# Board Meeting

## Comprehensive Agenda

April 11, 2019 - 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM

Chateau Louis Conference Centre, St. Michael Room
11727 Kingsway NW, Edmonton, AB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Opening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.1 Call to Order | Action: Declaration  
Lead: Chair Abbott |
| 1.2 Chair’s Opening Remarks | Action: Information  
Lead: Chair Abbott |
| 2. Approval of Agenda | Action: Approval  
Lead: Chair Abbott |
| 3. Approval of Minutes | Action: Approval  
Lead: Chair Abbott |
| 4. Executive Committee | |
| 4.1 Chair Update | Action: Information  
Lead: Chair Abbott |
| 4.2 Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy Project Charter | Action: Approval  
Lead: Chair Abbott/CEO Wichuk |

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Agenda of April 11, 2019.

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Minutes of February 14, 2019.
4.3 2018-2023 Strategic Plan Strategic Priorities Update
Action: Information
Lead: Chair Abbott/CEO Wichuk

4.4 Board Development
Action: Information
Lead: Chair Abbott/CEO Wichuk

4.5 Board Retreat
Action: Information
Lead: Chair Abbott/CEO Wichuk

4.6 Advocacy Update
Action: Information
Lead: Chair Abbott/CEO Wichuk

5. Audit & Finance Committee

5.1 Chair Update
Action: Information
Lead: Chair Doblaniko

5.2 Quarterly Financial Report
Action: Information
Lead: Chair Doblaniko/CEO Wichuk

5.3 Draft 2019/20 Budget
Action: Approval
Lead: Chair Doblaniko/CEO Wichuk

Recommended Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Draft 2019/20 Budget.

5.4 2018-2022 Business Plan (2019-2020 Update)
Action: Approval
Lead: Chair Doblaniko/CEO Wichuk

Recommended Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the 2018-2022 Business Plan (2019-2020 Update).

6. Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force
### 6.1 Selection of Chair

**Action:** Vote  
**Lead:** Chair Abbott/CEO Wichuk

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board appoint __________ as Chair.

### 6.2 Selection of Vice Chair

**Action:** Vote  
**Lead:** Chair Abbott/CEO Wichuk

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board appoint __________ as Vice Chair.

### 6.3 Motion to Destroy Ballots

**Action:** Approval  
**Lead:** Chair Abbott/CEO Wichuk

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board authorize Administration to destroy the ballots cast to elect the Chair and Vice Chair.

### 7. Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force

#### 7.1 Chair Update

**Action:** Information  
**Lead:** Chair Shaigec

### 8. Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force

#### 8.1 Chair Update

**Action:** Information  
**Lead:** Chair Ralph

### 9. Member Updates

### 10. CEO Update

**Action:** Information  
**Lead:** CEO Wichuk

### 11. Next Meeting

- June 13, 2019, 9:00 a.m. – Noon, Chateau Louis Conference Centre, Grand Ballroom
12. **In Camera**  
*Action: Approval*  
*Lead: Chair Abbott*

13. **Adjournment**  
*Action: Approval*  
*Lead: Chair Abbott*

**Recommended Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board meeting of April 11, 2019 be adjourned.
Minutes of the meeting of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board held at Grand Ballroom, Chateau Louis Conference Centre on Thursday, February 14, 2019.

**Delegates in Attendance:**
Dr. Jodi L. Abbott – Board Chair
Councillor Kathy Barnhart – Beaumont (alternate)
Mayor Ray Ralph – Devon
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Mayor Bob Young – Leduc
Mayor Tanni Doblanko – Leduc County
Mayor Barry Turner – Morinville
Mayor Rod Shaigec – Parkland County
Mayor Cathy Heron – St. Albert
Mayor Stuart Houston – Spruce Grove
Mayor William Choy – Stony Plain
Mayor Rod Frank – Strathcona County
Councillor Bill Tonita – Strathcona County (alternate)
Mayor Alanna Hnatiw – Sturgeon County
Dale Beesley – Government of Alberta

**EMRB Administration:**
Karen Wichuk, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Director, Regional Growth Planning
Alex Bonokoski, Project Manager
Taylor Varro, Project Manager
Barry Huybens, MRSP Project Manager
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Brandt Denham, GIS/IT Coordinator
Carol Moreno, Project Coordinator
Joseana Lara, Municipal Planning Intern
Agata Lewandowski, Executive Assistant
Raquel Chauvette, Administrative Assistant

**Attendance in Gallery:** 39
1. Opening

1.1 Call to Order

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

1.2 Chair's Opening Remarks

- Chair offers a good morning and Happy New Year to everyone in attendance.
- Chair acknowledges that we meet on the traditional lands referred to as Treaty 6 Territory.
- Chair welcomes all members of the public and media to the meeting.
- Chair reminds everyone that the meetings are voice recorded to help with the production of minutes and archival proposes.
- Chair welcomes everyone to the first meeting of 2019, sharing that in 2018 we saw a lot of change in the EMRB, and with our new CEO in place she looks forward to what our 2019 year will bring, Chair notes we have a heavy agenda going forward but there is a lot of confidence in EMRB achieving what it sets out to do.
- Chair welcomes and congratulates the City of Beaumont on their new status, as a city.
- Chair acknowledges that the agenda for this meeting consists of many items carried forward from the last Board meeting as well as a few new items.
- Chair states that the last couple of months have been very busy and rewarding. Chair acknowledges that the EMRB's new CEO has now been in place for 3 ½ months and transitioning very well into her role.
- Chair touches on previous meetings that the Chair and CEO have attended and the importance of these meetings.
- Chair thanks Mayor Young for the invitation to have CEO Wichuk and herself present to the City of Leduc Committee of the Whole. Chair Abbott lets members know CEO Wichuk and she would be happy to come out to member municipalities and present on the EMRB. Chair Abbott notes an upcoming meeting with Parkland County in June 2019.
- Chair thanks all 13 Board members and municipalities for participating in the 10 Year Celebration on December 13, 2018.
- Chair congratulates Mayor Katchur and the City of Fort Saskatchewan who received 6 million dollars toward an affordable housing project from the province.
- Chair congratulates Mayor Hnatiw and Sturgeon County on the announcement of Canada Kuwait Petrochemical Corporation; they will build a 4.5 billion petrochemical complex as a 50/50 joint venture between Canada’s Pembina Pipeline Corp. and Kuwait Petro Chemical Industries in Sturgeon County.
- Chair congratulates Mayor Houston, Mayor Choy and Mayor Shaigec who on January 16, 2019 signed a regional letter of intent for the development of a new regional plan.
• Chair congratulates Sturgeon County and the Town of Morinville on starting the process towards their inter municipal collaboration framework.
• Chair congratulates Leduc County on their big announcement related to Amazon opening a one million dollar square foot warehouse that will create over 600 jobs in the Region.
• Chair acknowledges all members who were able to attend the Mid-Sized City Caucus, sharing that it was great to see participation and contribution via social media.
• Chair congratulates Alberta Industrial Heartland Association on the success of their annual stakeholder event.
• Chair congratulates Strathcona County and the City of Leduc for each successfully hosting home town hockey, stating it was very exciting to see member municipalities getting national recognition.
• Chair shares Edmonton Global’s great news of receiving 2.3 million from WED to help establish its international trade and investment program.
• Chair shares the announcements shared regarding transportation infrastructure in the Region. First, Parkland County for the twinning of Highway 60 and rail grade separation between Highway 16 and 16A. Second, City of Spruce Grove, Parkland County and Stony Plain for the announcement related to Highway 628 alignment and reconstruction between campsite road and Highway 60. Lastly, City of Leduc on the 65 Avenue QE2 exchange. Chair shares that all of these advancements will make a big difference to the residents of municipalities and the Region.
• Chair acknowledges and congratulates all of the great work taking place in the Region, and apologizes if any of it was missed.

2. Approval of Agenda

Chair Abbott states that all Members should have an updated agenda in front of them due to a couple of late additions. Chair Abbott walks through the revisions, adding a new Item 11 – The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Operating Grant due to receiving some communication related to the Grant. Chair Abbott identifies two HR related items to be added for In Camera 13.1 Staffing Update and 13.2 Board Chair Review.

Moved by Mayor Ralph. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the amended Agenda of February 14, 2019.

Motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes

Moved by Mayor Katchur. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Minutes of December 13, 2018.

Motion carried unanimously.
4. Executive Committee

4.1 Chair Update

Chair Abbott provides an update on the January 10, 2019 Executive Committee meeting. Chair Abbott informs members of the Regional Energy Corridors Approach Project Charter that came forward for consideration and provides an update that the Executive Committee asked Administration to go back and re-orient the document on a few items. Chair Abbott touches on the continued work on the Advocacy Plan and Governance Excellence that will come forward later on in the Agenda.

4.2 Regional Context Statements

CEO Wichuk provides background information on the Regional Context Statements to the Board Members. CEO Wichuk updates Members that Administration has received all 13 Regional Context Statements, and thanks all for their time and effort to get them in on time.

Moved by Mayor Young. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board receive Administration’s update on the status of Regional Context Statements for information.

Motion carried unanimously.

4.3 Governance Excellence

Chair Abbott provides context around Governance Excellence to allow feedback from Board members. Chair provides background on the preliminary discussion regarding the direction the Board might take that was had at the January 10, 2019 Executive Committee meeting.

Chair Abbott concludes that the feedback provided will be taken back to help develop a plan.

4.4 Election Advocacy Plan

CEO Wichuk provides a brief overview and updates members on the work being done towards an advocacy plan and next steps that will take place.

5. Audit & Finance Committee

5.1 Chair Update
Chair Doblanko provides an update on the discussion that took place at the January 10, 2019 meeting. Chair Doblanko reminds members that there was no update brought to the previous Board meeting on December 13, 2018 as the Audit & Finance meeting of November 8, 2019 was cancelled in order to allow the new CEO time to familiarize herself with the budget.

5.2 Quarterly Financial Report

Chair Doblanko informs members that they can expect Quarterly Financial Reports to be brought to Board meetings going forward.

5.3 2018/19 Budget Review & Adjustments

Chair Doblanko provides background on the 2018/19 Budget Review & Adjustments.

CEO Wichuk reviews the Adjustments on the 2018/19 Budget with Board members.

**Moved by Mayor Young. Accepted by Chair.**

**Motion:** That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the 2018/19 Budget Review & Adjustments.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Abbott calls a 10 minutes break.

6. Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force

6.1 Chair Update

Chair Shaigec informs members of context that took place at the previous task force meeting on November 23, 2018 and next steps.

6.2 Vision Statement and Guiding Principles

Chair Shaigec provides background on the Vision Statement and Guiding Principles.

Mayor Choy makes a friendly amendment that the Guiding Principles are amended to add to Item 2 Key Principles “must be conserved and/or protected.” **Accepted by Chair.**

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

**Moved by Mayor Shaigec. Accepted by Chair.**
Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Vision Statement and Guiding Principles as amended.

Motion carried unanimously.

7. Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force

7.1 Chair Update

Chair Ralph provides background on the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan and next steps.

7.2 Environmental Scan

Moved by Mayor Ralph. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board receive the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Environmental Scan for information.

Motion carried unanimously.

8. Member Motions

8.1 REF Amendment Evaluation Criteria Update

Moved by Mayor Iveson. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board receive Administration’s update on Edmonton’s June 14, 2018 motion regarding REF Amendment Evaluation Criteria for information.

Motion carried unanimously.

9. Member Updates

9.1 Town of Devon – September 13th Weekend Family Event

Mayor Ralph shares a video presentation with members on the attractions of the Town of Devon, welcoming all members and families to join for a regional camping trip on the weekend of September 13, 2019.

10. CEO Update
CEO Wichuk highlights key updates from the written CEO Update.

11. Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board Operating Grant

CEO Wichuk provides historical context for the CRB/EMRB Operating Grant. CEO Wichuk informs Members of the specific funding of the last 10 years leading up the decrease in the 2020/21 year.

Government of Alberta representative Dale Beesley assures members Municipal Affairs is not looking to stop the funding. Dale Beesley lets members know all comments will be taken back.

The Board Members discuss the provincial Operating Grant and indicate it is important to have certainty related to the Operating Grant.

Chair Abbott summarizes a list of to dos:
1. Ramping up advocacy;
2. Applying for grants broadly not just within known ministries;
3. Assessment of impact including regional fees;
4. Request for government to make long term commitment to funding; and
5. Better understanding on project criteria for the $17 million.

12. Next Meeting

- April 11, 2019, 9:00 a.m. – Noon, Chateau Louis Conference Centre, St. Michael Room

13. In Camera

13.1 HR: Staffing Update

Moved by Mayor Iveson. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board move In Camera, in accordance with the provisions of Section 17, 21 and 27 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP), R.S.A. 2000, c.F-25.

Motion carried unanimously.
In Camera Participants:

Dr. Jodi L. Abbott–Board Chair
Mayor John Stewart–Beaumont
Mayor Ray Ralph–Devon
Mayor Don Iveson–Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur–Ft. Saskatchewan
Mayor Tanni Doblanko–Leduc County
Mayor Barry Turner–Morinville
Mayor Rod Shaigec–Parkland County
Mayor William Choy–Stony Plain
Mayor Rod Frank–Strathcona County
Mayor Alanna Hnatiw–Sturgeon County
Karen Wichuk-EMRB CEO

Chair Abbott and CEO Wichuk leave In Camera at 12:16 p.m.

13.2 HR: Board Chair Review – Section 17 Disclosure Harmful to Personal Privacy

Motion to Reconvene

Moved by Mayor Doblanko. Accepted by Chair.

B2019-09

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

Motion carried unanimously.

14. Adjournment

Moved by Mayor Ralph. Accepted by Chair.

B201-10

Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board meeting of February 14, 2019 be adjourned at 12:22 p.m.

Motion carried unanimously.
Executive Committee

Thursday, March 14, 2019
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board
Capital Region Boardroom

Members:
Dr. Jodi L. Abbott, Board Chair
Mayor Bob Young, City of Leduc (Vice Chair)
Mayor Tanni Doblanko, Leduc County
Mayor Rod Shaigec, Parkland County
Mayor Barry Turner, Town of Morinville
Mayor Don Iveson, City of Edmonton

Guests:
Tim Cartmell, City of Edmonton
Leslie Chivers, Sturgeon County
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Susan Evans, Sturgeon County
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Larissa Hepp, Sturgeon County
Greg Hofmann, City of Edmonton
Brandy Kelly, City of Leduc
Avril McCalla, City of Edmonton
Rick Preston, UDI – Edmonton Region
Paul Ross, City of Edmonton
Robert Stephenson, Strathcona County
Emily Strach, Parkland County
Julie Vizbar, Leduc County
Angela Wilson, Strathcona County

EMRB Staff & Consultants
Karen Wichuk, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Director, Regional Growth Planning
Debra Irving, Senior Project Manager
Alex Bonokoski, Project Manager
Agata Lewandowski, Executive Assistant
Raquel Chauvette, Administrative Assistant
1. Opening

1.1 Quorum

Quorum achieved; four of five voting members present.

1.2 Call to Order

Chair Abbott calls the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

1.3 Chair’s Opening Remarks

Chair Abbott has no opening remarks.

2. Approval of Agenda

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

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion: That the Executive Committee approve the January 10, 2019 meeting minutes.
Moved by: Mayor Young
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

4. Strategy

4.1 Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy Project Charter

Ms. Shuya presents the revised Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy Project Charter to members, providing history on the studies that helped frame the Project.

Motion: That the Executive Committee endorse and recommend the Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy Project Charter to the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board for approval.
Moved by: Mayor Doblanko
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

4.2 2018-2023 Strategic Plan Strategic Priorities Update

CEO Wichuk introduces the 2018-2023 Strategic Plan Strategic Priorities Update and indicates what progress has been made toward the Strategic Priorities. CEO Wichuk
informs members that a proposal will be brought forward in the future regarding data
collection throughout the Region.


*Mayor Turner arrives at the meeting at 9:10 a.m.*

CEO Wichuk introduces the 2018-2022 Business Plan (2019-2020 Update) to the
members. CEO Wichuk walks through the notable changes in the Business Plan,
informing members that going forward the Business Plan will be presented in a different
format and following an annual Board Retreat, to better align the Business Plan with the
Strategic Priorities and the Budget. CEO Wichuk explains that going forward the
Business Plan will go through the Audit & Finance Committee for endorsement and
recommendation to the Board, as it has direct correlation to the Budget. CEO Wichuk
states that the Terms of Reference for the Committees are not clear on which
Committee should be endorsing and recommending the Business Plan to the Board.

Chair Abbott suggests a process, noting all members are in agreement, that the Terms
of Reference are to be reviewed and revised to document this new process going
forward.

5. Governance

5.1 Board Development

*Chair Abbott calls a five minute break.*

Chair Abbott introduces the Board Development Work Plan, providing context on the
importance of a Board Charter. Chair Abbott concludes that based on feedback the plan
will move forward, starting with the introductions to National Growth Partners, Don
Cummings and Sheila Witwicky.

CEO Wichuk acknowledges the importance of spending more time together in an
informal setting, as requested by members. CEO Wichuk shares ideas of particular
initiatives and opportunities for members to participate in, outside of the formal Board
meetings, providing opportunity to think and engage but not make formal decisions.

5.2 Board Retreat

Chair Abbott discusses the desire for participation in an annual Board Retreat to take
place in early September 2019, proposing that the Board Retreat replace the
August 2019 Board meeting.

CEO Wichuk provides insight for replacing the August 2019 Board meeting to allow for
the time to think and prepare for the Board Retreat, stating it is critically important.

Chair Abbott concludes that the August 2019 Board meeting will be cancelled and the
date for the September 2019 Board Retreat will be confirmed in the coming months.

6. Advocacy & Communications

6.1 Advocacy Update

CEO Wichuk provides an advocacy update, introducing the targeted advocacy areas to members. CEO Wichuk explains that the EMRB will have a living document, as it changes based on outcomes and needs, to help complete a robust, action-oriented and impactful Advocacy Plan. CEO Wichuk concludes with the importance and benefits that are present in the opportunities for partnerships.

7. CEO Update

CEO Wichuk shares how it has been a busy month since the last Board meeting, with a large focus being on the Business Plan and Budget. CEO Wichuk touches on the three scenarios that are presented in the Audit & Finance Committee package, confirming that once a decision is made on the Budget then the Business Plan will be finalized. CEO Wichuk notifies members of the issue of regional capacity that has been brought to her attention at the previous CAO meeting, and will be present on the agenda for the CAO meeting on March 21, 2019. CEO Wichuk updates members on the final phase for the onboarding of new staff. CEO Wichuk looks for clarification on the roles of alternates in the upcoming Shared Investment for Shared Benefit (SISB) workshops. CEO Wichuk reminds all members that the fiscal year end is coming up, and asks that all members submit their claims before March 31, 2019. CEO Wichuk informs members that we have received the grant money for 2019-2020. CEO Wichuk concludes with a look into the meetings she has participated in over the last four weeks.

8. Next Meeting

- May 9, 2019, 9:00 a.m. – Noon, EMRB Office

9. In Camera

9.1 HR: CEO Transition Update – Section 17 – Disclosure Harmful to Personal Privacy

Motion: That the Executive Committee move In Camera, in accordance with the provisions of Section 17, of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP), R.S.A 2000, c.F-25.
Moved by: Mayor Doblanko
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously
In Camera Participants:

Mayor Doblanco  Dr. Jodi L. Abbott
Mayor Iveson  CEO Wichuk
Mayor Shaigec
Mayor Stewart
Mayor Turner
Mayor Young

Motion: That the Executive Committee move out of camera.
Moved by: Mayor Shaigec
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

10. Adjournment

Motion: That the Executive Committee meeting of March 14, 2019 be adjourned at 11:05 a.m.
Moved by: Mayor Doblanco
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

Committee Chair, Dr. Jodi L. Abbott
Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy Project Charter

Recommended Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy Project Charter.

Background

- The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board Regulation (189/2017) mandates the EMRB to prepare comprehensive, integrated regional land use plans, including the identification of corridors for energy transmission and the development of policies regarding planning for these corridors.
- In January 2019, a draft Project Charter focused on recommendations from previous reports to further energy corridor planning and advocacy in the Region, was presented to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee recommended that the charter be amended to prioritize the development of an advocacy strategy that would enable member municipalities to communicate and advocate for greater involvement in energy corridor planning.
- In March 2019, the Executive Committee endorsed and recommended the amended Project Charter for approval by the Board.

Project Charter

Guided by feedback from the Executive Committee, this project will address recommendations made in the 2014 Capital Region Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework and the 2016 Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan, as well as key takeaways from the 2018 Edmonton Region Energy Corridors Forum:

- That the EMRB lead the development of a comprehensive energy corridors advocacy strategy to communicate energy corridor issues and challenges in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region to the Provincial and Federal governments and other regional stakeholders.
- That the EMRB advocate to the Government of Alberta and other regional stakeholders for more substantial involvement of municipalities in the coordination and integration of long range regional energy corridor planning in the Region.
Next Steps

- Following Board's approval, a request for proposal will be issued to secure consultant services, with work to begin Q2 2019/20 budget year.
- Key stakeholders will be engaged as needed to provide professional technical and policy advice to the Project Team. Municipal administrative staff may be identified as key stakeholders.

Attachments

1. DRAFT Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy Project Charter
Regional Energy Corridors
Advocacy Strategy

DRAFT Project Charter
March 2019
Background and Context

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region is a hub for oil and gas exploration and development in Western Canada and has a vast network of petroleum pipelines and power transmission lines. Pipelines and transmission lines frequently occupy the same linear footprint as energy corridors. The Region’s existing energy corridors are at or near capacity and anticipated oil and gas development will require additional energy corridor capacity. The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) has expressed a need for a comprehensive advocacy strategy to influence coordinated energy corridor planning in the Region.

Current models for energy corridors focus on proponent-driven solutions, resulting in land fragmentation, constraints to pipeline expansion, and uncertainty to industry and municipalities. There is no clear authority leading a coordinated approach to energy corridor planning in the Region and municipalities have limited capacity to influence the location of energy corridors. Municipalities are limited to intervener status in regulatory hearings and are not the final arbiter of corridor locations. Municipalities have expressed a need for a stronger voice in the planning and regulatory process, particularly given its impacts on regional growth planning.

The Capital Region Board Regulation (38/2012) and subsequent Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board Regulation (189/2017) mandate the EMRB to prepare comprehensive, integrated regional land use plans, including the identification of corridors for energy transmission and the development of policies regarding planning for these corridors.

To address its mandate, the Capital Region Board completed and approved The Capital Region Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework (2014). This report recommended a policy framework be develop to enable a coordinated, strategic approach to planning for future regional energy corridors.

The Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan, was approved by the Board in 2016. The Master Plan identifies priority energy corridors and alignments based on stakeholder workshops and recommends that a strategy to protect energy corridors in the Region be developed.

To further the work of the Master Plan, the Board organized a forum to establish the need and level of support among industry stakeholders for a more coordinated approach to planning energy corridors in the Region. The Edmonton Region Energy Corridors Forum was held in January 2018 and included more than 100 stakeholders from provincial and municipal governments and the energy industry. The Forum provided wide-ranging perspectives and information about the state of energy corridor planning in the Region and resulted in broad support for advancing energy corridor planning with an emphasis on addressing the role of municipalities.

Project Summary

This project will develop a comprehensive energy corridors advocacy strategy and make recommendations regarding coordinated regional approaches to energy corridor planning. Building on previous work, the project will explore opportunities for greater involvement of municipalities for a more coordinated approach to energy corridor planning in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region. This project will develop a strategy for member municipalities to communicate and advocate for greater involvement in energy corridor planning in support of
their role in regional land use planning and to ensure the objectives of the regional growth plan for responsible growth are not jeopardized.

The intent for the project is to provide greater clarity and certainty to municipalities and industry and enable the Region to prepare for and support anticipated energy investment.

Project Objectives

This project will address recommendations made in the 2014 Capital Region Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework and the 2016 Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan, as well as key takeaways from the 2018 Edmonton Region Energy Corridors Forum:

1. That the EMRB lead the development of a comprehensive energy corridors advocacy strategy to communicate energy corridor issues and challenges in the Edmonton Metropolitan Region to the Provincial and Federal governments and other regional stakeholders.
2. That the EMRB advocate to the Government of Alberta and other regional stakeholders for more substantial involvement of municipalities in the coordination and integration of long range regional energy corridor planning in the Region.

Project Scope

The Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy Project will:

- Identify challenges and opportunities for municipal involvement in the energy corridor planning and regulatory processes
- Review best practices for regional energy corridor planning from other jurisdictions
- Recommend an advocacy strategy to address energy corridor planning issues in the Region to provincial and federal governments and regulatory agencies
- Recommend a governance structure to advance energy corridor planning in the Region that enables EMRB municipalities to participate in the planning and regulatory processes

Project Approach

The recommended project approach includes three phases:

Phase 1 – Project Initiation

The first phase will consist of setting up the project, including establishing the Project Charter, identifying stakeholders, and contracting consultants. Phase 1 will also confirm the specific project intent, guiding principles, policy directions, and specific project outcomes.

Phase 2 – Best Practices Review

The Master Plan examined the current state and assessed the future needs of energy corridors in the Region. Phase 2 will validate and summarize the current state and future needs at a high level.
Energy corridor planning and advocacy strategies in other regions will be examined to establish best practices. Best practices will be evaluated for applicability and use in the Region.

**Phase 3 – Advocacy Strategy**

Phase 3 will identify opportunities and challenges facing municipal involvement in the energy corridor planning and regulatory processes and develop a comprehensive energy corridors advocacy strategy to ensure the municipalities in the Region are recognized as an important stakeholder in the energy corridor planning process. The intent is to have a stronger voice and be recognized and consulted about the location of future energy corridors in the Region given the EMRB’s role in regional land use planning associated with the implementation of the EMR Growth Plan. The advocacy strategy will include recommendations regarding governance.

**Project Governance**

The EMRB is the sponsor for the Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy Project and provides the authority and support for the project. Oversight for this project will come from the Board.

The Project Team will consist of a project manager, project consultant, and key stakeholders. A project manager from EMRB administration will be assigned to oversee the planning, execution, and completion of the project. The project manager is responsible for project administration, including project resource management, schedule, budget management, and issues management.

Key stakeholders will be engaged as needed to provide professional technical and policy advice to the Project Team. Municipal administrative staff may be identified as key stakeholders.

A consultant will be contracted to assist in all phases of the project and prepare the final deliverables.

**Deliverables**

1. Review of current state, needs assessment, and best practices:
   - Validates, assesses, and summarizes the current state and future needs of energy corridors in the Region
   - Examines the current approval and regulatory system and identifies gaps, constraints, and opportunities regarding EMRB municipalities’ role in the system
   - Reviews best practices for approaches to energy corridors in other regions
2. An energy corridors advocacy strategy:
   - Recommend measures to ensure EMRB municipalities are able to substantively participate in the planning process
   - Considers the current regulatory and legislative frameworks, and
   - Recommends policy measures to support EMRB municipality involvement in the planning and regulatory processes

---
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Project Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SISB Project</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Initiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Best Practices Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Advocacy Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholders

The following is a preliminary list of project stakeholders. More stakeholders may be identified throughout the course of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Energy</td>
<td>Regulatory and approval perspective</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Energy Regulator</td>
<td>Regulatory and approval perspective</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Infrastructure</td>
<td>Land management and planning perspectives</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Environment</td>
<td>Regulatory and approval perspective, land use and management perspective, environment and water perspective</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Governments</td>
<td>Municipal planning, economic development, land use and management, policy perspectives</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Industrial Heartland Association</td>
<td>Association economic development, planning, technical perspectives</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Electrical System Operator</td>
<td>System planning and regulatory perspective</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipeline Companies</td>
<td>Capital planning and projects, land management, regulatory, right-of-way perspectives</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AltaLink</td>
<td>Land management, planning, right-of-way perspectives</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Energy Board</td>
<td>Regulatory and approval process perspective</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Sands Secretariat</td>
<td>Regulatory and approval process perspective</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers</td>
<td>Capital planning and projects, land management, regulatory, right-of-way perspectives, regulatory and approval perspective</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Global</td>
<td>Regional economic development and marketing perspective</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Communities</td>
<td>Traditional land use/management and cultural perspective</td>
<td>Provide professional technical policy advice and expertise throughout the project as required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget

The budget for this project is proposed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Total Project Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction and Summary

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2 Regional Energy Corridors

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

2.1 Regional Energy Corridors Defined

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

![Figure 2: Oil Liquids Transmission Schematic](http://www.cepa.com/about-pipelines/types-of-pipelines/liquids-pipelines)
2.1.3 Regional Energy Corridor Defined

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

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

2.2 Regional Energy Corridor Development Models

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

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

2.2.1 Individual Corridor Development

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

2.2.2 Common Corridor Development

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

2.2.3 Provincial Transportation Utility Corridor (TUC)

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

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

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

2.2.4 Municipal Utility Corridor

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

3 Regional Energy Corridor Development

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

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

3.1 Existing Regional Energy Corridor Development

3.1.1 Pipeline Corridors

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

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

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

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

The current pipeline infrastructure footprint in the Capital Region is shown on Figure 3.

Figure 3: Capital Region Pipeline Footprint
FIGURE 3: CAPITAL REGION PIPELINE FOOTPRINT
3.1.2 Power Line Corridors

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

The current power line footprint is shown on Figure 4.

Figure 4: Capital Region Power Line Footprint
FIGURE 4: CAPITAL REGION POWER LINE FOOTPRINT
3.2 Future Regional Energy Corridor Development

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

3.2.1 Power Transmission Corridor Needs

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

Future growth assumptions and estimates over the next 20 years in the Capital Region are driven by the following drivers of need:

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

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

**Current Projects**

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

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

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

Figure 9: Future Power Transmission Corridor Needs
Fort Saskatchewan Planning Region

Table 1: Fort Saskatchewan Region 20 Year Forecast Summary

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

Source: AESO 2013 Long-term Transmission Plan

Edmonton Planning Area

Table 2: Edmonton Region 20 Year Forecast Summary

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

Source: AESO 2013 Long-term Transmission Plan
3.2.2 Future Pipeline Corridor Development

The Capital Region’s success as a hub for petroleum production and distribution has exceeded original forecasts. Today, key components of our petroleum system are very close to being isolated with limited opportunities for growth and expansion. This is a direct result of a shortage of space for pipelines to export bitumen production.

Future pipeline growth is driven by the forecast growth for the export of crude bitumen from the oil sands regions of Alberta. The ERCB’s 2013 Energy Reserves 2012 and 2013 – 2022 Supply/Demand Outlook forecasts a decline in natural gas production, stable natural gas liquid and conventional oil production and a substantive increase of bitumen production from approximately 2 million barrels per day to 3.6 million barrels per day over a 10 year period. (Figure 10).

![Figure 10: Total Primary Energy Production in Alberta](Source: ERCB ST98-2013 page 2)

Current “Announced” Projects

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

1. Alberta Carbon Trunk Line
   » A 240 km pipeline connecting CO2 from industrial emitters in and around the Industrial Heartland south to Clive, Alberta
   » Regulatory approval 2011, engineering work underway, no construction dates

2. Enbridge Woodland Pipeline Extension
   » Pipeline connecting Cheecham to Enbridge Tank Farm in “Refinery Row”
   » The first 16 km construction completed to Highway 21
   » The remaining construction to the AIH and north to Cheecham to be completed 2014/2015

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

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

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

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

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

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

Future Pipeline Projects

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

The Capital Region can anticipate:

- 8-10 additional projects from 2014-2024
- An additional 4-6 projects from 2024-2034

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

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

4 Regional Energy Corridor Opportunities and Constraints

4.1 Corridor Constraints

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

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

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

A consolidated constraints map is shown on Figure 15.
FIGURE 12: REGIONAL ENERGY CORRIDORS PHYSICAL CONSTRAINTS

List of Corridor Constraint Areas
1. Eastern limits of Fort Saskatchewan
2. Proposed Bremner Town Site
3. Aurora Industrial Park Development
4. George Pacific Building
5. Fort Hills (Sugeon Land Holdings)
6. North Bruderheim Area
7. Ellerslie Substation
8. Genesee Area
FIGURE 13: REGIONAL ENERGY CORRIDORS POLICY CONSTRAINTS
FIGURE 13A: REGIONAL ENERGY CORRIDORS POLICY CONSTRAINTS – HEARTLAND AREA
FIGURE 15A: REGIONAL ENERGY CORRIDORS CONSOLIDATED CONSTRAINTS – HEARTLAND AREA
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4.2 Present and Future Growth Conflicts

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 4.3 Opportunities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Addressing corridor constraints proactively will:

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

5 Key Energy Corridor Stakeholders, Roles and Models

5.1 Stakeholder Roles

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder roles in the planning, development and regulation of regional energy corridors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRB Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inform/Consult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>CR_Brole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Energy Pipeline Association</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEA represents and advocates the interests of the Canadian electricity industry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Association of Energy and Pipeline Landowner Associations</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEPL represents and advocates the interests of landowner associations who represent landowners affected by energy and pipeline proposals and projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

6.1 Current Regional Corridor Policy

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

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

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

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

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

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

6.2 Proposed Policy Framework

There is a policy gap in the Growth Plan for planning future energy corridors – the current approach “to identify and protect” does not guide the CRB as to how to identify future corridors – as it assumes knowledge of where future corridors will be located. Municipalities, acting on their own have some resources and rights under existing legislation and regulations to react to proposed corridors (intervene at regulatory hearings), but have limited ability, on their own, to direct the location of future corridors. Due to the role that corridors have on the regional economy, and the impact that can have on land development, and in order to achieve the Principles and Policies of the Growth Plan, it is necessary to develop a coordinated strategic approach to planning for future Regional Energy Corridors.
From the research and stakeholder interviews it is apparent that something must be done, and soon, before growth in the region prevents new and expanded power lines and pipelines from reaching their destinations, and as a result, threatens economic sustainability and increases land fragmentation.

### 6.2.1 Policy Framework:

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

### 6.2.2 Recommended actions:

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

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

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

1. That the Land Use and Planning Committee direct that a Task Force be formed to oversee the development of an Regional Energy Corridor master plan. The purpose of the Plan is to development detailed policies and criteria for identifying and prioritizing the location of future Regional Energy Corridors in the Capital Region.
2. That the Land Use and Planning Committee, through the Board, request the Performance Monitoring Committee to develop a:
a. Detailed advocacy and communications plan that supports and advances the notion of a Regional Energy Corridor(s) that addresses existing and future electrical transmission and pipeline needs; and
b. A monitoring and reporting process for the implementation of the Regional Energy Corridors master plan.
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## Appendix 1: Glossary and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AER</td>
<td>Alberta Energy Regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESO</td>
<td>Alberta Electrical System Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>Alberta Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIH</td>
<td>Alberta Industrial Heartland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRA</td>
<td>Cluster Country Residential Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>A passageway or route such as a major utility, roadway and transit route through an area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraint</td>
<td>• physical constraints – constraints related to corridor capacity, or existing development footprint, airports, coal extraction areas&lt;br&gt;• policy constraints – growth areas (PGAs, CCRA, Alberta’s Industrial Heartland), lands outside local jurisdiction (reserves, CFB Edmonton)&lt;br&gt;• natural constraints – hydrology, parks, protected areas, environmentally sensitive areas; would result in fragmentation/disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB</td>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Direct Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>Long-term Transmission Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland Pipeline Corridor</td>
<td>Regionally significant corridors that are identified and protected as conceptual locations of multiple new energy sectors’ inter-connecting and intra-connecting pipelines necessary in conveying product to processors and to the market in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland. These corridors function to minimize risk, land fragmentation and the impact on the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Corridor</td>
<td>Defined in the Growth Plan Addendum as ‘A corridor designed to accommodate multiple infrastructure facilities such as roads, transmission lines and pipelines within and beyond the region’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEB</td>
<td>National Energy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>Priority Growth Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure</td>
<td>Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure consists of Transmission Pipelines and Feeder Lines that move petroleum across the province and internationally and between storage and processing facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Infrastructure</td>
<td>Power Infrastructure consists of Electricity Transmission lines that provide the bulk transfer of electricity on regional 138, 240 and 500 kV Transmission Corridors and their Substations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Energy Corridor</td>
<td>The identified Multiple-Use Corridors for regional Power Infrastructure - Electricity Transmission (138kv and larger) and Bulk System Substations and regional Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure - Transmission Pipelines and Feeder Lines within and beyond the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Development Areas</td>
<td>Restricted Development Areas are defined under regulation to enable the province to establish and maintain multiple-use corridors and are known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback</td>
<td>A setback is the absolute minimum distance that must be maintained between any energy facility (for example, a drilling or producing well, a pipeline, or a gas plant) and a dwelling, rural housing development, urban centre, or public facility. Setbacks vary according to the type of development and whether the well, facility, or pipeline contains sour gas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUCs Transportation Utility Corridors</td>
<td>TUCs are designed for long-term alignment of ring roads and major linear utilities in urban areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Study Research Questions

The following questions guided project research and interviews:

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

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

3.0 What is the technical definition of Regional Energy Corridors?

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

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

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

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

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

A summary of interview responses by question is outlined below.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

• Land owners both direct and adjacent, regulators, municipalities, various government departments, general public as a whole, First Nations and other operators both adjacent and crossing

• Land owners, communities, First Nations, other industry, government and the energy industry (The actual owner of the product being shipped is impacted by the results of the consultation and regulatory process.)

• Province, citizens, various municipal governments. As a comment, different municipalities are more active in the planning and development of projects. Strathcona County is good at involvement while the City of Edmonton is learning.

• Key stakeholders - Residents and tax payers. There is a difference between residents and tax payers. In other words, there is a difference between those being impacted and others in the community that are benefiting from jobs and tax revenues. Additional stakeholders include the GofA (various departments) and the oil and gas industry.

• Major pipelines, AESO, ATCO, AltaLink, landowners, communities, governments

• Land owners, pipeline companies (all are not equal), AESO, SRD, SRB, AT, Alberta Regulator

• Anybody that is impacted by the infrastructure, counties, adjacent land owners/infrastructure, employees of oil and gas infrastructure facilities, everybody else

• All pipeline companies, transmission companies (Atco, AltaLink), land owners, municipalities, AESO, AT, AE, AER, NEB.

• Strathcona believes it can play a role in determining alignments to ensure compliance with the greater good need. They also believe that a major need they participate in is the need for responsible growth.

• Key Stakeholders - Land owners, County, Communities, Government, Oil and Gas companies. The majors don’t connect with the communities as much as the locals that are there often. We are there to protect our land owners and communities.

2.1 What are the roles of the key stakeholders?
Regulators review approval and confirm it is constructed according to the approval granted. The land owner has to be willing to grant right-of-way and the right to operate and maintain the pipe. Other operators need to grant agreements for adjacent and crossing activities.

Roles – Community, FN and land owners – we need their social license to go with the project.

There is a general feeling in our county that we want to engage with the industry player and help facilitate and work with them.

Our county’s role – education related to benefits. As we become more involved we need to show the benefits to our residents. For our councillors it is hard for them to wear a business hat instead of a resident hat. Councillors don’t think long term. This becomes an issue when trying to build on the corridor concept because we have short term pain with long term gain.

From our county point of view, we are there to protect our land owners and communities.

Roles of land owners – because we have to access the land we need input into routing.

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

There needs to be a strategic relationship between the CRB, regulator and even the operator. Corridors bring definition; certainty and time clarity. We get there by zoning and possibly expropriation.

The CRB can invite key stakeholders to review both Stakeholder and CRB Growth plans.

Define corridors; enforce the use of the corridor by zoning and planning. The TUC has been the most effective tool in the last 30 years. They need to become part of the solution, maybe as a facilitator. Important thing to remember – the one thing pipeline companies can do is follow rules.

Education: The Regulators believe there is a general lack of understanding by the majority of municipalities regarding pipelines and population, risk management and the upstream and downstream aspects of the business and the benefits. (They mentioned at least three times the financial benefit of pipelines and the petroleum industry to the county through taxes, job, and spin off industries). (The public has no idea of the significance).

All those in this interview are worried about CRB moving into their domain and undertaking tasks they feel are theirs. They identified education as a major need amongst municipalities, politicians and the general public. (Note- Maybe the CRB is the vehicle that the “have not” municipalities could use to address their needs related to this issue?) Having people understand the industry, why there is a need for connecting the parts, how growth will come and the risks associated with everything is part of the education process. Consistency is needed between the various municipalities.

Education, industry association presentations, all hear directly from the pipeline companies and associations including CEPA, CAPP, and CNDN Heavy Oil Association.

There is need for a body to bring players together including industry, government, municipalities in order to develop a coordinated energy plan for the region and to preserve development able land. Today the risk is that infrastructure on lands can make it not fit for large development projects.
• Corridors need to be tied to an overall plan.
• Awareness and support of ongoing developments. The issue of social license has become more prevalent for all linear developments. Independent support from the CRB and their views on the economic benefits to the region and public would be helpful.
• Set the standards to the existing layers – standardization, take the arbitrary nature out of the various counties. A good example is setbacks – the setbacks don’t make sense from a risk management point of view. How do the counties’ setbacks trump the AER? There is a need for an interface between the CRB and the AER.
• Governments representing Environment – They walk a fine line between minimizing footprints and putting unrealistic duties on projects. Club root is an example – the default is to follow previous project’s approach and not take a stand that is responsible and based on fact. An additional example would be Forestry offices, as there are differences between each office in how they work.
• Role of CRB – get everyone to the table.
• CRB Participation could be high level policy stuff – not in day to day decisions – they could make sure policies are aligned. We do not need another level slowing things down – set high level policy – area structure plan – maybe needs a bit of a hammer for times
• The role of CRB is to get everyone to the table but need the respect of municipalities. CRB could bring standardization, one door instead of multiple. The AIH is an example of this. Houston is also somewhere where we have seen this – there they have everything in place, a regional board with 40 communities and with legislative authority. The CRB could be part of the public consultation – because of NIMBY there is a need to be out there ahead of time.

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

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

3.0 What is the technical definition of Regional Energy Corridors?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

• Forecasted demand – at present there are 11 interested parties looking at developing in the AIH. We appear to be ramping up to 5 million barrels a day. We are seeing a shift – where the AIH will be the HUB and not Refinery Row. Future growth is about gas, natural gas and gas liquids with NE British Columbia going to be our source.
• The AESO produces a 20 year Long Term Plan every 2 years. That should form the base forecast for any transmission demand.

• Need corridors near Williams river crossing, AIH into Refineries, into and through Lamont as well as through Sturgeon. (They mentioned risks zones around rail and heavy industry.

• Continued ramp up of oil sands will have a continued need for infrastructure. In the Refinery Row area we see a shortage of room for additional tankage. As well, corridor access into the area has become an issue. AIH has been on the radar for 10 years. Site activity builds pipe infrastructure activity. All the major pipeline companies have acquired land holdings in the AIH and with the shortage of land in the Refinery Row area, it is realistic to expect a shift to the AIH.

• The next eight years are going to be intense. AIH is going to expand and become a bigger hub. There will be a continuation of the need to run some new lines between AIH and the Refineries. The ability to interconnect in the AIH is a problem – very limited opportunities for alignments. Setbacks on industrial land are a problem as well.

• There is a shift away from the refineries area near Edmonton to the AIH. We will see less lines coming into Edmonton. Rail will continue to grow. We do not see it slowing down. Is there public sensitivity towards rail? The tax benefit for the municipalities is minimal for railways.

• The sense is that there is continued interest. It is becoming more and more evident that we have problems with skilled labour and lack of tide water. As extraction increases and shale gas ramps up we are going to see a bigger demand to ship our raw products elsewhere for enhancement and manufacturing.

• For the next 15 to 20 years we are going to see increases in products being shipped. We are seeing a significant increase to rail car activity – (from memory) in 1955 5700 car movements, in 2035 there will be 235,000 car movements. This year we are seeing three trains per week from the area, next year eight to 10 trains a week. We see a significant amount of our tax revenue from pipeline and power line infrastructure.

• Power lines are finished – the Heartland Transmission Project took care of that. Ongoing need for pipelines with continued growth for the next 10 to 20 years. New developments in the AIH will need new pipelines. It is likely we will see some of the pipelines being a duplication – but they will meet a business need of a different supplier.

• Forecasted demand – The day when we complete the big export pipeline the price will go up, this will drive development and increase the players. The role of Edmonton will decline with the AIH seeing more and more coming and going from this area. He asked the question – will new technologies improve efficiencies, which will result in the need to increase capacity. As we see our population growing we will see more opportunities for additional services and opportunities for industries.

• Oil sands are in a significant growth mode. We are going from 2mbd to more than 5mbd. A great deal will go through the port of Prince Rupert. Impact of NGP will be to accelerate the time frame. Project and capacities will increase sooner than originally thought. Today we are seeing different avenues for oil – important integration of rail and pipe.

• Significant build in the Heartland, smaller projects, for the next four or five years very significant growth, shifting more to the AIH as it is too congested in Edmonton, recognize the fact all the majors have purchased lands in the AIH. Comment about congestion in Edmonton area. We had two 300km pipelines and a 45km pipeline all start at the same time. The 45km
pipeline in the Edmonton to AIH area is still bogged down and slow to start—no space, too much congestion. The others are basically finished.

5.0 What are the desired project locations (corridors) for these projects and key issues to consider?

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

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

- Acreage development in Lamont is threatening to block development and pipeline capacity. What is the growth plan for Acheson (possibly Campbell and the international airport should be looked at).
- TUC pinch points – Georgia Pacific and NEPC. We are going to see more pipes going to the AIH to individual sites – not everyone goes to the same site.

6.0 Operational Management and Funding Models

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

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

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

- Management and funding – If designated, then over time they should be acquired. Put in place a TUC like structure that is revenue neutral. The problem with an industry model is that they don’t trust each other. The TUC model has worked until Henday and the arrival of pinch points.
- Regulated utilities cannot get a return on their investment from land purchased in advance, or on speculation for a future corridor. Their funding for operational management models are limited by the legislation.
- Management and funding – Maybe the Edmonton Pipeline Group has a role. You need an outside party. A group could better address the need for Risk Management. Maybe the big companies should be brought to the table to participate?
  - Models - Private, municipalities, P3. It needs to be regulated to back it and push the companies in the direction. You need someone to set it up.
  - Roles – The CRB role could be to consider where they go and make sure they are aligned with the plan. Make sure any new pipelines are compliant. The danger is that we get too many people or groups involved and we start to see “scope creep”.

- Operational and funding models – TUC, Private model, municipality controlled, some arms-length government involvement, a land trust. Ownership is the key – regulation gets you there. The problem that arises is the ability to expropriate and the ability to regulate – do you really need that? Management and funding models – P3 with industry, provincial and federal dollars. In urban areas, controlled is better. In rural self-regulated is preferable.
- Operational and Management Funding Models - Province should buy land. We need a National Energy Strategy and include the Feds in this. The Provincial Government needs to
step up as there is no real impetus for this. A model based on Industry involvement will not work.

- History has shown that where a designated corridor is not owned, the pipeline companies are held to ransom. The TUC and NEPC are effective models as they provide certainty. There are some areas where problems are encountered in these corridors and that is where the government has failed to purchase the land.

- One option is for the government to buy a strip of land for a corridor – to be effective it should be continuous and not voluntary. The idea of government and industry will not work as the perception is that industry is driving the process not regional or land use planning – without the government stepping up the companies will continue to do as they do now.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

iii. minimization and mitigation of land use conflicts; and,
iv. risk management.

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

**General comments**

- Today, municipalities and counties are in a tough spot. They need to recognize not only the above ground infrastructure but also what they don’t see and that is the pipeline infrastructure. They are all not at the same extent. Strathcona County is very active talking to industry. They understand the revenues and importance of the pipeline infrastructure to their county.
- It is a stretch to think buying a corridor will take place. Planning is a mechanism where the issues can be identified early but we need processes to be in place where the potential issue can be acted upon.
- General comments – Time is the key, change from an engineering perspective impacts the client. Costly delays increase the net costs to the project, which impacts the producer.
- We see today that there is a potential to get dragged down in the process and never get your approval. We also see that the regulatory approval process has been used by special interest groups to highjack the process.
- Whenever planning a pipeline we use Abadata, which gives us the information about what is there and we try and follow existing alignments. Planners need to know what is there and recognize it.
- The corridor concept allows the ability to gather resident information as well as helps with costing and addressing the annoyance of bothering people.
• Taxes are a big concern – we have site and linear taxes – be wary of pushing industry away because of tax.
• A corridor provides a means to control the separation of industry types while providing a stable environment for linear development and clarity. It will help to improve the regulatory process.
• The idea of further developing corridors is long overdue, they need to persevere. Education is significant - policy needs to be sold – you need a vision and keep on the path.
• We have pressure points that need addressing but we need to look beyond that. We can’t let the dollars limit our creativity or we will never get this done.
• Not everyone is coming from the same place, but they are probably going to the same place. Planners see the faces of the locals but they don’t see the face of business. There needs to be a forum to tell the public about pipelines. A corridor eliminates the public impact on routing – the definition is there and it helps great.
• THE SRB IS NOT ALIGNED WITH BASIC PLANNING PRINCIPLES – wasting land.
• Problem – when you declare a regional corridor – what does it do to land values? Does it create a land grab issue?
• Coordination of the use of our land is a must. How we connect into the markets and other areas is just as important. Corridor needs to be tied to an overall plan. Being proactive is a key – there are lessons learned from the oil sands (Tying up land where infrastructure is needed – shape of leases). How corridors fit with development, needs to be addressed.
• Need to recognize that the energy industry is vital to our growth.
• The fact that this study will bring education to some is a major benefit and a step forward.
• Defined corridors eliminate the competition for linear space – this also helps to build the case for other entries into the corridor concept.
• Viable corridors do provide positive growth and help build our communities – tax is very beneficial.
• People have to understand that pipelines are a reality as we are a resource province. They need to look at a refinery as 1500 people, all with children, needing schools, doctors etc.
Appendix 5: Regulatory Approval Requirements for Energy Corridors

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

### Power Transmission

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

| Alberta Electricity System Operator | Electrical Statutes Amendment Act | | |

### Province

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

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

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

The Capital Region Board recently approved a vision statement for the first 5 year update to the Capital Region Growth Plan. Embedded in the vision are two elements at the core of energy corridor planning:

“The Edmonton Metropolitan Region is the dominant hub for northern Alberta”

and

“is globally recognized for its... leadership in energy development”.

If the Edmonton Metropolitan Region is the hub, then the petroleum pipelines and power transmission lines extending into and out of the Region are the spokes which drive the energy industry and the Canadian economy. Energy corridors are the essential networks that maintain the economic viability of the petrochemical energy cluster in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland and continued success of existing refining activities.

Over 40% of Alberta’s GDP is generated in the Edmonton Region. While the current low price of oil may result in a slowing of the economy over the next year or two, the Region is fully aware of the cyclical nature of a boom and bust resource industry. Planning for the next economic boom is critical to ensuring the region remains globally competitive and continues to prosper and thrive. This means planning for the people that are going to come to the Region to take advantage of the opportunities.

Between 2006 and 2011 the population of the Capital Region grew by over 12%, one of the fastest growing areas in Canada, driven mostly by the influx of skilled workers needed by the energy industry. Another 1 million people are expected to make the Capital Region their home in the next 30 years, increasing the population from 1.2 million to 2.2 million.

With the anticipated growth where are these people going to live? Work? Recreate? What is the plan for the efficient use of land? Maintaining a safe and healthy environment? All the while ensuring industry can continue to flourish.

Energy Corridors are needed to provide efficient and cost-effective access into and out of the Region from power and petroleum producing sources. As the ability to move and access power and petroleum products becomes more constrained in the Region, other potential petrochemical hubs such as Hardisty or Northeast British Columbia will become more attractive for related industrial development and economic growth.

The rational planning of energy corridors is also needed to maintain the quality of life of residential and commercial areas of the Region. Land fragmented by energy corridors limits efficient development of Priority Growth Areas and the ability of the Region to meet the objectives of the Growth Plan. However, there is little direction and policy to support the planning or integration of future corridors, energy or otherwise, into the land use fabric of the region.

The Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan establishes a policy framework and regional corridor strategy to protect energy corridors needed for future economic growth, and limit land fragmentation of growth areas in the Capital Region.
**Policy Framework**

The Policy Framework of the Master Plan is derived from the principles and policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan to support development and economic growth, and minimize land fragmentation. The Policy Framework establishes the following themes:

Policy Themes:
- Integrate energy corridors with the principles and policies of Growth Plan
- Minimize land use conflicts and the fragmentation of land
- Support the development of energy industrial clusters and economic development of the region
- Ensure effective coordination of energy corridors across and between municipal jurisdictions

The themes are used to guide the development of the energy corridor policies.

**Corridor Strategy**

The Regional Energy Corridors Strategy was developed to identify which corridors, existing and future, should be prioritized and what options are available for their protection. The Strategy sets out four steps for this process:

1. Identify existing regional corridors (e.g. the Transportation Utility Corridor)
2. Assess future corridor needs and options
3. Identify priority corridors
4. Identify approaches and management models to protect lands for priority Regional Energy Corridors

The Strategy identifies seven priority corridors for the CRB to review as part of its future growth planning (see Figures 2.0 and 4.0 in Appendix F):

**Short Term – 0 to 5 years**

*North East Penetrator Corridor* – Actions are necessary to increase corridor space and access needed for multiple projects into the Transportation and Utility Corridor (TUC), Refinery Row and Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.

*Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Intersite Connector Corridor* – An energy corridor(s) within Alberta’s Industrial Heartland to move product to and between the multiple energy facilities within the area.

*Heartland East Connector Corridor* – An increased focus on prioritizing corridor routing to the east corridor rather than the west corridor to limit land alienation.

**Medium Term – 5 to 20 years**

*Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Connector* – An energy corridor from Alberta’s Industrial Heartland to the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park (EETP) and TUC to provide product to EETP and an alternate route to Refinery Row to complement the North East Penetrator Corridor.

*Redwater Bypass Corridor* – An energy corridor from northeast Alberta to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland on north side of the North Saskatchewan River.
Northwest Alberta Connector – An energy corridor from northwest Alberta and northeast British Columbia to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.

Long Term – 20 plus years

Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor – A multi-use corridor aligned along the east and south boundary of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland that supports access to all areas of the Heartland.

The Strategy also identifies potential protection options for the priority corridors. The approaches are based on a combination of potential land easement and ownership opportunities ranging from individual right-of-way easements to provincially owned corridors (e.g. TUC) and land use tools ranging from Growth Plan designated corridors to regulatory and/or bylaw tools to manage land uses on and adjacent to regional energy corridors.

Recommendations and Further Actions

The Master Plan establishes recommendations and identifies further actions to plan for the management of regional energy corridors in the Capital Region.

Recommendations

1. That the Capital Region Board endorse the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan, and that its policies be integrated into the Growth Plan through the 2015/16 Growth Plan Update.

2. That the Capital Region Board facilitate the development of common best practices and approaches for the siting, right-of-way design, and protection of energy corridors by member municipalities in discussion with industry, the province and regulators.

3. That the Capital Region Board work with member municipalities to refine the locations and alignments of the Priority Energy Corridors as shown on the Maps of Energy Corridors in Appendix F.

Further Actions

1. That the Capital Region Board support and provide leadership in the development of a Capital Region Energy Corridors Stakeholder Forum. The purpose of the Forum will be to bring together the various stakeholders involved in policy development, regulation, planning, acquisition, infrastructure development, and monitoring of energy corridors in the Capital Region to:
   a. Meet on a periodic basis to review energy corridors and serve as a communications forum.
   b. Identify and facilitate energy corridor protection options for consideration.
   c. Review best practices for energy corridors development.
   d. Maintain an up-to-date map and summary of developed, approved, planned and anticipated energy corridors with a twenty-year outlook.
   e. Invite participation from key stakeholders including, but not limited to:
      i. Pipeline Companies with interests in the Capital Region
      ii. Transmission Line Companies with interests in the Capital Region
      iii. Alberta Industrial Heartland Association
      iv. Alberta Utilities Commission
      v. Alberta Electrical System Operator
      vi. Alberta Energy Regulator
      vii. Alberta Municipal Affairs
viii. Alberta Energy  
ix. Alberta Infrastructure  
x. Capital Region Board  
xi. Capital Region Member Municipalities  
xii. Capital Region Water and Wastewater Commissions  
xiii. National Energy Board  

2. That the Capital Region Board approach the Government of Alberta with a proposal to grant the CRB standing in Alberta Energy Regulator and Alberta Utilities Commission hearings related to the review of energy corridor projects and their routing within the Capital Region. Should standing be granted, the CRB will develop policy to guide intervening in hearings for proposed transmission lines and pipelines that are inconsistent with the Capital Region Growth Plan.  

3. That the Capital Region Board seek industry and government support, participation and funding of a business case that defines, assesses and evaluates multi-use corridors verses individual rights-of-ways to support the protection and use of multi-use corridors for energy infrastructure.  

4. That the Capital Region Board advocate to the Government of Alberta the coordination and integration of long range regional transportation and energy corridor planning in the Capital Region.  

5. That the Capital Region Board request the Alberta Energy Regulator review options and alternatives to more effectively enable energy corridors within the Capital Region, including:  
   a. Clarifying AER Directives to:  
      i. further influence the use of multi-use energy corridors by pipeline proponents; and,  
      ii. consider the level of project review for proponents using identified multi-use energy corridors.  
   b. Considering the use of a Play Based Regulation Pilot for planned regional pipeline corridors to encourage applicants to collaborate on surface development plans in order to  
      i. minimize the number of facilities and other surface impacts; and,  
      ii. ensure that effective practices are used to minimize land alienation.
## Glossary of Terms and Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AER</td>
<td>Alberta Energy Regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESO</td>
<td>Alberta Electrical System Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>Alberta Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIH</td>
<td>Alberta’s Industrial Heartland - A 582 km² heavy industrial zoned area northeast of Edmonton that has become the largest hydrocarbon processing region in Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Growth Plan</td>
<td>The Growth Management Plan approved by the CRB and the Province pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation (AR 38/2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>Defined in the Growth Plan Addendum as ‘A corridor designed to accommodate multiple infrastructure facilities such as roads, transmission lines and pipelines within and beyond the Region’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Constraint            | • Physical constraints – constraints related to corridor capacity, or existing development footprint, airports, coal extraction areas  
                        • Policy constraints – growth areas (PGAs, CCRAs, Alberta’s Industrial Heartland), lands outside local jurisdiction (reserves, CFB Edmonton)  
                        • Natural constraints – hydrology, parks, protected areas, environmentally sensitive areas; would result in fragmentation/disturbance |
<p>| CRB                   | Capital Region Board – is a non-profit corporation consisting of an elected official from the 24 member municipalities from within the Greater Edmonton Metropolitan Region. |
| Easement              | A right-of-way across land supported by regulatory approvals that grants the owner rights to install and operate their energy facility. |
| LTP                   | Long-term Transmission Plan                                                                                                                                 |
| Heartland Pipeline Corridor | Regionally significant corridors that are identified and protected as conceptual locations of multiple new energy sectors’ inter-connecting and intra-connecting pipelines necessary in conveying product to processors and to the market in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland. These corridors function to minimize risk, land fragmentation and the impact on the environment. |
| NEB                   | National Energy Board                                                                                                                                 |
| NRCB                  | Natural Resources Conservation Board                                                                                                                                 |
| PGA                   | Priority Growth Areas as defined in the Capital Region Growth Plan                                                                                                                                 |
| Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure | Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure consists of Transmission Pipelines and Feeder Lines that move petroleum across the province and internationally and between storage and processing facilities. |
| Play Based Regulation | Through the play-based regulation initiative (PBR), the AER will be piloting a new framework to govern unconventional oil and gas development. The play-based regulation pilot project aims to encourage applicants to collaborate on surface development plans and participate in the pilot in order to minimize the number of facilities and other surface impacts during the pilot. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power Infrastructure</th>
<th>Power Infrastructure consists of Electricity Transmission lines that provide the bulk transfer of electricity on regional 138, 240 and 500 kV Transmission Corridors and their Substations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>A method to influence and/or protect lands for the location of energy corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refinery Row</td>
<td>The unofficial name given to the concentration of oil refineries in west Sherwood Park, Strathcona County, Alberta, just east of the city of Edmonton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Energy Corridor</td>
<td>The identified Multi-Use Corridors for regional Power Infrastructure - Electricity Transmission (138kv and larger) and Bulk System Substations and regional Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure - Transmission Pipelines and Feeder Lines within and beyond the Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Development Areas</td>
<td>Restricted Development Areas are defined under regulation to enable the province to establish and maintain Multi-Use Corridors and are known as Transportation Utility Corridors (TUCs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>An easement across land supported by regulatory approvals that grants the owner rights to install and operate their energy facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback</td>
<td>A setback is the absolute minimum distance that must be maintained between any energy facility (for example, a drilling or producing well, a pipeline, or a gas plant) and a dwelling, rural housing development, urban centre, or public facility. Setbacks vary according to the type of development and whether the well, facility, or pipeline contains sour gas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUC</td>
<td>Transportation Utility Corridors - TUCs are Multi-Use Corridors designed for long-term alignment of ring roads and major linear utilities in urban areas. For the purposes of this report TUC refers to the Edmonton TUC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 Introduction

The Capital Region Board recently approved a vision statement for the first 5 year update to the Capital Region Growth Plan. Embedded in the vision are two elements at the core of energy corridor planning:

“The Edmonton Metropolitan Region is the dominant hub for northern Alberta”
and
“is globally recognized for its... leadership in energy development”.

If the Edmonton Metropolitan Region is the hub, then the petroleum pipelines and power transmission lines extending into and out of the Region are the spokes which drive the energy industry and the Canadian economy. Energy corridors are the essential networks that maintain the economic viability of the petrochemical energy cluster in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland and continued success of existing refining activities.

Over 40% of Alberta’s GDP is generated in the Edmonton Region. While the current low price of oil may result in a slowing of the economy over the next year or two, the Region is fully aware of the cyclical nature of a boom and bust resource industry. Planning for the next economic boom is critical to ensuring the region remains globally competitive and continues to prosper and thrive. This means planning for the people that are going to come to the Region to take advantage of the opportunities.

Between 2006 and 2011 the population of the Capital Region grew by over 12%, one of the fastest growing areas in Canada, driven mostly by the influx of skilled workers needed by the energy industry. Another 1 million people are expected to make the Capital Region their home in the next 30 years, increasing the population from 1.2 million to 2.2 million.

With the anticipated growth where are these people going to live? Work? Recreate? What is the plan for the efficient use of land? Maintaining a safe and healthy environment? All the while ensuring industry can continue to flourish.

Energy Corridors are needed to provide efficient and cost-effective access into and out of the Region from electrical and petroleum producing sources. As the ability to move and access electrical and petroleum products becomes more constrained in the Region, other potential petrochemical hubs such as Hardisty or Northeast British Columbia will become more attractive for related industrial development and economic growth.

The Capital Region Board Regulation (38/2012) directed the Capital Region Board (CRB) to prepare a comprehensive, integrated regional land use plan. The approved plan includes the location of municipal infrastructure, priority growth areas, and existing corridors for recreation, transportation, and inter-municipal transit. The Plan also identifies a limited number of existing energy and utility corridors within the Capital Region. However, there is little direction and policy to support the planning or integration of future corridors, energy or otherwise, into the land use fabric of the region.

The rational planning of energy corridors is needed to maintain the quality of life of residential and commercial areas of the Region. Land fragmented by energy corridors limits efficient development of Priority Growth Areas and the ability of the Region to meet the objectives of the Growth Plan.
To understand the scope and context of energy corridors, the Land Use and Planning Committee of the CRB undertook the preparation of a Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework in 2014 to establish the groundwork for developing Growth Plan policies for energy corridors. The Framework concluded that there is a policy gap in the Growth Plan when it comes to energy corridors. The current approach “to identify and protect” existing corridors does not support the planning of future energy corridors, and as a result impacts the coordinated and strategic planning of growth areas.

The Capital Region Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework Report was approved by the Board in October 2014. The Report contained two recommendations:

1. That the CRB develop a comprehensive master plan to guide the location and development of energy corridors within the Capital Region; and
2. That the CRB leads the development a comprehensive energy corridors advocacy strategy, in partnership with industry stakeholders, to communicate energy corridor issues and challenges in the Capital Region to the Provincial and Federal governments.

The Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan establishes a regional corridor strategy and policy framework to protect energy corridors needed for future economic growth, and limit land fragmentation of priority growth areas in the Capital Region. This Master Plan proposes energy corridor policies to guide the location and development of energy corridors within the Capital Region; a regional energy corridors strategy; and recommendations and further actions to implement the Master Plan.

### 1.1 Organization of the Master Plan

The Master Plan is organized into six sections:

- **Section 1.0** Introduction – Introduces this report and describes its purpose
- **Section 2.0** Background and Context – Describes the CRB Energy Corridor Policy Framework and the CRB Growth Plan context for energy corridors
- **Section 3.0** Energy Corridor Policy Framework – Identifies objectives and policies for the identification and protection of energy corridors within the Capital Region
- **Section 4.0** Regional Energy Corridor Strategy – Identifies the strategic approach for the identification, assessment and protection of regional energy corridors
- **Section 5.0** Recommendations and Further Actions – Recommendations and suggested further actions for the Capital Region Board to explore with key stakeholders of energy corridors

**Appendices**
2.0 Background and Context

2.1 Capital Region Board Mandate

The mandate of the Capital Region Board, as directed in the Capital Region Board Regulation, was to prepare a Capital Region Growth Plan. The Growth Plan was completed and approved in 2010. The mandate further directed the Board to facilitate the resolution of issues arising from the preparation and implementation of the Capital Region Growth Plan. A noticeable issue in the preparation and subsequent implementation of the Growth Plan was the lack of a regional transportation plan and energy corridors plan. Therefore, the CRB made it a priority after approval of the Plan to prepare and integrate a regional transportation master plan into the Growth Plan. Similarly, as the 5 year Growth Plan Update proceeds, it is evident that planning for energy corridors requires the same approach.

2.2 Growth Plan Objectives

The Capital Region Board Regulation states the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan:

- To promote an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Capital Region
- To identify the overall development pattern and key future infrastructure investments that would best complement existing infrastructure, services and land uses in, and maximize benefits to the Capital Region
- To co-ordinate decisions in the Capital Region to sustain economic growth and ensure strong communities

The objectives clearly support the preparation of a Master Plan for energy corridors: A strategic approach to integrating land use and energy corridors is critical to planning for future growth in the Region; where to direct key infrastructure investments and locate energy corridors will complement and benefit the overall development pattern; and through the coordination and collaboration with key energy industry stakeholders the Board can ensure sustained economic growth and strong communities.

2.3 Growth Plan Principles and Policies

The purpose of the Growth Plan is to coordinate and manage growth to the benefit of the entire Region. The Growth Plan establishes a regional policy framework to integrate and manage growth across four priority areas – Land Use, Intermunicipal Transit, Housing and Geographic Information Services. The Plan’s foundation is based on a set of six guiding principles and numerous policies that support regional decision-making in the priority areas.

The following are the principles of the Capital Region Growth Plan to manage growth:

Protect the environment and resources

The Plan establishes appropriate policy to ensure a balance between resource-based activities and regional growth while minimizing the impacts on the surrounding natural environment and other uses.
Minimize the regional footprint

The Plan directs that lands identified for regional infrastructure such as energy transmission, highways, municipal infrastructure, etc. be protected from incompatible development and that priority growth areas be reviewed and planned in conjunction with new alignments or changes to alignments and/or location of major regional infrastructure.

Strengthen communities

Creating complete, compact and contiguous communities is a foundational objective of the Plan.

Increase transportation choice

Transportation choice is about more than just the movement of people – it is about moving goods and products into, through and out of the region in a variety of ways – pipelines, power lines, rail, air, etc.

Ensure efficient provision of services

One method of ensuring the efficient provision of services is identifying and protecting corridors for transportation, transit and infrastructure, now and in the future.

Support regional economic development

The Plan directs that an adequate supply of land be available for the future development of the Region’s industries and support for the further diversification of the regional economy.

2.4 Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework

The CRB adopted the Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework in October 2014 to help guide further work on the planning and integration of energy corridors in the Capital Region.

The Policy Framework called for a comprehensive Master Plan to guide the location and development of energy corridors within the Capital Region. A summary of the overall Policy Framework and recommendations are provided in Appendix A. However, the following specific themes from the policy framework are relevant to the development of an Energy Corridors Master Plan:

“The CRB will plan for energy corridors in the Growth Plan to ensure the needs of industry are supported and sustained”

The energy industry continues to grow in Alberta, and it is important to recognize the role of this sector in the provincial and regional economy. Therefore it is prudent that any planning for growth ensure the needs of industry are understood, acknowledged and sustained into the future, and are not prejudiced by the growth pattern of the Region.

“Growth Plan policies should recognize and seek to address existing and potential barriers to energy corridor development”

The growth of the Region has paralleled the growth of the energy industry. As the development footprint expands, the potential for conflict with the energy infrastructure increases resulting in incompatible development adjacent to pipeline rights-of-way and electrical transmission lines. These conflicts limit the ability of energy corridors to expand and accommodate new energy infrastructure,
requiring the development of costly new rights-of-way and utility corridors, and increase the requirement to establish safety and emergency measures. Further, unchecked energy infrastructure growth also impacts the ability to logically and efficiently extend municipal infrastructure and the overall development pattern.

“Policies in support of energy corridors shall align to the greatest extent possible with the Growth Plan principles and policies”

The principles and policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan are the framework that guides future growth and development in the Capital Region to achieve its vision. The Region has grown around energy infrastructure and will continue to expand together with the energy industry well into the future. Therefore, planning for energy corridors must also abide by the Growth Plan’s principles and policies.

2.5 Growth and Constraints

The population of the Capital Region is expected to grow from 1.2 million to 2.2 million over the next 30 years. To accommodate the growth in population, the Growth Plan has identified Priority Growth Areas (PGAs) wherein growth will be concentrated in order to maximize the use of infrastructure and public transit by incorporating mixed use and higher density development that establishes a growth pattern integrated with and complementary to the needs of communities and industry.

The coordinated approach to planning future energy corridors requires the accommodation of PGAs and an understanding of the constraints to locating power transmission lines and pipelines in the region.

The Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework identified three types of constraints to the location of energy corridors:

Physical constraints – limited capacity in existing corridors; the existing development footprint; and other features and uses that impact the placement or expansion of corridors such as airports, coal extraction areas, etc.

Policy constraints – includes legislation and regulations that impact the location of corridors, such as designated growth areas in the Growth Plan (PGAs, CCRAs, Alberta’s Industrial Heartland), lands outside of local jurisdiction (reserves, CFB Edmonton), etc.

Natural constraints – hydrology, parks, protected areas, environmentally sensitive areas, etc.

2.6 Future Corridor Development

Future Power Transmission Projects

Electrical transmission growth forecast was based on the 2013 Alberta Electricity System Operator (AESO) Long Term Transmission Plan. AESO forecast nine large (138 kv or larger) transmission lines and three major power substations within the Region over the next twenty years. The geographical start and end points for these projects have been identified (reference Figure 9, CRB Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework, October 2014).
Future Pipeline Projects

Pipeline project growth forecast was based on the ERCB 2013 Energy Reserves Supply/Demand Outlook and interviews with industry stakeholders. Over the next ten years (2014 – 2024) the Capital Region can anticipate eight to ten additional projects. Ten to twenty years out (2025 – 2034) the Capital Region can anticipate a further four to six projects. Eight of these anticipated projects have been publically announced and are at different stages of design, permitting or preliminary construction. These projects are described in more detail in the 2014 CRB Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework Report.

2.7 Recent Energy Corridor Planning

The challenge of regional growth and the location of energy corridors is not new, and efforts have been made over the past ten years to address the issue. A number energy corridor planning documents were reviewed through the preparation of the Master Plan, including:

- Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Linear Corridor Feasibility Study (2015)
- Linear Infrastructure Corridor System Proposed Pipeline Corridors (2010)
- Regional Pipeline Corridor and Setback Study (2004)

The above studies provided an understanding of energy corridor needs to accommodate future growth and in context of existing constraints, and develop a policy framework to plan for that growth.

2.8 Municipal Legislative Limitations

Finally, member municipalities have few resources and rights under existing Federal and Provincial legislation to influence the location of corridors and rights-of-way used for the transmission of energy and movement of product in pipelines. They are limited to reacting to proposed corridors by intervening at regulatory hearings and are not the final arbiter of corridor location. The ability of municipalities to plan for, or direct the location of future corridors is restricted to those capabilities under the Municipal Government Act, and due to exemptions provided to pipelines in section 619(1) of the Act which:

- Recognizes NRCB, AER and AUC authorizations over any municipal statutory plan, land use bylaw, subdivision decision or development decision.
- Requires Municipal decisions to be consistent with NRCB, AER and AUC authorizations.
- Restricts municipalities from holding hearings covering issues already decided upon by the NRCB, AER and AUC.
3.0 Policy Framework

The Capital Region Growth Plan provides the current policy framework for energy corridors at the Regional level in an effort to protect growth areas from fragmentation. The Growth Plan provides the basis for an Energy Corridors Master Plan to plan for and protect future corridors.

Using the Growth Plan as a basis to extend policies specific to the Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan, key themes have been derived to guide policy development. They are identified below.

Policy Themes:
- Integrate energy corridors with the principles and policies of Growth Plan
- Minimize land use conflicts and the fragmentation of land
- Support the development of energy industrial clusters and economic development of the region
- Ensure effective coordination of energy corridors across and between municipal jurisdictions

3.1 Integrate Energy Corridors with Capital Region Growth Plan Principles and Policies

Principle 1 Preserve the Integrity of Priority Growth Areas

Preamble

Established by the Growth Plan, Priority Growth Areas (PGAs) are areas of planned concentrated growth within the Region, supported by higher urban densities and land uses, and major employment areas. In order to protect PGAs and major employment areas for growth, existing and future energy corridor needs must be identified and integrated into the Growth Plan.

Policy

A. Identified energy corridors will be integrated into Growth Plan policies and represented graphically.
B. In order to maintain the integrity of PGAs, new energy corridors will be identified and planned to avoid fragmenting and severing the contiguity of growth areas.
C. Existing Energy Corridors within PGAs will be considered first to accommodate additional pipelines or transmissions line rights-of-way in effort to reduce the creation of new corridors within PGAs.

Principle 2 Identify, Protect and Prioritize Lands for Existing and Future Energy Corridors

Preamble

The Growth Plan currently identifies existing regional infrastructure that member municipalities need to protect from incompatible development through their statutory plans; but energy corridors are not specifically addressed, nor is their growth. Future energy corridors must also be identified and protected from incompatible development.

Policy

A. Strategic entry points to access existing regional and future energy corridors shall be identified and protected through Growth Plan policy and through municipal statutory plans.
B. Member municipalities will protect regional energy corridors from incompatible development and facilitate the integration of energy corridors through policy or graphic representation in municipal statutory plans or amendments thereto.

C. Lands for needed for energy corridors in and out of the region shall be identified, protected and prioritized to ensure access to key upstream sources and their product destination sites within and beyond the Region.

3.2 Minimize Land Use Conflicts and Fragmentation of Land

Principle 1 Reduce Land Use Conflicts Associated with Regional Energy Corridors

Preamble

PGAs are the focus for growth in the Capital Region. They are urban areas that consist of a mix of land uses, employment, and higher residential densities. There are increased probabilities of land use conflicts and risks associated with regional energy corridors. In order to reduce the potential for land use conflicts, the Region must strive to utilize existing infrastructure corridors to accommodate energy infrastructure, and they should be located minimally within PGAs, while acknowledging that there are major employment areas located within PGAs.

Growth within the Region is also to be accommodated in areas outside of PGAs. The ability of the Region to reduce land use conflicts is also closely tied to minimizing the fragmentation of growth areas. Co-location of energy infrastructure will reduce land use conflicts by enabling the Region and member municipalities to plan for compatible and complementary adjacent land uses.

Policies

A. Leverage existing regional multi-use corridors (e.g. TUC, NEPC) to address existing constraints and accommodate future energy infrastructure growth.

B. Locate and integrate regional energy infrastructure with existing linear infrastructure (e.g. highways, railway right-of-ways).

C. Identify regional energy corridors in the Growth Plan to enable member municipalities to plan for appropriate adjacent land uses to reduce possible land use conflicts.

Principle 2 Minimize Fragmentation of Growth Areas

Preamble

Fragmented land negatively impacts the ability to achieve Growth Plan principles and the efficient development of land. A considerable number of energy corridors transect the Region and impact the ability to efficiently develop land in the long term. In order to reduce the further fragmentation of growth areas, it is necessary to identify and protect land to address current and future energy corridor needs.

Policies

A. Encourage and advocate for energy sector stakeholders to accommodate energy infrastructure growth within existing and future multi-use corridors. Adjacent lands should be identified and protected to respond to existing constraints and accommodate future growth.
B. Regional energy corridors should:
   o integrate with existing linear infrastructure (e.g. highways, railway right-of-way).
   o be rationalized by demonstrating that the proposed Regional energy corridor:
     • addresses current constraints;
     • responds to future planned growth within the energy sector; and,
     • connects upstream sources, major employment areas within the Region, and markets.

C. Best practices should be developed and used to minimize corridor widths and ensure the efficient use of land within PGAs in order to avoid the severance of developable lands.

### 3.3 Support the Energy Sector Industrial Clusters and Economic Development of the Region

**Principle 1**  
**Support the Role of the Energy Sector in the Prosperity of the Regional Economy**

**Preamble**

The prosperity of the Region and the viability of growth areas are dependent on the energy related industrial clusters throughout the Capital Region. The energy cluster within the AIH is one of the core drivers of the regional and provincial economy. The success of the clusters depends on movement of energy resources into, within, and beyond the Region. This includes those areas illustrated on Figure 1.0: Regional Pipeline Corridors, and Figure 3.0: Regional Power Transmission Corridors.

To support regional prosperity, a strategic and coordinated system of regional energy corridors that responds to existing conditions and anticipates future growth is necessary.

**Policies**

A. Regional energy corridors will establish connections to existing and future planned upstream sources, national and global energy markets, and major employment areas within the Region.

B. Regional energy corridor needs will be strategically prioritized in order to efficiently meet current and future demands to move upstream goods, and grow and strengthen the Regional economy.

C. The expansion of existing, and the identification of new regional energy corridors, will be supported by a business case that demonstrates the role of regional energy corridors as a key component of the success of the energy sector and the economic prosperity of the Capital Region. The business case will also be used to assist the Capital Region Board in identifying priorities for regional energy corridor growth.

### 3.4 Ensure Effective Coordination of Energy Corridors Across and Between Jurisdictions

**Principle 1**  
**Coordinate Energy Corridor Planning and Development between Jurisdictions**

**Preamble**

In order to maintain and support the energy industry in the Capital Region, member municipalities, energy sector stakeholders, regulators and the Government of Alberta must work collaboratively to coordinate energy corridor activities that benefit the Region.
Policies

A. The Capital Region Board will work collaboratively with the Government of Alberta, member municipalities and energy sector stakeholders to investigate, identify, develop and strategically implement a regional energy corridor management model for the protection and administration of the energy corridors depicted in Figure 2.0: Priority Pipeline Corridors and Figure 4.0: Priority Power Transmission Corridors.

B. That the Capital Region Board work with the Government of Alberta, the Alberta Energy Regulator and the Alberta Utilities Commission to explore, identify, and implement amendments to relevant Acts, Regulations and processes to support the precedent use of regional energy corridors.

C. The Capital Region Board and stakeholders will identify, prioritize, and regularly confirm energy corridors needs to ensure current and future growth can be efficiently accommodated within the Region.

D. Adopt and maintain a CRB Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan strategy that identifies and protects regional energy corridors.
4.0 Regional Energy Corridor Strategy

The Regional Energy Corridors Strategy was developed to identify which corridors, existing and future, should be prioritized and what options are available for their protection. The Strategy sets out four steps for this process:

1. Identify existing regional corridors – the main corridors used now
2. Assess future energy corridor needs and options
   - amongst potential corridor routes within the Region
   - against the principles of the Growth Plan to assess the overall impact of the Region
3. Identify priority corridors
4. Identify protection approaches and models for priority corridors

4.1 Identify Existing Regional Energy Corridors

There are hundreds of existing power and petroleum based rights-of-way and corridors throughout the Capital Region. Many of these are spokes that emanate out of the Transportation Utility Corridor Hub around Edmonton, facilitating the movement of energy goods from outside of the Region into and around Edmonton and Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.

The primary existing Energy Corridors in the Region are depicted on Figure 1.0: Regional Pipeline Corridors and Figure 3.0: Regional Power Transmission Corridors. The Regional Corridors were identified by stakeholders and were selected to show the main corridor routes into and out of the Capital Region. Not all routes are identified. Regional Energy Corridors, Transportation Facilities, and Priority Growth Areas are outlined on Figure 5.0. (All Figures are provided in Appendix F).

Regional Corridors

Currently Defined Multi-Use Corridors:
- Transportation Utility Corridor (TUC) – Hosting petroleum and power project access into and around Edmonton.
- North East Penetrator Corridor (NEPC) - Hosting (mostly) petroleum and power project access into and from Refinery Row to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.
- Heartland Connector Corridors - Hosting (mostly) petroleum and power project access into and from the NEPC into Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.

Petroleum Pipeline Corridors
- Brazeau/Drayton Valley – Shipping products from the Pembina and Drayton Valley fields and others into the refineries and storage facilities in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.
- Hardisty Connectors – Shipping products from refineries and storage facilities in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland to the United States and eastern Canada.
- Cold Lake/Southern Athabasca Oilsands/Fort McMurray – Shipping bitumen into the refineries and storage facilities of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland and diluent in return.
- Heartland – Fort McMurray - Shipping bitumen into the refineries and storage facilities of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland and diluent in return.
- Vancouver – Shipping oil to Vancouver via Jasper from the refineries and storage facilities of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.
4.2 Assess Priority Corridor Needs and Options

4.2.1 Corridor Needs

Corridor needs were addressed through previous assessments and a review of options with stakeholders. Based on past studies and the Stakeholder Workshop, a preliminary set of priority Regional Energy Corridors were identified.

The overall needs assessment is summarised on Table 1.0.

Other corridors that were identified in previous studies, through stakeholder interviews, and workshops include:

- **Transportation Utility Corridor** - The existing provincial TUC serves to enable large transmission line connections and connect the Leduc, Devon and Pembina oil and gas fields to the petrochemical complexes of Refinery Row and Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.

- **Hardisty Connector** - This corridor currently provides access from the Alberta’s Industrial Heartland to Hardisty north of Elk Island Park, following the Alliance Pipeline east.

- **Hardisty Connector (2)** - This corridor currently provides access from Refinery Row towards Hardisty south of Sherwood Park, paralleling existing Enbridge mainlines.

- **Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor** - This conceptual corridor was identified as a ring coming from the north and extending around the east side of the main Heartland Industrial Area east of Bruderheim and then circling west along the south border of AIH to connect with the Heartland Connectors.

- **Northern Gateway Corridor*** – An energy corridor to accommodate the planned twin pipeline from Alberta’s Industrial Heartland to Kitimat, B.C. (*Note – This corridor was added as a priority based on input received from the Land Use & Planning Committee and was not part of stakeholder discussions)

- **Fort McMurray West 500kv Transmission Project** - A power transmission line corridor heading directly north from Sunnybrook (Genesee Area) past Barrhead to Fort McMurray is currently under study by ATCO.

- **Fort McMurray East 500kv Transmission Project** - A transmission line corridor heading directly north from the Heartland Transmission Line to Fort McMurray is in the planning stages by AESO.

The priority energy corridors depicted in Figures 2.0 and 4.0 have been evaluated against the Regional Growth Plan Principles. The results are shown in Appendix E.
Table 1.0: Priority Regional Energy Corridor Needs Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor Needs Assessment Summary</th>
<th>North East Penetrator Corridor</th>
<th>Heartland Connector(s)</th>
<th>Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor</th>
<th>AIH Intersite Connector Corridor</th>
<th>Redwater Bypass Corridor</th>
<th>Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Connector</th>
<th>NW Alberta Connector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address Constraint</strong></td>
<td>Specific land access constraints to access Refinery Row</td>
<td>To focus routing decisions</td>
<td>To route around oil and gas fields west of Bruderheim limit access through area</td>
<td>Multiple projects and facilities need corridor access</td>
<td>To route west of Redwater and access across the Sturgeon River</td>
<td>To ship oil, gas and liquids from Swan Hills, Rainbow Lake, Norman Wells etc. to the Heartland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Access</strong></td>
<td>Multiple projects anticipated over next 20 years</td>
<td>Multiple projects anticipated over next 20 years</td>
<td>Multiple projects accessing and connecting facilities</td>
<td>To connect the EETP to the Heartland north of the river</td>
<td>From the NW corner of the AIH north and west</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitate Goods Movement</strong></td>
<td>Connecting Refinery Row and Storage facilities</td>
<td>Connecting Refinery Row and Storage facilities</td>
<td>Access into the Industrial Heartland from North-East Alberta</td>
<td>Accessing and connecting facilities within the Heartland</td>
<td>Access into Heartland from Northern Alberta</td>
<td>To connect the EETP to other industrial locations in the Heartland</td>
<td>Access into the Industrial Heartland from North-West Alberta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Identify Priority Energy Corridors

The identification of Priority Energy Corridors is based on the development of the hydrocarbon cluster in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland and Refinery Row. Priority Energy Corridors are selected to provide energy system access through existing constraint areas and reduce future land fragmentation.

The identified Priority Energy Corridors connect four key industrial areas in the northeast portion of the Capital Region:

1. Refinery Row – East of the North Saskatchewan River
2. Alberta’s Industrial Heartland – East of the North Saskatchewan River
3. Alberta’s Industrial Heartland – West of the North Saskatchewan River
4. Edmonton Energy and Technology Park - West of the North Saskatchewan River

Priority corridors are depicted on Figure 2.0: Priority Pipeline Corridors and Figure 4.0: Priority Power Transmission Corridors and described in Appendix D.

4.3.1 Priority Energy Corridors:

1. **North East Penetrator Corridor** - Connecting Refinery Row and the TUC to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland
2. **Heartland East Connector Corridor** - Connecting the NEPC into AIH following the southern edge of the Canadian Pacific Rail line
3. **Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor** – An energy corridor around the core of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland for raw products coming from the northeast portion of the province
4. **AIH Intersite Connector Corridor** - Connecting into and within the chemical cluster, storage and tank farms of the AIH. This is an internal AIH corridor network
5. **Redwater Bypass Corridor** - To provide access into the northern border of Sturgeon County into and out of the AIH on the west side of the North Saskatchewan River
6. **Edmonton Energy and Technology Park (EETP) Connector** - Connecting the EETP in northeast Edmonton to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.
7. **Northwest Alberta Connector** – Shipping petroleum products from the Swan Hills, Rainbow Lake, Norman Wells fields and others in northwest Alberta to the Capital Region.

Of the seven identified corridors above, one project, a 240kv transmission line from Clover Bar to a new substation between Sherwood Park and Fort Saskatchewan has been identified by the AESO that follow similar routing along the NEPC Corridor. There are six other planned transmission lines/ sub-stations (see 2014 Capital Region Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework). There are recognised co-location issues associated with pipelines and transmission lines. The utility of these corridors and potential integration of them needs to be reviewed with the electricity industry.
4.3.2 Corridor Timing

Through stakeholder interviews, review of previous energy corridor planning reports, and stakeholder workshops, timing for the development of priority corridors was considered. They are identified below:

**Short Term – 0 to 5 years**

- **North East Penetrator Corridor** – Actions are necessary to increase corridor space and access needed for multiple projects into the Transportation and Utility Corridor (TUC), Refinery Row and Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.
- **Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Intersite Connector Corridor** – An energy corridor(s) within Alberta’s Industrial Heartland to move product to and between the multiple energy facilities within the area.
- **Heartland East Connector Corridor** – An increased focus on prioritizing corridor routing to the east corridor rather than the west corridor to limit land alienation.

**Medium Term – 5 to 20 years**

- **Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Connector** – An energy corridor from Alberta’s Industrial Heartland to the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park (EETP) and TUC to provide product to EETP and an alternate route to Refinery Row to complement the North East Penetrator Corridor.
- **Redwater Bypass Corridor** – An energy corridor from northeast Alberta to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland on north side of the North Saskatchewan River.
- **Northwest Alberta Connector** - An energy corridor from northwest Alberta and northeast British Columbia to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.

**Long Term – 20 plus years**

- **Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor** - A multi-use corridor aligned along the east and south boundary of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland that supports access to all areas of the Heartland.

4.4 Priority Corridor Protection Approaches and Strategy

Priority energy corridors can be protected using a range of regulatory and ownership tools. However, there is no one size fits all approach or model. Most projects currently use a variety of approaches to secure tenure along the length of its route as it moves through different jurisdictions, land ownership and landscapes. These will be represented through different corridor models over the length of the project. For example, a pipeline may use part of the TUC, a single right-of-way, and/or run parallel to other energy infrastructure to create an unofficial common corridor.

A corridor can be protected using a range of land use policy and ownership tools to influence how and where projects are located. Protection can include a combination of tools ranging from simple identification (map notation) to outright ownership (TUC). Municipal statutory plans and permits may provide some limited influence over corridors. However, municipal plans must comply with AER, AUC, AEUB and NRCB authorizations (Section 619, *Municipal Government Act*).

A summary of the current protection status of the priority energy corridors is provided in Appendix D.
4.4.1 Corridor Protection Approaches

The following types of approaches would most likely be used in combination to protect Priority Corridors:

**Land Easement/Ownership**

- **Private Single Proponent Right-of-Way** – An easement supported by regulatory approvals that grants a single proponent development rights for their energy facility. (e.g. Transcanada Grand Rapids pipeline or AltaLink Heartland Transmission line north of the TUC.)

- **Private Common Corridor** – An easement supported by regulatory approvals that grants adjacent individual proponent development rights for their energy facilities. Current regulations recommend the development of corridors along existing corridors. (e.g. Pipeline Alley).

- **Municipal (Publicly Owned) Corridor** – Municipal land ownership of a corridor specifically to secure access (i.e. Sturgeon County corridor in AIH). The City of Edmonton is currently considering this as one option to connect Alberta’s Industrial Heartland and the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park.

- **Provincial (Publically Owned) Corridor** – Provincial land ownership of a corridor specifically to secure access. Land protected by Restricted Development Area Regulation (e.g. Provincial Transportation Utility Corridors).

- **Options to Purchase** – Future options to purchase lands/easements on routes for corridors.

- **Special Purpose (Multiple private and public owners) Corridor** – A combination of private and public interests establishing a special purpose corporation for the securing of land for corridor access. There are no current examples in the Region - this is one option under consideration within the EETP.

**Land Use Tools**

- **Growth Plan Designated Corridor** – A policy statement and/or map designation without land use zoning protection.

- **Regulatory Protected Corridor** – A provincial regulation that limits land use such as the existing Restricted Development Area Regulation, which is used to regulate land uses within the TUC.

- **Bylaw Protected Corridor** – A specific municipal bylaw that assigns land use regulation through land use or zoning bylaws to protects land for energy corridor use.

- **Complementary Highway Alignment** – Integrate transportation and energy corridor planning and alignments.

- **Statutory Tools** – Recommend amendments to provincial acts and regulations to implement tools to protect and facilitate energy corridors such as easement tax, trade-offs and incentive options.

- **Corridor Right-of-Way Widths and Setbacks** – adjust land required for rights-of-way to incorporate future linear projects within existing rights-of-way.
### 4.4.2 Preferred Corridor Protection Strategy

A preferred corridor protection strategy will need to be developed for each priority corridor. The strategy will depend on the location and types of constraints that each corridor faces. There are many policy and ownership roles that different stakeholders play with every energy corridor.

A review of potential protection options was undertaken by stakeholder workshop participants. Feedback from stakeholders is outlined on Table 2.0: Corridor Protection Options, detailing potential methods and relative stakeholder preferences to protect each corridor.

#### Table 2.0: Stakeholder Workshop Corridor Protection Options Feedback

#### Ranking Method and Summary Discussion

- Protection Options were ranked as participants were asked to identify their top three protection options for each potential corridor option.
- Protection Options were scored with a simple formula: 1\(^{\text{st}}\) choice = 3 points, 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) choice = 2 points, 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) choice = 1 point.
- The ranked results were tabulated and then colour coded to show differentiation using the coding table to the left.
- The darker colours show the preferred protection options for each corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection Option</th>
<th>NEPC</th>
<th>Heartland Connector Corridors</th>
<th>Southeast Heartland Ring</th>
<th>A1H Intersite Connector</th>
<th>Redwater Bypass</th>
<th>EETP</th>
<th>NW Alberta Connector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth Plan Identified Corridor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private ROW (Project Easements)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Common Corridor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Owned Corridor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Owned Corridor (TUC)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Purpose Corridor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation Protected Corridor (RDA model)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Instrument to Influence Protection</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Options to Purchase Rights</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Alignment Corridor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 Recommendation and Further Actions

5.1 Recommendations

The following recommendations have been identified within the mandate of the Capital Region Board:

1. That the Capital Region Board endorse the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan, and that its policies be integrated into the Growth Plan through the 2015/16 Growth Plan Update.

2. That the Capital Region Board facilitate the development of common best practices and approaches for the siting, right-of-way design, and protection of energy corridors by member municipalities in discussion with industry, the province and regulators.

3. That the Capital Region Board work with member municipalities to refine the locations and alignments of the Priority Energy Corridors as shown on the Maps of Energy Corridors in Appendix F.

5.2 Further Actions

The following further actions have been identified by stakeholders throughout the process of the CRB Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan for future individual and/or collective action:

1. That the Capital Region Board support and provide leadership in the development of a Capital Region Energy Corridors Stakeholder Forum. The purpose of the Forum will be to bring together the various stakeholders involved in policy development, regulation, planning, acquisition, infrastructure development, and monitoring of energy corridors in the Capital Region to:
   a. Meet on a periodic basis to review energy corridors and serve as a communications forum.
   b. Identify and facilitate energy corridor protection options for consideration.
   c. Review best practices for energy corridor development.
   d. Maintain an up-to-date map and summary of developed, approved, planned and anticipated energy corridors with a twenty-year outlook.
   e. Invite participation from key stakeholders including, but not limited to:
      i. Pipeline Companies with interests in the Capital Region
      ii. Transmission Line Companies with interests in the Capital Region
      iii. Alberta Industrial Heartland Association
      iv. Alberta Utilities Commission
      v. Alberta Electrical System Operator
      vi. Alberta Energy Regulator
      vii. Alberta Municipal Affairs
      viii. Alberta Energy
      ix. Alberta Infrastructure
      x. Capital Region Board
      xi. Capital Region Member Municipalities
      xii. Capital Region Water and Wastewater Commissions
      xiii. National Energy Board
2. That the Capital Region Board approach the Government of Alberta with a proposal to grant the CRB standing in Alberta Energy Regulator and Alberta Utilities Commission hearings related to the development of new energy corridors within the Capital Region. Should standing be granted, the CRB will develop policy to guide intervening in hearings for proposed transmission lines and pipelines that are inconsistent with the Capital Region Growth Plan.

3. That the Capital Region Board seek industry and government support, participation and funding of a business case that defines, assesses and evaluates multi-use corridors verses single purpose corridors to support the protection and use of multi-use corridors for energy infrastructure.

4. That the Capital Region Board advocate to the Government of Alberta the coordination and integration of long range regional transportation and energy corridor planning in the Capital Region.

5. That the Capital Region Board request the Alberta Energy Regulator review options and alternatives to more effectively enable energy corridors within the Capital Region, including:
   c. Clarifying AER Directives to:
      i. further influence the use of multi-use energy corridors by pipeline proponents; and,
      ii. consider the level of project review for proponents using identified multi-use energy corridors.
   d. Considering the use of a Play Based Regulation Pilot for planned regional pipeline corridors to encourage applicants to collaborate on surface development plans in order to
      i. minimize the number of facilities and other surface impacts; and,
      ii. ensure that effective practices are used to minimize land alienation.
6.0 Appendices
# Appendix A Stakeholders and Workshop Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Infrastructure</td>
<td>Lyle Markovich</td>
<td>Director, Land Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian DeJong</td>
<td>Manager, Land Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury Board Oil Sands Secretariat</td>
<td>Gary Haynes</td>
<td>Director, Community and Regional Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Hoyland</td>
<td>Policy Analyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Transportation</td>
<td>Shaun Hammond</td>
<td>ADM Safety, Policy and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Affairs</td>
<td>Gary Sandberg</td>
<td>ADM Municipal Services and Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Brown</td>
<td>Manager, Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
<td>Neal Samecki</td>
<td>Manager Regional Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Chai</td>
<td>Regional Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipalities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>Rick Sloan</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the General Manager, Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kate Gibson</td>
<td>Senior Consultant, Office of the General Manager, Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kunal Sharma</td>
<td>Strategic Initiatives Coordinator, Business Strategy and Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly Greenland</td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ken Mamczasz</td>
<td>Senior Development Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ian Morrison</td>
<td>Consultant, Senior Principal at Stantec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>Gerry Gabinet</td>
<td>Director Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lori Mills</td>
<td>Energy Exploration Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>Jordan Rumohr</td>
<td>Economic Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>Jim Newman</td>
<td>Economic Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Hill</td>
<td>Director, Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allan Harvey</td>
<td>CAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Mark Morrissey</td>
<td>Economic Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janel Smith</td>
<td>Director, Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>Paul Hanlan</td>
<td>Manager of Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>Jordan Evans</td>
<td>Manager, Long Range Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Desimone</td>
<td>Director, Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Electrical System Operator</td>
<td>Bill Strongman</td>
<td>Director, Regional System Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ata Rehman</td>
<td>Director, Transmission System Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Energy Regulator</td>
<td>Mark Taylor</td>
<td>Vice President, Industry Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria Stoig</td>
<td>Manager, Enforcement and Surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Helmer</td>
<td>Director, Pipeline Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Industrial Heartland Association</td>
<td>Neil Shelly</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garret Matteotti</td>
<td>Business Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pipeline Companies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransCanada Pipelines</td>
<td>Scott Clark</td>
<td>Capital Projects Land Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Goggyelka</td>
<td>Sr Land Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enbridge Pipelines Inc.</td>
<td>Brent Kaup</td>
<td>Sr. Manager, Land Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kara Schwebe</td>
<td>Sr Land and ROW Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theresa Doolittle</td>
<td>Team Lead, Crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyera Energy</td>
<td>Jason Johnson</td>
<td>Commercial Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InterPipline Fund</td>
<td>Michele Dawson</td>
<td>Director of Regulatory Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plains Midstream</td>
<td>Manuel Perez</td>
<td>Senior Project Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Schwarz</td>
<td>Surface Landman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Pipelines</td>
<td>Michelle Wright</td>
<td>Director, HSE and Regulatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinder Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembina Pipelines</td>
<td>Bart Grant</td>
<td>Surface Landman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Operators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AltaLink</td>
<td>Mark Johns</td>
<td>Director, Stakeholder Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Britney Wickham</td>
<td>Right-of-Way Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ian Johnstone</td>
<td>Manager, Sting, Regional and Customer Projects South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Companies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Land</td>
<td>Terry Jewell</td>
<td>President Phoenix Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Land</td>
<td>Elliott Fredrichs</td>
<td>General Manager Progress Land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix C  CRB Energy Corridors Policy Framework

The CRB Energy Corridors Policy Framework commitments are outlined below.

Policy Framework

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

Recommendations

- Planning - That the CRB develop a comprehensive master plan to guide the location and development of energy corridors within the Capital Region.
- Advocacy - That the CRB leads the development a comprehensive energy corridors advocacy strategy, in partnership with industry stakeholders, to communicate energy corridor issues and challenges in the Capital Region to the Provincial and Federal governments.
## Appendix D  Priority Energy Corridor Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>North East Penetrator Corridor (NEPC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor</strong></td>
<td>Connecting Refinery Row and the Transportation Utility Corridor (TUC) to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland (AIH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Purpose** | • To provide access for raw, refined and finished products in the Refinery Row refineries, tank farms and plant sites to and from the AIH, Athabasca Oilsands and Cold Lake areas of Alberta  
• To provide access from the AIH to the chemical developments in the Joffre area of the province  
• To feed export lines in from storage in the Enbridge and Kinder Morgan pipeline systems |
| **Constraints/Design Considerations** | • Light/ medium industrial development north of highway 16  
• Potential future developments in the Bremner/ Cambrian areas  
• Limited capacity within the NEPC  
• Georgia Pacific plant site adjacent to Highway 16  
• Natural/ environmental constraints including Oldman Creek  
• Alignment of 130th Avenue |
| **Protection Status and Options** | • NEPC is partially protected by provincial government crown land ownership  
• Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor  
• Strathcona County MDP  
  o Bremner has been identified as a possible constraint to the expansion of the corridor, however, no development is contemplated in the MDP. Development is proposed in the area immediately west of Highway 21, Cambrian Crossing.  
  o Policy 7.24 – requires new pipelines or utilities to follow existing corridors, quarter sections or rights of way, in accordance with Map 2;  
  o Policy 7.25 – ensure that new or expanded pipelines or utility corridors do not impact high or medium priority environment management areas, wherever possible;  
  o Policy 16.2 – work with surrounding municipalities and utility companies to ensure integrated utility corridors are created and maintained;  
  o Policy 16.3 – support the rationalization and development of pipeline/utility corridors in consultation with industry, utility companies, federal, provincial and municipal governments;  
  o Policy 16.4 – Use pipeline/utility corridors as multiple use corridors to accommodate oil, natural gas, municipal utilities, electrical transmission lines, communications infrastructure, and pedestrian linkages;  
  o Policy 16.4(a) – encourage that regional corridors and infrastructure as identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan will be integrated into |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North East Penetrator Corridor (NEPC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>common corridors wherever possible in order to protect these lands for their intended purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Edmonton MDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Policy 8.1.6.4 – plan for regional corridors for transportation, utilities and pipelines within the context of the Capital Region Growth Plan (see map 16);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Policy 9.3.1.3 – collaborate with Edmonton Area Pipeline and Utility Operators Committee (EAPUOC), Energy and Resources Conservation Board (ERCB), other jurisdictions and other industry operators as they plan and maintain pipeline corridors;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Policy 9.3.1.5 – Plan pipelines in corridors with other utilities where possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.0 Heartland Connectors

| Corridor                          | Connecting the NEPC into the AIH along two parallel Heartland Connector corridors:  
|                                 | - Heartland West – Connecting the NEPC to the SE corner of Fort Saskatchewan  
|                                 | - Heartland East – Following the southern edge of the CP Rail line north-east  

### Purpose

- To provide access for raw, refined and finished products to the NEPC and Refinery Row from the AIH linking Athabasca Oilsands and Cold Lake areas of Alberta  
- To provide access to and from the NEPC to the AIH and to the chemical developments in the Joffre area of the province  
- To feed export lines from the NEPC to the Enbridge and Kinder Morgan pipeline systems

### Constraints/Design Considerations

- Capacity of existing corridors/linear disturbances to facilitate additional pipelines  
- Potential future growth node for Sherwood Park adjacent to Highway 21  
- Minimizing new routes on existing farm and acreages  
- Impact on development in Fort Saskatchewan

### Protection Status and Options

- Two main corridors supported by existing right of ways  
- Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridors  
  - Strathcona County MDP  
    - Policy 7.24 – requires new pipelines or utilities to follow existing corridors, quarter sections or rights of way, in accordance with Map 2;  
    - Policy 7.25 – ensure that new or expanded pipelines or utility corridors do not impact high or medium priority environment management areas, wherever possible;  
    - Policy 16.2 – work with surrounding municipalities and utility companies to ensure integrated utility corridors are created and maintained;  
    - Policy 16.3 – support the rationalization and development of pipeline/utility corridors in consultation with industry, utility companies, federal, provincial and municipal governments;  
    - Policy 16.4 – Use pipeline/utility corridors as multiple use corridors to accommodate oil, natural gas, municipal utilities, electrical transmission lines, communications infrastructure, and pedestrian linkages;  
    - Policy 16.4(a) – encourage that regional corridors and infrastructure as identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan will be integrated into common corridors wherever possible in order to protect these lands for their intended purpose.  
- Fort Saskatchewan MDP  
  - No policies protecting a corridor within the MDP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor</strong></td>
<td>A by-pass access around the core of the AIH area for raw products coming from the NE portion of the province</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose**
- To provide access into the AIH for major pipelines in NE Alberta
- To bypass industrial activities in the AIH and access Refinery Row
- To connect to the Heartland Corridors

**Constraints/Design Considerations**
- To develop an economic and effective alignment into the AIH
- To find routes around existing oil and gas wells and gathering lines south and west of the Town of Bruderheim
- To find a suitable crossing of Beaverhill Creek
- To minimize disturbances and impact on alienation of farm land

**Protection Status and Options**
- Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor
- Strathcona County MDP
  - Policy 7.24 – requires new pipelines or utilities to follow existing corridors, quarter sections or rights of way, in accordance with Map 2;
  - Policy 7.25 – ensure that new or expanded pipelines or utility corridors do not impact high or medium priority environment management areas, wherever possible;
  - Policy 16.2 – work with surrounding municipalities and utility companies to ensure integrated utility corridors are created and maintained;
  - Policy 16.3 – support the rationalization and development of pipeline/utility corridors in consultation with industry, utility companies, federal, provincial and municipal governments;
  - Policy 16.4 – Use pipeline/utility corridors as multiple use corridors to accommodate oil, natural gas, municipal utilities, electrical transmission lines, communications infrastructure, and pedestrian linkages;
  - Policy 16.4(a) – encourage that regional corridors and infrastructure as identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan will be integrated into common corridors wherever possible in order to protect these lands for their intended purpose.
- Lamont County MDP
  - Policy 10.8(d) – use corridors to integrate a number of utilities;
  - Policy 10.13 – when planning for future residential development in the areas near pipelines and powerlines, the County will require rights-of-way to contain sufficient width to ensure adequate buffers or setbacks between the proposed residential development and adjoining uses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.0</th>
<th><strong>AIH Intersite Connector</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor</strong></td>
<td>Connecting into and within the chemical cluster, storage and tank farms of the AIH. This is an internal AIH corridor network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Purpose** | • To provide external access to the AIH to connect to key points  
  o East to connect to the NE pipeline corridors from the Oilsands and Cold Lake  
  o Access through to the Suncor/ Fort Hills lands and the EETP  
  o South to connect to the Heartland Connector  
  • To provide a main internal access corridor within the AIH |
| **Constraints/Design Considerations** | • Working around existing oil and gas operations (East of river)  
  • Impact on Silica Sand operations – north of Bruderheim  
  • Future space to twin Highway 643  
  • North Saskatchewan River Crossing  
  • Access through existing industrial developments |
| **Protection Status and Options** | • Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor  
  • Strathcona County MDP  
  o Policy 7.24 – requires new pipelines or utilities to follow existing corridors, quarter sections or rights of way, in accordance with Map 2;  
  o Policy 7.25 – ensure that new or expanded pipelines or utility corridors do not impact high or medium priority environment management areas, wherever possible;  
  o Policy 16.2 – work with surrounding municipalities and utility companies to ensure integrated utility corridors are created and maintained;  
  o Policy 16.3 – support the rationalization and development of pipeline/utility corridors in consultation with industry, utility companies, federal, provincial and municipal governments;  
  o Policy 16.4 – Use pipeline/utility corridors as multiple use corridors to accommodate oil, natural gas, municipal utilities, electrical transmission lines, communications infrastructure, and pedestrian linkages;  
  o Policy 16.4(a) – encourage that regional corridors and infrastructure as identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan will be integrated into common corridors wherever possible in order to protect these lands for their intended purpose. |
## 5.0 Redwater Bypass

### Corridor

To provide access into the northern border of Sturgeon County into and out of the Heartland on the west side of the North Saskatchewan River

### Purpose

- Providing access into the AIH, connecting north east Alberta, the Suncor/ Fort Hills lands into the AIH and the EETP

### Constraints/Design Considerations

- Determining around the Redwater oil and gas fields
- Redwater River crossing
- Land alienation impact southeast of the Redwater Town site

### Protection Status and Options

- Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor
- Strathcona County MDP
  - Bremner has been identified as a possible constraint to the expansion of the corridor, however, it is believed that the possible constraint may be in the proposed Cambrian development to the west. An amendment is currently being reviewed by the County that would increase the population in this area from 10,000 to 13,500;
  - Policy 7.24 – requires new pipelines or utilities to follow existing corridors, quarter sections or rights of way, in accordance with Map 2;
  - Policy 7.25 – ensure that new or expanded pipelines or utility corridors do not impact high or medium priority environment management areas, wherever possible;
  - Policy 16.2 – work with surrounding municipalities and utility companies to ensure integrated utility corridors are created and maintained;
  - Policy 16.3 – support the rationalization and development of pipeline/utility corridors in consultation with industry, utility companies, federal, provincial and municipal governments;
  - Policy 16.4 – Use pipeline/utility corridors as multiple use corridors to accommodate oil, natural gas, municipal utilities, electrical transmission lines, communications infrastructure, and pedestrian linkages;
  - Policy 16.4(a) – encourage that regional corridors and infrastructure as identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan will be integrated into common corridors wherever possible in order to protect these lands for their intended purpose.
- Sturgeon County MDP
  - Policy 5.4.9 – should identify utility corridors that promote efficient use of land and that maximize development potential;
  - Policy J.5(d) – working with the Province, the Energy Resources Conservation Board and regional partners to formulate a consolidated pipeline plan for locating new pipeline right-of-ways in the AIH region.
### 6.0 EETP Connector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Corridor</strong></th>
<th>Connecting the EETP in NE Edmonton to the NW corner of the AIH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>• To link the EETP into the AIH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Constraints/Design Considerations** | • Identification of connection to the AIH west of the North Saskatchewan River  
• Topography of Sturgeon valley and river  
• Future location of petrochemical facilities within the AIH |
| **Protection Status and Options** | • Corridor supported by existing Pembina ROW into NW corner of the EETP  
• Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor |

### 7.0 Northwest Alberta Connector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Corridor</strong></th>
<th>Shipping oil, gas and natural gas lines from the Swan Hills, Rainbow Lake, Norman Wells fields and others.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>• To link NW Alberta and NE BC into the AIH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Constraints/Design Considerations** | • Identification of connection to the AIH west of the North Saskatchewan River  
• Future location of facilities within the AIH |
| **Protection Status and Options** | • Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor |

---
### Appendix E  Priority Energy Corridors - Growth Plan Land Use Principles and Policies Review

#### Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consistency with Growth Plan Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corridor has a high level of consistence with Growth Plan Policies

Corridor has a medium level of consistence with Growth Plan Policies

Corridor has a low level of consistence with Growth Plan Policies

#### Core Principle I: Protect the Environment and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>NEPC</th>
<th>Heartland Connectors</th>
<th>Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor</th>
<th>AIH Intersite Connectors</th>
<th>Redwater Bypass</th>
<th>EETP Connector</th>
<th>Northwest Alberta Connector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Preserve and Protect the Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One creek crossing, potential North Saskatchewan river crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One creek crossing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sturgeon River crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Preserve Agricultural Lands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only corridor outside of AIH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will fragment heavy industrial land, but purpose is to serve industry in AIH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Minimize the Impact of Heavy Industrial Developments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only corridor outside of AIH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will fragment heavy industrial land, but purpose is to serve industry in AIH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will fragment heavy industrial land, but purpose is to serve industry in AIH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will fragment heavy industrial land, but purpose is to serve industry in AIH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will fragment heavy industrial land, but purpose is to serve industry in AIH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will fragment heavy industrial land, but purpose is to serve industry in AIH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will fragment heavy industrial land, but purpose is to serve industry in AIH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Will fragment heavy industrial land, but purpose is to serve industry in AIH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Core Principle II: Minimize Regional Footprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>NEPC</th>
<th>Heartland Connectors</th>
<th>Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor</th>
<th>AIH Intersite Connectors</th>
<th>Redwater Bypass</th>
<th>EETP Connector</th>
<th>Northwest Alberta Connector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Identify, Protect and Prioritize Lands for Regional Infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Concentrate New Growth Within Priority Growth Areas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traverses PGA B and F; land area F is currently undeveloped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragments G and F; most land area is undeveloped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Allow Growth Outside of Priority Growth Areas</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragments land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Principle V: Ensure Efficient Provision of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Consistency with Growth Plan Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Design Integrated Physical Infrastructure with the Region</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Maximize Utilization of Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core Principle VI: Support Regional Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Consistency with Growth Plan Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Ensure a Supply of Land to Sustain a Variety of Economic Development Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Support Regional Prosperity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Position the Capital Region Competitively on the World Stage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F  Figures 1.0 – 5.0:  Maps of Energy Corridors
Edmonton Energy and Technology Park (EETP)

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

Priority Growth Area
Alberta's Industrial Heartland
Refinery Row/Clover Bar
Member Municipality (County)
Member Municipality (Urban)
Urban Service Area
Elk Island National Park
Provincial Park/Protected Area
Regional Road (Existing)
Rail Line
Water Course
Water Body
North Saskatchewan River Crossing
Transportation Utility Corridor
Pipeline
Existing Major Pipeline Corridor

Priority Pipeline Corridors
1. Northeast Penetrator Corridor
2. Heartland Connector
3. Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor
4. AIH InterSite Connector
5. Redwater Bypass
6. EETP Connector
7. Northwest Alberta Connector

Final alignment to be agreed to by affected municipalities

*Note - All corridor alignments are conceptual and subject to change based on further detailed investigation and study*
FIGURE 5.0: REGIONAL ENERGY CORRIDORS, TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND GROWTH AREAS

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

- Existing Roadway
- New Roadway
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- Railway
- Transportation Utility Corridor
- Priority Pipeline Energy Corridor
- Future Energy Corridor
- Pipeline
- Power Corridor Need (Conceputal)
- Heartland Transmission Corridor
- Existing Power Transmission Corridor
- Power Corridor Under Construction
2018-2023 Strategic Plan Strategic Priorities Update

Background

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approved its 2018-2023 Strategic Plan on June 14, 2018. The Strategic Plan identifies the strategic direction and includes our vision, mission, guiding principles, strategic priorities and our strategies.

The results and outcomes from the Strategic Plan are tracked and reported on through various monitoring, evaluation and performance measurement mechanisms.

Status

The key performance measurement mechanism for the Strategic Plan priorities will be annual reporting of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to assess progress and results for the Strategic Plan.

A mid-year status update is important to include in the Board’s Annual Report on progress towards our Strategic Priorities. The Annual Report is due to the Province in June 2019, whereas the annual update is scheduled to be brought forward to the Board in June 2019.

Next Steps

This agenda item is being brought forward for discussion.

Attachments:

1. EMRB 2018-2023 Strategic Plan Status Update
## 2018-2023 Strategic Plan Strategic Priorities Update

April 11, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priorities</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Key Results</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Previous Status</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Shared Investment for Shared Benefit</strong></td>
<td>The shared and equitable contributions, investments, and efforts by the EMRB result in measurable benefits for the Region as a whole.</td>
<td>1A. Develop and implement a benefits realization model that reflects shared regional interests.</td>
<td>1A. Project Charter and Task Force Terms of Reference were approved by the Board on December 13, 2019. Project initiation work is underway with a request for proposal to be issued in Q2 2019 to complete the first phase of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1B. Measure the contributions and investments by the member municipalities.</td>
<td>1B. Process and Framework to be developed as part of the project and implementation plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1C. Identify and assess investments by public and private partners for the shared benefit of the Region.</td>
<td>1C. Process and Framework to be developed as part of the project and implementation plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1D. Evaluate the benefits realized by the contributions and other investments in the Region.</td>
<td>1D. Process and Framework to be developed as part of the project and implementation plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1E. Provide reporting on the shared contributions, investments, and benefits to the Region, key stakeholders, and partners.</td>
<td>1E. Process and Framework to be developed as part of the project and implementation plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Responsible and Sustainable Growth</strong></td>
<td>The EMRB develops and implements sustainable growth to enable future generations to</td>
<td>2A. Develop and implement the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan (MRSP).</td>
<td>2A. MRSP Environmental Scan was accepted as information on February 14, 2019 by the Board. MRSP Final Phase is on schedule to be completed by the end of October, 2019. The project is on budget and remains within scope based on the direction of the Task Force.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Progress/Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.</td>
<td>Develop and implement the Regional Agriculture Master Plan (RAMP).</td>
<td>RAMP Situation Report was accepted by the Board as information in August 9, 2018. The RAMP Vision and Guiding Principles were approved by the Board on February 14, 2019. The next phase focus of the project is on addressing the three objectives of the Plan starting with regional fragmentation and conversion. A preliminary Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Tool has been completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C.</td>
<td>Establish key performance indicator targets and monitor the implementation of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan.</td>
<td>EMRB Administration received Regional Context Statements from all 13 member municipalities. One new MDP has been submitted through the REF process to comply with EMRGP; twelve remain. 17 of the 26 identified key performance indicators of the Growth Plan have been developed and work is ongoing to develop the remaining nine. A public facing web dashboard has been developed to report on the KPIs and will continue to evolve and improve. On December 14, 2018, the Board approved the Sturgeon Valley Special Study Area Negotiated Policies and submitted a letter to the Province for approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D.</td>
<td>Provide leadership for a regional symposium for education and stakeholder collaboration.</td>
<td>A regional symposium is being planned for the 2020/2021 budget year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E.</td>
<td>Embed an energy, climate, and economic opportunity lens on regional initiatives.</td>
<td>All projects include these lenses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Maintaining Momentum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3A. Maintain and enhance collaboration amongst Board members to foster healthy relationships.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A. Board Development Program is under development and will be implemented throughout 2019-2021.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3B. Maintain and evolve the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3B. Eleven REFs approved in 2018; zero rejected. The EMRB Planning Toolkit was comprehensively reviewed and improved to provide municipalities greater clarity of REF. Implementation of REF 2.0 is ongoing, municipal working group established and continues to discuss areas for improvement to support the implementation of the Regional Growth Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3C. Maintain and improve the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Geographic Information Services (EMRGIS).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3C. EMRGIS continues to support all on-going projects and the EMRGIS website continues to evolve in terms of regional GIS capabilities, maps and open data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3D. Maintain and improve advocacy (e.g., Provincial, Federal, Public Engagement Policies, Indigenous Stakeholders, etc.).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3D. A Board Advocacy Committee has been formed to participate in advocacy initiatives. At the October 11, 2018 Board meeting, the Fall 2018 Advocacy Plan and the Board’s Public Engagement Policy G022, was approved. Administration is leading the development of a pre-and post- election advocacy strategy at the provincial and federal levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3E. Maintain and enhance innovation to inform decisions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3E. EMRB Administration is in the process of implementing new agenda software (iCompass) to improve internal efficiency.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3F. Complete annual regional transportation priorities to inform Alberta Transportation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3F. 2018 Regional Transportation Priorities approved by the Board and submitted to Alberta Transportation. From the 2018 list of regional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
priorities, four transportation projects have had funding announcements made by the Province.

| 3G. Update the Integrated Regional Master Plan (IRTMP). | 3G. Work is underway to prepare a Project Charter and Terms of Reference in consultation with Alberta Transportation. On July 24, 2018, the EMRB and Alberta Transportation signed a letter of agreement to work collaboratively on regional transportation projects involving planning of the regional road network. The update of the IRTMP is a two year project expected to start in 2019 and be completed in 2021. |

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

Background

- At the January 10, 2019 Executive Committee meeting, the Board Chair introduced an agenda item related to Governance Excellence. The outcome of the discussion was a suggestion to move forward with a discussion on Governance Excellence at the Board with a focus on the following areas: relationship and trust building, the development of Board culture, a mechanism for conflict resolution, and protecting and ensuring the integrity of the Board.

- At the February 14, 2019 Board meeting, the Board Chair brought forward the agenda item outlining the areas of focus suggested by the Executive Committee. This item was brought forward for discussion with the Board Chair seeking feedback and input from the full Board.

- The Board engaged in a robust discussion that included a focus on strengthening relationships among Board members, trust building, conflict resolution and protecting the integrity of the Board. Also reflected in the discussion was the importance in understanding governance and engaging in ongoing education opportunities.

- Board members also commented and made suggestions related to a Board Strategic Planning Retreat, changing the seating order of Board members at the Board meetings, and Board meeting methodology (i.e. consider alternatives to the strict use of Robert’s Rule of Order at Board meetings).

- Following the Board meeting, the Board Chair and CEO took the feedback and input garnered at the Board meeting, and work with the consultant - National Growth Partners, to move forward with a plan. The plan was brought forward to the Executive Committee for update and discussion on March 14, 2019.

Next Steps

Following the April 11, 2019 Board meeting, the Board Development work will begin.

Attachments:

1. Board Development Work Plan
Proposed Governance Development and Education Project Plan

Project Objectives

- Support the Board in optimizing the outcomes of its recently designed governance structure/model through a focus on governing culture, style, practices and process.
- Support the Board in defining its own standard for a high-performing governing system.
- Support the Board in the intentional design and adoption of a Board culture and set of norms.
- Through the process, create space for less formal interactions and discussions for the purpose of enhancing relationships between Board members.

Key Deliverable

The key deliverable of the project is a Board Charter that:
- Describes the Board’s governing intent – how the Board will operate to maximize its value to the organization and ultimately, to the Region;
- Articulates the role and value of the Board in the context of a maturing governance system and complex regional arrangements;
- Continues to develop the specific roles and responsibilities of Board Members, the Board Chair and Committee and Task Force Chairs;
- Defines the desired Board culture and norms;
- Describes the practices, processes and policies of the Board including things such as:
  - The process for and approach to Board, Committee, and/or member development and evaluation;
  - Approach to strategic management and oversight;
  - Approach to conflict management and resolution;
  - The Board’s relationship to its executive as well as internal/external stakeholders; and,
  - Approach to building, and working through, an effective agenda.

Project Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing (subject to availability)</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Intent, Outcome and/or Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| March                           | Executive Committee Briefing  
  • Provide an overview of the objectives, deliverables and work plan for the project | Ensure Executive Committee clarity and support for the project.           |
• Seek Executive Committee endorsement for the proposed process, approach, timeline and budget

**March**

- Review and assess key documents relating to the current strategy and governance structure, committee terms of reference, policies, processes, models, frameworks, past facilitated sessions, etc.

| March | Review and assess key documents relating to the current strategy and governance structure, committee terms of reference, policies, processes, models, frameworks, past facilitated sessions, etc. | Equip National Growth Partner (NGP) with background information and context. |

| April – May | Complete confidential interviews with members of the Board and executive management. The interviews will explore questions such as: | The purpose of these interviews is to understand the range of board perspectives and key areas of focus for advancing the culture and behaviours of the board. |
| Complete confidential interviews with members of the Board and executive management. The interviews will explore questions such as: | | |
| What context, structure, model, assumption or roles has the Board been operating with? | | |
| What is working well? | | |
| What have been the most significant challenges to governance effectiveness? | | |
| What are the most significant factors (risks, shifts, new opportunities) at play in the strategic environment? How has the governance system responded to these challenges? | | |
| What is the culture of the Board? | | |
| What is the single most significant decision the EMRB should consider making to advance its governing model? | | |

| Late May – June (exact dates TBD) | Board Governance Workshops | Complete the design of the major components of a Board Charter through a facilitated discussion |
| Board Governance Workshops | | |
| • Prepare for and facilitate a series of two, half-day board development sessions including a review of interview findings, an assessment of key gaps, improvement opportunities and potential changes or enhancements. | | |
| • Present and work through ideas for continued discussion and development. | | |

| July | Complete final refinements to Board charter based on Board feedback | Complete the design of the model based on Board and executive feedback. |
| Complete final refinements to Board charter based on Board feedback | | |
| • Develop implementation plan and timeline | | |
Board Retreat

Background

- At the February 14, 2019 Board meeting, several Board members indicated a desire to have an annual Strategic Planning Retreat.

- EMRB Administration discussed this matter with the Board Chair and Vice-Chair, and the subject was brought forward to the March 14, 2019 Executive Committee meeting. As a result of the discussions, it was recommended a one-day Board Strategic Planning Retreat be held in late August or early September 2019. The Strategic Planning Retreat would replace the August Board meeting.

- Late August or early-September is an opportune time to hold an annual Strategic Planning Retreat, as it allows Administration to incorporate the Board’s vision and strategic priorities into the Business Plan and the Budget for the upcoming fiscal year.

- EMRB Administration has been canvassing Board Members availability and the first week of September is being targeted.

Next Steps

Following the Board meeting, EMRB Administration, in concert with the Chair and Vice-Chair, will begin working on the Strategic Planning Retreat. An update will be provided at the next Board Meeting.
Advocacy Update

Background

The EMRB is moving forward with a more comprehensive advocacy plan that will not only be focused on election periods and cycles, but will engage in an ongoing targeted approach. The outcome of such a plan will ensure the EMRB is: (1) top of mind among elected and unelected government officials, (2) enhancing relationships, (3) influencing policy development, (4) identifying new opportunities for strategic partnerships, (5) accelerating the delivery of key outcomes, and (6) solidifying provincial funding.

That said, the initial focus is on the current environment, provincial election and post-election.

Status

- Over the last two months, Administration has been moving forward with the development of an Advocacy plan focused on activities to be undertaken pre-, during and post-election, as well as the establishment of an ongoing targeted approach to advocacy.

- Candidate lists and bios are being developed, and platform developments and major announcements are being monitored and consolidated.

- The collateral material is being developed with a focus on EMRB’s success, value, and return on investment through both a regional and provincial lens.

- EMRB Administration has engaged the services of Crown Strategic Consulting to assist with the advocacy approach and the development of some of the material.

Next Steps

The attached document from Crown Strategies outlines our advocacy approach and framework, including pre-election, election and post-election strategies and opportunities. Administration will be working with Crown Strategies to execute on the approach and will be engaging with Board members in this regard.

Attachments:

1. EMRB Advocacy Approach
2. Candidate List - March 2019
EDMONTON METROPOLITAN REGION BOARD
ADVOCACY APPROACH
MARCH – 2019
INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

The provincial election in 2015 represented a significant shift in Alberta’s political climate. Albertans pivoted sharply to the left after four decades of Progressive Conservative governments, in favour of the New Democrat Party (NDP).

The result of this choice has been felt across the social, political and economic spectrum. There is no doubt the NDP government came into power with clear ideas on how they would change the way public policy was developed and delivered to Albertans.

The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) is the 13-member growth management board of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region, mandated to coordinate long-range growth planning via the EMRB Growth Plan and to develop a Metropolitan Servicing Plan for the Region. Its members come from the municipalities with populations of 5000 or more; the regional leadership representing and collaborating in the best interests of the region as a whole. It sets the conditions, strategic priorities and vision for the EMRB thus leveraging tax dollars and other resources to the benefit of citizens of the region, and ultimately all Alberta.

In 2019, we will see both provincial and federal elections. Developing a federal and a provincial advocacy plan will be critical to ensuring that elected officials at all levels are educated and aware of the EMRB, its successes and the value and return on investment it brings not only to the region, but to our province and country as well. Though we will apply similar tactics towards a federal advocacy plan, the initial focus will be on developing and execution of a provincial plan. The EMRB has a strong relationship with the Government of Alberta but this could change with the upcoming election, regardless of who is the successful government. The province is facing many challenges including significant debt, a high unemployment rate, little to no investment and is currently polarized by a pipeline discussion with the Federal Government.

The EMRB has expressed the desire to extract more value from their relationship with the provincial and federal government and position themselves uniquely through illustrating their return on investment and contribution to the region. The upcoming provincial election provides an opportunity to evolve and modernize the relationship.

The EMRB has a significant role and voice in the debate involving funding and policy and as a part of the strategy should consider aligning with other organizations interested in improving the region and the province. Coalition building greatly amplifies the urgency and need for change in funding and policy and takes your advocacy beyond the reach and capacity of any one group. Consideration should be given to working with the Calgary Metropolitan Region Board to identify common interests and initiatives to approach government on collectively. The strength of both regions represents 23 municipalities and 65% of Alberta’s
population. As an example, insulating the grant that both organizations receive should be considered as a priority due the recent
decrease from the existing government. In addition, the EMRB should be aware of, and align where appropriate, with other
organizations including AUMA, RMA and the Alberta Industrial Heartland, among others.

Now is the time to build on the good advocacy work that has been done by the Board. The meetings at the Alberta Legislature on
December 6, 2018 and the 10-year celebration on December 13, 2018 are great examples of how the Board worked collaboratively
to illustrate to the provincial government its priorities and initiatives. The advocacy work going forward will build off of this strong
platform.

**ADVOCACY STRATEGY**

We are not in position to predict the outcome of the election, but what we do know is that there is an opportunity to evolve and
advance the partnership the EMRB has with the newly elected government. Over the past two years, the EMRB has delivered
significant plans and initiatives and is now in a position to educate and illustrate to the government not only the value it brings to
the Region but to the Province as a whole. The ability to leverage tax dollars to save the Government time, energy and resources as
they look to the future will be a significant consideration in the development of the advocacy framework. Given the current
political environment, EMRB requires a four-stage approach; pre-election, election, post-election and ongoing targeted advocacy.

**Pre-Election Strategy**

The Premier’s nomination meeting is March 17, 2019 and the Throne Speech is set for March 18, 2019. Knowing that the election
will be called within a couple of weeks, there is little value in engaging with government at this time. This time is being used to
gather information, review and revise key messages and collateral documents, and initiate the draft of a new advocacy framework.
The development of collateral documents for Board Members and Administration is also being done to leave behind when meeting
with each party candidate in their municipality during the election to develop relationships with potential new MLAs.

**Pre-Election**

- Use this time to gather information, statistics and data
- Review current collateral documents and key messages
- Build a draft advocacy framework
- Draft key messages and a “leave behind” illustrating an introduction to the EMRB and a list of major successes and what’s upcoming

**Election Strategy**

Once the writ has dropped and the policy platforms are unveiled, work will begin on understanding how each political party views the roles of municipalities and the EMRB, as well as any potential impact this might have. During these 28 days, Board members will be encouraged to meet with the candidates running in their constituencies, using this as an opportunity to understand clearly from each candidate further detail on their party policy platforms. That feedback will be key in identifying opportunities and challenges within the advocacy framework and initiating a targeted approach.

**Election**
- Activate Board members to engage with each party candidate within their respective municipalities
- Board members can educate each party candidate with a high-level overview of their municipality and the benefits of belonging to the EMRB.
- Provide a “leave behind” document and key messages to the Board members for their meetings with candidates
- Review policy platforms and determine linkages to advocacy framework
- Identify opportunities and challenges
- Encourage the Board members to use social media to talk about who they are meeting with and to highlight the EMRB and key stats
- Develop a strategic communications plan to support your advocacy framework

**Post-Election Strategy**

After the election, building relationships with the newly elected MLAs and Ministers, as well as department officials will be a top priority. There stands to be quite a few newly elected officials and the learning curve will be steep. Government will take time to organize themselves, appoint officials and set priorities. The ERMB can finalize work on collateral documents that reflect the new advocacy framework with supportive key messages. Presenting the EMRB as a resource to government as they are transitioning from campaigning to governing will develop strong ties and ensure you are viewed as a partner in the future.
Post-Election
- Build relationships with newly elected MLAs
- Engage with key officials and educate them on the EMRB
- Provide information to support the value of the EMRB and illustrate the return on investment
- Roll out new strategic communications plan

Ongoing Targeted Approach

Strengthening the significance and position of the EMRB as a relevant and important voice in the province is the purpose of the advocacy framework. Once the government has established itself, passed a budget, developed ministry mandates and coordinating business plans, the EMRB can effectively align itself with the priorities of government and thus start to target the approach and identify obstacles. The goals of advocacy framework include:

1. Knowledge, engagement and understanding the Need for Action
   - Educate the provincial government about the need for strategic and sustainable investments in the EMRB
   - Increase influence with public policy makers
   - Promote solutions that are fair and equitable to all stakeholders
   - Identify further opportunities to partner on key initiatives

2. Establish Key Partnerships
   - Identify and align with organizations who share the same goals as the ERMB
   - Empower other stakeholders to assist in influencing common policies in the province

3. Policy Innovation
   - Enhance public policy and practices regarding the region
   - Improve decision making processes to ensure a collaborative approach to policy development

Without knowing what shape government will take, it will be hard to provide a targeted approach until it is understood how the new government has organized the ministries and coordinating officials. That said, EMRB will be targeting those ministries and
officials who are responsible for municipal affairs, transportation, infrastructure, agriculture, energy, environment, finance and treasury, economic development and executive council. This will illustrate to government the breadth and depth of EMRB’s approach and provide an opportunity to review EMRB’s major accomplishments and demonstrated return on investment, as well as the ambitious agenda for 2019-2021.

Finally, there are “Seven Deadly Sins” of advocacy that will be kept in mind as the plan is developed and executed:

1. Unclear aims and objectives
2. Activity planning happening before (or without) developing an influencing strategy
3. Action plans that run to an internal timetable
4. Lack of innovation
5. Messages that do not get noticed and move people
6. Poor monitoring and evaluation
7. Failing to focus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athabasca - Sturgeon - Redwater</td>
<td>Colin Piquette (NDP)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrhead - Morinville - Westlock</td>
<td>Glenn van Dijken (UCP)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drayton Valley - Devon</td>
<td>Mark Smith (UCP) *</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Beverly - Clareview</td>
<td>Daron Bilious (NDP) *</td>
<td>Jeffery Walters</td>
<td>Deron Bilious *</td>
<td>David Egan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Calgar</td>
<td>David Eggen (NDP) *</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Castle Downs</td>
<td>Nicole Goehring (NDP)</td>
<td>Moe Rahall</td>
<td>Nicole Goehring</td>
<td>Ed Ammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - City Centre</td>
<td>David Shepherd (NDP)</td>
<td>Bob Philip</td>
<td>David Shepherd</td>
<td>Lily Le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Decore</td>
<td>Chris Nielsen (NDP)</td>
<td>Ali Haymour</td>
<td>Chris Nielsen</td>
<td>Karen Principe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Ellerslie</td>
<td>Rod Loyola (NDP)</td>
<td>Hazelyn Williams</td>
<td>Rod Loyola</td>
<td>Sanjay Patel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Glenora</td>
<td>Sarah Hoffman (NDP) *</td>
<td>Glen Tickner</td>
<td>Sarah Hoffman *</td>
<td>Marjorie Newman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Gold Bar</td>
<td>Marlin Schmidt (NDP) *</td>
<td>Diana Ly</td>
<td>Marlin Schmidt *</td>
<td>David Dorward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Highlands - Norwood</td>
<td>Brian Mason (NDP) *</td>
<td>Tish Prouse</td>
<td>Janis Irwin</td>
<td>Leila Hose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Manning</td>
<td>Heather Sweet (NDP)</td>
<td>Manwar Khan</td>
<td>Heather Sweet</td>
<td>Harry Grewal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - McClung</td>
<td>Lorne Dach (NDP) *</td>
<td>Stephen Mandel</td>
<td>Lorne Dach</td>
<td>Laurie Mozerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Meadowlark</td>
<td>Jon Carson (NDP)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Meadows</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Amrit Matharu</td>
<td>Jassie Deol</td>
<td>Len Rhodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Mill Creek</td>
<td>Denise Woollard (NDP)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Mill Woods</td>
<td>Christina Gray (NDP) *</td>
<td>Anju Sharma</td>
<td>Christina Gray *</td>
<td>Heather Sworin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - North West</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Judy Kim-Meneen</td>
<td>David Eggen *</td>
<td>Ali Eltayeb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Riverview</td>
<td>Lori Sigurdson (NDP) *</td>
<td>Katherine O'Neill</td>
<td>Lori Sigurdson *</td>
<td>Kara Barker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Rutherford</td>
<td>Richard Feehan (NDP) *</td>
<td>Aisha Rauf</td>
<td>Richard Feehan *</td>
<td>Hannah Presakuchuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - South</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Pramod Kumar</td>
<td>Thomas Dang</td>
<td>Tunde Obasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - South West</td>
<td>Thomas Dang (NDP)</td>
<td>Mo Elsalhy</td>
<td>John Archer</td>
<td>Kayce Mada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Strathcona</td>
<td>Rachel Notley (NDP) *</td>
<td>Preem Pal</td>
<td>Rachel Notley *</td>
<td>Kulshan Gill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - West Henday</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Winston Leung</td>
<td>Jon Carson</td>
<td>Nicole Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton - Whittemud</td>
<td>Bob Turner (NDP)</td>
<td>Jonathan Dai</td>
<td>Ralph Pancharoli</td>
<td>Elisabeth Hughes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan - Vegreville</td>
<td>Jessica Littlewood (NDP)</td>
<td>Marvin Olsen</td>
<td>Jessica Littlewood</td>
<td>Jackie Armstrong-Homeniuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac Ste. Anne - Parkland</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Don McCargar</td>
<td>Nwell Carlier *</td>
<td>Shane Getson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc - Beaumont</td>
<td>Shaye Anderson (NDP) *</td>
<td>Robbi Connelly</td>
<td>Shaye Anderson *</td>
<td>Brad Rutherford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville - St. Albert</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Neil Korotash</td>
<td>Natalie Birnie</td>
<td>Dale Nally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood Park</td>
<td>Annie McKiritch (NDP)</td>
<td>Sue Timanson</td>
<td>Annie McKiritch</td>
<td>Jordan Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove - St. Albert</td>
<td>Trevor Horne (NDP)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Marie Renaud (NDP)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>Erin Babcock (NDP)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona - Sherwood Park</td>
<td>Estefania Cortes-Vargas (NDP)</td>
<td>Dave Quest</td>
<td>Moira Vane</td>
<td>Nate Glubish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

* Current MLA
* Current Minister

**New Ridings**

**Old Ridings**

Current as of: March 2019
Audit & Finance Committee

Thursday, March 14, 2019
1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board Office
Capital Region Boardroom

Members:
Mayor Tanni Doblanko, Leduc County (Chair)
Councillor Michael Walters, City of Edmonton (Vice Chair)
Mayor Ray Ralph, Town of Devon
Mayor John Stewart, City of Beaumont

EMRB Staff:
Karen Wichuk, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Director Regional Growth Planning
Debra Irving, Senior Project Manager
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Agata Lewandowski, Executive Assistant
Raquel Chauvette, Administrative Assistant

Guests:
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Trevor Duley, City of St. Albert
Larissa Hepp, Sturgeon County
Greg Hofmann, City of Edmonton
Avril McCalla, City of Edmonton
Robert Stephenson, Strathcona County
Emily Strach, Parkland County
Julie Vizbar, Leduc County
Angela Wilson, Strathcona County

Item 5.1
EMRB Board Meeting
Agenda Package Apr. 11/19 Page 167 of 228
1. Opening

1.1 Quorum

Quorum achieved; five of five voting members present.

1.2 Call to Order

Chair Doblanko calls the meeting to order at 1:28 p.m.

1.3 Chair Opening Remarks

Chair Doblanko has no opening remarks.

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Audit & Finance Committee approve the March 14, 2019 meeting agenda.
Moved by: Mayor Ralph
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion: That the Audit & Finance Committee approve the January 10, 2019 meeting minutes.
Moved by: Councillor Walters
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously

4. Finance

4.1 Quarterly Financial Report

CEO Wichuk updates members that they will not always see true Quarterly Financials as the timing of the Audit & Finance meetings do not align with the timing of the Quarterly Financial Reports. CEO Wichuk informs members of a couple options, the true Quarterly Financials can be brought to the Board and sent out via email to the Committee earlier, or Administration can continue to bring them to the Committee beforehand noting that they will look different when brought to the Board.

After discussion, CEO Wichuk concludes that, based on the Committee Member feedback, the estimated Quarterly Financials will continue to be brought to the Committee as is. The true Quarterly Financials will be brought to the Board, with an email sent to the Committee beforehand highlighting the changes made.
4.2 Draft 2019/20 Budget

CEO Wichuk introduces the Draft 2019/20 Budget at a high level, starting with the operating costs and concluding with a walk through of each of the three scenarios. The Committee discusses the merits of the scenarios.

Chair Doblanko calls a five minute break.

**Motion:** That the Audit & Finance Committee endorse and recommend the 2019/20 Budget (Scenario 3) to the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board for approval.

**Moved by:** Mayor Stewart

**Accepted by:** Chair

**Decision:** Carried unanimously


CEO Wichuk introduces the 2018-2022 Business Plan (2019-2020 Update). CEO Wichuk walks through the notable changes in the Business Plan, informing members that going forward the Business Plan will be presented in a different format and following the annual Board Retreat to better align the Business Plan with the Strategic Priorities and the Budget.

**Motion:** That the Audit & Finance Committee endorse and recommend the 2018-2022 Business Plan (2019-2020 Update) to the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board for approval.

**Moved by:** Councillor Walters

**Accepted by:** Chair

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

5. CEO Update

CEO Wichuk shares how it has been a busy month since the last Board meeting, with a large focus being on the Business Plan and Budget. CEO Wichuk notifies members of the issue of regional capacity that has been brought to her attention at the previous CAO meeting, and will be present on the agenda for the CAO meeting on March 21, 2019. CEO Wichuk updates members on the final phase for the onboarding of new staff. CEO Wichuk looks for clarification on the roles of alternates in the upcoming Shared Investment for Shared Benefit (SISB) workshops. CEO Wichuk reminds all members that the fiscal year end is coming up, and asks that all members submit their claims before March 31, 2019. CEO Wichuk informs members that we have received the grant money for 2019-2020. CEO Wichuk concludes with a look into the meetings she has participated in over the last four weeks.

6. Next Meeting

- May 9, 2019, 1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m., EMRB Office
7. In Camera

There are no items for In Camera.

8. Adjournment

Chair Doblanko concludes that the Quarterly Financials will be sent via email to Audit & Finance Committee members prior to the Board meeting with mark-up to show the changes. Next meeting Administration will come back with the Reserves policy to be capped at $100,000. Chair Doblanko concludes with clarification on how Budget Scenario 3 will be brought to the Board, stating it is to be linked to the Business Plan and context around it.

**Motion:** That the Audit & Finance Committee meeting of March 14, 2019 be adjourned at 3:17 p.m.
**Moved by:** Mayor Ralph
**Accepted by:** Chair
**Decision:** Carried unanimously

Committee Chair, Tanni Doblanko
Quarterly Financial Report
Q4 2018/19 Fiscal Year – Prior to year-end adjustments

On February 14, 2019, the Board approved the updated 2018/19 Budget. The fourth quarter financial report to March 31, 2019, including budget adjustments is attached.

Through March 31, 2019, expenditures are well under those anticipated in the Budget, notably with respect to project consulting. As explained at the Q3 2018/19 Fiscal Year update, the Board Administration underwent a significant transition. During this time, effort was focused on hiring, orientation, and maintaining operations of the organization through the transition. This resulted in some phases of existing projects, as well as the initiation of planned projects, being delayed.

During transition, work continued on the Regional Agricultural Master Plan, Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan and a Public Engagement Policy. Additional research and project initiation work included the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit initiative, Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy, the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Update, and planning for the four-year update of the EMRB’s corporate policies.

It is important to note the attached Quarterly Financial Report is being brought forward prior to year-end adjustments. Reporting highlights include:

- Revenues are higher than budgeted ($2,000,000), as the 2019/20 Operating Grant was received in the current fiscal year (March 2019).
- All expenditures are under budget with the exception of the following:
  1. Additional Meeting Support is over budget by $3,112.00. This includes all expenses such as honoraria, travel, and meeting costs associated with Shared Investment for Shared Benefit (SISB), Regional Agricultural Master Plan (RAMP) and Metropolitan Regional Servicing Plan (MRSP).
  2. Legal & Professional Fees is over budget by $2,812.00 due to unforeseen circumstances, such as recruitment for new CEO and Project Manager.
  3. Information Technology is over budget by $8,388.00. Administration initiated an audit of the IT system, performance from our current provider, as well as an external provider. The audit has resulted in a change of IT providers.
  4. Office Furniture/Equipment is over budget by $3,564.00 due to timing of invoices from boardroom renovations occurring in the previous year.

Attachments

1. Quarterly Financial Report (Q4) to March 31, 2019, prior to year end adjustments.
# 2018/19 Budget

**Quarterly Financial Report as of March 31, 2019**

Prior to Year-end adjustments and Audited Financial Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Revenue</strong></th>
<th><strong>Budget</strong></th>
<th><strong>Actual Q3</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOA Regular Grant</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA ACP Internship program</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Contribution</td>
<td>$1,351,000</td>
<td>$1,351,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Committed Funds</td>
<td>$2,382,883</td>
<td>$2,382,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit Interest</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$44,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$5,776,883</td>
<td>$7,822,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Expenditures</strong></th>
<th><strong>Budget</strong></th>
<th><strong>Actual Q3</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board and Committees</td>
<td>$197,400</td>
<td>$157,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration Events</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$13,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>$25,400</td>
<td>$25,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$4,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
<td>$17,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Additional Meeting Support</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$35,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Retainer</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$60,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration</strong></td>
<td>$2,315,761</td>
<td>$2,284,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries/Benefits</td>
<td>$1,781,461</td>
<td>$1,780,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Lease/Utilities</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$260,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Legal &amp; Professional Fees</td>
<td>$71,000</td>
<td>$73,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Communications</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
<td>$27,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel / Professional Development</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$28,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$25,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Information Technology</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$33,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$7,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMS/ Record Management</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$19,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$5,300</td>
<td>$5,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$13,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges and Interest</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$7,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital and Other</strong></td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$62,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Intern</td>
<td>$64,000</td>
<td>$46,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Office Furniture/Equipment</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$15,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consulting Fees</strong></td>
<td>$1,042,250</td>
<td>$450,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$43,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Projects</td>
<td>$967,250</td>
<td>$406,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$3,631,411</td>
<td>$2,955,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated Project Funds</td>
<td>$2,145,472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$4,867,819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*see breakdown on Page 2
## Consulting Fees

### Regional Mandate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audited Financials/Annual Report</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$40,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan Preparation</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$40,607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Education &amp; Info Sessions (Speakers)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$19,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Communications/Branding/Messaging</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$44,897</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP Implementation</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Reporting</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRTMP</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg Context Statements/SSAs/Reviews/Etc.</td>
<td>$130,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update GP Document re: Membership/Maps/Design/Production/Etc.</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$235,000</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Projects</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAMP</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRSP</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$138,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$284,000</td>
<td>$272,750</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$43,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$43,881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Regional Projects**     | $690,000        | $412,135|

### Funding Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan (addition of recreation)</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Engagement Policy</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPI Dashboard Development</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Prioritization Review</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRTMP Update</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Ag Master Plan</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$13,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreation/Open Spaces Master Plan</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Investment for Shared Benefit</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadband - phase 2</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Systems Working Groups</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy - phase 2</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Stabilization Reserve</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$284,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Symposium</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Needs Assessment</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Total Regional Projects**          | $352,250       | $38,677|

### Total Consulting Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,042,250</td>
<td>$450,813</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft 2019/20 Budget

Recommended Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approve the Draft 2019/20 Budget.

Background

On April 12, 2018, the Board approved the 2018/19 Business Plan and Budget. The Budget was adjusted to accommodate $2,382,883 in non-committed deferred revenue identified through an analysis of several years of grant funding to the EMRB. Administration therefore put forward a comprehensive Budget that would use the deferred revenue to advance the strategic priorities of the Board. Over the course of the 2018/19 year, a number of changes occurred with the EMRB Administration, including the resignation of the CEO and the recruitment of a successor. As a result, many of the projects referred to in the 2018/19 Budget were delayed or deferred.

On February 14, 2019, an Adjusted Budget was approved by the Board, reflective of the current budget situation. The Board was also made aware of a January 28, 2019 letter from the Minister of Municipal Affairs signaling a reduction in the provincial grant in the year 2020/21.

The EMRB Budget is based on a three year forecast. The Audit & Finance Committee is recommending the Budget be based on the change to the grant, and a projected shortfall in the year 2020/21. The draft 2019/20 Budget reflects the continuation of a number of projects, and the potential commencement of new projects.

Budget

The format of the 2019/20 Budget has been revised to be more clear and transparent in accounting for Projects and Programs expenditures. The previous 2018/19 Budget used general terms such as Compliance, Education, Regional Projects, etc. which were not clear with regard to their purpose and intent, nor the projects included. The new categories and the projects and programs listed under each are now more specific and align clearly with the Regulation, Growth Plan and Strategic Plan. For example, the EMRB Regulation Mandate category includes projects and programs sourced directly from the Regulation such as the Growth Plan, Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan, Public Engagement Policy and REF. The Growth Plan Implementation and Strategic Plan Initiatives categories are also represented in this manner.

The 2018/19 Budget allocated the majority of the non-committed deferred revenues to fully fund projects in the current year; however, most of the projects will be multi-year, and significant portions of the expenditures for the projects will occur in subsequent budget years. The 2019/20 Budget distributes the expenditures for the projects across the years in which the expense is expected to occur, allowing for more accurate projections of future budgets.

The Draft 2019/20 Budget also reallocates funds within the line items to better represent where the funds are being expended. The reallocation is explained in the Budget notes.
The Business Plan

On June 14, 2018, the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approved the 2018-2022 Business Plan. The Plan was developed a four-year model, that is reviewed/renewed on an annual basis.

The Draft Revised 2019-20 Business Plan accompanies the 2019-20 Budget. The final draft of the Revised 2019-20 Business Plan will be dependent on the Board’s decision regarding the 2019-20 Budget.

In reviewing and drafting both the 2019-20 Budget and the 2019-20 Revised Business Plan, it was noted that while the Budget is developed on a three-year basis, the Business Plan is a four-year document. In discussion at the Audit & Finance Committee, it was suggested that the cycle of the two documents be aligned.

The 2019-20 Revised Business Plan has been updated to reflect the 2019-20 Budget recommendation being brought to the Board through the Audit & Finance Committee. This includes initiatives and references related to Transit, specifically a cost-benefit analysis and advocacy, have also been removed.

A more detailed briefing note on the Draft Revised 2019-20 Business Plan may be found under agenda item 5.4.

Budget Notes

EMRB Administration has looked for efficiencies and reallocated some funds within the Administration-Strategic Plan Initiatives and Operations sections of the Budget, based on need and upcoming priorities. These changes are captured in the Budget Notes.

EMRB Administration has also maintained the Board Stabilization Reserve at $100,000 on a go-forward basis. As discussed in the Audit & Finance Committee meeting of March 14, 2019, EMRB Administration will draft a policy to cap the reserve at $100,000 for the Board’s approval.

In the current proposal, it is proposed the Budget shortfall be made up through Member Contributions.

As a result of the proposed Budget and Business Plan, the Board is requested to consider deferring the start of some of the upcoming projects in order to manage Budget expenditures. In this Budget, EMRB Administration has proposed the following:

- Defer the start of the Integrated Regional Open Space Master Plan from 2019/20 to 2020/21 and continue into 2021/22;
- Defer the start of the Regional Infrastructure Master Plan from 2020/21 to 2021/22 and continue in 2022/23; and,
- Remove the project on Complete Communities as a result of the Board’s direction to focus on Advocacy.
The following provides a detailed explanation of changes to Revenue and Expenditures:

**Revenue**
- 2019/20 core funding remains at $2,000,000.
- 2020/21 core funding reduced to $1,750,000.
- 2021/22 assumption core funding will remain at $1,750,000.
- EMRB will not apply for a municipal planning intern in 2020/21.
- Member Contributions to remain at $1,468,000 in 2019/20, increase to $1,898,454.11 in 2020/21, and reduce to $1,872,017.89 in 2021/22.

**Expenditures**
1. Salaries and Benefits: 2018/19 there is an overall savings of approximately $45,000. 2019/20 - added $130,000 from RCS/NSPR/SSAR, as this is where the FTE was previously captured.
2. Office Lease: 2018/19 reduced to reflect actual costs of $265,000. Effective February 2019, the lease rate has changed from $26/ sq. ft. to $29/ sq. ft. for the remainder of the lease- in effect until January 31, 2024. This brings the cost to $310,000, annually.
3. Travel/Professional Development: decrease of $10,000 to be reallocated in Meetings-Non/Board Committee.
4. Information Technology (IT): added $50,000 as an audit of the current IT provider will result in a change of providers. An upgrade to the server is also required. Reallocating $7500 from Office Furniture/Equipment to IT for M-Files.
5. Office Communications: added $15,000 from Marketing & Communications for hard costs of website and social media.
6. Insurance: reduced budgeted amount from $8,000 to $5,300 to accurately reflect costs in 2018/19. Reduced 2019-2022 to reflect actual costs with modest increases year-over-year.
7. Office Furniture/Equipment: reallocation of $7500 to IT. Carry-over $20,000 from 2019/20.
8. REF: 2018/19 reduced to reflect anticipated costs of approximately $75,000.
9. RAMP and LESA: increase of $75,000 in anticipation of potential additional costs.
10. Integrated Regional Open Space Master Plan: to be deferred in 2019/20, anticipated start 2020/21 and continue in 2021/22.
11. Regional Infrastructure Master Plan: to be deferred in 2020/21, anticipated start 2021/22 and continue in 2022/23.
12. Complete Communities: removed as per Board’s direction to focus on Advocacy.
13. Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy: decreased Budget by $75,838 in both 2019/20 and 2020/21. (Note the line item name has changed from Regional Energy Corridors Approach Project.)
14. RCS/NSPR/SSAR: decrease of $130,000, as FTE is now included in Salaries and Benefits.
15. Shared Investment for Shared Benefit- Increase in 2019/20 and 2020/21 of $29,000 to account for increased membership from 7 to 13.
16. Regional Symposium: defer $100,000 to 2020/21.
17. Board Development & Strategic Planning (previously Board Collaboration & Education): decrease 2018/19 from $50,000 to $10,000 to reflect actual costs. Carry-over of $20,000 to
2019/20, increasing the Budget from $50,000 to $70,000. Going forward it is reduced back to $50,000. (This includes one annual retreat and Board Development).

18. Advocacy: decrease of $10,000 to reflect actual costs in 2018/19 and carry-over of $10,000 to 2019/20.


Next Steps

It is recommended the Board:

1. Approve the Draft 2019/20 Budget; or
2. Direct Administration to revisit the Draft 2019/20 Budget in order to bring a revised Budget forward.

Attachments

1. Draft 2019/20 Budget
2. Membership Contributions
## Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Updated 2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOA Operating Grant</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>2,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,750,000.00</td>
<td>1,750,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA Planning Intern Grant</td>
<td>43,000.00</td>
<td>24,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Member Contribution</td>
<td>1,351,000.00</td>
<td>1,468,000.00</td>
<td>1,898,454.11</td>
<td>1,872,017.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Committed Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>2,382,883.00</td>
<td>2,145,471.77</td>
<td>610,532.13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry Over</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>5,776,883.00</td>
<td>5,637,471.77</td>
<td>4,258,986.24</td>
<td>3,622,017.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenditures

### Board & Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Updated 2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board &amp; Committees Collaboration Events</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>25,400.00</td>
<td>32,400.00</td>
<td>32,400.00</td>
<td>32,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>17,500.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Meeting Support</td>
<td>32,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Retainer</td>
<td>80,000.00</td>
<td>80,000.00</td>
<td>80,000.00</td>
<td>80,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Board &amp; Committees</strong></td>
<td>197,400.00</td>
<td>169,400.00</td>
<td>169,400.00</td>
<td>169,400.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Updated 2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Salaries &amp; Benefits</td>
<td>1,781,461.23</td>
<td>1,953,386.64</td>
<td>2,011,988.24</td>
<td>2,072,347.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Office Lease</td>
<td>265,000.00</td>
<td>310,000.00</td>
<td>310,000.00</td>
<td>310,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Fees - Legal/Advisory</td>
<td>71,000.00</td>
<td>55,000.00</td>
<td>55,000.00</td>
<td>55,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Travel/Professional Development</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>38,000.00</td>
<td>38,000.00</td>
<td>38,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Information Technology</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>77,500.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
<td>25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Management</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Office Communications</td>
<td>38,000.00</td>
<td>53,000.00</td>
<td>53,000.00</td>
<td>53,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>31,295.00</td>
<td>31,295.00</td>
<td>31,295.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Insurance</td>
<td>5,300.00</td>
<td>6,000.00</td>
<td>6,200.00</td>
<td>6,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings - Non Board/Committee</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank Charges &amp; Interest</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Expenses</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Administration</strong></td>
<td>2,315,761.23</td>
<td>2,604,181.64</td>
<td>2,610,483.24</td>
<td>2,666,142.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capital & Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2018/19 Budget</th>
<th>Updated 2019/20</th>
<th>2020/21</th>
<th>2021/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Intern</td>
<td>64,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Office Furniture/Equipment</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
<td>27,500.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Capital &amp; Other</strong></td>
<td>76,000.00</td>
<td>77,500.00</td>
<td>12,500.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regional Projects & Programs

**EMRB Regulation Mandate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Overage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth Plan</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$392,300.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRSP</td>
<td>$41,000.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report/ Auditors</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement Policy</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
<td>$38,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 REF</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$266,000.00</td>
<td>$555,800.00</td>
<td>$188,500.00</td>
<td>$163,500.00</td>
<td>$163,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Growth Plan Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Overage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 RAMP &amp; LESA</td>
<td>$152,000.00</td>
<td>$497,030.00</td>
<td>$145,475.00</td>
<td>$145,475.00</td>
<td>$145,475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Integrated Regional Open Space Master Plan</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Regional Infrastructure Master Plan</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Complete Communities</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRTMP Update</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$202,000.00</td>
<td>$707,320.00</td>
<td>$405,765.00</td>
<td>$345,475.00</td>
<td>$345,475.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Growth Plan Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Overage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 RCS/NSPR/SSAR/Etc.*</td>
<td>$130,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Plan Amendments/Updates</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toolkit/Education/Interpretation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI Dashboard</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Reporting</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$235,000.00</td>
<td>$205,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
<td>$55,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Plan Initiatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Overage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Shared Investment Shared Benefit</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$237,338.00</td>
<td>$437,338.00</td>
<td>$437,338.00</td>
<td>$437,338.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$150,400.00</td>
<td>$150,400.00</td>
<td>$150,400.00</td>
<td>$150,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI Targets for GP</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Regional Symposium</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Board Development &amp; Strategic Planning</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
<td>$70,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Advocacy</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
<td>$547,738.00</td>
<td>$657,338.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
<td>$80,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Overage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Board Stabilization Reserve</td>
<td>$284,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Marketing &amp; Communications</td>
<td>$25,000.00</td>
<td>$60,000.00</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
<td>$35,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans &amp; Transit Working Group</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$309,250.00</td>
<td>$160,000.00</td>
<td>$135,000.00</td>
<td>$135,000.00</td>
<td>$135,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Regional Projects & Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Overage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,042,250.00</td>
<td>$2,175,858.00</td>
<td>$1,466,603.00</td>
<td>$778,975.00</td>
<td>$778,975.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Total Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount 1</th>
<th>Amount 2</th>
<th>Amount 3</th>
<th>Amount 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated Funds</td>
<td>$3,631,411.23</td>
<td>$5,026,939.64</td>
<td>$4,258,986.24</td>
<td>$3,622,017.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td>$2,145,471.77</td>
<td>$610,532.13</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulate Surplus Beginning of Year</td>
<td>$2,145,471.77</td>
<td>$610,532.13</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulate Surplus End of Year</td>
<td>$2,145,471.77</td>
<td>$610,532.13</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* RCS = Regional Context Statements
  NSPR = Non-Statutory Plan Reviews
  SSAR = Special Study Areas Reviews
Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board
GENERAL Cost Sharing Formula

### Formula Variables

| Total Project Cost | $1,898,454 |

### Part 1: Core Fee Calculation

| Source Data for year 2017: |  
| Total Core Fee % Project Cost | 10.00% |
| Maximum Total Core Fee $ to be Allocated (A x B) | $189,845 |
| Divided by the number of municipalities | 13 |
| Core Fee per municipality (F/D) | $14,603 |

#### Municipal Affairs

- **Morinville**: Municipality with lowest Operating Expenses
- **Operating Expenses**: $18,258,963
- **Core Fee - 1% of Operating Expenses**: $0.01
- **Total Core Fee - $ of Operating Expenses (F x G)**: $182,590
- **Core Fee per municipality for this project (F/D)**: $14,045

### Part 2: Weighting

- **50% - Population**
  - Total: $857,932
- **50% - Total Equalized Assessment**
  - Total: $857,932

### Total Allocation

- **Total**: $1,898,454

### Municipality Cost Allocation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Core Fee ($)</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Cost Allocation by Population (%)</th>
<th>Cost Allocation by Population ($)</th>
<th>Total Equalized Assessment ($)</th>
<th>Cost Allocation by Eq. Assessment (%)</th>
<th>Cost Allocation by Total Equalized Assessment ($)</th>
<th>Cost Allocation Total ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>932546</td>
<td>71.64%</td>
<td>$614,595</td>
<td>$144,383,870.0</td>
<td>64.46%</td>
<td>$553,042</td>
<td>$1,181,681.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>24149</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
<td>$15,915</td>
<td>$4,974,041,069</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
<td>$19,090</td>
<td>$49,050.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Leduc</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>29993</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>$19,767</td>
<td>$4,463,073,744</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>$17,126</td>
<td>$50,937.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spruce Grove</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>34066</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>$22,451</td>
<td>$4,240,524,704</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>$16,272</td>
<td>$52,768.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Albert</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>65589</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
<td>$43,226</td>
<td>$10,279,575,826</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>$39,445</td>
<td>$96,716.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>13780</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>$9,082</td>
<td>$6,685,759,816</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
<td>$25,655</td>
<td>$48,781.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>98044</td>
<td>7.53%</td>
<td>$64,616</td>
<td>$28,760,464,369</td>
<td>12.86%</td>
<td>$110,360</td>
<td>$189,020.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>98044</td>
<td>7.53%</td>
<td>$64,616</td>
<td>$28,760,464,369</td>
<td>12.86%</td>
<td>$110,360</td>
<td>$189,020.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>20495</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
<td>$13,507</td>
<td>$5,236,336,962</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>$20,093</td>
<td>$47,645.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Beaumont</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>17396</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>$11,465</td>
<td>$2,144,638,877</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>$8,229</td>
<td>$33,739.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Devon</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>6578</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>$4,335</td>
<td>$798,252,665</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>$3,063</td>
<td>$21,443.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Morinville</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>9848</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>$6,490</td>
<td>$1,105,294,389</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>$4,214</td>
<td>$24,776.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Stony Plain</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>17189</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>$11,328</td>
<td>$2,249,871,831</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>$8,633</td>
<td>$34,006.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

- **$182,590**
- **$1,301,770**
- **$857,932**
- **$223,582,935,071.00**
- **$857,932**
- **$1,898,454.11**
Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board
GENERAL Cost Sharing Formula

Prepared February 2019

Formula Variables

| Total Project Cost | $1,872,018 |

Part 1: Core Fee Calculation

| Total Core Fee % Project Cost | 10.00% |
| Maximum Total Core Fee $ to be Allocated (A x B) | $187,202 |
| Divided by the number of municipalities | 13 |
| Core Fee per municipality (C/D) | $14,400 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Core Fee</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Cost Allocation by Population</th>
<th>Cost Allocation by Population</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cost Allocation by Total</th>
<th>Cost Allocation</th>
<th>Cost Allocation</th>
<th>Cost Allocation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>932546</td>
<td>71.64%</td>
<td>$605,126</td>
<td>$144,383,870</td>
<td>64.46%</td>
<td>$544,521</td>
<td>$1,163,692.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>24149</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
<td>$15,670</td>
<td>$4,974,041</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
<td>$18,796</td>
<td>$48,511.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Leduc</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>29993</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>$19,462</td>
<td>$4,463,073</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>$16,862</td>
<td>$50,369.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spruce Grove</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>34066</td>
<td>2.62%</td>
<td>$22,105</td>
<td>$4,240,524</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>$16,021</td>
<td>$48,246.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Albert</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>65589</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
<td>$42,560</td>
<td>$10,279,575</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>$38,837</td>
<td>$95,442.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>13780</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>$8,942</td>
<td>$6,685,759</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
<td>$25,259</td>
<td>$48,464.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>32097</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>$20,828</td>
<td>$8,517,316</td>
<td>3.81%</td>
<td>$32,181</td>
<td>$67,053.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>98044</td>
<td>7.53%</td>
<td>$63,620</td>
<td>$28,760,464</td>
<td>12.86%</td>
<td>$108,659</td>
<td>$186,325.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>20495</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
<td>$13,299</td>
<td>$5,236,336</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>$19,783</td>
<td>$47,127.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Beaumont</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>17396</td>
<td>1.34%</td>
<td>$11,288</td>
<td>$2,144,638</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>$8,103</td>
<td>$34,436.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Devon</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>6578</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>$4,268</td>
<td>$798,252</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>$3,016</td>
<td>$21,329.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Morinville</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>9848</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>$6,390</td>
<td>$1,105,294</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>$4,176</td>
<td>$24,611.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Stony Plain</td>
<td>$14,045</td>
<td>17189</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>$11,154</td>
<td>$2,249,871</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$33,699.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$182,590</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,301,770</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$844,714</strong></td>
<td><strong>$223,582,935</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$844,714</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,872,017.89</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Data for year 2017:
Municipal Affairs
Population
Equalized Assessment

Instructions: Insert the project amount in to cell A.
The spreadsheet will automatically calculate each municipal share per project.
2018-2022 Business Plan (Updated March 2019)

Recommended Motion: That the Audit & Finance Committee endorse and recommend the 2018-2022 Business Plan (2019-2020 Update) to the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board for approval.

Background

- On June 14, 2018, the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board approved the 2018-2022 Business Plan. The current Business Plan was developed on a four-year model that is to be reviewed/renewed on an annual basis.

- The 2018-22 Business Plan was developed to direct administrative operations responding to the Board’s strategic priorities while honouring the need to carry out and enhance, where appropriate, the ongoing operations of the Board.

- The Draft Revised 2019-20 Business Plan that is before the Board has been reviewed and revised using the format that was developed in 2018 with some notable changes:
  1. A Strategic Priorities Status Update has been added to the Strategic Priorities section.
  2. The 2019-20 Business Plan Priorities have been built into a table format that aligns the 2019-20 Business Plan Priorities with the Strategic Priorities. The information from Section 3, Section 6 (Appendix C), and Section 7 from the 2018-2022 Business Plan has been combined into this one table in order to provide a comprehensive overview of the business priorities for the year ahead.
  3. The removal of references related to transit, specifically a cost-benefit analysis and advocacy.


- The Draft Revised 2019-20 Business Plan has been developed ahead of the 2019-20 Budget being approved. As a result of budget discussions, the Draft Revised 2019-20 Business Plan may require changes.

- In previous years, the EMRB Business Plan has been endorsed and recommended to the Board through the Executive Committee. However, the Budget and the Business Plan are integrated, with the Business Plan being dependent on the final Budget. As a result the Business Plan will move forward with the Budget, through the Finance & Audit Committee, to the Board.
Audit & Finance Committee  
Recommendation to the  
Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board  

April 11, 2019

- Feedback and input into the document, in particular the Business Plan Priorities is highly valued and as such the Draft Revised 2019-20 Business Plan was also brought to Executive Committee on March 14, 2019. The feedback from the Executive Committee was shared with the Audit & Finance Committee.

- In reviewing and drafting both the 2019-20 Budget and the 2019-20 Revised Business Plan, it was noted that while the budget is developed on a three-year basis, the business plan is a four-year document. In discussion at the Audit and Finance Committee, it was suggested that the cycle of the two document be aligned going forward. It was suggested that the Business Plan be developed to align with the Budget cycle.

Next Steps

Based on the Board’s decision related to the 2019/20 Budget, the Business Plan will either:

1. Be completed by inserting the Approved Budget Table into section 6.0 of the Business Plan, or
2. Be revised based on the direction of the Board.

Attachments

2018-2022 Business Plan
Updated March 2019
Operationalizing the Mission, Values, and Strategic Plan of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board

June 14, 2018
Updated March 2019
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Preface

INTRODUCTION

At the end of 2018, the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) took the opportunity to celebrate the significant accomplishments of the first 10 years of meaningful collaboration, and to thank everyone who had a hand in our success. It reminded us all of the vision, hard work and dedication of those who came before, and the promise and responsibility that must be fulfilled going forward. We have an ambitious and challenging agenda in front of us. It is an agenda that is game-changing, and successful outcomes will depend on the Board, Administration and our stakeholders having the same vision, leadership and dedication.

BUSINESS PLANNING FRAMEWORK

The EMRB Regulation gives the Board its mandate and sets out its fiduciary responsibilities. The Strategic Plan focuses the Board’s attention and resources on maintaining the resiliency of the Region through its guiding principles and strategic priorities for the future. The Growth Plan, the Board’s primary obligation under the Regulation, guides the Region’s growth through the implementation of sound and responsible policies developed through the collaborative and respectful exchange of ideas amongst our members. The Business Plan and Budget operationalize the direction in these documents.

BUSINESS PLAN

Building on the success of the previous 10 years, the Board undertook a strategic planning exercise in 2018 which culminated in a new and visionary Strategic Plan aimed at taking the work of the Board to the next level. Within the Strategic Plan, the Board identified three key strategic priorities: (1) Shared Investment for Shared Benefit, (2) Responsible and Sustainable Growth, and (3) Maintaining Momentum.

The Regulation, Strategic Plan, and Growth Plan define the framework upon which the Business Plan is formed. The Business Plan is the roadmap that implements the ambitious agenda that will continue to move the Region forward. Those initiatives continuing on from 2018-19 as well as those commencing in 2019-20 are significant and demanding. They will challenge the Board to continue to work together in a collaborative fashion, and to find common ground and innovative solutions. As the Board moves forward with its work, it will be important to continuously reflect on a few key foundational pillars to ensure the actions of the Board align with our established goals and objectives. This includes the mandate given to the Board by the Province through the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board Regulation; the vision and direction within the recently approved Strategic Plan; and the foresight and guiding principles established in the Growth Plan.

THE POLITICAL LANDSCAPE

Looking ahead, 2019-20 will be a year marked by change and some uncertainty, as well as renewed opportunity. Top of mind are the upcoming provincial and federal elections. Regardless of the outcome of the provincial election, the Alberta Government will not look the same. There are many new individuals running for office across all parties. Provincial government priorities will be revisited and realigned, and it will be incumbent upon the EMRB to both respond any shifts in strategic direction and policy, and to provide vision and strong leadership in support of the ongoing work and partnership with the Province.
While the EMRB does not experience the impact of a federal election in the same way as a provincial one, changes in leadership, strategy and policy at the federal level still have the potential to affect the work of the EMRB. It is incumbent upon the EMRB to seize and capture new opportunities, respond to and promote policy initiatives, and build and advance relationships and partnerships across both orders of government.

KEY PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

The focus of the upcoming year will be the continuation of projects started in 2018 and early 2019, as well as key priorities and outcomes established in the Strategic Plan. The projects were identified in the Regulation mandate, Strategic Plan priorities, and initiatives arising from the implementation of the Growth Plan. Further, corporate planning and operations activities and programs will take on a more significant role this year. The priorities over the next year include:

- Regional Agriculture Master Plan;
- Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan;
- Shared Investment for Shared Benefit;
- Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan Update;
- Regional Energy Corridors Advocacy Strategy;
- Broadband;
- KPI Dashboard Update;
- Board Development;
- Corporate Policies Review;
- Risk Assessment and Mitigation Strategy;
- Advocacy; and
- Brand and Reputation Enhancement.

STAFFING TRANSITION

While 2017/18 was a transition year that included a municipal election, new legislation, new board, and a new growth plan, 2018/19 was a year of administrative transition. A new CEO was recruited, starting in the role in November, 2018. In addition, there was a change to the organizational structure and other staff changeover throughout 2018-19. Transition planning, which started at the end of 2018, will continue into the new fiscal year to minimize disruption and maintain the stability of the organization. Throughout this transition period, EMRB administration has continued to drive forward the Board’s agenda.

BUDGET

The 2018-19 Budget was enhanced by non-committed deferred revenue resulting from an analysis of several years of grant funding to the EMRB. The deferred revenue has been identified to support and accelerate the Board’s strategic priorities. The 2018-19 Budget allocated the majority of the non-committed revenues to fully fund projects in 2018-19 and 2019-20. The 2019-20 Budget distributes the expenditures for the projects across the years in which the expense is expected to occur, allowing for more accurate projections of future budgets.

In addition, the 2019-20 Budget format has been revised to reflect full-cost accounting of the projects. This will give Board members, Administration and others a more fulsome account of the actual costs associated with each project.
Of note, member municipalities have increased their municipal contributions to the EMRB over the last two years, and are positioned to do so again this year. These contributions are key to the ability of the Board to deliver on its key strategic priorities.

Finally, the Government of Alberta has signaled a decrease in grant funding in 2020-2021. The Province has indicated funding will be reduced from $2M to $1.75M leaving a notable shortfall. The Board and Administration will be engaging in discussions over the next few months to determine steps to address the shortfall.
1.0. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1. MISSION

1.1.1. The Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board (EMRB) Administration enables the Board to meet its fiduciary and mandated obligations.

1.2. VALUES

1.2.1. The four key values administration believes are mission critical to success are: respect, integrity, accountability, and innovation.

1.3. VISION

1.3.1. The Edmonton Metropolitan Region is the dominant hub for northern Alberta and is recognized globally 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.

1.4. SCOPE

1.4.1. The EMRB must meet its obligations under the *Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board Regulation (189/2017)* of the *Municipal Government Act* (MGA), and also forge a role outside the Regulation to ensure additional value in the eyes of stakeholders. This additional value will be delivered by nurturing respectful stakeholder relationships based on a set of well-defined values and collaboration opportunities.

The Business Plan directs EMRB’s administrative operations for the year in a way that is responsive to the Board’s strategic priorities while honouring the need to carry out and enhance, where appropriate, the ongoing operations of the Board related to strategic planning, regional planning, regional servicing, public engagement, and internal operations. The Business Plan is a four-year model renewed/reviewed annually.

1.4.2. On October 26, 2017 the Minister of Municipal Affairs approved the *Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board Regulation (189/2017)*, which includes a new membership, mandate, and voting structure. This has had an impact on the scope of work for the EMRB, which has been taken into consideration in the financial plan and work plan.

1.4.3. For the purposes of the Alberta *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* and *Alberta Capital Finance Authority Act*, the EMRB is deemed to be a Growth Management Board as defined in the newly updated MGA approved in 2017.
2.0. STRATEGIC PRIORITIES

2.1. 2018-19 was a transition year for the EMRB. The transition involved organizational changes resulting from a new MGA, the new Regulation, new members as a result of the 2017 municipal election, provincial approval of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan, as well as Administrative leadership changes. 2019-20 will see the EMRB emerge from its transition period focusing on the ambitious agenda ahead.

2.2. EMRB approved its new Strategic Plan in June 2018. The strategic priorities now in place solidify the work outlined within this Business Plan.

2.3. The Strategic Priorities for 2018-2023 are:

1. Shared Investment for Shared Benefit;
2. Responsible and Sustainable Growth; and
3. Maintaining Momentum.

2.4. The Strategic Priorities, including sub-tasks or projects, are mapped out over time and depicted graphically in the 2018-2022 Implementation Gantt Chart (Appendix C), and are projected out over four years.

2.5. The table below reflects the key activities identified to achieve the Strategic Plan objectives. While not all activities are currently funded, it is understood these items are forecasted and will be undertaken in the future as funding is approved through the budgeting process or as funding becomes available. A complete list of unfunded projects is found on the Forward Planning List (FPL) (Appendix E). These projects are reviewed annually to ensure they stay consistent, and as part of the budgeting process to confirm ongoing relevance to the organization and prioritization against available resources.

2.6. Each Strategic Priority has a series of Key Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priorities</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Key Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHARED INVESTMENT FOR SHARED BENEFIT</td>
<td>The shared and equitable contributions, investments, and efforts by the EMRB result in measurable benefits for the Region as a whole.</td>
<td>1A: Develop and implement a benefits realization model that reflects shared regional interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1B: Measure the contributions and investments by the member municipalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1C: Identify and assess investments by public and private partners for the shared benefit of the Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1D: Evaluate the benefits realized by the contributions and other investments in the Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1E: Provide reporting on the shared contributions, investments, and benefits to the Region, key stakeholders, and partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPONSIBLE AND SUSTAINABLE GROWTH</td>
<td>The EMRB develops and implements sustainable growth to enable future generations to meet their needs, including responsible planning, decision-making, and monitoring of growth in accordance with the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan and the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan.</td>
<td>2A: Develop and implement the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2B: Develop and implement the Regional Agriculture Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2C: Establish key performance indicator targets and monitor the implementation of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2D: Provide leadership for a regional symposium for education and stakeholder collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINTAINING MOMENTUM</td>
<td>The EMRB successfully completes major activities and projects, and continually improves programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E: Embed an energy, climate, and economic opportunity lens on regional initiatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A: Maintain and enhance collaboration amongst Board members to foster healthy relationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B: Maintain and evolve the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C: Maintain and improve the Edmonton Metropolitan Region GIS (EMRGIS).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D: Maintain and improve advocacy (e.g., Provincial, Federal, Public Engagement Policies, Indigenous Stakeholders, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E: Maintain and enhance innovation to inform decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F: Complete annual regional transportation priorities to inform Alberta Transportation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3G: Update the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3H: Promote integrated transportation and transit systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3I: Promote advocacy on regional energy corridors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3J: Promote advocacy on housing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 – Strategic Priorities’ Key Results

2.7. The following table provides a Strategic Priorities Status Update as of February 28, 2019.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priorities</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Key Results</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Previous Status</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shared Investment for Shared Benefit</td>
<td>The shared and equitable contributions, investments, and efforts by the EMRB result in measurable benefits for the Region as a whole.</td>
<td>1A. Develop and implement a benefits realization model that reflects shared regional interests.</td>
<td>1A. Project Charter and Task Force Terms of Reference were approved by the Board on December 13, 2019. Project initiation work is underway with a request for proposal to be issued in Q2 2019 to complete the first phase of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1B. Measure the contributions and investments by the member municipalities.</td>
<td>1B. Process and Framework to be developed as part of the project and implementation plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1C. Identify and assess investments by public and private partners for the shared benefit of the Region.</td>
<td>1C. Process and Framework to be developed as part of the project and implementation plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1D. Evaluate the benefits realized by the contributions and other investments in the Region.</td>
<td>1D. Process and Framework to be developed as part of the project and implementation plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1E. Provide reporting on the shared contributions, investments, and benefits to the Region, key stakeholders, and partners.</td>
<td>1E. Process and Framework to be developed as part of the project and implementation plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Responsible and Sustainable Growth</td>
<td>The EMRB develops and implements sustainable growth to enable future generations to</td>
<td>2A. Develop and implement the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan (MRSP).</td>
<td>2A. MRSP Environmental Scan was accepted as information on February 14, 2019 by the Board. MRSP Final Phase is on schedule to be completed by the end of October 2019. The project is on budget and remains within scope based on the direction of the Task Force.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2B. Develop and implement the Regional Agriculture Master Plan (RAMP).</th>
<th>2B. RAMP Situation Report was accepted by the Board as information on August 9, 2018. The RAMP Vision and Guiding Principles were approved by the Board on February 14, 2019. The next phase focus of the project is on addressing the three objectives of the Plan starting with regional fragmentation and conversion. A preliminary Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Tool has been completed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2C. Establish key performance indicator targets and monitor the implementation of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan.</td>
<td>2C. EMRB Administration received Regional Context Statements from all 13 member municipalities. One new MDP has been submitted through the REF process to comply with EMRGP; twelve remain. 17 of the 26 identified key performance indicators of the Growth Plan have been developed and work is ongoing to develop the remaining nine. A public facing web dashboard has been developed to report on the KPIs and will continue to evolve and improve. On December 14, 2018, the Board approved the Sturgeon Valley Special Study Area Negotiated Policies and submitted a letter to the Province for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D. Provide leadership for a regional symposium for education and stakeholder collaboration.</td>
<td>2D. A regional symposium is being planned for the 2020/2021 budget year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - 2018 – 2023 Strategic Plan Strategic Priorities Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Maintaining Momentum</th>
<th>The EMRB successfully completes major activities and projects, and continually improve programs.</th>
<th>3A. Maintain and enhance collaboration amongst Board members to foster healthy relationships.</th>
<th>3A. Board Development Program is under development and will be implemented throughout 2019-2021.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3B. Maintain and evolve the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).</td>
<td>3B. Eleven REFs approved in 2018, zero rejected. The EMRB Planning Toolkit was comprehensively reviewed and improved to provide municipalities greater clarity of REF. Implementation of REF 2.0 is ongoing, municipal working group established and continues to discuss areas for improvement to support the implementation of the Regional Growth Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3C. Maintain and improve the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Geographic Information Services (EMRGIS).</td>
<td>3C. EMRGIS continues to support all ongoing projects and the EMRGIS website continues to evolve in terms of regional GIS capabilities, maps and open data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3D. Maintain and improve advocacy (e.g., Provincial, Federal, Public Engagement Policies, Indigenous Stakeholders, etc.).</td>
<td>3D. A Board Advocacy Committee has been formed to participate in advocacy initiatives. At the October 11, 2018 Board meeting, the Fall 2018 Advocacy Plan and the Board’s Public Engagement Policy G022 were approved. Administration is leading the development of a pre- and post-election advocacy strategy at the provincial and federal levels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 - 2018 – 2023 Strategic Plan Strategic Priorities Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priorities Update</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3E. Maintain and enhance innovation to inform decisions.</td>
<td>3E. EMRB Administration is in the process of implementing new agenda software (iCompass) to improve internal efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F. Complete annual regional transportation priorities to inform Alberta Transportation.</td>
<td>3F. 2018 Regional Transportation Priorities approved by the Board and submitted to Alberta Transportation. From the 2018 list of regional priorities, four transportation projects had funding announcements made by the Province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3G. Update the Integrated Regional Master Plan (IRTMP).</td>
<td>3G. Work is underway to prepare a Project Charter and Terms of Reference in consultation with Alberta Transportation. On July 24, 2018, the EMRB and Alberta Transportation signed a letter of agreement to work collaboratively on regional transportation projects involving planning of the regional road network. The update of the IRTMP is a two-year project expected to start in 2019 and be completed in 2021.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
Colours – Green = significant progress; Yellow = work in progress; Red = yet to be initiated or just started Arrows – Up = progressing according to plan; Sideways = no progress
3.0. 2019-20 BUSINESS PLAN PRIORITIES

3.1. The new Regulation and expanded mandate, along with the renewed Strategic Plan, impacts the Board’s work. The Board recognizes the unique opportunity at this moment in time, and is positioning itself to seize the opportunity, and accelerate and enhance its outcomes.

3.2. The 2019-20 Business Plan Priorities reflect the key work to be accomplished in support of the Board’s Strategic Priorities, as well as key strategic initiatives identified to advance the work of the Strategic Priorities.

3.3. The following Table outlines the work to be undertaken in 2019-20 in alignment with the Board’s Strategic Priorities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priorities</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Key Results</th>
<th>2019/ 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Shared Investment for Shared Benefit (SISB) | The shared and equitable contributions, investments, and efforts by the EMRB result in measurable benefits for the Region as a whole. | 1A. Develop and implement a benefits realization model that reflects shared regional interests. | • The Board approves Shared Strategic Intent for SISB and Guiding Principles. Objectives for the project are clearly defined. Project Plan is approved.  
*The following is subject to change, in accordance with the Project Plan:*  
• Environmental Scan of local funding models and other jurisdictions informs the development of SISB Framework and Approach.  
• Development of a shared project vocabulary (terminology).  
• Framework for the identification of regional benefits is under development.  
• Framework SISB Model is under development.  
• Criteria for determining SISB Initiatives is under development.  
• Governance Model is under discussion. |
| | | 1B. Measure the contributions and investments by the member municipalities. | |
| | | 1C. Identify and assess investments by public and private partners for the shared benefit of the Region. | |
| | | 1D. Evaluate the benefits realized by the contributions and other investments in the Region. | |
| | | 1E. Provide reporting on the shared contributions, investments, and benefits to the Region, key stakeholders, and partners. | |
| 2. Responsible and Sustainable Growth | The EMRB develops and implements sustainable growth to enable future generations to meet their needs, | 2A. Develop and implement the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan (MRSP). | • MRSP Final Phase is endorsed by Task Force with inaugural Plan completion by September 2019 in accordance with Project Charter 2.0.  
• Inaugural Edmonton Metropolitan Region (EMR) MRSP presented to the Board for approval, October 2019, then submitted to the Province for approval. |
Table 3 - 2019 – 2020 Business Plan Strategic Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2B.       | **Develop and implement the Regional Agriculture Master Plan (RAMP).**  
- Inaugural EMR RAMP is endorsed by the Task Force and presented to the Board for approval April 2020, then submitted to the Province for approval.  
- The development and implementation of a Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Tool (LESA) is addressed as part of the RAMP Implementation Plan, endorsed by the Task Force and presented for the Board’s approval in April 2020. |
| 2C.       | **Establish key performance indicator targets and monitor the implementation of the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan.**  
- EMRB Administration will provide annual updates on MDP submissions as part of Growth Plan Implementation.  
- All 26 Key Performance Indicators have been defined and EMRB Dash Board has been re-launched to provide more information on Growth Plan KPIs, enhanced with strategic insights and reporting on our progress towards implementation of the regional Growth Plan.  
- Work is underway to establish the EMRB as the source for regional GIS and Open Data. |
| 2D.       | **Provide leadership for a regional symposium for education and stakeholder collaboration.**  
- The Board’s direction on the theme and objectives for a regional symposium are identified for implementation in the 2020/2021 Budget year. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Maintaining Momentum</th>
<th>2E. Embed an energy, climate, and economic opportunity lens on regional initiatives.</th>
<th>• All projects continue to include these lenses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3A. Maintain and enhance collaboration amongst the Board members to foster healthy relationships.</td>
<td>• The Board Development and Education Program is defined identifying program objectives with initial work completed by the end of Q2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The Board Retreat is held in Q2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• As a part of the Board Retreat, the Board will review and revisit the 2018-2023 Strategic Priorities / Key Results based on the current operating environment and make adjustments (if required) to the Growth Plan Implementation Program and the Board Strategic Initiatives to inform the 2020-2021 Budget and Business Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3B. Maintain and evolve the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF).</td>
<td>• Improvements to the REF Tool Kit are ongoing based on discussions with REF Working Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• REF 101 and EMR Growth Plan 101 education sessions are ongoing for municipal administrations and key regional stakeholders, and are supported by the REF Working Group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3C. Maintain and improve the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Geographic Information Services (EMRGIS).</td>
<td>• The EMRGIS is embedded into the Growth Plan Implementation Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• EMRGIS website continues to evolve in terms of regional GIS capabilities, maps, and open data based on stakeholder input and feedback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 - 2019 – 2020 Business Plan Strategic Priorities
Table 3 - 2019 – 2020 Business Plan Strategic Priorities

| 3D. Maintain and improve advocacy (e.g., Provincial, Federal, Public Engagement Policies, Indigenous Stakeholders, etc.) | • The Board Advocacy Plan is implemented and adapted as required to address any changes in the political landscape or the Board’s strategic priorities.
• Development of a narrative which fully describes the EMRB’s success, value and return on investment to the Region, as well as provincially and federally. |
|---|---|
| 3E. Maintain and enhance innovation to inform decisions. | • The EMRB Administration formalizes its process of e-scanning and intelligence reporting through the collection, synthesis and analysis of potential risks and impacts to the Board and its programs and initiatives, based on information, reports, announcements, social media and events gathered relative to the Board’s priorities and initiatives.
• The EMRB Administration implements a new agenda planning system increasing efficiency and allowing users to opt for an enhanced paperless experience.
• Ongoing investment in the EMRB Staff Development to grow the skills and capabilities of the organization. |
| 3F. Complete annual regional transportation priorities to inform Alberta Transportation. | • The Annual Regional Transportation Priorities are approved by the Board in June and submitted to the Province for consideration in the Provincial Capital Budget Planning.
• The process of developing the Annual Transportation Priorities List is a component of the project to update the Integrated Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP).
• The IRTMP update is scheduled to start in Q2 2019. |
Table 3 - 2019 – 2020 Business Plan Strategic Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3G. Update the Integrated Regional Master Plan (IRTMP).</th>
<th>The development of a 2019 Transportation Priority List is under discussion.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Project Charter and Terms of Reference are approved by the Board in June 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project Scope will include an update of the regionally significant roads and transportation infrastructure review, and potential revamp of the Annual Transportation Priorities criteria and process for establishing regional priorities aligned to the EMRB Growth Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional work is required around defining the EMRB’s role going forward with respect to regional transit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is of regional interest; regionally significant, a regional priority, what will be our process to plan (alignment with the Regional Growth Plan and Regional Transit Services Commission) and understanding what are the plans to service.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional work is required to coordinate the future process to plan with Edmonton Global, as an important regional stakeholder.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – 2019-2020 Business Plan Strategic Priorities
### Table 3 - 2019 – 2020 Business Plan Strategic Priorities

#### Strategic Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Strategic Priority</th>
<th>2019/2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Risk Management</td>
<td>Maintaining Momentum</td>
<td>• Further work is planned to assess risks to the organization and the identification of mitigation strategies, as needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• An organizational risk assessment and identification of mitigation strategies will be included in the 2020/2021 Business Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of a process to update the Board of any issues as they arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Regional Broadband</td>
<td>Shared Investment for Shared Benefit</td>
<td>• This is an emerging issue for economic competitiveness of the Region. Initial efforts will focus on developing a regional view of existing service levels and future needs to inform the next phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of a strategy and plan to address the Broadband gaps identified and to include potential regional partners to enable a regional solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Regional Energy Corridors</td>
<td>Responsible and Sustainable Growth</td>
<td>• Project Charter is endorsed by the Executive Committee in March, 2019, and recommended to the Board for approval in April, 2019.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3 - 2019 – 2020 Business Plan Strategic Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Review of Board Policies</th>
<th>Maintaining Momentum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft Advocacy Strategy to be presented to the Board for approval within 13 months of the approval of the Project Charter and Terms of Reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Enhanced Brand and Reputation</th>
<th>Maintaining Momentum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensive Review of Policy G005.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of all remaining Policies starting in May 2019.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Integrated Regional Corridors / Open Spaces Master Plan</th>
<th>Responsible and Sustainable Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently an unfunded project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop an integrated regional corridors/open spaces master plan as part of further work to support the implementation of the Growth Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Master Plan will address the objectives under Natural Living Systems Policy area with additional direction found under future studies and initiatives Section 5.5 of the EMRB Growth Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0. PLANNING FRAMEWORK

4.1. EMRB’s Strategic Planning Framework is a combination of the Board’s Vision, Strategic Priorities, and the Administration’s Values and Mission, which together ensure the successful completion and reporting of the Board’s strategic priorities.

![Diagram of Planning Framework]

- **Board’s Vision**
  - Shared Investment for Shared Benefit
  - Responsible and Sustainable Growth
  - Maintaining Momentum

- **Projects & KPIs**

- **Administration’s Mission**

- **Administration’s Values**
5.0. RISK

5.1. Determining and mitigating risks to EMRB is an evolving process. It includes real world and digital risks. Work will be undertaken on a more robust and coherent risk assessment model, which will help the EMRB better manage risk into the future. The current assessment criteria for mitigation strategies are outlined below at Table 3.

5.2. EMRB Criteria for Risk definition:

1. The impact reaches across EMRB;
2. Poses potential reputational impact to EMRB and its authorities;
3. Is an issue of public interest;
4. May be proactive (e.g. Creation of a Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan) or reactive (e.g. New Legislation); and
5. May be external (e.g. an Act of God, Ransomware) or internal (e.g. Loss of the Office).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Financial Impact</th>
<th>P x FI</th>
<th>Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Change – Loss of Regulation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$3,000,000.00 plus Matching Funding/Grants</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Return of uncommitted funds to the province and municipalities; A compliant robust document management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Offence – FOIP, Criminal Act, Conflict of Interest</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000,000.00 annual aggregate coverage for Primary Commercial General Liability; $1,155,000.00 Crime Coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board and Staff General Coverage</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000,000.00 annual aggregate coverage for Primary Commercial General Liability; $7,500,000.00 annual aggregate coverage for Excess of Primary Commercial General Liability and Primary Professional Errors &amp; Omissions Liability; $5,000,000.00 per Occurrence coverage for Primary Non-Owned Automobile Liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major lawsuit and resulting damages awarded due to negligence</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of God</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$10,000,000.00 annual aggregate coverage for Primary Commercial General Liability; $7,500,000.00 annual aggregate coverage for Excess of Primary Commercial General Liability and Primary Professional Errors &amp; Omissions Liability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Loss of Workspace</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 – Risk/Mitigation Matrix

5.3. Work to be undertaken to address issues related to Risk Assessment and Risk Mitigation is outlined in Section 3.0 of the Business Plan.
6.0. BUDGET

6.1. A three-year Budget was approved by the Board on <>. The Budget reflects an increase in member contribution funding as well as the projected reduction to the provincial grant in 2020-21. The Budget reflects the funding required to deliver on the strategic priorities of the Board.

6.2. In 2019-20, the format of the Budget has been changed to reflect full cost accounting for the projects and programs undertaken by the Board. This will provide the Board members with a better understanding of how and where funding is allocated, as well as the actual costs of the work that is undertaken.

6.3. The Budget table below is presented in thousands of Canadian dollars.

<Insert Approved Budget Table>
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APPENDIX A: ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES FOR 2018/19 COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

Technical/Administrative Advisory Committees established based on Project Terms of References approved by the Board.

Figure 2 – Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board Governance Structure
APPENDIX C: 2018-2022 IMPLEMENTATION GANTT CHART

Updated as of March 5, 2019

Strategic Priorities and Key Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority 1: Shared Investment for Shared Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Plan Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Orientation: Jan 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority 2: Responsible and Sustainable Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Agriculture Master Plan and Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Plan Update KPIs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Regional Recreation Corridors/Open Space Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Plan 2 year Update</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Priority 3: Maintaining Momentum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Prioritization Annual Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Masterplan Update (RTMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Energy Corridor Advocacy Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Initiatives (Reserve)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Transportation Funding Initiatives (Transit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As opportunities arise

Strategic Priority 3: Maintaining Momentum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Influencers/Activities

- Business Plan Review
- Annual Report
- Board Orientation: Jan 19
- Strategy 2019-2023 in effect
- GPU Azimuth Check
- Provincial Election
- Federal Election
- Municipal Election
- Edmonton Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan
- Regional Agriculture Master Plan and Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Tool
- Growth Plan Update KPIs
- Broadband
- Integrated Regional Recreation Corridors/Open Space Master Plan
- Growth Plan 2 year Update
- Public Engagement Policy
- Transportation Prioritization Annual Update
- Transportation Masterplan Update (RTMP)
- Regional Energy Corridor Advocacy Strategy
- Regional Symposium
- Board Initiatives (Reserve)
- Provincial Transportation Funding Initiatives (Transit)
- Website Review

As opportunities arise
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Advocacy + Communications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton Metropolitan Region Growth Plan Communications Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Plan Implementation Tool Kit and Education Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Policy Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Roadshow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- Forward Planning List items currently unfunded (List B)
- Reflect proposed schedule changes

Timing of projects is based on Board priorities determined annually as part of the Business Plan/Budget cycle.
## APPENDIX D: 2018-2022 BUSINESS PLAN UNFUNDED PROJECTS FOR 2018/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMRB Brand Review</td>
<td>A five-year comprehensive Brand Review.</td>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Congestion Management Strategy (formerly HOV) Phase 2</td>
<td>Following on the results of the 2016 HOV Study, review the next step in moving forward with HOV in the Region, including selecting a corridor for a pilot study.</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Ongoing implementation of Intermunicipal Transit Plan as per Board Mandate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Infrastructure Masterplan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX E: FORWARD PLANNING LIST FOR 2018-2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Unfunded</th>
<th>Expected Start Date</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMRB Brand Review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Congestion Management Strategy</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(formerly HOV) Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Corridors Phase 3 - (Advocacy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Infrastructure Masterplan</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Unfunded</td>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 – 2018-2022 Forward Planning List
Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force Chair and Vice Chair Appointments

Recommended Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board appoint ________________ as Chair to the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force.

Recommended Motion: That the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board appoint ________________ as Vice Chair to the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit Task Force.

Background

- At the December 2018 Board meeting, a resolution was passed to approve the Shared Investment for Shared Benefit (SISB) Project Charter and the amended SISB Task Force Terms of Reference to include all thirteen Board members.

- It was identified at the first workshop of the Task Force held on March 28th, the Task Force is required to appoint a Chair and Vice Chair.

- In the event that more names than required for these positions come forward, the final selection will be made via a Board vote.
Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force

Friday, March 22, 2019
9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
City of Beaumont – Beaumont Community Centre
5204 50 Avenue – Beaumont, AB

Members:
Rod Shaigec, Parkland County (Chair)
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton (Vice Chair)
Kathy Barnhart, City of Beaumont
Tanni Doblanko, Leduc County
Alanna Hnatiw, Sturgeon County
Robert Parks, Strathcona County (Alternate)
Barry Turner, Town of Morinville

Technical Members:
Garett Broadbent, Leduc County
Darren Haarsma, Parkland County
Diana Wahlstrom, Strathcona County
John Knapp, Parkland County
Hani Quan, City of Edmonton
Angela Veenstra, Sturgeon County

EMRB Staff:
Karen Wichuk, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Director, Regional Growth Planning
Debra Irving, Project Manager
Taylor Varro, Project Manager
Brandt Denham, GIS & IT Coordinator
Carol Moreno, Project Coordinator

Consultants
Jerry Bouma, Toma & Bouma
Bob Burden, Serecon
John Steil, Stantec

Guests:
Abul Azad, Town of Morinville
Teaka Broughm, City of Beaumont
Neal Comeau, Sturgeon County
Charleen Currie, City of Edmonton
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Linton Delainey, Strathcona County
Trevor Duley, City of St. Albert
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Susan Evans, Sturgeon County
Lyndsay Francis, City of St. Albert
Larissa Hepp, Sturgeon County
Laurie Johnson, Leduc County
Kari Jones, City of Leduc
Avril McCalla, City of Edmonton
Reegan McCullough, Sturgeon County
Peter Reeson, UDI
Don Rigney, Sturgeon County Resident
Shree Shinde, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Robert Stephenson, Strathcona County
Emily Strach, Parkland County
John Stewart, City of Beaumont
Patrick Tighe, Sturgeon County
Jason Unger, Environmental Law Centre
Larry Wanchuk, Leduc County
1. Opening
   
   1.1 Quorum
   
   Quorum achieved; 7 of 7 voting members present.
   
   1.2 Call to Order
   
   Chair Shaigec called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.
   
   1.3 Chair Opening Remarks
   
   Chair Shaigec welcomed the members of the Task Force and other guests.

2. Approval of Agenda
   
   **Motion:** That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force approve the March 22, 2019 meeting agenda as amended.
   **Moved by:** Mayor Doblanko
   **Accepted by:** Chair
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

   The agenda was amended to move In-Camera items to the end of the agenda.

3. Approval of Minutes
   
   **Motion:** That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force approve the November 23, 2018 meeting minutes.
   **Moved by:** Councillor Barnhart
   **Accepted by:** Chair
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

4. RAMP Planning Process Update
   
   Ms. Shuya described an updated project timeline, the efforts of the last four Working Group meetings and expected meeting outcomes with respect to the Task Force’s direction. The Task Force discussed the relationship between building regional policy and developing an agricultural boundary.

5. RAMP Refresher
   
   Mr. Bouma offered a brief overview of the Situation Analysis from the previous phase of the RAMP project, as well as the Vision and Guiding Principles approved by the Task Force in Fall 2018.
6. RAMP Working Definitions

Mr. Bouma and Mr. Steil led the Task Force through the working definitions proposed by the Working Group in order to inform the development of regional policy. The Task Force discussed the implications of the Metropolitan Area Tier line on the RAMP planning process.

**Motion:** That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force approve the working definitions to inform the work of developing a Regional Agriculture Master Plan.

*Moved by:* Councillor Walters  
*Accepted by:* Chair  
*Decision:* Carried unanimously

*Break from 10:30 a.m. to 10:42 a.m.*

7. Rural Fragmentation

Mr. Bouma summarized the Working Group’s presentations and observations related to fragmentation. Mr. Burden described the process used to project further fragmentation in the counties. The Task Force discussed the types of fragmentation and constraint assumptions. The Task Force discussion questions were moved to be addressed in camera.

**Motion:** That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force accept the presentation on fragmentation as information.

*Moved by:* Mayor Hnatiw  
*Accepted by:* Chair  
*Decision:* Carried unanimously

8. Rural Conversion

Mr. Bouma summarized the Working Group’s presentations and observations related to conversion. The Task Force discussed the topics of secondary agriculture support services, possible country residential and rural industrial land. The Task Force discussion questions were moved to be addressed in camera.

**Motion:** That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force accept the presentation on conversion as information.

*Moved by:* Mayor Turner  
*Accepted by:* Chair  
*Decision:* Carried unanimously

9. Lunch

*Break from 11:43 a.m. to 12:20 p.m.*

10. Urban Growth Plans & Perspectives
Mr. Bouma summarized the Working Group’s presentations and observations related to plans for urban growth. The Task Force discussed urban agriculture strategies and agriculture service strategies in transition lands. The Task Force discussion questions were moved to be addressed in camera.

Councillor Barnhart rejoined the meeting following lunch at 12:28 p.m.

**Motion:** That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force accept the presentation on urban growth plans as information.

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

11. RAMP Policy Framework

Mr. Steil led the Task Force in reviewing the draft RAMP policy framework for large holdings, mixed agriculture/environmental, small holdings, and transition lands. The Task Force discussed coordination with the Working Group and the proposed application of the LESA tool. The Task Force discussion questions were moved to be addressed in camera.

12. RAMP – Draft Policy Framework - Task Force Direction

Mr. Bouma described the planning assumptions and invited discussion around Task Force direction to the Working Group. The Task Force discussion questions were moved to be addressed in camera.

13. RAMP – Economic Development and Diversification

Mr. Bouma described the next steps planned to address the third objective of the RAMP. The project team proposed connecting with municipal administration, local industry experts and Edmonton Global. The Task Force discussion questions were moved to be addressed in camera.

**Motion:** That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force table agenda items 14, 15 and 16 until the next scheduled Task Force meeting.

**Moved by:** Councillor Parks  
**Accepted by:** Chair  
**Decision:** Carried unanimously

Chair Shaigec thanked the host municipality, the City of Beaumont, for their hospitality and expressed gratitude to members of the RAMP Working Group for their hard work. Councillor Barnhart invited attendees to accept a gift bag on behalf of the City of Beaumont.
15. RAMP – Communications

This item was deferred to the next scheduled Task Force meeting.

16. RAMP – Engagement Plan

This item was deferred to the next scheduled Task Force meeting.

17. Next Steps & Meeting Date

This item was deferred to the next scheduled Task Force meeting.

18. In Camera

**Motion:** That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force move in-camera, in accordance with the provisions of Section 16, of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP) R.S.A. 2000,c.F-25.

**Moved by:** Mayor Hnatiw  
**Accepted by:** Chair  
**Decision:** Carried unanimously

**In Camera Participants:**

Mayor Rod Shaigec, Parkland County  
Councillor Michael Walters, City of Edmonton  
Councillor Kathy Barnhart, City of Beaumont  
Mayor Tanni Doblanko, Leduc County  
Mayor Alanna Hnatiw, Strurgeon County  
Councillor Robert Parks, Strathcona County  
Mayor Barry Turner, Town of Morinville  
Abul Azad, Town of Morinville  
Garett Broadbent, Leduc County  
Teaka Broughm, City of Beaumont  
John Knapp, Parkland County  
Hani Quan, City of Edmonton  
Robert Stephenson, Strathcona County  
Emily Strach, Parkland County  
Angela Veenstra, Strurgeon County  
Karen Wichuk, EMRB CEO  
Sharon Shuya, EMRB

**Motion:** That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force move out of camera.

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

*Mayor Turner left the meeting at 3:35 p.m.*
Motion: That the Regional Agriculture Master Plan Task Force direct the Working Group to inform the development of the RAMP Draft Policies in sub-areas based on the current commuter shed boundary as a potential agriculture boundary and to include a map.

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

19. Adjournment

Chair Shaigec declared the Task Force meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.
Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force

Friday, March 15, 2019
9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
La Cité Francophone, Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
8627 Rue Marie-Anne Gaboury NW, Edmonton, AB

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

Advisory Group Members:
Barry Belcourt, City of Edmonton
Rob McGowan, Parkland County
Eleanor Mohammed, Town of Beaumont
Shawn Olson, City of Leduc
Travis Peter, Sturgeon County
Brad White, Town of Morinville

Consultants:
Jeannie Bertrand, Dillon

EMRB Staff:
Karen Wichuk, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Director of Regional Growth Planning
Barry Huybens, Senior Project Manager
Debra Irving, Senior Project Manager
Taylor Varro, Project Manager
Carol Moreno, Project Coordinator

Guests:
Lauren Aebig, Parkland County
Grant Bain, Leduc County
Teaka Broughm, City of Beaumont
Leslie Chivers, Sturgeon County
Trevor Duley, City of St. Albert
Cameron Grayson, City of Edmonton
Cathy Heron, City of St. Albert
Greg Hofmann, City of Edmonton
Nancy Lyzaniwski, Strathcona County
Avril McCalla, City of Edmonton
Brian McCosh, City of Edmonton
Kendra Raymond, City of Beaumont
Peter Reeson, UDI
Grant Schaffer, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Robert Stephenson, Strathcona County
John Stewart, City of Beaumont
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton
1. Opening

1.1 Quorum

Quorum achieved; 7 of 7 voting members present.

1.2 Call to Order

Chair Ralph called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

1.3 Chair Opening Remarks

Chair Ralph offered words of welcome and identified the following primary objectives for the meeting:

• Ensure understanding, support, and/or direction for the MRSP Final Phase component of the project; and

• Provide guidance for the inaugural MRSP document and major outcome planned for completion by October 26, 2019.

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force approve the March 15, 2019 meeting agenda.

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

3. Approval of Minutes

Motion: That the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force approve the October 26, 2018 meeting minutes.

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

4. Review and Status

Chair Ralph invited Mr. Huybens to lead the Task Force through the agenda’s discussion items.

Mr. Huybens described the changes to the project charter and the final phase approach. He reported on the project status and project governance, including the Regional Fire Chiefs and three Technical Working Groups. Project communication was identified as an opportunity for improvement.
5. MRSP Contents

Mr. Huybens provided some context related to MRSP content as per the EMRB Regulation and Advisory Group input. Task Force members provided some insights and comments on what the MRSP document and process should identify including – principles, and a framework for going forward.

Break 10:12 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

Following the break, Mayor Doblanko rejoined the meeting at 10:37 a.m.

6. Regional Significance/Regional Priorities

Mr. Huybens led the Task Force through the following workshop questions:

1. What is of regional significance?
2. What are the regional priorities?

Task Force members provided perspectives on what is important for regional collaboration of Metropolitan Regional Services including – regional risk, regional focus, regional opportunities, regional value, and a sense of urgency.

Mayor Doblanko left the meeting at 11:16 a.m. and returned at 11:18 a.m.

7. Next Steps

Mr. Huybens shared the objectives and timelines for project work going forward. Task Force members provided suggestions for future meeting topics and requested that a summary of this meeting be shared at the next Board meeting.

8. Next Meeting

MRSP Task Force
May 24, 2019, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Aspen Conference Centre, Room 2
#401 Bell Tower, 10104 103 Ave, Edmonton, AB

9. Adjournment

Motion: That the Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan Task Force meeting of March 15, 2019 adjourn at 11:46 a.m.
Moved by: Mayor Iveson
Accepted by: Chair
Decision: Carried unanimously
Task Force Chair, Ray Ralph
CEO Update

The last couple of months have been busy ones. My focus has been on the development of the Budget and the Business Plan, the advocacy framework, engaging more in the Regional Agriculture Master Plan (RAMP), Metropolitan Region Servicing Plan (MRSP) and Shared Investment for Shared Benefit (SISB), the evolution of our team, and continuing to meet with regional stakeholders and visit member municipalities.

Given all this activity, my update is more operationally focussed. In March, I provided the Audit & Finance Committee with a preliminary overview of the Quarterly Financial Report, the Draft 2019/20 Budget, and Draft 2018-2022 Business Plan (2019-2020 Update). This Budget is a new budget model meant to allow for greater financial transparency and clarity for the Board. I am pleased with the results of this work and thank the Audit & Finance Committee for their questions and insight during the discussion. I also wish to thank Charlene Chauvette and Sharon Shuya for their assistance with the drafting of both of these documents. Of note, the Draft 2018-2022 Business Plan (2019-2020 Update) was also provided to Executive Committee for their feedback regarding the priorities.

Attention continues to be focussed on the ongoing development and evolution of the Draft Business Plan, as we seek to better align the yearly plan with our Budget and strategic planning cycles. The planned Board Retreat will also assist in this same regard and provide an ideal opportunity to assess our results, examine and discuss our priorities and commitments, and ensure a cohesive and coherent approach to achieving our outcomes. In future, the Business Plan will be developed following the Board Retreat to ensure alignment with the Board’s Strategic Priorities.

In terms of additional work planned or underway, the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) Review Process has proceeded to Phase 2 in order to examine specific areas requiring further review and discussion; it is anticipated the REF working group will reconvene in early May. Also, in keeping with the commitment of EMRB Administration to advise the Board as to the status of any updates to Municipal Development Plans (MDPs); the City of Beaumont MDP update received EMRB approval on March 11, 2019. The next semi-annual MDP update report will be provided to the Board during the October 11, 2019 EMRB meeting; however, for your information, I have attached the 2019 Q1 REF Report which provides additional data regarding the six REFs in process or approved by EMRB. I am committed to providing a REF update in each of my reports going forward.

EMRB Administration is presently arranging a series of Growth Plan and REF Implementation Workshops for member administrations. These workshops are part of our commitment to provide ongoing support during transition from the former Growth Plan to the New Growth Plan. The workshops are targeted to occur in May and June of this year, and will be open to all
administration. I will be reaching out shortly to identify member municipalities who may be willing to host these sessions.

There were several meetings of note over the last two months including: Jim Saunderson, ADM, Western Economic Diversification; Traci Bednard from EIA; Laura Bruno from CHBA; Rick Preston and members of the UDI Board; Jordon Copping, CEO of CMRB; Colleen Sklar, Executive Director, Winnipeg Metropolitan Region; Neil Fassina, President of Athabasca University; as well as meetings with Mayor Houston and Mayor Frank. I also attended the 2019 St. Albert Business Breakfast; the Town of Devon’s State of the Town Address; the Smart Communities Roadshow; and two UDI-Edmonton Region lunches. In addition to my ongoing meetings with Malcolm Bruce, I have also met with Lee Malleau and Lynette Tremblay from Edmonton Global.

Looking ahead, I anticipate very busy months. In addition to all of our ongoing work, we will be learning the results of the April 16, 2019, Alberta Election, and re-engaging with the Government of Alberta. While we have made great strides in our own internal transition, certainly the upcoming election, no matter the result, may serve to introduce new challenges and opportunities for the Board and EMRB Administration.

I am also pleased to welcome Bryan Haggarty to the role of Director of Strategic Initiatives and Operations. Bryan will provide leadership and guidance to the organization in ensuring effective and dedicated support to the Board, and in advancing our strategic and operational planning framework and business planning processes.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge and thank the EMRB Administration team for their dedication, collaboration and hard work. They are a dynamic team of professionals and I am privileged to lead them.

I wish everyone a lovely spring and look forward to the months ahead.

Best Regards,
Karen Wichuk, CEO
Edmonton Metropolitan Region Board

Attachment:
2019 Quarter 1 REF Report
Total REFs

6

2 approved
1 under review
3 in appeal period

REF Application Types

1 New Municipal Development Plan
1 Municipal Development Plan Amendment
1 New Area Structure Plan
3 Area Structure Plan Amendments

Length of EMRB Review

The average length of an EMRB REF review was

14 working days

*Does not include 28 day appeal period