Meeting Objective:
To recommend the policy areas and planning approach for the Growth Plan Update 2.0 for Board approval.
To provide direction on the remaining Policy Areas of the Plan not discussed on June 26, 2015.

Agenda Items

1. **Call to Order** – Mayor Roxanne Carr, Chair
2. **Chair Opening Remarks**
3. **Approval of Agenda** – Mayor Roxanne Carr, Chair
4. **Approval of Minutes of May 14, 2015** – Mayor Roxanne Carr, Chair

5. **Approval Of Minutes of June 26, 2015** – Mayor Roxanne Carr, Chair
   *to be distributed separately

6. **Growth Plan Update - Project Administration** – Mayor Roxanne Carr
   - Revised Roles & Responsibilities
   - Information Request Register
   - Information Request Template
   - Correspondence Register

   **Recommended Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force receive the project administration components as information, as presented by CRB Administration.

7. **Growth Plan Update 2.0 - Correspondence and Consultations** – Mayor Roxanne Carr
   - City of Leduc
   - CRB Response to City of Leduc letter
   - Cites Consultation – June 11, 2015
   - Counties Consultation - follow up – June 25, 2015
**Recommended Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force receive the April 8, 2015 letter from the City of Leduc, the Cities Consultation summary and the follow up consultation with the Counties facilitated by Chair Carr, as information to further inform the Growth Plan Update 2.0.

**Recommended Motion:** That the Growth Plan Task Force direct CRB Administration to prepare a formal letter of response to the City of Leduc, once the Task Force has addressed the areas raised in the letter, as part of process to update the Capital Region Board Growth Plan.

8. **External Stakeholder Consultation** – Sharon Shuya

**Recommended Motion:** The Growth Plan Task Force receive the External Stakeholder Consultation material as information.

9. **Growth Plan Update Task Force June Workshop** – Melanie Hare

a. Regional Policy Areas

**Recommended Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force recommend the Board approve the Regional Policy Areas to include: *Economic Competitiveness & Employment, Agriculture, Natural Heritage, Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure, Transit & Mobility, Community & Housing Choice* and a separate area of Implementation.

b. Planning Approach

**Recommended Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force recommend the Board approve the Planning Approach that includes a tiered structure made up of a – Metropolitan Core, a wider metropolitan area which includes sub-regional clusters and rural areas.

**Lunch Break 30 Minutes (12:00 – 12:30 p.m.)**

**Growth Plan Update 2.0 - Policy Areas** – Melanie Hare/Barry Huybens

10. a. Discussion of remaining Policy Areas for Task Force Direction

   i. Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure
   ii. Transit & Mobility
   iii. Communities and Housing Choice
   iv. Natural Heritage
b. Review of outcomes of the June 26, 2015 Workshop Policy Area discussion
   v. Economic Competiveness and Employment
   vi. Agriculture

c. Summary of key directions for each Policy Area
d. Next steps

**Recommended Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force approve the Policy Area direction as input for the development of the draft policies, as part of project work plan – Stage 3.

11. **Adjournment**

   **Next Meeting Date:**

   **August 13, 2015**

   **Chateau Louis Conference Centre – Grand Ballroom**

   **12:00 – 5:00 p.m.**
Growth Plan Update Task Force

Thursday, May 14, 2015
11:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Chateau Louis Conference Centre – Grand Ballroom
11727 Kingsway, Edmonton

Members:
Roxanne Carr, Strathcona County (Chair)
Lisa Holmes, Town of Morinville (Vice Chair)
Don Iveson, City of Edmonton
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Cathy Heron, City of St. Albert
John Schonewille, Leduc County
Ralph van Assen, Village of Warburg

Provincial Liaison:
Victoria Brown, Alberta Municipal Affairs

Regional Technical Advisors:
David Hales
Greg Hofmann
Clayton Kittlitz
Peter Vana

Strategic Advisor:
Barry Huybens

Consultants:
Melanie Hare, Urban Strategies
Hassan Shaheen, ISL Engineering & Land Services

Regrets:
Peter Ohm, Regional Technical Advisor

CRB Staff:
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager (acting CEO)
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Leslie Chivers, Operations Manager
Brandt Denham, GIS Coordinator
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant
1. **Call to Order**
   
   Chair, Mayor Roxanne Carr called the meeting to order at 11:05 a.m.

2. **Chair’s Opening Remarks**

3. **Approval of the Agenda**
   
   Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force agenda of May 14, 2015 include an in-camera session as the last order of business, and be approved as amended.

   Moved by: Mayor Ralph van Assen, Village of Warburg

   Decision: Carried unanimously

4. **Approval of the Minutes, April 9, 2015**
   
   Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force minutes of April 9, 2015 be approved.

   Moved by: Mayor Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan

   Decision: Carried unanimously

5. **Growth Plan Update – Vision and Principles**
   
   Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force approve the Vision and Principles and recommend them to the Board.

   Moved by: Councillor Cathy Heron, City of St. Albert

   Decision: Carried unanimously

6. **Growth Plan Update 2.0**

   a. **What is Regional Planning**

   It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept the discussion as information.

   b. **Purpose of Growth Plan 2.0**

   Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force agree that the Growth Plan Update will involve a comprehensive update of the 2010 Plan to address Policy Gaps and Implementation Gaps.

   Moved by: Mayor Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan

   Decision: Carried unanimously

   c. **Roles and Responsibilities**

   Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force has reviewed the Role and Responsibilities of the project team and accepts them as the basis for moving forward.

   Moved by: Councillor Cathy Heron, City of St. Albert

   Decision: Carried unanimously
d. **Plan Approach – Issues and Expectations**

   It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept the discussion as information, and agreed that this topic would be discussed under item #8.

   **2015-26**

  

e. **Proposed Engagement Strategy**

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force approve the Engagement Strategy as presented.
   **Moved by:** Mayor Lisa Holmes, *Town of Morinville*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

  

f. **Revised Work Plan**

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force approve the revised work plan as presented, subject to Provincial approval.
   **Moved by:** Councillor John Schonewille, *Leduc County*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

  

g. **Revised Meeting Schedule as of April 29, 2015**

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force approve the revised project schedule as amended, subject to Provincial approval.
   **Moved by:** Mayor Gale Katchur, *City of Fort Saskatchewan*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

  

7. **Task Force June Workshop**

   a. **Draft Agenda**

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force approve the draft agenda for the June 26 Task Force Workshop, as amended.
   **Moved by:** Councillor John Schonewille, *Leduc County*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

  

8. **GPU Stakeholder Engagement Summary**

   a. **Feedback from Towns and Villages**

   b. **Feedback from Counties Consultation**

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force receive the Towns & Villages and Counties consultation summaries as information.
   **Moved by:** Mayor Gale Katchur, *City of Fort Saskatchewan*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously
9. Growth Plan Update – Regional Road Show Summary

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force receive the Road Show summary report as information.
   **Moved by:** Mayor Lisa Holmes, *Town of Morinville*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

10. Roundtable Task Force Meeting Feedback

   It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept the discussion for information.

11. In-camera

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force move in-camera (3:30 p.m.).
   **Moved by:** Councillor John Schonewille, *Leduc County*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

12. Out of In-camera

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force move out of in-camera (4:02 p.m.).
   **Moved by:** Councillor Cathy Heron, *City of St. Albert*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

13. Adjournment

   It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force meeting be adjourned.

   **Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.**

   **Next Meeting:** August 27, 2015 at 9:00 a.m., La Cite Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger

Task Force Chair, Roxanne Carr
Growth Plan Update Task Force

Friday, June 26, 2015
8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Holiday Inn & Conference Center – Raleigh Room
2100 Premier Way, Sherwood Park, AB

Members:
Roxanne Carr, Strathcona County (Chair)
Lisa Holmes, Town of Morinville (Vice Chair)
Don Iveson, City of Edmonton
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Cathy Heron, City of St. Albert
Nolan Crouse, City of St Albert (alternate)
John Schonewille, Leduc County
Ralph van Assen, Village of Warburg

CRB Staff:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Brandt Denham, GIS Coordinator

Guests:
Jerry Bouma, Toma & Bouna Management Consultants
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Tanni Dobranko, Leduc County
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Susan Evans, Sturgeon County
Andrea Friedman, Urban Strategies Inc.
Dwight Ganske, Town of Stony Plain
Connie Gourley, ISL Engineering and Land Services
Ryan Hall, Strathcona County
Jacquie Hansen, City of St. Albert
Greg Krischke, City of Leduc
Bonnie Riddell, Strathcona County
Dana Smith, City of Leduc
Charlene Smylie, Village of Wabamun
Pamela Steppan, Strathcona County
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton

Regional Technical Advisors:
David Hales
Greg Hofmann
Clayton Kittlitz
Peter Ohm

Facilitator:
Barry Huybens

Consultants:
Melanie Hare, Urban Strategies Inc.
Hassan Shaheen, ISL Engineering & Land Services

Regrets:
Peter Vana, Regional Technical Advisor
Victoria Brown, Alberta Municipal Affairs
1. **Call to Order**

   Chair, Mayor Roxanne Carr called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m.
   Mayor Lisa Holmes joined the meeting via conference call between 8:03 a.m. and 8:45 a.m.

2. **Chair’s Opening Remarks**

   Following a discussion amongst Task Force members about conducting the Workshop In-camera, members agreed the workshop would be conducted as a meeting and would remain open.

3. **Approval of the Agenda**

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force agenda of June 26, 2015 be approved as amended.
   **Moved by:** Councillor John Schonewille, **Leduc County**  
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

4. **Relinquish Chair to Facilitator**

   Barry Huybens to lead the Task Force through the Workshop agenda.
   Mayor Gale Katchur and Mayor Ralph van Assen joined the meeting at 8:35 a.m.

5. **Recap of completed Work presented by Hassan Shaheen**

6. **Review of proposed Policy Areas presented by Melanie Hare**

7. **Policy Areas and possible Directions presented by Melanie Hare**

   Councillor Cathy Heron joined the meeting via conference call at 12:30 p.m.

8. **Approach for Managing Growth presented by Melanie Hare**

9. **Summary of meeting outcomes lead by Barry Huybens**

   Following a recap of the meeting outcomes, the Task Force members unanimously agreed that CRB Administration would draft recommended motions for the approval of the Policy Areas and Planning Framework by Task Force for the next meeting.
   
   Mayor Carr was requested to send a copy of the follow up consultation with the Counties to CRB Administration for inclusion with the meeting minutes.

10. **Facilitator returns Chair**

11. **Task Force Terms of Reference**

   Following a brief discussion about the membership of the Task Force, the Task Force members unanimously agreed that no changes were required.
12. Adjournment

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Growth Plan Update Task Force meeting be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Next Meeting: July 9, 2015 at 10:00 a.m., Chateau Louis Conference Centre – Grand Ballroom

Task Force Chair, Roxanne Carr
# 2015 Growth Plan Update - Project Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Role &amp; Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Sponsor(s)</strong></td>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Champion of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Media Spokesperson (Chair Crouse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leads the communication and engagement with the Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sponsor of the communications plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides leadership support to the Task Force and works to resolve issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Makes key decisions about the assignment of resources from the organization to support the requirements of the project (CEO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approves the project budget (CEO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Manager</strong></td>
<td>Sharon Shuya, Manager Regional Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overall responsibility for ensuring the completion of the program/projects to update the growth plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In conjunction with regional stakeholders develop the Project Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manages the performance of the project team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop the program for updating the growth plan, and secure approval of the approach, process and deliverables from the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruit and manage the consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Deliver the project on time, on budget and within scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide project leadership to CRB staff in support of the project deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manage the engagement of strategic partners and stakeholders in the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Single point of contact for CRB member administrations about the progress and process of updating the growth plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Primary communicator for the project distributing information according to the communications plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Provides status report to the project sponsor, CRB Task Force and CRB as required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop and manage the process for updating the growth plan in accordance with the detailed project plan and communications plan – to include a Government Relations Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manage project deliverables in accordance with the project plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Manage project scope and change control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitor project progress, and budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Team</td>
<td>ISL Engineering &amp; Land Services Ltd. and Urban Strategies Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Manage project evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Resolves issues affecting the process and project deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Member of the Project Leadership Team and the Core Project Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Coordinate all CRB meetings including stakeholder consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leads the process for updating the growth plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Leads the development and approval of project deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensure the availability of project resources to meet the expectations of the project and contractual obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Ensures the transfer of knowledge throughout the project to CRB administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prepares and manages the documentation to support the client facing activities of updating the plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provides support to the communications plan with key messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Produces consolidated reporting to the Project Manager and Task Force, including milestone summary, key issues, risks, detailed budget summary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Quality Assurance for all project deliverables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To advise the Project Manager of any changes scope in advance and the implications to budgets, project timelines, deliverables and resources for resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Project Team</th>
<th>Consulting Team, CRB Administrative Staff, Strategic Advisors and Regional Technical Advisors(RTAC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overall responsibility for planning and executing the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provides functional/technical expertise to the project regarding relevant regional issues, policies, programs and initiatives for consideration in the preparation of the growth plan update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Represent the regional issues within the CRB priority areas as identified by the CRB committees and task forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Supports the project consultants, as required. This may involve undertakes research, data gathering, analysis and preparing reports, reviewing and editing documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provide the best professional planning and policy advice to the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force</th>
<th>Elected Officials, RTAC and Provincial Liaison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Provides regional political oversight and direction to the project as a delegate of the Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Understand the strategic implications and outcomes of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Appreciate the impact of the project outcomes on all major stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Accept responsibility for the project strategy and overall benefit realization of the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amended 14 May 2015
Original Approved November 28, 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of individual Task Force members</th>
<th>Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Oversees the progress of the project in accordance with the approved work plan  
• Champions the project and raises awareness and support amongst Board members  
• Reviews and approves all project deliverables – work plan, communications plan, project milestones, draft growth plan and makes recommendations to the Board  
• Provides leadership with respect to strategic and policy issues  
• Provide direction to the project team | 24 member municipalities |
| • Understand the strategic implications and outcomes of initiatives being pursued through different stages of the project  
• Appreciate the significance of the project for some or all major stakeholders and bring the different perspectives into the discussions  
• Be genuinely interested in project and the outcomes  
• Be an advocate for the project’s outcomes by being actively committed to being involved in the process  
• Ask questions, deliberate and debate information and issues  
• Each member is expected to contribute  
• Bring a regional perspective to the discussion and to make decisions in the best interest of the region  
• Task Force Chair provides regular updates to the Board on the progress of the project and identifies areas requiring direction and decisions of the Board | |
| • Provides direction and makes decisions  
• Approves project deliverables and final plan  
• Approves major changes in scope and deliverables of the project for impacts on the final deliverable and program budget  
• Accountable for the delivery of the final product | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of individual Task Force members</th>
<th>Communications Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • To provide constructive input and feedback regarding the deliverables for the growth plan update throughout the project  
• Provide local level perspectives to enhance the regional perspective | Loreen Lennon |
| • Develop and execute the communications plan for the project – includes the Government Relations Plan | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of individual Task Force members</th>
<th>CAO’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • To provide constructive input and feedback regarding the deliverables for the growth plan update throughout the project  
• Provide local level perspectives to enhance the regional perspective | |

Amended 14May 2015  
Original Approved November 28, 2014  
Task Force Meeting: July 9, 2015
| External Stakeholders (Includes the Province) | • Provide guidance with respect to political sensitivities that could affect the project  
• To provide constructive input and feedback regarding the deliverables for the growth plan update throughout the process  
• Provide technical knowledge and other considerations to inform the regional perspective  
• As the Province, bring the provincial perspective into the discussions  
• To facilitate the cross Ministerial review of the Plan Update throughout the process  
• To give consideration to future amendments to the CRB Regulation |

Task Force Meeting: July 9, 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR #</th>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IR #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>From</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April 8, 2015 to M. Bruce</td>
<td>City of Leduc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 8, 2015

Capital Region Board  
Attention Malcolm Bruce, CEO  
10104 – 103 Avenue  
1100 Bell Tower  
Edmonton, AB T5J 0H8

SENT BY EMAIL:  
mbruce@capitalregionboard.ab.ca

Dear Mr. Bruce,

Subject: CRB Growth Plan Update and the Initial Preferred Direction

Following the Capital Region Board Growth Plan Update Task force meeting on March 19, 2015 and the CAO Workshop on March 20th, our administration received a copy of a presentation from the CRB regarding the “Initial Preferred Direction” as prepared by Urban Strategies, ISL Engineering, and CRB administration. Having reviewed this information, we feel this is an important time to ask some critical questions, while the Initial Preferred Direction is being discussed and solidified.

While the City of Leduc does not have an elected representative on the Growth Plan Update Task Force, we do regularly send representatives as observers. The Task Force has expressed that its process is open and transparent, and we believe ongoing feedback is critical for updating the Growth Plan appropriately. In particular, the City of Leduc would like to provide its feedback regarding the Initial Preferred Direction.

In order for the City of Leduc to be able to meaningfully comment on the Initial Preferred Direction, our Council and administration will first need more detailed information, with a reasonable timeframe to review that information. Therefore, the City of Leduc would appreciate the CRB and its consultants answering the following questions in a written response, and provide any additional information that is pertinent to a better understanding to the Growth Plan’s Initial Preferred Direction:

1. What is the underlying premise and purpose of the Initial Preferred Direction, and in particular, the “Metropolitan Core” boundary?
2. What specific criteria is being used to define “Urban Centres” and other areas to be included and excluded from the Metropolitan Core? Please identify any population, density, land-use planning, economic, geographic, political, and/or other criteria being used.
3. What are the anticipated impacts of the Initial Preferred Direction, specifically in relation to the Metropolitan Core area, for the following items:
   a. prioritizing regional infrastructure investment decisions;
   b. the location and funding of future regional amenities, such as new post-secondary campuses and cultural institutions;
   c. “higher-order” public transit, such as LRT corridors and connections, as well as rapid bus service;
   d. planning and implementing an airport-city (or “Aerotropolis”) around the Edmonton International Airport (see more details in this letter below);
   e. planning for the integrated growth of key regional economic drivers, such as the Industrial Heartland, Leduc-Nisku, and Edmonton International Airport (EIA)-Aerotropolis employment areas;
4. What is the anticipated role of the updated Capital Region Growth Plan for informing and guiding future infrastructure decisions at provincial and federal levels?

5. What role will the existing Priority Growth Areas play in the new plan, given the Initial Preferred Direction?

6. Is there a new pattern of residential growth densities associated with the Preferred Initial Direction? What are the changes, and how will they be implemented?

7. What is the rationale behind the Metropolitan Core boundary splitting the City of Leduc from its key local employment and economic drivers, including the North Leduc Industrial Area, Nisku, and the EIA?

8. What will be the role and function of the “Metropolitan Shadow Area” and how will that affect the future growth of Urban Centres (for example, will Urban Centres outside of the Metropolitan Core be discouraged from growing within the Metropolitan Shadow Area)?

9. Does the CRB envision the potential for the Metropolitan Core to extend past its envisioned boundary, following the 50-year time horizon?

In addition, we would like to take this opportunity to once again raise awareness with the CRB and its members on the Aerotropolis initiative, as a key economic driver that will impact the Capital Region for many generations to come. As we are establishing a long-range vision for the Capital Region, it is important to recognize upcoming game changers and manage them so that their benefits can be maximized. The City of Leduc, Leduc County, and EIA have retained the services of world-renowned expert, MXD Development Strategists, in partnership with Stantec, to quantify the opportunities associated with a future Aerotropolis and prepare an action plan to tap into these new opportunities. These expert consultants, having worked on seventeen other Aerotropolis projects around the world, are confirming the prominence of an EIA-based Aerotropolis within the Capital Region, and are helping prepare an action plan that would lead to several thousands of additional jobs (early estimates show 30,000 - 35,000 new jobs that could be created within the Aerotropolis study area). We feel strongly that the CRB must consider this vital initiative during the Growth Plan update, and are willing to share a summary of our work, to the extent it is acceptable to our partners.

Finally, it is important to state that we support the continued efforts of the CRB as it undertakes this arduous task. We believe that the updated Growth Plan has the potential to be an outstanding model regional plan that will achieve credibility from CRB members as well as the Province. In order for us to get this plan “right” though, the CRB will need to maintain an open and transparent process which allows sufficient time for information sharing and feedback to be effective. We thank-you in advance for providing us with a fuller understanding of the Task Force’s Initial Preferred Direction, as well as the time and ability to allow for meaningful feedback during this momentous process.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul Benedetto
City Manager
Phone: (780) 980-7130
pbenedetto@leduc.ca

c: sshuya@capitalregionboard.ab.ca, ncrouse@capitalregionboard.ab.ca, mhare@urbanstrategies.com, hshaheen@islengineering.com; Brian@leduc-county.com

www.leduc.ca
Attachment: Excerpts from a recent Leduc Aerotropolis Workshop Presentation, by MXD Development Strategists & Stantec

### Land Use Allocation

#### How Much to Allocate? – Employment Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>2014 Total Jobs</th>
<th>2044 New Jobs (Status Quo)</th>
<th>2044 Aerotropolis Induced New Jobs</th>
<th>2044 Total New Jobs</th>
<th>2044 Total Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status Quo</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>51,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>11,496</td>
<td>30,996</td>
<td>62,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>16,268</td>
<td>35,768</td>
<td>67,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>21,388</td>
<td>40,888</td>
<td>72,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Potential New Employment Scenarios to 2044

- **Status Quo**: 19,500
- **Conservative**: 30,996
- **Moderate**: 35,768
- **Aggressive**: 40,888
Land Use Allocation

How Much to Allocate?

- SUMMARY:
  - Employing three different methods, historic absorption, historic new development, and employee projections, the Leduc Aerotropolis could absorb between 1,750 and 3,000 acres of new development over a 30 year period.
  
  - Up to 100 acres per year.
  
  - Provide employment lands for 30,000 to 40,000 employees.
  
  - Land demand will increase if the primary focus continues to be towards heavy industry that has been typical in Nisku such as oil & gas manufacturing, pipe yards, etc.
### Initial Land Use & Phasing Strategy

**Total Allocation - All Priority Areas - 30 Year Development Period**

**By Economic Cluster**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters</th>
<th>Square Footage Developable Space</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>5,960,000</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>9,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Manufacturing</td>
<td>2,100,000</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Logistics &amp; Distribution</td>
<td>6,400,000</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>4,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agri-Business</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace &amp; Aviation</td>
<td>1,150,000</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>1,960,000</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>1,055,000</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>360,000</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>570,000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Commercial Hub</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Business</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,705,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,144</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,184</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 29, 2015

Paul Benedetto
City Manager, City of Leduc
1 Alexandra Park,
Leduc, AB T9E 4C4

RE: CRB Growth Plan Update and Initial Preferred Direction

Dear Mr. Benedetto,

Thank you for your letter, received via email on April 10, 2015, expressing concerns about the Initial Preferred Direction for the Growth Plan Update. Your questions are very constructive and I will have answers for you as soon as possible. However, as you may know, the Task Force is still in the process of reviewing the context and framework for a ‘preferred direction’, and so it is very much in the formative stage.

The Task Force unanimously agreed that it was more important to produce a quality plan for the region rather than rushing to meet a deadline of December 2015 and, to that end, has decompressed the projected schedule adding an additional nine months. Please see these changes in the attached Revised Project Schedule 27 April 2015. The Board will be informed of this on May 14, 2015, and we already have a spoken with the Province.

The additional time will allow for a broader engagement strategy for CAOs, the Board and the Province at multiple touch points in the process. As well, we will now have time to include consideration of the outcomes of relevant work currently underway - the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan, the MGA review, the big City Charters, any potential boundary changes and the 50 Year Multi Modal Transportation Strategy - all of which are due to be completed later this year and throughout 2016.

As part of the broader engagement strategy, additional consultations with CAOs have been added to the project schedule before major milestones are reviewed by the Task Force and the Board. The new schedule ensures a full two-week (14 days) turnaround time between meetings, so feedback from each consultation can be fully considered before the next review by a stakeholder, and a minimum of one week (7 days) for your own review of materials prior to meetings.

Thank you for your offer to provide additional materials to better inform the Core Project Team and the Consultants about the Leduc Aerotropolis. We welcome receiving any materials you can make available to better inform the team of the scope, scale and timing of Aerotropolis, and its expected economic impact on the Region. Understanding the employment lands and needs for future growth has been identified as a gap in the current Growth Plan, which will be addressed in the update. The Task Force does agree it is critical for the long
term prosperity and sustainability of the region to understand all the economic drivers, as part of advancing the Region’s overall global competitiveness and sustainability.

I spoke with Mayor Krischke yesterday, and he indicated that he will be attending all Task Force meetings starting in May. Mayor Carr has also just set up a Consultation with the City Mayors and their CAOs for June 11, 2015 following the Board meeting. These, and the other extra meetings, are important opportunities for the Task Force to hear directly from municipalities about what they see as issues to be addressed, and for municipalities to express new ideas for the Task Force’s consideration.

I appreciate your taking the time to put your concerns in writing. Again, I will have answers to your questions regarding the “preferred direction” once the Task Force is more comfortable with an approach. If you have any follow up thoughts or questions in the meantime, please feel free to call me. I’d be pleased to continue this discussion.

Sincerely,

Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Capital Region Board

cc. Nolan Crouse, Chair, Capital Region Board
    Brian Bowles, CAO, Leduc County
    Sharon Shuya, Project Manager, CRB
    Melanie Hare, Urban Strategies Inc.
    Hassan Shaheen, ISL Engineering and Land Services
Summary of Consultations with Cities

July 9, 2015
Cities Consultation June 11, 2015

• **Attendees**: Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Leduc, Spruce Grove, St. Albert

• **Major Themes**
  
  – Urban center must have the right to grow, and will require additional land.
  
  – The role of Green belts need to be explored to determine the fit, for this region.
  
  – The Plan need to be integrated and address all areas to support growth in cities – land uses- employment, transportation including transit, housing, recreation, environment and quality of life.
  
  – The plan need to be about fairness. The rules for how and where to grow must be considered for all municipalities. *Rules for Counties are different than rules for Urbans.*
  
  – **Growth Nodes**- should we have them, are they the right policy? *How should we deal with them (in the current plan, and in the future?)*
– What is the end state for the Plan? What are we trying to achieve through the Growth Plan in the next 30 years? Long term thinking must influence decisions today. Most planning is incremental.

– Important to think more broadly as a region as opposed to focusing on the different sizes of municipalities. We need to adopt a ‘systems approach’ to planning for the region to identify where we will grow and where we will not.

– Need to accept the fact that the growth plan will affect us all (directly or indirectly).

– We agree that compact, contiguous, well serviced with low environmental impact is in all of our best interests, and is the “floor”.

– “We need to have consistent service standards for how we service and manage grow in the region that applies to residential and non residential”.

– “We also need to consider the next level of services” - what is important at a at a regional level?
– Agree with the concept of a metropolitan “core”. Need a clear definition that considers the future footprint of the core in the 30-50 years with planning on the basis of 5-10 year increments.

– Need to understand the differences between being inside the Metro core versus outside of the core.

– The Growth Plan should be a means to better influence growth by ‘design’ versus today’s model of growth based on ‘market response’.

– Need to ensure the REF process is inclusive of all types of plans an not limited to Statutory Plans.

– Infrastructure decisions should be tied to economic drivers in the region and supported by policies that inform land uses, investment in infrastructure and regional priorities. Should we only allow growth where infrastructure exists?

– Infrastructure management plans would be useful to understand lifecycle costs. Should the REF process include some form of long term viability? Should we hold ourselves accountable to this higher standard?
– Mobility/Public Transportation - need to focus on the long term needs of transit through the growth plan. Includes corridors for LRT in the next 50 year, regional park and ride lots, transit terminus, etc.

– Corridor Planning also applies to TUC’s are we protecting lands for the future needs?

– Downtown viability – what should be the plan direction for smaller urbans to fit with the long term vision for the Core and Metro Area?

– Core/Density – need to include redevelopment of older areas. Need to consider density = opportunity to improve mobility. This need to be part of the conversation about how we manage growth.

– Policies need to be enforceable at the Regional Level. Need a mechanism.

– Current Policy Framework should be reviewed and updated as necessary. Not all policies will need to change.

– More emphasis on “globally competitiveness” in the plan- we are still too dependent on oil & gas. More emphasis on economic drivers and density targets- infill and greenfield.
- The Plan should be about quality of life versus land uses.
- Not all growth is positive, as sometimes it's hard to keep up with what's needed.
- Need a plan today to achieve the 50 year vision.
- Need to include First Nations in Consultations.
- Defining where we came from as a region and then reframing where we need to go... (with the Growth Plan)
- The kind of “place” we build for this region will define our future as a region.
Counties Submission to CRB: Leduc County; Parkland County; Strathcona County & Lamont County

June 26, 2015

As a result of a Counties Consultation with CRB and the Growth Plan Representatives Task Force members met to confirm consensus a number of Issues & Solutions. We submit the following for consideration of the Task Force and, ultimately the Board.

Executive Summary

Sub Regional Model
We submit that, to succeed the Capital Region model in the revised Growth Plan Update needs to be one of equal partners as follows:
Metro Sub Region
North Sub Region
West Sub Region
South Sub Region
East Sub Region

The essence of a sub-regional model is that each sub region is a strong member of the team that advocates for regional success.
Each rural sub region is a combination of both common and unique elements of a geographic area that have existing governance, economic, environmental, and social relationships. They are a group of municipalities that build on the strengths of existing relationships and alliances to positively impact the economy of their area and quality of life of citizens in the entire region.

Current and proposed alliances and partnerships within each sub-region ensure sustainability and collaboration;
It is understood and recognized that there are partnerships between sub-regions; and that there are also partnerships and mutual benefits between sub-regions and the metropolitan core which add to regional cohesiveness and prosperity.

Policy/Planning Approach
1. Counties agree that any agriculture land policies developed should have an overarching theme or spirit, but not be one-size-fit-all for each sub-region.
2. Counties support wise management of agriculture land, and believe that Agriculture Master Plans are required to be developed for each rural municipality.
3. Counties agree that a 30 year land supply be identified by urban municipalities to allow periods of stability for sub-regions.
Background:
The policy and planning approach will be an Outcome of process – 
RATIONALE: p89 of 126 from the March 19 slides provided before the meeting - 
“scenarios will allow us to test policy options, mechanisms and inform initial policy 
directions”, the sub-region model is a viable model to test options on. 
EXPECTATIONS: Policies and plans should reflect the commonality of the region, 
yet have the flexibility to adapt to the specific characteristics of each region 
AGRICULTURE LAND POLICY - Counties currently have either policies or planning 
practices which promote value-add or diversification of agri-business, protect 
farmland or minimize agricultural land fragmentation

Densities
A sub-region is a mixture of urban and rural, thus density calculations will need to 
be determined through the policy and planning approaches 
1. Counties agree that all sub-regions need to have density criteria that need to 
be higher than what they are currently. 
2. The Current draft Growth Plan states that Country Cluster Residential Areas 
(CCRA)” is permitted only in fragmented areas on lower quality lands and 
prohibited within a defined area around the Metro Area (definition from 
Growth Plan)” 
Counts propose the definition of CCRA to be: permitted only in fragmented 
areas, or on lower quality lands which are lower than class 3. 
Counts submit that “prohibited within a defined area around the Metro Area” 
be removed.

Transitional Lands
1. Counties agree that any transitional land policies developed should have an 
overarching theme or spirit, but not be one-size-fit-all for each sub-region.
### Background: Table of general information of regions surrounding Edmonton - both common and distinctive elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>East</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>North</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economy/Industry</strong></td>
<td>Heavy industry (AIHA, SIA) Agriculture</td>
<td>Heavy manufacturing (Nisku) Power/Mining Agriculture</td>
<td>Manufacturing (Acheson) Power/Mining Agriculture</td>
<td>Heavy industry (AIHA) Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correction Services</td>
<td>Transportation Hub</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rail trans loading</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation/logistics</td>
<td>Agricultural Commercial Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong></td>
<td>Various agriculture types</td>
<td>MDP Policies to preserve Ag Land, Agriculture Strategy underway</td>
<td>Agri-services industry</td>
<td>Value added eg pet food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protectionist practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moratorium on agricultural lands (2008) prohibiting sub-division development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lamont County MDP Policy for preservation of AG Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>River Valley Alliance, Natural &amp; Wilderness areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 watersheds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environment</strong></td>
<td>River Valley Alliance, Beaver Hills Moraine, National &amp; Provincial park, Wetlands policy</td>
<td>River Valley Alliance, Beaver Hills Moraine PLWA, North Saskatchewan Watershed Association, Wizard Lake Watershed</td>
<td>61 ESAs</td>
<td>U of A Research station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Provincial parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 municipal parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Natural Areas –Wagner &amp; Clifford E. Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 watersheds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation &amp; Culture</strong></td>
<td>Dow Centennial Millennium Place Ardrossan Rec Centre Strathcona Olympi...</td>
<td>Various Intermunicipal Rec Agreements Leduc Rec Centre, Thorsby Rec Centre, Leduc #1 Historic Site, Beaumont Rec Centre, Rundle Mission, etc.</td>
<td>TransAlta Tri-Leisure Ctr. Entwistle Pool Meridian Sports Parkland County Pembina Rec-Plex</td>
<td>Arena, rinks Community Halls Pools Multicultural Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooking Lake – Blackfoot Recreational Area Lamont Recreation Centre Lamont AG Society Facility (under development)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation/Transit</strong></td>
<td>SC Transit - assisted and commuter</td>
<td>Leduc Transit - assisted and commuter</td>
<td>West/north rail and highway access</td>
<td>St. Albert Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy Load East-North corridor</td>
<td>International Airport</td>
<td>Spruce Grove-Edmonton Transit Route</td>
<td>Regional Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East rail and highway</td>
<td>South transportation corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td>North transportation corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Over dimensional Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td>CFB Edmonton-Edmonton Transit route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Fire</strong></td>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan Community Hospital Strathcona Community Hospital Lamont Health Care Centre Rural Fire Services (Heartland &amp; South Cooking Lake) Lamont County 5 intermunicipal fire service agreements</td>
<td>Leduc Hospital, Devon Hospital, Fire Agreements with 10+ municipalities</td>
<td>3 municipal fire halls</td>
<td>Sturgeon Community Hospital Redwater Hospital West Country Seniors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 inter-municipal fire service agreements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Westview Health Ctr. (Stony Plain Hospital)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spruce Grove Health Ctr. Devon Hospital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evansburg Health Ctr. Drayton Valley Health Ctr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Partnerships with Edmonton** | Compost Facility  
34th Street Trunk  
Joint Watershed  
Drainage Transfer Station  
Joint Planning Study  
Capital Region Intersection  
Safety  
Regional Transit Service  
Partner  
MAPS Alberta Capital Region | 41st Avenue Funding Agreement, Referral Agreement, Free Trade Zone | Inter-municipal transit with ETS | Inter-municipal transit with ETS |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| **Intra-Regional Partnerships** | Heartland Housing, AIHA, SIA, NCIA  
Common Bonds Agreement Management Services Agreement  
John Batiuk Regional Water Service Commission  
Alberta Capital Water Commission  
Lamont County Regional Economic Development Initiative  
Lamont County Seniors Housing Foundation  
St. Michael regional Landfill Commission  
Regional FCSS Initiatives | Leduc Foundation, Leduc-Nisku EDA, Cost Sharing projects, EIA Revenue Sharing Agreement, Regional Collaboration Initiatives (AVS, JIMPSE, Governance and Sustainability, Emergency Services, etc.), Intermunicipal Development Plans, FCSS, etc. | 8 Inter-municipal agreements, cost-sharing projects (i.e. Tri-Leisure Centre) $26+M over 10 years  
2 Senior Foundations  
5 FCSS cost-sharing | Sturgeon Foundation  
AIHA, NCIA |
| **CRB Members in Trading Area** | Fort Saskatchewan  
Strathcona County  
Lamont County  
Lamont  
Bruderheim | Leduc  
Beaumont  
Leduc County  
Calmar  
Devon  
Thorsby  
Warburg | Spruce Grove  
Stony Plain  
Parkland County  
Wabamun  
Devon | St. Albert  
Sturgeon County  
Morinville  
Redwater  
Gibbons  
Bon Accord  
Legal |
GPU 2.0 External Stakeholder Consultation

- **Provincial Direction**
  - Consider the appropriate level of consultation to fit within the project budget

- **Task Force Direction**
  - Inclusive of key regional stakeholders and First Nations

- **Work Plan**
  - CRB website
  - External Stakeholder Consultations
    - September 2015
    - April 2016

- **First Nations**
  - Engagement Plan under development in collaboration with City of Edmonton, Aboriginal/ Multi-Cultural Relations
Regional Stakeholders

- Perspectives to be included:
  - Institution/ Association/ Individual Organization
  - Organizations responsible for Public Policy
  - Coverage of GPU 2.0 Policy Areas
  - Rural/Urban perspectives
  - Limit 30 – 40 organizations
  - First Nations
### Regional Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business/Industry</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Infrastructure/Transit</th>
<th>Natural Heritage/Environment</th>
<th>Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIHA</td>
<td>Agriculture and Rural Development - GOA</td>
<td>U of A</td>
<td>Diversified Transit</td>
<td>Alberta Air shed</td>
<td>Urban Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA/ Aerotropolis</td>
<td>Agricultural Services Board of Alberta</td>
<td>MacEwan University</td>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>Pembina Institute</td>
<td>Canadian Home Builders Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Capital Association</td>
<td>Alberta Land Institute</td>
<td>NAIT</td>
<td>CNR</td>
<td>Alberta Riparian Habitat Management Society</td>
<td>Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona Industrial Association</td>
<td>Sustainable Food Edmonton</td>
<td>U of A City Regions Study Center</td>
<td>Alberta Transportation</td>
<td>Ducks Unlimited Alberta</td>
<td>Alberta Realtors Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acheson Business Association</td>
<td>Alberta Agriculture Crop Development Center</td>
<td>CUTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>EPCOR, Environmental Policy Leadership</td>
<td>Edmonton Capital Region Housing Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc/ Nisku Economic Development Association</td>
<td>Alberta Capital Region Wastewater Commission</td>
<td>Alberta Capital Region Wastewater Commission</td>
<td>North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance</td>
<td>Homeward Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliers International - Edmonton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sierra Club of Canada – Prairie Chapter</td>
<td>Seniors Association of Greater Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avison Young</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alberta Environment and Sustainable Resource Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Force Meeting: July 9, 2015

Growth Plan Update Task Force
### Regional Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aboriginal</th>
<th>Recreation</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treaty 6</td>
<td>North Saskatchewan River Valley Alliance</td>
<td>Next Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metis Nation of Alberta</td>
<td>Mack Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dave Cournoyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make Something Edmonton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Growth Planning Approach

This Briefing Note outlines the regional planning approach - the overall strategy to plan for growth in the Capital Region. This Briefing Note introduces the components of the updated Growth Plan and discusses the regional growth planning approach. This includes a proposed tiered planning framework to respond to the diversity of the region and a metropolitan growth structure to align settlement patterns with regional transportation networks. To inform the discussion, this Briefing Note summarizes best practices for establishing a metropolitan growth structure based on a review of precedent regional plans.

GROWTH PLAN COMPONENTS

The updated Growth Plan will provide an integrated framework to plan for growth and infrastructure in the region with the following proposed components:


- **Principles**: Guiding elements to achieve the vision.

- **Regional Growth Planning Approach**: Strategy to plan and manage growth, including a growth concept, metropolitan growth structure and tiered planning framework.

- **Policy Areas with Strategies and Policies**: Policy areas related to each principle detailing policies and actions to address regional issues.

- **Implementation Framework**: Defining roles, responsibilities, detailing implementation and monitoring mechanisms.
REGIONAL GROWTH PLANNING APPROACH

The Growth Plan Update will include a strategy to plan and manage growth to ensure growth promotes an excellent quality of life and prosperity in the Capital Region. The planning approach needs to be aligned with the vision, principles and policy areas, and tailored to the context of the region. The proposed regional planning approach includes three interrelated elements:

1. Growth concepts

Growth concepts depict an overall strategy for how a region can manage and optimize growth. In Stage 2 of the Growth Plan Update, the Project Team prepared three concepts to explore different ways the region could align growth with major infrastructure and regional assets. The concepts looked at the region as a whole, without any municipal boundaries, today or in the future. The preferred direction, once adopted by the Task Force will provide a basis for creating policy and a detailed metropolitan growth structure for the updated Growth Plan.

2. Definition of a metropolitan growth structure

The Project Team is proposing that a metropolitan growth structure be included in the updated Growth Plan. A metropolitan structure is a more detailed illustration showing settlement patterns and regional transportation networks. The illustration could build on the existing development patterns and structure of the region, and show regional land use designations or overlays that apply to related policies and implementation mechanisms.

Metropolitan structure addresses the whole region, showing the way land uses, transportation, infrastructure, open spaces and natural features are arranged. The Capital Region is a metropolitan region that is not consistent across its entire expanse. It varies in terms of type of land use and density. It includes Downtown Edmonton, locally-servicing centres and smaller-scale clusters with clusters of employment, cultural, education and healthcare and institutional uses, employment areas with different types of employment and industrial operations, residential and commercial areas, open spaces, parks and natural heritage features for recreational purposes, and agricultural lands and resources areas. These features are all tied together by a regional transportation network, which enables people and goods to move from one part of the region to another to carry out daily activities. The region is also tied together by infrastructure that is not usually visible, including energy pipeline corridors, water pipes, sewer pipes, and stormwater management systems.

3. Tiered planning framework - planning for the diverse urban and rural contexts in the region

The Capital Region is a large and complex region, consisting of diverse communities in terms of scale and urban and rural contexts. Different geographic areas in the region have varying regional roles and distinct opportunities and constraints for growth and change. A tiered planning framework has been proposed to reflect, respond and plan for the diversity of urban and rural contexts in the region. A tiered framework provides a mechanism to introduce tailored policies to respond to different urban and rural contexts.

The tiered planning framework that has been presented introduced three geographic tiers, including a Metropolitan Core, a wider Metropolitan Area consisting of Sub-Regional Clusters and Rural Areas. Through the Growth Plan Update, we will explore and draft appropriate policies to plan for growth and infrastructure within each tier. Policies related to compact growth, intensification and infrastructure investment can include context-specific targets tailored to each tier.
Capital Region communities offer differing levels of service across the region. Some of these are regional assets or benefits, others are more locally serving. The Growth Plan has a role to recognize the different levels of service in the region, and respond to how best to align growth with existing and planned amenities and services.

Working together, the RTAC and the Project Team have outlined the key levels of service and attributes typical to the regional core, sub-regional, local and rural scale of community. The proposed tiered planning framework considers and builds on the following classifications of levels of service in the region. The tiered planning framework recognizes that regional services are clustered together within the Regional Core, and as such the Core plays an important role and function for the entire Capital Region. Communities within the Sub-Regional Clusters provide levels of service for their local communities and also a wider sub-regional area. Towns and villages within the Rural Area provide local services. Within the Rural Area there are a distinct set of agricultural and rural uses. There are also heavy industry and resource extraction related services which are important locally and also contribute to the regional economy.

### Regional
- Water & sewer treatment
- Highways, bridges, arterial roads, expressways
- Police
- Justice system
- Major multi-use recreation/entertainment/cultural facilities
- Emergency services
- Post-secondary education
- Diverse housing stock including highest residential density and mixed use development
- Health care - Primary care facility - large scale & specialized services
- Social services
- Transit - fixed rail and scheduled bus service 7 days x 18+ hours
- Broad-base of employment
- Diversity of retail offerings and amenities
- All government services – federal, provincial, municipal
- International airport
- Rail system

### Sub-Regional
- Reservoir/ Fill Station
- Lagoon
- Library
- Community health centre
- Multi-use recreation facility e.g., Tri Leisure Centre, Servus Centre
- Agricultural service centre
- All grades of public education K - 12
- Fewer government Services
- Low-density housing with some multi-family housing
- Arterial roads connecting to provincial highways
- Local and commuter bus transit service
- Industrial/business parks
- Emergency services

### Local
- Hockey rink, sports fields, swimming pool
- Community centre
- Neighbourhood convenience retail
- Medical centre or clinic
- Not all levels of primary school
- Very limited government services
- Range roads connecting to Highways
- Specialized local transit
- Primarily low density housing
- Local downtown commercial
- Highway commercial e.g., car dealer
- Light industrial/business parks

### Rural
- Outdoor recreation
- Rural residential
- Cluster country residential
- Extensive and intensive agriculture

### Other Rural
- Heavy industry
- Resource extraction
- Energy and pipeline corridors
BEST PRACTICES: METROPOLITAN GROWTH STRUCTURE

In order to plan and manage growth efficiently, metropolitan regions use growth structure concepts to promote more compact and sustainable development patterns, optimize investment in transportation and infrastructure, and ensure growth is financially sustainable. Based on a comparative review of ten regional plans, the following four common characteristics of growth structure concepts have been identified:

Establishing a hierarchy (or tiers) of urban centres as places to focus growth

Most growth plans identify a regional hierarchy of centres – places to concentrate residential and employment growth to achieve higher densities of people and jobs. Centres are defined as places appropriate for mixed-use development with higher densities, serviced by existing or planned transit. As a region grows, centres become the strategic areas for municipalities to concentrate residential and job growth at higher densities, appropriate to the scale of the community. Concentrating growth in strategic locations such as centres enables a municipality to deliver services and infrastructure efficiently.

Most regional plans identify a hierarchy of centres with varying levels of intensity, from the core or central metropolitan downtown area of the region, that services the entire region, to smaller city centres and municipal town centres, servicing a sub-regional or local area. The amount of growth, anticipated density, employment and range of service levels varies in relation to the type of centre. Regional plans contain policies that provide direction for appropriate development in identified centres.

Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) identifies a hierarchy of 26 regional centres as the places to concentrate residential and housing growth. The hierarchy of urban centres includes the Downtown Vancouver, Surrey Metro Centre, and a number of regional city centres and municipal town centres. In the greater Toronto area, the Growth Plan identifies 25 urban growth centres through the region. Each urban growth centre is required to achieve a minimum growth density target by 2031 (residents and jobs per hectare). The urban growth centres within the City of Toronto have the highest gross density target, followed by the surrounding suburban communities and other major cities within the region, and then smaller communities and those at a greater distance from the core.

Metro Denver’s Metro Vision 2035 categorizes urban centres as existing centres, emerging centres and planned centres. These are diverse areas, including traditional downtowns, transit station areas, existing and emerging employment centres and future greenfield areas. Metro Vision also identifies rural town centres in freestanding communities separate from the larger urban area. New development in the rural portion of the region is encouraged to occur within rural town centres where infrastructure can be provided efficiently.

Aligning planned growth with regional transit and transportation networks

One of the elements of a metropolitan growth structure is to align residential and employment growth with planned transit and roadway networks. There is a strong correlation between the density and mix of uses in a community and the availability and viability of transportation alternatives. In general, as the density and mix of uses in a community increases, so does the viability of a number of choices available for getting around.

Regional plans typically identify growth centres and regional transit stations as places with existing or planned rapid transit service connections. In addition to the identification of growth centres, regional plans also provide direction for municipalities to identify transit development areas and intensification areas along transit corridors. These are considered appropriate locations to promote mixed-use development and increase residential and employment densities to support existing and planned transit services.

Identifying employment lands to promote economic activity and job growth

Regional growth plans also contain policies that provide guidance for the planning of employment lands. Some regional plans identify regional employment lands on a conceptual level, while others provide criteria for municipalities to identify and designate employment lands in their local plans.

Metro Vancouver’s RGS identifies industrial and mixed employment areas within the region to protect the land supply for
a variety of industrial and employment uses in support of a diverse and sustainable regional economy. In the Toronto region, the Growth Plan provides direction to municipalities to plan for, protect and preserve employment areas for current and future uses. It states that major office and major institutional development should be located in urban growth centres, major transit station areas and areas with existing or planned higher order transit service, and encourages municipalities to designate employment areas in the vicinity of major highway interchanges, ports, rail yards and airports for manufacturing and warehousing.

**Defining where growth is and isn’t anticipated**

Metropolitan growth structure concepts identify areas where growth is anticipated, including existing areas (where growth will be accommodated through intensification) and future areas (where growth will be accommodated through greenfield development). The Comox Valley Regional District’s Regional Growth Strategy identifies settlement areas, including settlement nodes and expansion areas as the places where urban growth is anticipated.

Metropolitan structure plans also identify areas where growth is not anticipated or encouraged, including valuable natural heritage, agricultural lands and resource areas. These areas have corresponding policies that conserve and protect lands from development. Metro Vancouver’s RGS identifies non-urban land uses, including conservation and recreation, agricultural, and rural lands. Development within these areas is limited to a rural character, and sewer services are not permitted to extend into protected agricultural areas. The San Francisco Bay Area’s Plan Bay Area identifies 100 priority conservation areas as a mechanism to protect regionally significant open spaces and agricultural lands under significant development pressure in the near term.

**APPLYING LESSONS FROM ELSEWHERE FOR THE CAPITAL REGION**

Based on the review of other regional growth plans and the existing characteristics of the Capital Region, we propose that the updated Growth Plan include a metropolitan structure concept. The metropolitan growth structure should build on the existing development pattern and transportation network in the region, and provide direction to promote compact growth and the efficient use of infrastructure in the future.

The metropolitan growth structure concept may include the following:

- **Network of Urban Centres** - Identify a network of urban centres for planned residential and job growth. The network of urban centres should be based on a hierarchy relative to the scale of the community, based on the tiered planning framework.

- **Major Transit Station Areas** - Identify major transit station areas for planned residential and job through, aligned with planned transit station infrastructure. Establish the criteria for municipalities to determine and define future major transit station areas.

- **Transit Corridors and Transportation Networks** - Identify existing and planned regional transit stations and regional transit corridors and transportation networks.

- **Employment Areas** - Identify and distinguish major employment areas. Establish the criteria for municipalities to determine future employment areas, locate higher density employment uses in areas with transit infrastructure, and potentially differentiate their role in the region.

- **Living Areas** - Identify at a conceptual level, existing future areas where new residential development is anticipated in a compact and contiguous form to accommodate the population forecasts to 2044. Establish minimum densities for new residential development based on the tiered planning framework.

- **Natural Heritage, Agriculture and Resource Areas** - Identify at a conceptual level, natural heritage areas, prime agricultural lands and resource areas, as places where growth is not anticipated and where new growth may not be appropriate.
Drilling into the POLICY AREAS

• What are the three key issues the Growth Plan needs to address?

• What are we trying to achieve? What are the initial policy objectives?
An Integrated and Interconnected Plan

- Economic Competiveness & Employment
- Agriculture
- Natural Heritage
- Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure
- Transit & Mobility
- Communities & Housing Choice

Regional Growth
The approved principles will be linked with policy areas

Collaborate and coordinate as a region to manage growth responsibly

Promote global economic competitiveness and regional prosperity.

Achieve compact growth that optimizes infrastructure investment.

Ensure effective regional mobility.

Ensure the wise management of prime agricultural resources.

Protect natural heritage systems and environmental assets.

Implementation

Economic Competitiveness & Employment

Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure

Transit & Mobility

Communities & Housing Choice

Agriculture

Natural Heritage

Each principle will result in one or more policy areas…..
Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure

2010 Plan and the REF process enables management and oversight of growth plans across the region but lacks the mechanisms to align individual municipal infrastructure plans with regional scale infrastructure involving multiple players.
Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure

Planning growth in a manner that logically builds on existing patterns, considers energy pipeline corridors, respects natural heritage systems and protects major infrastructure corridors.
Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure

Consultation Recap: What we’ve heard to date

- Communities are facing aging infrastructure and need transportation to grow.
- How do we use infrastructure to greatest capacity?
- Densities should apply to both rural and urban lands. If densities go higher than the established targets then onus on municipality to show what infrastructure there is to support higher densities.
- Compact, contiguous, well serviced development with low environmental impact is in all of our best interests. Need to have consistent service standards for how we service and manage grow in the region.
- “We also need to consider the next level of services” - what is important at a regional level?
- Infrastructure management plans would be useful to understand lifecycle costs. Should the REF process include some form of long term viability assessment? Should we hold ourselves accountable to this higher standard?
- Infrastructure decisions should be tied to economic drivers in the region and supported by policies that inform land uses, investment in infrastructure and regional priorities. Should we only allow growth where infrastructure exists?
Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure

How do other jurisdictions manage agricultural lands?

- **Identify a hierarchy of urban centres and corridors** as places to concentrate growth (Toronto Region, Metro Vancouver, Metro Portland, DC Region, Metro Denver)

- **Coordinate regional transportation and transit plans** with regional growth plans through a **regional transportation authority** (Toronto, Metro Vancouver, Metro Portland, DC Region, Metro Denver)

- **Promote growth and intensification in areas well serviced by transit** (Toronto, Metro Vancouver, Metro Portland, DC Region, Metro Denver)

- **Develop new communities at higher densities** with a mix of uses to promote compact development, transit feasibility and minimize the need for linear infrastructure (Toronto Region, Calgary, Metro Denver)

- **Establish minimum targets** (intensification, residential, people and job) that are tailored to different scale and contexts for development (Toronto Region)

- **Provide financial and infrastructure investment incentives** to transit-supportive development initiatives (San Francisco Bay Area, DC Region, Metro Chicago)
Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure

Issues for Consideration

- There are 25 jurisdictions involved in regional infrastructure planning and implementation. How do we compel them to align all their efforts?
- Considering a REF process for regional infrastructure
- Aligning growth with existing and planned future infrastructure across 24 municipalities (transit, transportation, municipal services, community services)
- Staging and funding of future planned regional infrastructure and transportation
- Defining mixed use and higher density centres and areas to concentrate people and jobs
- Identifying mechanisms to ensure logical, compact and contiguous progression of urban growth across municipal boundaries
- Refining density targets to achieve compact form appropriate to the scale of the community; with clear timeframes and method for application
- Harmonizing infrastructure codes and standards across the region
Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure

What are we trying to achieve?

- Compact and contiguous growth patterns
- Residential and employment densities that support required infrastructure investment
- Efficient use of existing infrastructure capacity
- Alignment of growth with existing and planned infrastructure across the region
- Coordination and logical phasing of regionally significant infrastructure planning and investment
- Long term financially sustainable infrastructure and settlement patterns
- Other?
Housing choice across the region is limited today. Planning for the needs of today’s and future populations will be key for the regions livability and prosperity.

- 86% of the region’s housing stock is owned.
- 88% of housing units, outside of Edmonton, are single family, low density housing.
- Edmonton has 90% of the region’s multi-family dwellings and the greatest concentration of affordable housing units.
- 86% of the region’s housing stock is owned.
- Residents in some communities do not have easy access to services and employment opportunities.
- Housing has been identified as a key issue for labour attraction.
- Current Housing Plan – an innovative model which has yet to be implemented.
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Consultation Recap: What we’ve heard to date

- Smaller urbans want to maintain a degree of flexibility
- Need to support the sustainability of smaller municipalities and rural areas
- What will density requirements mean for rural and urban areas in the Counties and for CCRAs?
- The region needs more seniors’ housing and services due to its changing demographics
- Need to provide diverse housing options that appeal to the labour market
- Need to support communities’ ability to provide affordable housing
How do other jurisdictions plan for liveable communities and housing choice?

- In larger urban centres, allow and encourage a diversity of housing types and mix of densities to accommodate a wide range of incomes and full spectrum of lifestyles (Metro Vancouver, Metro Denver)

- Recognize smaller local centres as places appropriate for a mix of housing types, local-servicing commercial activities and access to transit (Metro Vancouver)

- Locate housing to maximize access to transit, employment, services, amenities (Comox District, Metro Denver, Metro Vancouver, Calgary Regional Partnership, Toronto Region)

- Encourage investment in existing neighbourhoods and transit-oriented development and provide technical assistance for municipalities and grants to promote livable communities at the local level (Metro Chicago)
Communities & Housing Choice

Policy Issues for Consideration

- Responding to the diversity of housing needs in Capital Region communities – today and in 30-50 years
- Providing a greater range of housing options and affordable housing to accommodate a mix of age and income groups
- Locating key services and amenities so they are accessible to the people who need them
- Encouraging forms of development that respect and retain the distinct character of communities
- Ensuring residential growth can occur both through intensification and greenfield development
- Determining an adequate supply of residential lands in communities across the region
- Reviewing rural and country residential provisions: viability of CCRA; severance of acreages
Communities & Housing Choice

What are we trying to achieve?

- A greater diversity of housing choices throughout the Capital Region
- Promoting quality of life and housing choices to attract and retain workers
- Increasing housing choice in areas proximate to employment areas
- Housing affordability, particularly in the core and in transit serviced areas
- More balanced type and tenure of housing in new neighbourhoods
- Reinvestment in existing neighbourhoods and communities
- Sustainable villages, towns and rural areas
- Clear direction on residential development in rural areas
- Other?
Regional traffic flow patterns reflect the economic activities within the Region and to a lesser extent the outside world, but Edmonton remains the focal point for these flows and related connections.

Transit systems in the Capital Region are successful when focused on high density residential and employment environments and corridors, but suffer in low density residential areas and industrial/commercial areas.

Roadway and transit accessibility to jobs and employment areas is a key component of the region’s economic competitiveness.
Consultation Recap: What we’ve heard to date

Regional roadways - a second regional ring road should be considered

Aging Infrastructure – more money needed

Small municipalities need transportation to grow

Need to focus on long term needs for transit; LRT corridors, Park n Ride

Revenue Sharing – time to have the conversation
How do other jurisdictions plan regional transit & mobility?

- In some Canadian regions, (Vancouver, Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, Gatineau) regional transportation infrastructure planning, implementation and funding are carried out by a single “entity”.
- In many countries, unlike Canada, there is ongoing federal participation in and funding of transportation infrastructure.
- In the United States federal funding is often contingent upon the creation of a state-wide or regional transportation plan.
- Integration of land use and transportation remains a challenge across the country.
Transit & Mobility
Policy Issues for Consideration

- **Mode Shift** - At a regional scale, commitment to and transition from highly auto oriented transportation policies and infrastructure to greater reliance on transit for personal mobility.

- **Traffic Congestion** - Enhancements to the regional roadway network to meet the needs of a region of over 2.2 million people. (what does that look like?)

- **Policy shift** towards transit requires complementary approaches on land use, communities/housing, roadway investments, funding and governance.

- As demand for transit increases and transit systems proliferate, there is an increasing need for **integration of multiple systems**, multiple operators, multiple fare regimes and multiple operating agreements.

- Need to address **mobility needs of individuals with mobility impairments**, particularly in smaller CRB communities and across municipal boundaries.

- Significant **misalignment in transportation policy approaches** and related issues between the Province and municipalities in the Region.

- Lack of **consistency and uniformity in the funding of transportation infrastructure across the region.** (different grant systems, different off-site levy systems, different cost sharing arrangements with other levels of governments, lack of long-term federal funding program)
Transit and Mobility

What are we trying to achieve?

- Define the Region’s long term transportation policy approach
- Define the role of private and public transportation in the region
- Define types and locations of roadway and transit infrastructure to align with policy approach and the roles of the main travel modes.
  - Classify existing and future regional roads (highways and arterials)
  - Define the location of new highways and arterials roadways
  - Define types and locations of Mass Transit corridors and facilities (LRT, Commuter Rail, Bus, Regional Transit Centres/ Park and Ride)
- Define linkages with other policy areas to ensure alignment and consistency
- Define mechanisms to better align and coordinate multi-jurisdictional priorities
- Define mechanisms to share the costs and benefits of the region’s transportation system
- Other?
Natural Heritage

A key challenge for the Growth Plan Update is managing growth in a manner that protects the region’s natural heritage assets and ecological systems.

These include:
- Water bodies and water courses
- National and provincial parks and protected areas
- Environmentally sensitive and significant areas
Natural Heritage

Consultation Recap: What we’ve heard to date

- Some view recreation lands as trade-off to providing social services in the Metro Core.
- The Plan needs to be integrated and address all areas to support growth in cities – land uses, employment, transportation including transit, housing, recreation, environment and quality of life.
- We need to adopt a ‘systems approach’ to planning for the region to identify where we will grow and where we will not.
- Existing natural resources support (gravel, peat, coal) support Capital Region economic growth.
- Our region is defined by a major natural asset – the North Saskatchewan River Valley.
- We agree that compact, contiguous, well serviced with low environmental impact is in all of our best interests, and is the “floor”.
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Natural Heritage

How do other jurisdictions address natural heritage and environmental assets?

• **Protect critical watershed areas for the benefit of the region**, and support development and implementation of an Integrated Watershed Management (IWM) approach to deal effectively with relationships between land use, water quality management and water supply. (Calgary)

• **Enhance Ecological Infrastructure through alignment of local, regional and intermunicipal plans** to protect key elements of the region’s ecological infrastructure – wetlands, riparian buffers, regional corridors, large patches of natural vegetation, ridges and escarpments. (Calgary)

• Work with the Province, member municipalities and private sector to **develop and implement a range of conservation tools to support the Plan and Provincial Land-use Framework**. (Calgary)

• **Use of Indicators to assess performance including land consumption and environmental impact** (Metro Denver)

• **Develop and implement a regional cumulative effects management (CEM) approach** with the Province of Alberta. (Calgary)

• **Support the coordination of environmental actions and conservation initiatives of regional interest** with member municipalities, the provincial and federal governments and First Nations. (Calgary)
Natural Heritage

Policy Issues for Consideration

- Preservation/conservation of natural heritage systems including regionally significant natural areas and features
- Making connections between natural heritage systems
- Planning pipeline, power and transportation corridors to minimize disruption to natural areas and fragmentation of the region’s ecological systems
- Mitigating the adverse impacts of growth on environmental assets through the use of green technologies
- Recognizing natural landscapes, wildlife habitat and biodiversity as valued assets in the region
- Recognizing the value of ecological systems: provision of potable water, climate regulation and wildlife habitat corridors
- Creating infrastructure networks and growth patterns that preserve clean air and water
- Direction regarding managing conflict between natural heritage and natural resource extraction
What are we trying to achieve?

- Ensure the location, scale and density of future development protects valued natural assets
- Define and promote Healthy Environment in the context of the Capital Region
- Provide direction for protection/conservation of the region’s natural heritage systems, recreational assets, clean water and air
- Measure and monitor the cumulative impacts of growth across the region
- Plan for and address climate change and promote resiliency at the regional scale
- Promote use of green technologies
- Other?
Discussion questions for each policy area:

• What are the three *key issues* the Growth Plan needs to address?

• What are we trying to achieve? What are the initial *policy objectives*?
This Briefing Note summarizes common themes and key issues discussed at the GPU Task Force Workshop with regard to the policy areas of: Employment and Economic Competiveness; and Agriculture.

At the GPU Task Force Workshop on June 26, 2015, participants were asked to identify the top three issues that the Growth Plan Update should address related to these two policy areas. These issues have been distilled into key themes and priority issues, based on common and connected ideas.

These priority issues identified by the Task Force are intended to provide a focus and starting point for the development of draft growth plan policies and strategies in response to the issues. Issues highlighted in green indicate critical themes/ priorities arising from the discussion and many require further validation by the Task Force by way of more dialogue, refinement of the themes and more direction to the Project Team.

Policy Area #1: Economic Competiveness & Employment

Key Themes / Discussion Recap

- Support and enable growth of existing employment areas to include identifying important economic drivers and distinct clusters
- Focus on aligning infrastructure with the needs of major clusters and employment in the region, with emphasis on transportation, utility corridors and other regional servicing impacts
- Need to optimize assets in oil and gas to diversify economy for tomorrow. How do we use oil and gas as a spring board for something else?
- Need to enhance productivity from a regional view and have a compelling value proposition and story to the world.
- Focus on livability as part of economic competitiveness – how do we keep people here in the future?
- Think about agriculture as a key economic sector
- Need a funding model for infrastructure
- Must remain forward thinking about the next generation of jobs

What are the priority issues for the Growth Plan Update?

1) Define and foster existing economic clusters

- Grow and distinguish existing employment areas and regional economic drivers
- Focus on regional economic clusters – cluster things together where they have existing and potential relationships, leverage assets and infrastructure and related economic activities
- Provide direction on any future employment lands
2) **Plan for full range of employment from heavy industrial to office in the region**
- Provide direction on managing job growth in a range of employment types: heavy to light industrial, commercial, major retail, office
- Recognize employment areas and other concentrations of employees such as in downtowns
- Define employment areas/uses with potential to achieve higher employee densities and access to transit
- Define employment land supply and capacity for next 30-50 years
- Promote economic sectors with relevance on regional scale that contribute to regional economic growth and global competitiveness

3) **Plan and coordinate infrastructure to foster and support employment clusters and economic competitiveness**
- Goods and people movement in and out of the region
- Infrastructure needs for next 30-50 years to support growth of employment nodes areas
- Set servicing and intensification standards
- Plan for infrastructure, energy and utility corridors

4) **Promote livability and plan for the needs of a changing population and workforce**
- Key livability factors include: quality of life, housing and transportation
- Attract and retain workers with excellent quality of life offerings
- Develop a regional transportation network to support mobility and access to jobs

5) **Strengthen oil and gas sector by encouraging diversification of sector opportunities for the future**
- Foster diversification with tools of workplace for tomorrow – skills training, human capital, education
- Advocate regional perspective on provincial issues related to education, labour development
- Need to define diversification – what does this mean?

6) **Address funding model and cost/sharing**
- Create win-wins through regional joint venture model
- Funding model to allow for success – revenue sharing as model
- Share non-residential wealth
- Link clusters to the potential for ‘wealth sharing’

7) **Promote agriculture as an economic sector with a focus on food production and processing**
- Promote agricultural economy – create value-added opportunities
Policy Area #2: Agriculture

Key Themes / Discussion Recap

- Agreement that the Growth Plan needs to address and provide direction on agriculture – with a focus on protecting prime agricultural lands, managing urban-rural interface, and sustaining the ongoing viability of the agricultural sector
- Need to balance preservation with the community’s right to grow
- Need to define what agricultural policies apply in rural areas and in urban areas
- Support agricultural economy as a key economic driver
- Acreage/country cluster residential and rural residential development are big issues relative to fragmentation of agricultural land need to support value added agriculture opportunities such as processing of local agricultural products
- Define boundary and transition issues

What are the priority issues for Growth Plan Update to address?

1) Address how to sustain prime agricultural lands - preserve or not

- Staging of future growth
- Need to identify future land requirements for residential, commercial, industrial uses as relates to 30 year planning horizon
- Major impact of land speculation on agricultural viability; need to provide certainty in terms of agricultural producers return on investment and sustaining agricultural uses in the region for the future
- Explore Agricultural Impact Statements, Density Transfer, Ecological Goods and Services and other conservation tools

2) Respond to near neighbour impacts on agriculture

- Defining near urban/neighbour areas and related policy responses to minimize impacts
- Consider if land use conflicts in terms of noise, dust, odour, transportation require regional policy in addition to provincial policy
- Fragmentation of agricultural lands from non-agricultural uses including urban development and infrastructure
- Interface between urban and rural – hard edge or transition edge?
- Define compatible agriculture and non-agricultural development uses in agricultural areas in proximity to urban areas
- Infrastructure investment in support of/with minimal impact on agricultural production

3) Address pressures for non-agricultural development on rural/agricultural lands [e.g., new multi-lot country cluster residential, rural residential, all types of industrial] and fragmentation of agricultural lands

- Policy direction on acreage developments (subdivisions for residential and non-agricultural use/densification of residential uses on large lots)
- Provisions related to location, scale and impact of multi-lot country cluster residential and rural residential development
- Viability of Multi-lot Country Cluster Residential
- Impact of rural industrial development on agricultural lands
- Rural development of agricultural lands—what is the extent of current fragmentation of agricultural lands in counties today? Where is this an issue in the region and what policy direction at the regional level to minimize the impacts?
- Explore impact of densification of acreages on infrastructure requirements and increased car dependent commuting

4) **Promote growth of agriculture/food production and processing as a key regional economic sector**
- Support long-term agricultural sector - food production and processing. Certainty will be here in the long term
- Foster viable agricultural operations – plan and coordinate infrastructure required for production, processing, distribution, value-added production activities
- Recognition of agriculture/local food production and processing as a key economic driver and contributor to the region’s economy
- Define mechanisms to support and sustain agriculture operations for the future
- Promote value-added agricultural opportunities

5) **Plan and coordinate infrastructure to support agriculture sector**
- Address infrastructure needs to support agricultural sector growth: food production, processing, distribution, logistics, warehousing etc.
- Recognize the roles and contributions of rural and urban communities in providing this chain of infrastructure to support agriculture
- Coordinate regional-scale marketing and promotion of the agricultural sector
Economic Competitiveness & Employment

Priority Issues

- Define and foster existing economic clusters
- Plan for full range of employment from heavy industrial to office in the region
- Plan and coordinate infrastructure to foster and support employment clusters and economic competitiveness
- Promote liveability and plan for the needs of a changing population and workforce
- Strengthen oil and gas sector by encouraging diversification of sector opportunities for the future
- Address funding model and cost/sharing
- Promote agriculture as an economic sector with a focus on food production and processing

* green indicates critical themes/priorities arising from the discussion that may require further validation by the Task Force and direction to the Project Team
What are we trying to achieve?

- Strong and growing regional economic clusters
- Labour force attraction and retention in support of the region’s key economic sectors (resource, manufacturing, agriculture, health and education, cultural and creative)
- Support for employment growth in industrial, commercial and office development
- Efficient expansion of infrastructure to support economic growth
- A diverse and resilient regional economy – for today and the future
- Implementation of new regional models for cost and wealth sharing
Agriculture

Priority Issues

- Address how to sustain prime agricultural lands - preserve or not
- Address urban development pressure for conversion of prime agricultural lands
- Respond to near neighbour impacts on agriculture
- Address pressures for non-agricultural development on rural/agricultural lands [e.g., new multi-lot country cluster residential or rural residential, all types of industrial] and fragmentation of agricultural lands
- Address new country cluster residential development – where, how and rationale
- Promote growth of agriculture/local food production and processing as a key regional economic sector
- Plan and coordinate infrastructure to support agriculture sector (food production, processing, distribution and value add)

* green indicates critical themes/priorities arising from the discussion that may require further validation by the Task Force and direction to the Project Team
Agriculture

What are we trying to achieve?

- Protection of prime agricultural lands while allowing communities to grow
- Minimizing fragmentation of agricultural lands
- Minimizing conflicts between adjacent non-agricultural uses and agriculture
- Support for agriculture/food production and processing as a key regional economic sector