drivers aged 45–64 and 65+ to those of non-drivers aged 65+ on how well the transportation needs of seniors were being met for the different trip purposes and how well the transportation needs of seniors were being met overall. Despite the apparent visual differences in ratings (i.e., differences in percentages for participants 45–64 and 65+ who were
drivers vs. the 65+ non-drivers), these differences were not statistically significant. These results suggest that responses from participants who are aged 45–64, with many of them likely to be adult children, and drivers 65+ can be considered as relatively good ‘proxies’ of the unmet transportation needs of seniors in their community. Having said that, further research combined with a larger sample size of 65+ non-drivers would be important to see if these trends continue to hold. Future research on the congruency of ratings between adult children and their parent(s) on unmet transportation needs would also be informative. Third, the difficulty in recruiting 65+ non-drivers indicates that additional methodologies such as community-based recruitment are needed. In addition, an expansion of the population base to include the remaining regions in the Capital Region would likely yield a higher number of older non-drivers, which in turn would lead to more reliable results. The limitation of a small sample and relevance of this limitation as described above also applies to the sample of PWD. Again, expansion of the population base and the addition of community-based recruitment strategies would assist in addressing this limitation.

SECTION C.2: Conclusion

Canada’s population is aging, as is the population of the Capital Region. The percentage of PWD also is increasing. These changes bring with them challenges to local government and service providers. In general, older seniors wish to ‘age in place’. Yet, increasingly, due to the regionalization of many services, residents in rural communities are required to travel to urban centres. However, for those who do not drive, access to those services is hampered by the lack of alternate forms of transportation. The same holds true for PWD. Transportation services that are age- and disability-friendly are critical for the health and well-being of these two growing segments of the population. This means that knowledge about the adequacy of current transportation services, and, if inadequate, knowledge about the perceived transportation needs is requisite to meeting the mobility needs of these vulnerable populations.

The current study provides an important step toward understanding the adequacy and needs of relevant transportation services for seniors and PWD. The research focused exclusively on rural populations, where the challenges may the greatest and empirical evidence is least available. In this initial research, three groups were administered questionnaires about transportation needs of seniors and PWD. The large majority of participants aged 45–64 and 65+ (without disabilities) responded that they perceived the transportation needs of seniors were not being met. Those 45–64 and those 65+ also responded that it was important to meet those needs with additional
services, and if those services were available, they would be used. The findings from this Transportation Needs Assessment also provide insights on features of service delivery that are deemed to be responsive to seniors and PWD. Expansion of the Transportation Needs Assessment throughout the Capital Region would address the major limitations associated with the current needs assessment. Results of an expanded Transportation Needs Assessment could be used to inform on policy and planning initiatives related to transportation needs of seniors who voluntarily or involuntarily stop driving and to PWD of any age in a rural setting.
## APPENDICES

### Appendix A. Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATS</td>
<td>Alternate transportation for seniors’ service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATI</td>
<td>Computer Assisted Telephone Interview system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB</td>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOIPP</td>
<td>Freedom of information and protection of privacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMT</td>
<td>Intermunicipal Transit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARD</td>
<td>Medically At-Risk Driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$p$ Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRL</td>
<td>Population Research Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDD</td>
<td>Random digit dialing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Specialized transit service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. Place of Residence for the Sample as a Whole

Table AB-1. *Place of Residence for the Sample as a Whole* \(^{17}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Total Sample (N = 413)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>218 (52.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>53 (12.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>6 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>85 (12.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>51 (20.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality (^{17})</th>
<th>Total Sample (N = 413)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>51 (12.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>38 (9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundare</td>
<td>45 (10.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Lamont</td>
<td>75 (18.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>32 (7.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipman</td>
<td>21 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilliard</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>1 (0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael</td>
<td>4 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>85 (20.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Redwater</td>
<td>60 (14.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{17}\) Percentages within each category may not total 100% due to rounding.
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Growth Plan Update 2.0 - Vision and Principles

Recommended Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the Growth Plan Update Vision and Principles as recommended by the Growth Plan Update Task Force.

Background

- On November 14, 2013, the Capital Region Board approved the creation of a Task Force to oversee the 5 year update of the Capital Region Growth Plan.
- On September 11, 2014, the Board endorsed the Growth Plan Review and Policy Analysis Report and directed the Task Force to use it “as the basis for moving forward with the Growth Plan update”.
- On March 19, 2015, the Task Force passed a motion to endorse the Growth Plan Update Vision and Principles that represent the completion of Stage one of the Update - Regional Vision.
- On May 14, 2015, the Task Force unanimously approved the draft Vision and Principles for approval by the Board.

Rationale

- The development of a 50 year Vision and Principles was a key recommendation in the Growth Plan Review and Policy Analysis Report. The report was endorsed by the Board on September 11, 2014, as the basis for moving forward with the Growth Plan Update. The report cited the importance of establishing a long range vision to guiding decisions about growth and would address a key gap in the existing Plan.
- The Vision and Principles were developed through extensive consultation with the Growth Plan Task Force, Board and Board Alternates, CAOs and representatives from all Committees of the Board over several months. Each round of consultation resulted in enhancements to the final Vision and Principles.
- The Task Force has committed to bringing the key deliverables from each Stage of the Project (milestones) to the Board for its approval as part of the process to update the Growth Plan. These key deliverables will be incorporated into the final plan, once approved.

Attachment:
1. Growth Plan Update 2.0 - Vision and Principles
Capital Region Vision (50 Year)

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region is the dominant hub for northern Alberta and is globally recognized for its economic diversity, entrepreneurialism, leadership in energy development, environmental stewardship and excellent quality of life.

The Region is anchored by a thriving core that is interconnected with diverse urban and rural communities.

The Region is committed to growing collaboratively through the efficient use of infrastructure, building compact communities and fostering economic opportunities and healthy lifestyles.

Principles

1. **Collaborate and coordinate as a Region to manage growth responsibly.**
   We will work together to ensure the Region is well managed and financially sustainable with a shared commitment to growing responsibly and achieving long-term prosperity.

2. **Promote economic competitiveness and regional prosperity.**
   We will foster a diverse and innovative economy that builds upon our existing infrastructure and employment areas to achieve sustained economic growth and prosperity.

3. **Achieve compact growth that optimizes infrastructure investment.**
   We will make the most efficient use of our infrastructure investments by prioritizing growth where infrastructure exists and optimizing use of new and planned infrastructure.
4. **Ensure effective regional mobility.**
   Recognizing the link between efficient movement of people and goods and regional prosperity, we will work towards a multi-modal and integrated regional transportation system.

5. **Recognize and celebrate the diversity of communities and promote an excellent quality of life across the Region.**
   In planning for growth, we will recognize and respond to the different contexts and scales of communities and provide a variety of housing choice with easy access to transportation, employment, parks and open spaces, and community and cultural amenities.

6. **Ensure the wise management of prime agricultural resources.**
   In the context of metropolitan growth, we will ensure the wise management of agricultural resources to continue a thriving agricultural sector.

7. **Protect natural heritage systems and environmental assets.**
   We will practice wise environmental stewardship and promote the health of the regional ecosystem, watersheds and environmentally sensitive areas.
Growth Plan Update 2.0 – Work plan Extension Request

Recommended Motion:

That the Capital Region Board approves the Growth Plan Update 2.0 work plan extension request as recommended by the Task Force and authorizes the Board Chair to write a letter to the Province seeking approval of a 10 month extension, to October 2016, to submit an updated Growth Plan for the Capital Region.

Background

- At the November 28, 2014 Growth Plan Update Task Force Meeting, the Task Force approved a project work plan and meeting schedule for the 2015 Growth Plan Update, to be completed by December 2015. The work plan and meeting schedule was presented at the March 12, 2015 Board meeting. Given the substantive nature of the update, several Board members expressed concerns about the work plan and about the ability of the project to be completed within the time frame proposed. The concerns were noted by the Task Force Chair and Board Chair.
- Over the next several months, various stakeholders raised concerns about the work plan and the lack of time to review materials before meetings, consultations, and workshops. Further, there was an identified need for a broader level of engagement with member municipalities that was putting pressure on the project schedule.
- The Task Force discussed the concerns with the work plan and schedule on April 9, 2015. There was unanimous agreement that the quality of the Growth Plan Update was more important than rushing the project to meet the December 2015 deadline. The Task Force directed CRB Administration to prepare a revised work plan that would allow more time for broader engagement and to review information and project deliverables by the Task Force and stakeholders in advance of meetings.
- CRB Administration presented the revised work plan and schedule at the May 14, 2015 Growth Plan Update Task Force meeting. The revised work plan adds an additional 10 months to the existing schedule, extending the deadline to October 2016. The Task Force unanimously approved the following motion:

  \textbf{Motion:} That the Growth Plan Update Task Force approve the revised project schedule as presented, subject to provincial approval.

Rationale

- The Task Force believes the input and feedback from stakeholders is an essential part of the overall process of updating the 2010 Growth Plan and will result in a better final product.
- The work plan extension, is a direct response to feedback from key stakeholders in the process and includes:
  - Additional engagements with the member CAOs
  - More time for review and consideration by municipal Councils and Board members
Growth Plan Update Task Force
recommendation to the Capital Region Board

- Additional Task Force Meetings
- Additional Regional Roadshows

- Decompressing the work plan and schedule also provides more time to take into consideration outcomes of the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan, the MGA review, the big city charters, and any changes to municipal boundaries as a result of ongoing annexation bids.
- There is no change to the project deliverables with the work plan extension.
- The estimated budget impact is $375,000 in 2016/2017 will be asked as part of the CRB’s budget process.

Attachment:

1. Growth Plan Update 2.0 - Revised Work Plan and Meeting Schedule as of May 14, 2015
## Growth Plan Update: Phase 2 and 3

### Revised Master Meeting Schedule as of 14 May 2015 (as approved By Task Force)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Location / Time</th>
<th>Focus (subject to change)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 11 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOARD</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Approval of Vision and Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11 2015</td>
<td>New Meeting Date</td>
<td>Consultation with City Mayors and CAO’s</td>
<td>12:00- 2:00PM Chateau Louis Conference Center- Leland Room</td>
<td>GUP Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 26 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Task Force Workshop#1</td>
<td>8:00AM-5:00PM Holiday Inn Sherwood Park – Conference Centre 2100 Premier Way, Sh. Pk.</td>
<td>Explore Regional Issues; Growth Plan Models and Planning Approach and Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOARD</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Project Update- R. Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 7 2015</td>
<td>New Meeting Date</td>
<td>CAO Workshop</td>
<td>8:30AM – 2:30PM Chateau Louis Conference Center- Leland Room</td>
<td>Present and Discuss Policy Approach and Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOARD</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Project Update – M. Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 27 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>Task Force Meeting</td>
<td>9:00AM-3:00PM La Cite Francophone – Jean –Louis Dentinger</td>
<td>Present and Discuss Policy Approach and Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 10 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOARD</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Approval of Stage 2 Deliverables –Policy Approach for Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 11 2015</td>
<td>External Stakeholder Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td>9:00AM- 12:00 Noon Chateau Louis Conference Center- Leland Room</td>
<td>Policy Approach and Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2 2015</td>
<td>Task Force Workshop #2 with Strategic Advisors</td>
<td></td>
<td>8:00AM- 5:00PM TENTATIVE: Holiday Inn Sherwood Park – Conference Centre 2100 Premier Way, Sh. Pk</td>
<td>Workshop on Policy Framework, Indicators, and Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOARD</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Project Update – M. Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 6 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>8:30AM -2:30 PM La Cite Francophone – Jean –Louis Dentinger</td>
<td>Present Final Policy Framework and Draft Implementation approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 12 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td>BOARD</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Project Update – M. Carr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Growth Plan Update: Phase 2 and 3

**Revised Master Meeting Schedule as of 14 May 2015 (as approved By Task Force)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>New Meeting Date</th>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Event Details</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 27 2015</td>
<td>New Meeting Date</td>
<td>Task Force Meeting</td>
<td>9:00AM- 3:00PM La Cite Francophone – Jean –Louis Dentinger</td>
<td>Present Final Policy Framework and Draft Implementation Approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 10 2015</td>
<td>BOARD Meeting (Milestone)</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Approval of Stage 3 Deliverable – Policy Framework and present Draft Implementation Approaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 11 2016</td>
<td>Task Force Workshop #3 (and to include Chairs of all CRB Committees)</td>
<td>8:00AM- 5:00PM Location TBD</td>
<td>Workshop on Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 22- March 1</td>
<td>CRB Admin</td>
<td>8:30AM-2:30PM Location TBD</td>
<td>Review of the Draft Plan 1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31</td>
<td>CAO Workshop</td>
<td>9:00AM-3:00PM Location TBD</td>
<td>Present Draft Plan 1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13 2016</td>
<td>Task Force Meeting</td>
<td>9:00AM-3:00PM Location TBD</td>
<td>Present Draft Plan 1.2 Includes Implementation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 14 2016</td>
<td>BOARD</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Project Update – M. Carr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15 2016</td>
<td>External Stakeholder Consultation</td>
<td>9:00AM- 12:00 Noon Location TBD</td>
<td>Present Draft Plan 1.2 Includes Implementation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12 2016</td>
<td>BOARD</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Project Update – M. Carr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 9 2016</td>
<td>BOARD</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Project Update – M. Carr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 15 2016</td>
<td>CAO Workshop</td>
<td>8:30AM-2:30PM Location TBD</td>
<td>Present Growth Plan Draft 2.1 for Q&amp;A and input (Includes Implementation Plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 29 2016</td>
<td>Task Force Meeting</td>
<td>9:00AM-3:00PM Location TBD</td>
<td>Present Draft 2.1 for feedback (Includes Implementation Plan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post June 29- July 26</td>
<td>Regional Presentations 4 weeks</td>
<td>Same Format as Spring Road shows - Regional Presentations to Councils and Administrations</td>
<td>Present Draft Plan 2.1 (Includes TF edits)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 14 2016</td>
<td>BOARD (Milestone)</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Notice of Motion: To Approve Plan Version 2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 11 2015</td>
<td>BOARD</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Project Update – M. Carr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 18 2016</td>
<td>Task Force</td>
<td>9:00AM-3:00PM Location TBD</td>
<td>Review and recommend Approval of Draft 3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared By Sharon Shuya
Manager, Regional Projects
Last updated 29 May 2015
# Growth Plan Update: Phase 2 and 3

**Revised Master Meeting Schedule as of 14 May 2015 (as approved By Task Force)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug 25 2016</td>
<td>CRB Admin to send out prior to Board Package</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Plan (draft 3.0) sent to the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept 8 2016</td>
<td>BOARD (Milestone)</td>
<td>Chateau Louis Conference Center</td>
<td>Motion to Approve: Final Plan (Draft 3.0) (includes track changes version)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1 2016</td>
<td>CRB Submits to Province</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revised Work Plan

May 14, 2015 Task Force Meeting
Growth Plan Update 2.0 - Engagement Strategy

- At the November 28, 2014 Growth Plan Update Task Force meeting the draft Communications Plan for the Growth Plan Update was approved. The communication plan identified a framework for the project engagement activities which included a series of workshops and consultation with Board and Committees of the Board, CAOs and External Stakeholders. The CRB website is also an important channel to receive input from the public.

- In addition to the project engagement activities identified in the initial project work plan and communications plan, the Task Force sponsored five regional public engagement sessions (Road shows) and hosted separate consultations with the Towns and Villages on March 19, 2015, and the Counties on April 27, 2015. The Cities are scheduled for a consultation session on June 11, 2015.

- The purpose of the consultations is to provide information on the Growth Plan Update to regional stakeholders and solicit input on specific aspects of the project work under development.

- Over the past several months the identified stakeholders have been involved in several workshops and consultations providing valuable input and feedback to inform both the process to update the 2010 Growth Plan but also the content to be included in the updated Growth Plan.

- In addition to the face-to-face meetings, the Task Force has also received written correspondence from municipalities seeking additional clarification on specific components of the project.

- The ongoing outreach for Growth Plan Update 2.0 will continue until an updated Growth Plan is approved by the Board. The Task Force has identified the need to clarify how the input received will be considered in the preparation of the Update to ensure a consistent, open and fair process is in place.

- On May 14, 2015, the Task Force reviewed and approved the draft Engagement Strategy, which provides specific direction on how the Task Force will deal with input received from the different engagements or correspondence received throughout the process of updating the 2010 Growth Plan.

- The Task Force has also incorporated a review of all correspondence as part of its meeting Agenda.

- The Growth Plan Update Engagement Strategy is being provided to the Board, for information.

Attachments:
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Growth Plan Update 2.0 – Engagement Strategy

- Decompressed Schedule allows for more engagements with key stakeholders – CAOs, Board, Committees of the Board and external Stakeholders.
- Each engagement with a Stakeholder throughout the process is an opportunity for feedback and input for Task Force’s consideration.
- A consultation with a Stakeholder is not taken as ‘direction’, unless it comes through a Motion by the Board to the Task Force.
- The Task Force must ultimately decide what to do with the feedback received from any engagement and is responsible to decide how to deal with the information.
- The Task Force may request input in writing.
- All input and questions received in writing will receive a written response (where required).
- Task Force members are encouraged to attend as many of the scheduled Stakeholder engagements as possible.
- The Task Force is responsible to make recommendations to the Board.
- The Board may Approve or Reject a recommendation.
Growth Plan Update 2.0 – Comprehensive Update

- March 2010 - The Capital Region Growth Plan was approved by the Province. The Plan included a commitment to ‘evergreen’ the Plan by “conducting a full review of all aspects of the Growth Plan at least every five years as part of its ongoing business planning process”.

- A Project Charter for the Growth Plan Update was prepared and received by the Board on July 11, 2013. The Project Charter, prepared after extensive consultation and assistance of the CAOs in the region, identified the gaps in the Plan, aspirations for the Update, and included a high level process and engagement plan.

- On September 11, 2014 the Capital Region Board received a presentation on the findings and recommendations for the first project in the process of updating the Plan. Project 1A provided an objective assessment of the current Growth Plan, taking into consideration the aspirations of the region and best practices for Regional Planning.

- This outcome of Project 1A was to provide clear direction for an approach to updating the current plan that would address identified gaps and issues and be consistent with the Board’s mandate and Regulation.

- Project 1A Plan Review and Policy Evaluation involved a comprehensive review of the current Growth Plan by experienced regional planning experts, and extensive consultation with the 24 municipalities who have been working with the plan for the past five years.

- The results of the analysis are contained in the August 22, 2014, draft *Final Report - Growth Plan Review: Findings and Recommendations Report*. The report included 15 recommendations. (see Attachment 1)
  - Based on the experience of the consultants the Board was strongly encouraged to consider “The Plan Update process is an important opportunity to substantively update the Plan to address key policy gaps, improve the structure and organization of the Plan, provide a greater level of substance and level of detail, set more progressive targets and respond to the complexities and diversity of communities within the Capital Region”

- Throughout the report the Consultants emphasized that in their professional opinions the Board needs to think of this update as being a comprehensive work effort to address notable policy gaps. (see Attachment 2)

- September 11, 2014, the Board approved the following motion:
  - “That the Capital Region Board receive the draft final report for the Plan Review and Policy Evaluation (Project 1A) and endorse it as the basis for undertaking the Growth Plan Update.”
• The scope of the Growth Plan Update has been an ongoing debate among Board members. Is the Update a ‘tweak’ or a “comprehensive update”?

• On May 14, 2015, the Task Force reviewed the findings and recommendations from Project 1A, and discussed the identified policy gaps identified by the consultants. (see Attachment 2)

• The consensus of the Task Force was that the Growth Plan Update 2.0 would involve a comprehensive update of the 2010 Capital Region Growth Plan and was not a ‘tweak’ given the list of policy gaps critical to the future sustainability of the region. The following motion was unanimously approved.

  o “That the Growth Plan Update Task Force agrees that the Growth Plan Update will involve a comprehensive update of the 2010 Plan to address policy gaps and implementation gaps.”

• A comprehensive update means:
  o Developing a 50 Year Vision and Principles
  o Identifying a planning approach to manage growth
  o Reviewing and align current policies with principles and planning approach
  o Addressing policy gaps
  o Developing an Implementation Plan to include monitoring and reporting
  o Reviewing and aligning the Growth Plan with Provincial Plans, Policies and Priorities.
  o Preparing a transition plan from 2010 Plan to 2016 Plan
  o Identifying Legislative and Regulatory changes to support implementation
  o Preparing an updated and integrated growth plan document for Board Approval
  o Establishing a Parking Lot for future work.

• The Growth Plan Update Project continues with the current work plan being proposed to be extended to September 2016, to allow for a greater level of engagement with the key stakeholders, subject to approval by the Province.

• The additional budget required for the additional stakeholder consultations requested is being addressed by CRB Administration as part of the 2016 Business Plan and Budget.

• The final product - one integrated Growth Plan for the Capital Region including an Implementation plan that recognizes the diversity of municipalities in the region - remains unchanged.

• This briefing note from the Growth Plan Update Task Force is provided to the Board for information.

Attachments

2. Summary from May 14, 2015 Task Force meeting
Growth Plan Review:
Findings and Recommendations Report
August 22, 2014

Prepared for the Capital Region Board
by ISL Engineering Land Services and Urban Strategies Inc.

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

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

Why regional growth management is important in the Capital Region

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

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

What is needed to manage growth

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

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

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

Why the Plan needs to be updated

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

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

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

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

**What the Growth Plan Update should consider**

**Key Findings**

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

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

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

WHY we need a Growth Plan

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

HOW we create the Growth Plan

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

WHAT should be addressed in the Growth Plan

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

WHAT the Growth Plan should look like

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

HOW to manage growth over time

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

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

The Growth Plan Update is also an opportunity to create a Plan authored by, and structured to meet the needs of the Capital Region. As a future region of over two million people and one million jobs, a Plan that pro-actively manages growth, coordinates infrastructure investment and enhances the economic competitiveness of the whole region will be key to the success and sustainability of the Capital Region.
What We Heard in Project 1A

Municipal leaders identified problems within the existing Growth Plan

- Plan does not recognize different communities in the Region
- Plan does not position the Region within Alberta, Canada and Internationally
- Considered a “compromise Plan” that was a response to diverse interests and personalities
- “We need to get this right this time”
- For there to be continued buy-in we need to find common ground
- Complexity and volume of family of GP documents
- Lack of clarity of CRB’s role in Region
- PGAs - Lack of planning direction, strategy and process
- Density Targets – could be raised higher in some places, clarity on how they are applied, expanded to include non-residential targets
- CCRAs – need for clarity on boundary definition, lack of clarity on policy and targets
- Growth Outside PGAs – Plan provides no direction

May 14, 2015 Task Force Meeting
The Region’s Key Challenges Moving Forward

Need to Enhance Global Economic Competiveness

Lack of Housing Diversity

Pressure on Agricultural Lands & Sector

Congestion & Lack of Mobility Options

Cost of Growth & Infrastructure
The Growth Plan Update needs to address key policy gaps in the 2010 Plan.
Growth Plan Update 2.0 – Summaries of Consultations with Towns & Villages and Counties

Board Members, attached are the summaries of the consultations received by the Growth Plan Task Force on May 14, 2015, for your information.

- Towns & Villages – April 9, 2015
- Counties – April 27, 2015
- Cities – scheduled for June 11, 2015
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Growth Plan Update 2.0 – Consultations Summary  

Towns and Village Consultation April 9, 2015  
Attendees: Bon Accord, Lamont, Morinville, Thorsby, Bruderheim, Warburg, Calmar, Beaumont, Gibbons, Redwater, Stony Plain,  
Regrets: Wabamun, Legal, Devon  

Major Themes  
- Need to understand who has the capacity for growth today?  
- What are the limitations to grow for a smaller municipality?  
- What is too much growth for a small municipality?  
- Ag Land Policy needs to recognize not all Ag Land is equal  
- How will the Growth Plan be used/implemented?  
- Want to retain some flexibility as a smaller urban  
- Need to support sustainability of smaller municipalities  
- Support for Tiered approach to Policies  
- How do smaller communities compete with the larger urbans?  
- Aging Infrastructure – more money is needed  
- Some interest in Revenue Sharing – suggests it’s time to have the conversation  
- Smaller municipalities need transportation to grow  

Counties Consultation- April 27, 2015  
Attendees: Sturgeon, Parkland, Leduc, Lamont and Strathcona  

Major Themes  
- Time to address Ag Land Policies. Need to define areas, understand mechanisms and means available to preserve agricultural land
• Sub Regional Planning model should be considered, as well as other models
• Higher Densities need to be applied to both urban and rural lands including CCRAs. If densities go higher than the established targets then onus on municipality to show what infrastructure there to support higher density
• Employment Targets – need to address. Comment that a lot of municipalities have surpassed targets
• Sustainability of the Rural Areas – must be allowed to grow
• Need to respect existing plans as these included investment in infrastructure
• Agricultural Land Studies/Plans underway. Most rural municipalities have Ag Policies in their MDPs – these should be considered.
• Recreation Lands viewed by some as a trade-off to providing Social Services in Metro Core
• Tight timelines for Plan update – need to get it right!
• Greenbelt as a form of urban containment boundary?
• Urban Shadow – a concern. Why have it?
• Who can develop the land best – rural versus urban?
• Jurisdiction boundary-based plan versus a Functional plan?
• Where growth should be directed? South or North?
• Lack of clarity around Plan process. Is it a Growth Plan update or a substantial re-write?
• Plan Implementation. Has to be addressed in the Growth Plan this time.

Outcome and Next Steps
• Broad range of opinions and perspectives
• Little consensus across Counties in major areas
• Suggestion to gain clarification: Identify follow up questions, and tabulate responses to bring to Task Force for consideration.

Regional Road Shows
• 5 Regional Presentations
- **Host Municipalities** – Fort Saskatchewan, Sturgeon, Parkland, Edmonton and Leduc County.
- **Task Force Members** attending – Roxanne Carr, Lisa Holmes, Cathy Heron, Gale Katchur, John Schonewille, and Ralph van Assen
- **RTAC members** attending – Peter Ohm, Clayton Kittlitz, Peter Vana, Neal Sarnecki, Greg Hofmann and David Hales.
- **21 Municipalities** participated, Chambers, Economic Development Officers, Business Associations and Public. Over 100 people.
- **Objective** – Provide information about the GPU and an opportunity to ask questions.
- **Presentation is available on CRB Website** – PowerPoint and speaking notes, video recording of the presentation and Q&A.
- Questions ranged from clarification on boundaries, terminology, density targets, use of forecasts to transportation planning and regional energy corridors.
- **Full Report is available on CRB website under Growth Plan Update.**
Launch of Capital Region Geographic Information Services (CRGIS) Website

Recommended Motion

*That the Capital Region Board receives the launch information and demonstration of the CRGIS website for information.*

Background

- On February 5, 2009, the CRB approved the Capital Region Geographic Information Services (CRGIS) Strategy and Implementation Plan.

- In 2010, the responsibility for the CRGIS Plan was moved to the Land Use Committee. Work on GIS by the Committee culminated in the acceptance by the Board of the CRGIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project Report in early 2013. The Report supported the development of a GIS program to assist with the Growth Plan Update and the monitoring and reporting on implementation of the Growth Plan.

- On February 13, 2014, the Board approved the Revised 2014 Project Budget, including funding to initiate the regional GIS program.

- On May 20, 2014, CRB Administration hired a GIS Coordinator to develop and administer the CRB GIS program.

- In July 2014, the CRB received a grant under the Alberta Community Partnership Program to fund the acquisition and development of the infrastructure and tools required to support the Capital Region GIS (CRGIS) program.

- On December 11, 2014, the GIS Policy (G018) was approved by the CRB which defines the role of the CRGIS and guidelines for administration and development.

Rationale

- The launch of the CRGIS website represents true implementation of the CRGIS Strategy and Implementation Plan and achieves the vision set out in that plan of “A shared regional geographical information service that provides equitable access and support for regional decision making”.

- The CRGIS website helps achieve all of the desired outcomes listed in the CRGIS plan:
  - Effective governance
✓ Web-based GIS
✓ Access by all municipalities, not just those with a GIS
✓ Provides a regional view or picture
✓ Ensures data and information security
✓ Establish appropriate data licensing
✓ Supports data sharing
✓ Allows regional analysis, modeling and scenario development

- The CRGIS website will also be available to all CRB stakeholders and the public
  - Access to maps and applications where appropriate.
  - Open data access where appropriate.
    - Non-confidential and non-restricted data is openly shared
      - ‘Open by default’
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CRGIS Vision and Mission

Vision

“A shared regional geographical information service that provides equitable access and support for regional decision making”

Mission

“To expand regional capacity to deliver regional geographic information services that support sustainable land use, intermunicipal transit and social market affordable housing decisions through the collaboration of the Capital Region Board and the Capital Region municipalities”

What are we actually trying to accomplish?

- Support regional planning and informed decision making
- Promote the Capital Region to the global market
- Create a regional view of ‘everything’
- Centralized hub of regional data
- Facilitate access, sharing and analysis of regional datasets
- Data and mapping standards
- Processes and guidelines for data submissions and requests
- Open Data by default

How are we going to accomplish this?

CRGIS website

- Easy to navigate website with interactive maps, tools and regional data
  - If someone asks what is Capital Region GIS? This website is the answer.
- Public facing access to regional GIS database as well as published maps, tools and applications
- A web-based interface that requires no software or additional requirements other than a web browser
- Collaborative platform for regional technical administration staff to share, access and contribute to regional data and information
Capital Region Geographic Information Services (CRGIS) Website Launch Information

capitalregion.maps.arcgis.com

Vision
A shared regional geographical information service that provides equitable access and support for regional decision making.

Mission
To expand regional capacity to deliver regional geographic information services that support sustainable land use, intermunicipal transit and social market affordable housing decisions through the collaboration of the Capital Region Board and the Capital Region municipalities.

Menu
Interactive Map and Application Gallery
View interactive pre-made maps and applications

Create Your Own Map
Create your own map using the CRB’s GIS database

Open Data Catalogue
Download data from the CRB’s GIS database

GIS Policy
View the CRB’s GIS policy
CRGIS Model

The CRGIS model is comprised of a local GIS database (located in the CRB main office), the online platform/website and the content hosted and available from within that platform.

The hosted content includes pre-made interactive maps, applications/tools and also the ability to create custom maps based on exploring any and all regional data available in the GIS database.

The website also includes an Open Data catalog. Where appropriate and by default, hosted data will be deemed ‘Open Data’ (freely usable, modifiable and sharable by anyone for any purpose) and will be available for download from the site.
CRGIS Stakeholders

The CRGIS website will benefit all stakeholders of regional decision making.

The above chart highlights different groups of key stakeholders and which services they are most likely to be engaged with.
Achieving the desired outcomes of CRGIS Plan

The CRGIS website promotes all of the desired outcomes listed in the CRGIS Strategy and Implementation Plan:

- Effective governance
  - The combination of the approved GIS Policy (G018) and the standards and procedures introduced with the CRGIS website form an effective governance structure for GIS related needs.

- Web-based GIS
  - The CRGIS website requires no additional software or additional requirements beyond a web browser.

- Access by all municipalities, not just those with a GIS
  - All municipalities will have free and equal access to the CRGIS website. Those without their own in-house GIS will be able to utilize the CRGIS website to accomplish basic GIS functions.

- Provides a regional view or picture
  - The very nature and purpose of the site. All data and information displayed on the CRGIS website will be regional in nature. Local datasets are aggregated and standardized to create regional views.

- Ensures data and information security
  - Where required, sensitive data will be restricted to only those who require it.

- Establish appropriate data licensing
  - Where required, data may be restricted to certain users or groups based on licensing limitations, otherwise open data by default will apply in most cases.

- Supports data sharing
  - The CRGIS website will function as a collaborative platform for sharing regional data with CRB members, and CRB members sharing local data with the CRB. Many regional datasets will be available for free and without restriction through the CRGIS Open Data Catalog.

- Allows regional analysis, modeling and scenario development
  - The combination of all of the above form the foundation needed for regional analysis, modeling and scenario development. Analytical applications and tools will be available on the CRGIS website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR #</th>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015.01</td>
<td>Feb 12</td>
<td>CRB Chair</td>
<td>Members requested that CRB administration report on whether a position on the <em>Municipal Government Act</em> should be taken by the Board.</td>
<td>Complete Apr 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.02</td>
<td>Mar 12</td>
<td>CRB Chair</td>
<td>Members requested that CRB administration and the Land Use &amp; Planning Committee clarify the rural and urban densities.</td>
<td>Complete May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.03</td>
<td>Apr 9</td>
<td>CRB Chair</td>
<td>What have been the external costs for REFs, broken down by municipality, for the last three calendar years?</td>
<td>Complete May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.04</td>
<td>Apr 9</td>
<td>City of Leduc</td>
<td>Clarification: Are municipalities able to exceed their density targets or would they be denied?</td>
<td>Complete May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.05</td>
<td>Apr 9</td>
<td>Leduc County, Sturgeon County</td>
<td>Who is involved in the Economic Development Initiative?</td>
<td>Complete May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.06</td>
<td>Apr 9</td>
<td>Town of Bon Accord</td>
<td>Do CRB Committees have the right to send items directly to other Board Committees without going through the Board first?</td>
<td>Complete June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.07</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>Town of Bon Accord</td>
<td>Members request administration report to the Governance, Priorities &amp; Finance Committee the impact that disbanding the Regional Services Committee will have on the Financials, and how the funds, if any, will be allocated?</td>
<td>In process To GPF June 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.08</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>CRB Chair</td>
<td>Clarification: what constitutes a meeting of the Board, its Committees and/or Task Forces</td>
<td>In Progress (legal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.09</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>Is Alberta Transportation willing to buy the right-of-way if an outer corridor was identified to everyone’s satisfaction?</td>
<td>Complete June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR #</td>
<td>Request Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2014.01 | Feb 13       | Fort Saskatchewan     | What will be the process for dispersing these line items in the 2014 Budget:  
- $250,000 - Special Projects?  
- $50,000 - Board Initiatives? | Complete Feb 21          |
<p>| 2014.02 | Mar 13       | Chair CRB             | Clarification of REF withdrawal process: What are the parameters for making amendments and/or withdrawing a REF appeal once it’s been made?             | Complete Mar 20          |
| 2014.03 | Apr 10       | Chair CRB             | Members requested that CRB administration report on the province’s position on Agricultural Land Policy.                                                                                             | Complete May 13          |
| 2014.04 | June 12      | Bon Accord            | What is impact of potential CRB REDA on local economic development activities in the region?                                                                                                | Complete Oct 24          |
| 2014.05 | June 12      | Chair CRB             | How is agricultural land consumption being monitored and/or tracked?                                                                                                                                  | Complete Oct 24          |
| 2014.06 | June 12      | Chair CRB             | How does CRB interact with Capital Region Waste Minimization Advisory Committee?                                                                                                                      | Complete Oct 27          |
| 2014.07 | July 10      | Chair CRB, Bon Accord | Does FOIP demand a minimum time limit or format for keeping Board records?                                                                                                                             | Complete Oct 27          |
| 2014.08 | July 10      | Chair CRB             | Request that a representative of the Ministry of Transportation be invited to attend a Land Use &amp; Planning meeting.                                                                                      | Complete Oct 9           |
| 2014.09 | Aug 14       | Chair CRB             | How will the Economic Development Summit be communicated to the media?                                                                                                                               | Complete Sept 29         |
| 2014.10 | Sept 11      | Chair CRB             | How will the Energy Corridors Final Report be communicated?                                                                                                                                             | Complete Sept 22         |
| 2014.11 | Sept 11      | Chair CRB             | How will we move forward with the Energy Corridors Final Report?                                                                                                                                       | Complete Sept 21         |
| 2014.12 | Oct 9        | Morinville, Redwater  | What will the extra money ($600K from members) projected in the 2015 budget be used for?                                                                                                               | Complete Oct 27          |
| 2014.13 | Oct 9        | Chair CRB             | Can the provincial government requisition funds based on the decisions of the Capital Region Board?                                                                                            | Complete June 2, 2015    |
| 2014.14 | Oct 9        | Bon Accord            | This request serves as clarification for IR.2014.10. How was the Energy Corridors Final Report communicated to Alberta Transportation and how was it accepted?                                           | Complete Oct 27          |
| 2014.15 | Oct 9        | Chair CRB             | What additional provincial departments should the Energy Corridors Final Report be communicated to?                                                                                                  | Complete Oct 27          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRB</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014.16</td>
<td>Oct 9</td>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>For Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas, what densities are actually being achieved on growth approved and growth built out since the Regional Growth Plan took statutory effect?</td>
<td>Complete Dec 1 Follow-up Mar 4, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.17</td>
<td>Nov 13</td>
<td>Chair CRB to Advocacy &amp; Monitoring committee</td>
<td>How do/should we forward information in the Sift Every Thing Report regarding infrastructure to the Province?</td>
<td>Complete Mar 4, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.18</td>
<td>Nov 13</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>Seeking clarification from archived recordings to determine if a letter to Municipal Affairs re REF Amendment to delete Section 5.4 b) (ii) has been formally accepted for debate previously.</td>
<td>Complete Dec 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2014.19 | Nov 13 | Chair CRB | RE: Warburg Motion: Planning Session to Review CRB Voting Structure  
Seeking clarification from the archived recordings to determine if this motion was formally accepted for debate previously | Complete Dec 1 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 9, 2014</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>Can the provincial government requisition funds based on the decisions of the Capital Region Board?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2, 2015</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>No legislation exists at this time for the Province to requisition funds from Capital Region Board’s member municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>However,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In the regulation establishing the Capital Region Board (AR 38/2012) the Minister may make one or more of the following orders related to cost, as seen in section 32 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32(1)(b) An order respecting the requisition of operating and capital costs of the Capital Region Board;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32(1) An order providing for any other matter the Minister considers necessary for carrying out the purposes of this regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In referencing Ministerial Order No. L:255/08, which speaks to municipal contributions, the Board Members are required to participate in cost sharing for any project mandated by the Board and approved by the Board as being regional in nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is nothing explicitly written in regards to the Province being able to request funds from member municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Also, The Capital Region Board does not have requisitioning authority, but the Province can provide that authority, should it choose to do so, via an amendment to the CRB Regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 9, 2015</td>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>Do CRB Committees have the right to send items directly to other Board Committees without going through the Board first?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| June 2, 2015  | Administration | There was no information found in existing policies restricting a Committee from referring an item (project) to another Committee.  
Policy G012 will be up for review in November 2015, and there will be an opportunity for suggested edits to provide greater clarity regarding this issue. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2015</td>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>Is Alberta Transportation willing to buy the right-of-way if an outer corridor was identified to everyone’s satisfaction?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2, 2015</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Alberta Transportation cannot answer hypothetical questions nor make future commitments until further planning has occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy with the new Minister will include the issue of an Outer Regional Transportation or Utility Corridor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee

Thursday, May 28, 2015
2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Capital Region Board Office, Large boardroom
1100 Bell Tower, 10104 103 Avenue, Edmonton

Members:
Camille Berube, Town of Beaumont (Chair)
Randy Boyd, Town of Bon Accord
Art Erickson, Village of Wabamun
Glen Finstad, City of Leduc
Cathy Heron, City of St. Albert
Phyllis Kobasiuk, Parkland County (Vice-Chair)
Karen Shaw, Sturgeon County
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton
Wayne Woldanski, Lamont County

Regrets:
Wally Yachimetz, Town of Calmar

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Stephanie Chia, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager

Guests:
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Michael Epp, Hawking Epp Dumont LLP
Jacquie Hansen, City of St. Albert
Doug Lagore, City of Leduc
Rick Preston, UDI
Yolande Shaw, Strathcona County
Dana Smith, City of Leduc
Kent Stewart, WMC
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1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair, Mayor Camille Berube called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

2. Chair’s Opening Remarks

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the agenda of May 28, 2015 be approved with a change to the order of recommended motions on item 7.

Moved by: Mayor Art Erickson, Village of Wabamun

Decision: Carried unanimously
4. Approval of Minutes of April 16, 2015

**Motion:** That the minutes of April 16, 2015 be approved.

**Moved by:** Councillor Phyllis Kobasiuk, Parkland County

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

5. Audited Financial Statements (Jan 1/15 – Mar 31/15)

**Presentation by Michael Epp, Hawkings Epp Dumont LLP**

**Motion:** That the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee recommend the Capital Region Board approve the Audited Financial Statements for the year ended March 31, 2015.

**Moved by:** Councillor Glen Finstad, City of Leduc

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

6. Annual Report

**Motion:** That the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee recommend the Capital Region Board approve the 2014/2015 Annual Report as presented.

**Moved by:** Councillor Phyllis Kobasiuk, Parkland County

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

7. Economic Development Initiative

**Motion:** That the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee recommend, in principle, the Capital Region Board approve the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Strategy.

**Moved by:** Councillor Phyllis Kobasiuk, Parkland County

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

**Motion:** That the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee recommend, in principle, the Capital Region Board approve the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Framework.

**Moved by:** Councillor Phyllis Kobasiuk, Parkland County

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

8. CEO Update

9. Meeting Schedule

It was approved by unanimous consensus that the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee receive for information the meeting schedule, as presented.

10. ADJOURNMENT
The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Committee Chair, Camille Berube
Transit Committee

Thursday, May 28, 2015
9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
La Cite Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
8627 rue Marie-Anne-Gaboury (91 Street), Edmonton

Members:
Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert (Chair)
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton (Vice Chair)
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Dana Smith, City of Leduc
Bill Steinburg, City of Spruce Grove (alternate)
Brian Botterill, Strathcona County
Susan Evans, Sturgeon County

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Len Bracko, City of St. Albert
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Jacquie Hansen, City of St. Albert
Patrick Inglis, City of Spruce Grove
Doug Lagore, City of Leduc
Yolande Shaw, Strathcona County
Pamela Steppan, Strathcona County
Kevin Wenzel, City of Leduc
Forest Yang, Strathcona County

Regrets:
Lawrence Schmidt, Provincial Liaison, GOA

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Stephanie Chai, Project Manager
Brandt Denham, GIS Coordinator

Lisa Sasaki, Administrative Assistant
Dr. Bonnie Dobbs, University of Alberta
Tara Pidborschynski, University of Alberta
Howaida Hassan, City of Edmonton

1. Call to Order

Chair, Wes Brodhead called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. Chair Opening Remarks
3. Approval of Agenda

**Motion:** That the Transit Committee agenda of May 28, 2015 be approved, as amended to add item #9 “Other Business”.

**Moved by:** Chair Wes Brodhead, *City of St. Albert*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

4. Approval of Minutes, March 13, 2015

**Motion:** That the Transit Committee minutes of March 13, 2015 be approved.

**Moved by:** Mayor Gale Katchur, *City of Fort Saskatchewan*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

5. 2015 Household Travel Survey

5.1 Overview Survey

**Motion:** That the Transit Committee receive the 2015 Household Travel Survey overview presentation for information.

**Moved by:** Councillor Brian Botterill, *Strathcona County*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

6. CRB Transportation Needs Assessment 2015

6.1 Final Report Presentation

**Motion:** That the Transit Committee recommend the Capital Region Board receive the Capital Region Board Transportation Needs Assessment 2015 Report for information.

**Moved by:** Councillor Michael Walters, *City of Edmonton*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

7. CRB/CRP Transit Policy Workshop – March 26, 2015

7.1 Workshop Meeting Notes

**Motion:** That the Transit Committee receive the March 26, 2015 CRB/CRP Transit Policy Workshop meeting notes for information and direct CRB Administration to work on scheduling a joint Fall 2015 Workshop.

**Moved by:** Councillor Dana Smith, *City of Leduc*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

Mayor Katchur left the meeting at 11:10pm.
8. Committee Meeting Schedule

8.1 Proposed cancellation of July 30, 2015 meeting and rescheduling of September 24, 2015 meeting

Motion: That the Transit Committee cancel the July 30, 2015 Committee meeting and reschedule the September 24, 2015 meeting to September 3, 2015.

Moved by: Councillor Michael Walters, City of Edmonton

Decision: Carried unanimously

9. Other Business

9.1 GreenTRIP Funding

It was approved by unanimous consensus that the Transit Committee accept the GreenTRIP Funding update as information.

9.2 Growth Plan Update Task Force

It was approved by unanimous consensus that the Transit Committee accept the Growth Plan Update Task Force update as information.

10. Adjournment

It was approved by unanimous consensus that the Transit Committee meeting be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 11:18 a.m.

Next Meeting: September 3, 2015 at 9:00 a.m., La Cite Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger

Committee Chair, Wes Brodhead
Growth Plan Update Task Force

Thursday, May 14, 2015
11:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Chateau Louis Conference Centre – Grand Ballroom
11727 Kingsway, Edmonton

Members:
Roxanne Carr, Strathcona County (Chair)
Lisa Holmes, Town of Morinville (Vice Chair)
Don Iveson, City of Edmonton
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Cathy Heron, City of St. Albert
John Schonewille, Leduc County
Ralph van Assen, Village of Warburg

Provincial Liaison:
Victoria Brown, Alberta Municipal Affairs

Regional Technical Advisors:
David Hales
Greg Hofmann
Clayton Kittlitz
Peter Vana

Strategic Advisor:
Barry Huybens

Consultants:
Melanie Hare, Urban Strategies
Hassan Shaheen, ISL Engineering & Land Services

Regrets:
Peter Ohm, Regional Strategic Advisor

CRB Staff:
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager (acting CEO)
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Leslie Chivers, Operations Manager
Brandt Denham, GIS Coordinator
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Grant Bain, Leduc County
Camille Berube, Town of Beaumont
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Linton Delainey, Strathcona County
Keith Dreger, Strathcona County resident
Cathy Ducharme, Strathcona County
Art Erickson, Village of Wabamun
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Susan Evans, Sturgeon County
Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton
Ryan Hall, Strathcona County
Jacquie Hansen, City of St. Albert
Michelle Hay, City of Leduc
Carla Howatt, Strathcona County
Doug Lagore, City of Leduc
Jeff Laurier, Government of Alberta
Cory Levasseur, City of Spruce Grove
Elaine Milliken, Town of Lamont
Claire Negrin, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Rick Preston, UDI-Edmonton Region
Bonnie Riddell, Strathcona County
Kelly Rudyk, Strathcona County
Karen Shaw, Sturgeon County
Yolande Shaw, Strathcona County
Bill Skinner, Town of Lamont
Dana Smith, City of Leduc
Mel Smith, Town of Redwater
Patty Walker, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Ken Woitt, City of Leduc
1. **Call to Order**

Chair, Mayor Roxanne Carr called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

2. **Chair’s Opening Remarks**

3. **Approval of the Agenda**

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force agenda of May 14, 2015 include an in-camera session as the last order of business, and be approved as amended.
   **Moved by:** Mayor Ralph van Assen, *Village of Warburg*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

4. **Approval of the Minutes, April 9, 2015**

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force minutes of April 9, 2015 be approved.
   **Moved by:** Mayor Gale Katchur, *City of Fort Saskatchewan*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

5. **Growth Plan Update – Vision and Principles**

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force approve the Vision and Principles and recommend them to the Board.
   **Moved by:** Councillor Cathy Heron, *City of St. Albert*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

6. **Growth Plan Update 2.0**

   a. **What is Regional Planning**

      **Motion:** It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept the discussion as information.

   b. **Purpose of Growth Plan 2.0**

      **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force agree that the Growth Plan Update will involve a comprehensive update of the 2010 Plan to address Policy Gaps and Implementation Gaps.
      **Moved by:** Mayor Gale Katchur, *City of Fort Saskatchewan*
      **Decision:** Carried unanimously

   c. **Roles and Responsibilities**

      **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force has reviewed the Role and Responsibilities of the project team and accepts them as the basis for moving forward.
      **Moved by:** Councillor Cathy Heron, *City of St. Albert*
      **Decision:** Carried unanimously
d. Plan Approach – Issues and Expectations

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept the discussion as information, and agreed that this topic would be discussed under item #8.

2015-26

7. Task Force June Workshop

a. Draft Agenda

Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force approve the draft agenda for the June 26 Task Force Workshop, as amended.
Moved by: Councillor John Schonewille, Leduc County
Decision: Carried unanimously

8. GPU Stakeholder Engagement Summary

a. Feedback from Towns and Villages

b. Feedback from Counties Consultation

Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force receive the Towns & Villages and Counties consultation summaries as information.
Moved by: Mayor Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Decision: Carried unanimously
9. Growth Plan Update – Regional Road show Summary

**Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force receive the Road Show summary report as information.

**Moved by:** Mayor Lisa Holmes, Town of Morinville

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

10. Roundtable Task Force Meeting Feedback

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept the discussion for information.

11. In-camera

**Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force move in-camera (3:30 p.m.).

**Moved by:** Councillor John Schonewille, Leduc County

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

12. Out of In-camera

**Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force move out of in-camera (4:02 p.m.).

**Moved by:** Councillor Cathy Heron, City of St. Albert

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

13. Adjournment

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force meeting be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** August 27, 2015 at 9:00 a.m., La Cite Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger