Meeting Agenda
February 14, 2013 – 9:30 a.m. – Noon

Chateau Louis, Grand Ballroom
11727 Kingsway, Edmonton

Open to the Public

1. Chair’s Opening Remarks
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes of January 10, 2013
4. Representations from the Public
5. REF Applications
   a. REF 2012-019, Parkland County
      Proposed Municipal Development Plan Amendment
      Proposed New Area Structure Plan - Acheson
      Motion: That the Capital Region Board approves the proposed amendment to the Parkland
      County Municipal Development Plan and New Acheson Area Structure Plan in accordance
      with the Regional Evaluation Framework.
6. Governance
   a. Request to Change Fiscal Year End
      Motion: That the Capital Region Board approves the request to Alberta Municipal Affairs to
      change the CRB’s financial year end from December 31 to a financial year end of March 31.
   b. Committee’s Terms of Reference
      Motion: That the Capital Region Board approves the changes to the Committee’s Terms of
      Reference as approved by the Governance Committee.
   c. 2012 Audited Financial Statements
      Notice of Motion: That the Capital Region Board approves the 2012 calendar year Audited
      Financial Statements as approved by Governance Committee.
   d. 2012 Annual Report (calendar year)
      Notice of Motion: That the Capital Region Board approves the CRB’s 2012 Annual Report
      as approved by Governance Committee.
7. Committee Reports
   a. Land Use Committee
   b. Transit Committee
c. Housing Committee
d. Governance Committee
e. Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee

8. Administrative Issues

9. Motion: That the CRB move to in camera session

In Camera

10. Advocacy & Communication Committee Report

11. Motion: That the CRB revert to public session

Open to the Public

12. Adjournment
Minutes of a meeting of the Capital Region Board
held at Chateau Louis, Grand Ballroom
on Thursday, January 10, 2013

Delegates in Attendance:
Mayor Nolan Crouse – St. Albert/Chair
Mayor Camille Berube – Beaumont
Mayor Don Rigney - Sturgeon
Mayor Barry Rasch - Thorsby
Councillor Ed Gibbons – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Mayor William Nimmo - Gibbons
Councillor Dwight Ganske – Stony Plain
Mayor Dawson Kohl - Warburg
Mayor Bill Skinner – Town of Lamont
Councillor Jocelyn MacKay – Leduc County
Mayor Lisa Magera - Legal

Mayor Linda Osinchuk – Strathcona County
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord
Mayor Greg Krischke – City of Leduc
Mayor Don Faulkner - Calmar
Councillor Bill Purdy - Wabamun
Mayor Karl Hauch - Bruderheim
Mayor Paul Krauskopf - Morinville
Mayor Anita Fisher - Devon
Councillor Phyllis Kobasiuk - Parkland
Mayor Houston – Spruce Grove
Mayor Mel Smith - Redwater
Reeve Wayne Woldanski – Lamont County

Absent:
Ivan Moore – Government of Alberta

CRB Administration:
Jim Simpson, Interim Chief Executive Officer
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Kim Wieringa, Project Manager

Brendan Pinches, Associate Project Manager
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Courtney Andrews, Executive Assistant
Allyson Jacques, Administrative Assistant
This meeting was open to the public except for agenda items 11 – 12, which were held in-camera.

Open to Public

1. Call to Order and Chair’s opening remarks
   Called to order at 9:02 a.m.
   The Chair informed members that the CRB February meeting would begin at 9:30 a.m. at the Chateau Louis Conference Centre following the AUMA, MLA Breakfast. The Chair reminded members to submit any remaining per diem claims for 2012. The Chair also thanked Jim Simpson for his service as Interim CEO to the Board.

2. Approval of Agenda
   
   Motion: To approve the agenda of January 10, 2013.
   
   Moved by Mayor Boyd.
   Motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Minutes of December 13, 21012
   It was noted that the vote on the motion put forward by Mayor Rigney regarding Item 5a should read 5 in favour and 19 opposed. CRB Administration noted the error and will revise the minutes.

   Motion: To accept the minutes of December 13, 2012, as revised.
   
   Moved by Mayor Katchur.
   Motion carried unanimously.

4. Representation from the Public

5. REF Applications

6. Land Use
   a. GIS Demonstration
      Mayor Fisher provided an overview of the item.

      9:11 a.m. Mayor Rigney replaced Councillor Shaw as Sturgeon County’s representative.

      Doug Olson, President from O2 Planning + Design gave a presentation regarding the GIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project. He highlighted the purpose, the major findings and recommendations and the benefits the Project could potentially provide to the CRB municipalities. Andrew Bjorn, Planner from O2 + Design was also at the table.

      CRB Administration noted that the Project has some CRB funding in its Interim 2013 Budget.
Mayor Krauskopf put forward a motion.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve that this matter be postponed to the March 2013 Board Meeting.

**Moved by** Mayor Krauskopf.

12 in favour, 12 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion failed.**

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the CRGIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project Report, subject to available funding and resources, as recommended by the Land Use Committee.

**Moved by** Mayor Fisher.

14 in favour, 10 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion failed.**

Following Item 7a, Mayor Krischke put forward a motion for the Board to reconsider the postponement of the GIS Project Report.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board reconsider the GIS demonstration postponement motion.

**Moved by** Mayor Krischke.

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

Deputy Mayor Kobasiuk requested a friendly amendment to the postponement motion to change the date to April 2013 instead of March 2013. Mayor Krauskopf accepted the friendly amendment.

**Amended Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve that this matter be postponed to the April 2013 Board Meeting.

**Moved by** Mayor Krauskopf. **Motion carried unanimously.**

7. Governance
   a. Population & Employment Projection Models

   Mayor Berube introduced the item. Interim CEO, Jim Simpson provided an overview of the background and rationale for the Project indicating that the Alberta Government agreed with the macro level projections as presented in the Report.

   The Consultants that worked on the Project, Mr. Ernie Stokes, Stokes Economic Consulting and Mr. Tom McCormack, Strategic Projections gave a presentation on the Capital Region projections highlighting the major assumptions and by what method the Macro and Micro level projections were developed in the three scenarios – low, medium and high - for the
Region. The Consultants provided additional detail on how the Capital Region projections by municipality, for population and employment, were generated for the Region.

Mayor Katchur put forward a motion.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board refer the Population and Employment Projections to CRB Administration for further review with municipal administrations.

**Moved by Mayor Katchur.**

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

10:05 a.m. Mayor Magera left the table as Legal’s representative.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the updated Population and Employment Projections as recommended by the Governance Committee.

**Moved by Mayor Berube.**

**Motion postponed.**

b. North Saskatchewan Regional Plan, Regional Advisory Council (RAC) – CRB Representation

Mayor Berube provided an overview of the discussions and recommendation from the Governance Committee.

Mayor Osinchuk put forward a motion.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board table the nomination of a representative(s) to the Regional Advisory Council for the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan until an official invitation is received from the Government of Alberta.

**Moved by Mayor Osinchuk.**

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

**Motion:** The Governance Committee recommends to the Capital Region Board that the Land Use Committee Chair or a Strathcona County representative be nominated as the Capital Region Board’s representative on the Regional Advisory Council for the North Saskatchewan Regional Plan.

**Moved by Mayor Berube.**

**Motion tabled.**

8. **Committee Reports**

   a. Land Use Committee

      Mayor Fisher provided an overview of the recent work and future initiatives of the Land Use Committee.

   b. Governance Committee
Mayor Berube provided a brief update on the work of the Governance Committee.

9. Administrative Issues

10. Motion: That the CRB move to in camera session.
    Moved by Mayor Skinner.
    Motion carried unanimously.

In Camera

11. Advocacy Committee – update

12. Motion: That the CRB revert to public.
    Moved by Mayor Nimmo.
    Motion carried unanimously.

Open to Public

13. Adjournment
    Meeting adjourned at 11:33 a.m.
REF 2012-019, Parkland County
Proposed Municipal Development Plan Amendment
Proposed New Area Structure Plan - Acheson

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves the proposed amendment to the Parkland County Municipal Development Plan and New Acheson Area Structure Plan in accordance with the Regional Evaluation Framework.

Background

On November 27, 2012 the CRB received an application from Parkland County (the County) for approval of a proposed amendment to the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) and a proposed new Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan (ASP) to replace the existing ASP.

An administrative recommendation to approve the subject application (attached) and a Third Party Consultant evaluation (attached) indicating compliance with the Growth Plan were posted to the CRB website on January 7, 2013. A Chief Administrative Officers (CAO) Subcommittee was convened on January 15, 2013.

The CAO Subcommittee waived presentations by the County and the Third Party Consultant requesting that they proceed directly to questions of clarification and discussion. The Subcommittee engaged in a discussion about the merits and concerns of approving the application. Following the discussion, four CAO’s supported approval of the application and one was opposed. In this regard, the Subcommittee was unable to approve the application unanimously. According to the approved CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF), when a CAO Subcommittee is unable to achieve unanimous approval, the application will be forwarded to the next Board meeting for disposition.

CAO Subcommittee Summary

The CRB Administrative Procedures for the Regional Evaluation Framework require CRB Administration to prepare a written summary of the CAO Subcommittee’s concerns with respect to the application for the Board’s information.

The concerns upon which the REF application did not receive unanimous approval are as follows:

1. The Employment Projection for the Acheson ASP exceeds the Growth Plan Employment Forecast.
2. There needs to be efficient use of land and the combined nature of the industrial-commercial designation is too broad to understand the land use implications of approving the ASP and any downstream impacts that may result in unanticipated infrastructure costs.
3. There is no information regarding land uses in the future study area immediately on our border, therefore the application is premature and potentially incomplete, requiring additional discussions so that infrastructure needed to support the ultimate development can be planned for well in advance.

4. There is a lack of information on who pays for the boundary related infrastructure costs ie. Interchanges, servicing infrastructure, etc.

In response to the concerns, Parkland County indicated that there is no heavy industry planned for the area, the proposed land uses are not unlike the development that is occurring in the area now.

It was confirmed that Alberta Transportation has completed a functional study for Highway 628 and the future interchange at Highway 60. Parkland County indicated the land use designations proposed in these areas were planned in such a way as to facilitate the protection of the required future road right of ways. The area is currently served by a regional service commission and there were no concerns identified with the extension of the existing services.

The County advised that work on the plan has been ongoing for over 4 years and that there has been significant consultation with the cities of Spruce Grove and Edmonton regarding intermunicipal interface issues. As a result of the consultations, the Study Areas were introduced in the ASP with the commitment to continue working with Edmonton and Spruce Grove to define the land uses to the benefit of both Parkland County and their neighbours.

The other members of the CAO Subcommittee commented that they were comfortable with the proposal as it pertains to the Growth Plan. Despite the inconsistency with the current employment forecast, it was understood that the population and employment forecast was in the process of being reviewed and updated. Further, the Acheson area is identified as a major employment centre in the Growth Plan where it is expected that jobs are to be directed. The study areas were not a concern. It was apparent that there had been consultations with the adjacent municipalities and that Parkland County was committed to resolving the land use issues in the area through a collaborative effort. With respect to servicing it was evident that Parkland County was working with Alberta Transportation to plan the highway network and the extension of existing contiguous services is consistent with Growth Plan policy. Parkland County was also complimented for incorporating the Wagner Natural Area into the ASP and including policies that support its conservation and protection.

As indicated in the CRB Administrative Recommendation and the Third Party Consultant evaluation, CRB Administration commented that the proposed amendments to Parkland County’s MDP and the new ASP are consistent with the criteria in the Regional Evaluation Framework and the principles and policies of the Growth Plan.
REF 2012-019, Parkland County
Proposed Municipal Development Plan Amendment
Proposed New Area Structure Plan - Acheson

Recommendation

CRB Administration recommends that REF application 2012-019 be approved.

Background:

On November 27, 2012 the CRB received an application from Parkland County (the County) for approval of a proposed amendment to the Municipal Development Plan (MDP) and a proposed new Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan (ASP) to replace the existing ASP. The County submitted the application pursuant to the following submission criteria in the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF):

Section 3.1 A municipality must refer any proposed new Intermunicipal Development Plan or Municipal Development Plan and any proposed amendment to an Intermunicipal Development Plan or Municipal Development Plan.

And,

Section 3.2 A Municipality must refer to the Board any other statutory plan or statutory plan amendment where:

a) the following conditions exist:
   (iv) the plan boundaries are within 0.8 km of a road identified in the Regional Transportation Infrastructure map of the Capital Region Growth Plan;
   (v) the plan boundaries are within 1.0km of an approved Inter-municipal Transit route or Park and Ride facility as identified by the Capital Region Growth Plan (Figures 8, 9 or 10 of the Capital Region Inter-municipal Transit Plan) or a Transportation Master Plan as approved by the City of Edmonton.

b) the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment proposes land uses that would add to, alter, interrupt or interfere with:
   (ii) the distribution, expansion, and/or integrated development of regional infrastructure, and recreation, transportation and utility corridors as identified on the Regional Transportation Infrastructure, Regional Water and Wastewater Infrastructure, Regional Water and Wastewater Infrastructure, Regional Power Infrastructure and Regional Corridor maps in the Capital Region Growth Plan or conservation buffers as shown on the Regional Buffers Areas map of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

CRB Administration deemed the application complete on December 3, 2012.
The Application

Parkland County is proposing to replace the existing ASP for the Acheson Industrial Area. The MDP is being amended to ensure consistency between the two statutory plans.

The amendments to the MDP include adding policies regarding servicing extensions into Acheson and servicing within the Acheson ASP; rewording of a policy regarding the Fringe Area; adding policy statements regarding Acheson Industrial Study Area A and Study Area B; replacing a policy regarding the Fringe Area south of Highway 16; and amending related maps to reflect the changes to the text and policies, and the new Acheson ASP.

The new Acheson Industrial ASP updates the original ASP to align with the Capital Region Growth Plan. The new ASP proposes an updated transportation network based on current Alberta Transportation direction and the roadway improvements identified in the County’s Draft Transportation Master Plan; updated and comprehensive water, sanitary and stormwater plans that extend municipal servicing throughout the entire ASP area; and expands the boundary of the Acheson Industrial ASP to include the Wagner Natural Area and lands to the south and west of the Wagner Natural Area.

Evaluation

CRB Administration obtained the assistance of ParioPlan planning consultants to evaluate the application with respect to the REF requirements. ParioPlan’s evaluation (attached) reviewed the proposal in relation to the objectives of the Growth Plan in section 11 of the Regulation, the Principles and Policies of the Growth Plan, and the evaluation criteria in section 5.4 of the Regional Evaluation Framework. ParioPlan’s evaluation recommends approval of the proposed amendment to the Municipal Development Plan and new Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan.

CRB Administration Comments

The purpose of the Regional Evaluation Framework is to ensure consistency of proposed statutory plan(s) with long term regional interests identified in the Capital Region Board Regulation and the Capital Region Growth Plan.

The proposed MDP amendments and new ASP present a comprehensive plan that will guide the future long term industrial/commercial development of an existing major employment centre located within a Priority Growth Area of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

The Growth Plan defines a Priority Growth Area (PGA) as:

“Locations where growth is directed, including Major Employment Areas, due to existing or planned multi modal transportation corridors, the proximity to existing or proposed major employment areas, the redevelopment or intensification opportunities within an existing urban area, and the ability to utilize and maximize existing infrastructure or logically and efficiently extend that infrastructure.”
The proposal updates the planning of an existing major employment area as shown on the Growth Plan’s PGA map. The area has excellent access to the regional transportation facilities including highway and rail. The proposal also supports exploring the potential for developing transit throughout the plan area.

The development plans to maximize the use of the existing infrastructure and support the logical and efficient extension of water and sanitary services throughout the plan area. Redevelopment and intensification opportunities are supported by policies requiring existing developments connect to municipal water and sewer services.

The proposal supports integrated planning with adjacent land uses, developments and stakeholders in the area and region. The Plan establishes policies to ensure that key environmental and natural areas in the ASP area, such as the Wagner Natural Area, are protected from incompatible development through the use of land use buffers. Further, Acheson is located between the City of Spruce Grove and the residential and commercial areas of West Edmonton. Two areas that interface with these municipalities have been identified as Special Study Areas in the ASP. The ASP requires joint planning with Edmonton and Spruce Grove to identify compatible land uses between suburban residential development and industrial development, and to identify development options that are mutually beneficial to both the County and the Cities.

The proposed amendments and area structure plan support regional economic development. Acheson is a designated area to support industrial, manufacturing, trading and transportation activities and services for the Region. The plan provides for a wide variety of employment opportunities, ensures an adequate supply of land is available for future industrial development, and supports further diversification of the Region’s economy.

The only concern in the evaluation was the employment forecast. The proposed employment forecast is significantly higher than the Growth Plan forecast through 2044. However, the time frame for build out of the ASP is anticipated to be greater than 30 years. In the absence of an overall growth strategy for the PGA’s, it is difficult to evaluate the size or capacity of any major employment centre, and suggest that the proposal is without merit based on either the plan area or the potential employment generation over the next 35 years.

In summary the proposed MDP amendment and new ASP meet with the overall intent of the Growth Plan. The plan expands upon and enhances the policies for an existing major industrial centre. It requires municipal servicing within a future urban area (PGA A). It incorporates an environmentally significant area in the region and establishes policy to protect the area from further degradation and encroachment. It maximizes the economic potential for the area and region. It recognizes that certain areas within the plan area require more consultation and coordination with neighbouring municipalities. And finally, it includes policy to explore the potential of transit in the plan area.

CRB Administration agrees with the third party’s evaluation of the proposed MDP amendments and new ASP in relation to the Growth Plan and section 11 of the CRB Regulation.
Recommendation

CRB Administration recommends that REF application 2012-019 be approved.

Attachments:

Evaluation: ParioPlan Evaluation

REF Documents:
  Council meeting minutes November 20, 2012 Unadopted
  Council meeting minutes November 6, 2012
  Acheson Consultation Summary Report 2012
  Council Report - proposed Bylaw 32-2012
  Council Report - proposed Bylaw 33-2012
  Bylaw 32-2012 Acheson Industrial ASP
  Draft Acheson Industrial ASP
  Bylaw 20-97 - Acheson Industrial ASP
  Admin Report - November 6, 2012
  Administration presentation to Council
  Bylaw 33-2012 MDP amendment - FINAL
  MDP Schedule A
  MDP Schedule B
  MDP Schedule C
  Parkland County MDP 37-2007
  CRB Submission letter - Parkland County Acheson
Parkland County Municipal Development Plan Amendment
Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan

☐ New Plan – Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan
☐ Amendment – Parkland County Municipal Development Plan

Board Reference Number: REF 2012-019

Proposed Municipality Bylaw Nos.:
   32-2012 (Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan)
   33-2012 (Parkland County Municipal Development Plan)

Introduction
The Province has adopted the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) as the criteria for the Capital Region Board’s evaluation of statutory plans. The purpose of the REF is to allow the Capital Region Board to evaluate new statutory plans and statutory plan amendments to ensure consistency with the Capital Region Growth Plan and Capital Region Board Regulations.

Pursuant to Section 3.1 of the REF:

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

Pursuant to Section 3.2 of the REF:

A Municipality must refer to the Board any other statutory plan or statutory plan amendment where:

a) the following conditions exist:
   (i) the plan boundaries are within 0.8 km of a road identified in the Regional Transportation Infrastructure map of the Capital Region Growth Plan;
   (v) the plan boundaries are within 1.0 km of an approved Inter-municipal Transit route or Park and Ride facility as identified by the Capital Region Growth Plan (Figures 8, 9 or 10 of the Capital Region Inter-municipal Transit Plan) or a Transportation Master Plan as approved by the City of Edmonton.

b) the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment proposes land uses that would add to, alter, interrupt or interfere with:
   (ii) the distribution, expansion, and/or integrated development of regional infrastructure, and recreation, transportation and utility corridors as identified on the Regional Transportation Infrastructure, Regional Water and Wastewater Infrastructure, Regional Water and Wastewater Infrastructure, Regional Power Infrastructure and Regional Corridor maps in the Capital Region Growth Plan or
conservation buffers as shown on the Regional Buffers Areas map of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

Background and Purpose

**Municipality:** Parkland County  
**Applicant** Parkland County  
**First Reading Dates:** October 9, 2012 (Bylaw 32-2012); October 9, 2012 (Bylaw 33-2012)

**Proposed Changes:** Amendments are proposed to align the Parkland County MDP and the new Acheson ASP. The amendments to the Parkland County MDP consist of adding policies regarding servicing extensions into Acheson and servicing within the Acheson ASP; rewording of a policy regarding the Fringe Area; adding a policy regarding Acheson Industrial Study Area B; replacing a policy regarding the Fringe Area South of Highway 16; and, adding a policy regarding Acheson Industrial Study Area A. Map changes occur on Map 2, Map 3 and Map 11-1 to reflect the changes to the text and policies, and the new Acheson ASP.

The new Acheson Industrial ASP includes information which has been updated from the original ASP to ensure the plan complies with the regulations of the Capital Region Growth Plan. The new ASP proposes an updated transportation network based on current Alberta Transportation direction; and, updated and comprehensive water, sanitary and stormwater plans that extend required municipal servicing through the entire ASP area. In addition, the boundary of the new Acheson Industrial ASP is expanded to include the Wagner Natural Area and lands to the south and west of the Wagner Natural Area.

Recommendations

That the Parkland County Municipal Development Plan Amendment and the Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan be APPROVED.

Summary/Discussion

The proposed amendment to the Parkland County Municipal Development Plan (MDP) and the accompanying proposed Acheson Industrial Area Structure Plan (ASP) are the result of Parkland County Council directing County Staff to prepare a new Acheson ASP and amend the Parkland County MDP to have them align with the Capital Region Growth Plan (CRGP) by ensuring they adhere to the policies contained in the CRGP. Reference to the Capital Region Growth Plan is found in the proposed Acheson ASP.

The proposed Acheson ASP has been drafted to replace the current 15-year old Acheson ASP and to set development direction for 20 to 30 years out. The ASP includes policies to ensure compliance with relevant CRB policies and regulations outlined in the Growth Plan. The boundary of the ASP is changed...
to incorporate the Wagner Natural Area and lands to the west and south of the existing ASP area. In addition, Special Study Areas have been identified in the ASP to ensure future uses in these areas are determined through joint planning endeavors with the City of Spruce Grove and the City of Edmonton. In the Special Study Areas, existing and non intensive land uses shall be allowed to continue until further studies are completed.

The ASP includes updated and comprehensive water, sanitary and stormwater plans that extend municipal servicing through the entire ASP and proposes an updated transportation network based on current direction from Alberta Transportation and roadway improvements identified in Parkland County’s draft Transportation Master Plan. Heavy Industrial uses are prohibited and no new residential development is allowed. Open space opportunities are enhanced with consideration to develop a trail network linking natural areas, Municipal Reserve parcels and stormwater management facilities.

The proposed amendment to the Parkland County MDP ensures both the MDP and the Acheson Industrial ASP are consistent with one another (Section 638 of the Municipal Government Act).

Highlights from the proposed MDP amendment are listed as follows:

- **Policy 5.8 Servicing Extensions into Acheson** added in Section 5 – Industrial and Commercial Development regarding servicing extensions into Acheson

- **Policy 10.21 Municipal Servicing of Acheson Industrial Area** added in Section 10 – Transportation and Utilities regarding municipal servicing of Acheson Industrial area

- **Policy 11.5 Fringe Area** reworded in Section 11 – Fringe Area Development regarding areas adjacent to neighboring municipalities

- **Policy 11.6 Acheson Industrial Study Area B** added in Section 11 – Fringe Area Development regarding consultations with the City of Edmonton on future land use designations in Special Study Area B

- **Policy 11.8 Fringe Area South of Highway 16** deleted and replaced in Section 11 – Fringe Area Development regarding the Fringe Area for the City of Spruce Grove (The referral area includes lands contained in Map 11-1 categorized as Referral Area - Spruce Grove)

- **Policy 11.9 Acheson Industrial Study Area A** added to Section 11 – Fringe Area Development regarding consultations with the City of Spruce Grove on future land use designations in Special Study Area A

As well, changes are made to Map 2 (Land Use Concept Map), Map 3 (Parkland County Area Structure Plans) and Map 11-1 (City of Spruce Grove Fringe Areas) to support the policy changes listed above.

**Evaluation Criteria**

Section 5.4 of the REF outlines the criteria which must be considered in the review and evaluation of a statutory plan or statutory plan amendment.

**5.4(a) Compatibility of the development with the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan as set out in Section 11 of the Regulation;**
11(a) to promote an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Capital Region;

The proposed Parkland County MDP and the Acheson Industrial ASP include policies to promote an integrated and strategic approach to development by extending services in this area in a logical and efficient manner; by integrating transportation planning with Alberta Transportation priorities; and, by increasing the referral area adjacent to the City of Spruce Grove.

The proposed Acheson Industrial ASP addresses employment growth in the context of Parkland County and the Capital Region, it addresses connections to existing water and sanitary services in Parkland County and it addresses locating future servicing infrastructure into regional corridors.

11(b)(i) to identify the overall development pattern and key future infrastructure investments that would best complement existing infrastructure, services and land uses in the Capital Region;

The Acheson Industrial ASP expands the boundary of the ASP to the City of Spruce Grove boundary. The expanded area contains the Wagner Natural Area and Special Study Area A, and adds to the existing Spruce Grove Referral Area used jointly in determining future land uses for this area. Parkland County will continue to work with Alberta Transportation on required upgrades to Highway 60 and 628 (for example), contributing to the overall transportation network for the Capital Region; and, Parkland County will undertake a transit feasibility study to explore the potential to develop a future transit network for Acheson. The ASP includes a policy to encourage the creation of potential future spur lines in Acheson by promoting businesses that require rail transport to locate adjacent to the CNR main line. As a result, future industrial commercial uses within the Acheson area may lead to expansion of rail service in this area. The Acheson Industrial ASP is a significant employment area in the Capital Region.

11(b)(ii) to identify the overall development pattern and key future infrastructure investments that would maximize benefits to the Capital Region;

The proposed Parkland County MDP Amendment and the Acheson Industrial ASP include policies to promote Transportation Planning; to complete a Transportation Master Plan for Acheson; to undertake a study on the Highway 60 and 628 interchange and other transportation investments to improve the transportation network in the Edmonton Region.

In coordinating decisions regarding overall land use with adjoining municipalities, the Acheson ASP identifies two locations for future planning consideration: Special Study Area A and Special Study Area B.

Special Study Area A requires further detailed study due to its proximity to the Wagner Natural Area and proximity to the City of Spruce Grove. Future land uses in Special Study Area A will be
informed through independent ecological studies undertaken by Parkland County, joint planning
initiatives with the City of Spruce Grove, and consultations with landowners and stakeholders.
The amendment to the Parkland County MDP identifies this area (Special Study Area A) as
“Referral Area – Spruce Grove” which establishes a reciprocal planning referral mechanism to
respect the interests of the County and the City of Spruce Grove on joint planning matters for
this area.

Special Study Area B includes 258 hectares (638 acres) of land immediately west of Hillview
Road and the Lewis Estates neighborhood in Edmonton. Study Area B requires further planning
study to identify compatible land uses between suburban residential development and
industrial development, and to identify development options that are mutually beneficial to
both Parkland County and the City of Edmonton.

Timing for development in both special study areas is contingent upon completion of required
planning studies, joint planning endeavors with neighboring municipalities, the approval of
Alberta Transportation plans and approved servicing agreements. Development of these lands
is not anticipated in the next twenty (20) years. In the meantime, existing, non intensive land
uses in special study areas shall be allowed to continue until future land uses have been
designated and all required statutory and regulatory plan amendments have been approved.

While the future land use of these Special Study Areas has not been defined at this time, the
delineation of these Special Study Areas meet the overall intent of the CRGP by adopting a
collaborative approach between neighboring municipalities in determining future land uses for
adjoining areas. A policy of the CRGP, reflected in the Acheson ASP, is that municipalities shall
protect existing and future land uses from incompatible uses through an appropriate transition
of land uses. The transitional uses will be determined by the appropriate assessment conducted
by the affected member municipalities.

11(c) to co-ordinate decisions in the Capital Region to sustain economic growth and ensure
strong communities and a healthy environment;

The Acheson Industrial ASP includes objectives and policies to coordinate transportation
matters with Alberta Transportation and surrounding municipalities in maximizing the
effectiveness of the regional infrastructure network.

The expanded employment opportunities and expanded industrial tax base in the ASP
contribute significantly to economic growth in the Capital Region.

Integrating planning issues in the Capital Region is essential to building complete and strong
communities. The amendment to the Parkland County MDP and the new Acheson Industrial
ASP include policies to improve the development of regional infrastructure and to increase
communication with neighboring municipalities and provincial departments. Policies are
included to protect the environment during construction, operation and site reclamation in
Acheson; and, to promote the use of green building materials and energy efficient technologies to reduce environmental impacts. The ASP supports a healthy environment by including policies to protect the Wagner Natural Area and Recharge Zone.

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

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

i) Buffer areas as shown on the Regional Buffers Area Map in the Capital Region Growth Plan;

The Acheson Industrial ASP is expanded by 462 hectares (1,142 acres) on the west side to include the Wagner Natural Area and land south and west of the natural area. The Wagner Natural Area is designated in the ASP as a Natural Area which ensures compliance with the Conservation Buffer designation defined for this area in the CRGP. In addition, the ASP creates Special Study Area A for the lands south and west of the Wagner Natural Area (including part of the Wagner Recharge Zone) which requires Parkland County to undertake an ecological assessment to determine an appropriate buffer and transition of land uses.

ii) Priority Growth Areas a shown on the Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential map in the Capital Region Growth Plan;

The subject land is located within Priority Growth Area A. The area of the Acheson Industrial ASP is a significant employment center within the PGA and is expected to continue experiencing significant employment growth to final build-out.

iii) Cluster Country Residential Areas as shown on the Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential map in the Capital Region Growth Plan;

NOT APPLICABLE.

iv) Density targets as outlined in the Capital Region Growth Plan;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absorbed and Unabsorbed Commercial Industrial Land</th>
<th>Absorbed (ha)</th>
<th>Unabsorbed (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGAs</td>
<td>13,045</td>
<td>14,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acheson</td>
<td>683.8</td>
<td>1,245.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed Acheson Industrial ASP does not propose any additional residential within the plan area and therefore the residential density targets outlined in the Capital Region Growth Plan are not applicable to this application.
The Acheson Industrial ASP is a significant employment center in the region and projected employment figures have a considerable impact on employment within the Capital Region.

v) Outside Priority Growth Areas.

NOT APPLICABLE.

5.4(b)(ii) The regional population and employment forecasts in the Capital Region Growth Plan.

No additional residential development is proposed in the Acheson Industrial ASP; consequently, the regional population forecasts remain unchanged for this area of Parkland County.

The Acheson ASP does provide employment projections based on current industrial and commercial growth in the plan area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7,552</td>
<td>8,770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The employment projections provided in the new Acheson Industrial ASP are based on the Alternative Scenario employment projections from the Capital Region Population & Employment Projections Report, Appendix 1, March 2009 using the 2.6% growth rate for Parkland County. Revised population and employment projections are contained in the Capital Region Growth Plan Addendum, December 2009, which was produced after the global financial crisis began in 2008, and project more modest employment growth for Parkland County. However, both of these documents recognized Acheson as the largest employment area in Parkland County and a significant employment centre in the Capital Region. Given the employment growth Acheson is currently experiencing, it may be reasonable to consider the higher, Alternative Growth Scenario originally proposed in the March 2009 projections.

Updating the regional population and employment forecasts are part of the ongoing review and update of the Capital Region Growth Plan. Population and employment forecasts, prepared at the municipal level, will continue to be updated to reflect trends as well as the actual pace and location of development in the Capital Region, such as Acheson.

In 2012, Parkland County estimated 5,400 existing jobs in the Acheson Industrial ASP. The ASP uses the 2012 estimate as a base employment figure and projects full build-out to be twenty (20) to thirty (30) years. Over this period, The Acheson Industrial ASP projects approximately 9,900 new jobs (at the CRGP 2.6% rate) for a total of approximately 15,300 jobs at full build-out. The Capital Region Growth Plan Addendum, December 2009, projects employment figures to 2044 (approximately 30 years) showing an
The earlier projection for Parkland County from the *Capital Region Population & Employment Projections Report, Appendix 1, March 2009,* to 2043 (thirty years) shows an increase of 8,440 jobs to a total of 17,347.

The ASP employment projections are in line with the high estimates from the *Capital Region Population & Employment Projections Report (Appendix 1, March 2009).* The base employment number used in the ASP is estimated from current Parkland County data (2012) and projected at the 2.6% CRGP rate for the Capital Region (Alternate Scenario) over a thirty (30) year period. As a significant regional employment centre, in a region experiencing a healthy rate of growth, Acheson is anticipated to continue growing at a higher rate of growth.

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

The Regional Transportation Infrastructure map shows existing and future regional transportation infrastructure in the Parkland County and Acheson Industrial area of the Capital Region. Policy 6.3.2.7 directs Parkland County to assist Alberta Transportation with required upgrades to Highways 60 and 628 by assisting with right-of-way land acquisition, and providing technical assistance where required to external agencies including the City of Edmonton and Alberta Transportation. The south part of the ASP along Highway 628 is designated Industrial Holdings (Fringe area in the MDP amendment) until the actual amount of required land for the upgrades is known. Once the land requirements have been confirmed by Alberta Transportation, excess lands identified as Industrial Holdings may be redesignated as industrial commercial in the ASP.

5.4(b)(iv) The Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan of the Capital Region Growth Plan (Figure 8, 9, or 10 of the Capital Region Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan), and a Transportation Master Plan as approved by the City of Edmonton.

Intermunicipal bus service currently exists on Highway 16 immediately north of the Acheson Industrial plan area and long-term intermunicipal bus is anticipated along Highway 16A. The Acheson Industrial ASP, within Policy 6.3.2.24, directs Parkland County to undertake a transit feasibility study to explore the potential to develop a future transit network for Acheson. The study shall identify potential ridership numbers, transit network staging and potential transit stops, routes and stations.

5.4(b)(v) The regional infrastructure, and recreation, transportation and utility corridors as identified in the Regional Transportation Infrastructure, Regional Water and Wastewater Infrastructure, Regional Power Infrastructure, and Regional Corridors maps of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

The Acheson Industrial ASP addresses regional infrastructure, recreation, transportation, utility corridors, regional transportation infrastructure and regional corridors. Policy 6.2.1.3, for
example, directs Parkland County to locate future servicing infrastructure into regional corridors that may be identified by the Capital Region Board, and to protect such corridors from incompatible development.

5.4(b)(vi) The boundaries of policies of Alberta's Industrial Heartland Area Structure plans and the Edmonton International Airport Area Structure Plan.

NOT APPLICABLE.
The Parkland County MDP amendment and the Acheson Industrial ASP must be consistent with the Land Use Principles and Policies of the Regional Growth Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Growth Plan Land Use Principles and Policies</th>
<th>Consistent</th>
<th>Evaluation/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect Environment and Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Preserve and protect the environment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Proposed policies in Section 6.2 – Servicing and Section 6.5 – Environment require on-site stormwater management; compliance with Alberta Environment water licensing requirements; and, the protection of wetlands and low-lying areas. Policy 6.5.2.8 directs all development to protect the environment at all stages including construction, operation and site reclamation. Policy 6.2.2.2 states that new and existing developments shall comply to all applicable federal and provincial regulations as they relate to human health and environmental protection when constructing, operating or expanding servicing systems. The CRB Growth Plan has identified lands around Wagner Natural Area as a Conservation Buffer. Consistent with Policy 2.7 (a) and (b) of the 2009 Growth Plan Addendum, the proposed Acheson ASP has identified lands around the Wagner Natural Area as “Special Study Area A” and Parkland County will proceed with necessary ecological studies to determine an appropriate setback and transition of land uses to any potential future adjacent development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Preserve agricultural lands</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>The Acheson Industrial ASP allows existing agricultural use to continue until phasing of industrial development requires land to be converted for industrial and commercial uses. The ASP proposes policies to maintain the AGG (Agricultural General) and AGR (Agricultural Restricted) land uses in the Parkland County Land Use Bylaw to allow land owners the ability to continue existing agricultural uses on lands south and west of the Wagner Natural Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Protect natural resources</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Policy 6.9.2.1 is included to manage encroachment relative to oil and gas infrastructure through the use of easements or separately titled parcels that shall protect land within the setback are from future development. Restrictive covenants shall also be used to protect oil and gas infrastructure from</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Minimize the impact of development on regional watersheds and airsheds

**d)** Minimize the impact of development on regional watersheds and airsheds

- **Status:** ✔️

  Within the objectives and policies concerning the environment, the proposed Acheson ASP, through Policy 6.5.2.9 directs all development within the plan area to manage all environmental nuisances (light, sound, dust and noise pollution) on-site. Also, all developments shall adhere to federal and provincial policies related to air and water pollution standards.

### Minimize Regional Footprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>a)</strong> Identify, protect, and prioritize lands for regional infrastructure</th>
<th>✔️</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed Acheson ASP includes objectives and policies to protect regional (infrastructure) corridors from incompatible development. Policy 6.3.2.7, for example, directs Parkland County to assist Alberta Transportation with required upgrades to Highways 60 and 628 by assisting with right-of-way land acquisition, and provincial technical assistance where required to external agencies including the City of Edmonton and Alberta Transportation. Policy 6.2.1.3 locates future servicing infrastructure into regional corridors that may be identified by the Capital Region Board, and to protect such corridors from incompatible development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>b)</strong> Concentrate new growth within Priority Growth Areas</th>
<th>✔️</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acheson is identified as a major employment centre within Priority Growth Area A. The proposed Acheson ASP focuses industrial development within the plan area and incorporates a more intensive form of development by requiring industrial and commercial development to be fully serviced by municipal water and sewer.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>c)</strong> Allow growth outside of Priority Growth Areas</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>d)</strong> Support expansion of medium and higher density residential housing forms</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy 6.6.2.2 states that no new multi lot residential subdivision shall occur in the ASP area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>e)</strong> Support cluster country residential development</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New residential development is not permitted in the ASP area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strengthen Communities

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Create inclusive communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Strong and inclusive communities are created with strong social infrastructure including</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recreational facilities, parks and open spaces. Policy 6.7.2.8 of the new Acheson Industrial ASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorporates the development of trails in the construction of new stormwater management facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in Acheson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Support healthy communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Policies in the Acheson Industrial ASP support development of park space and regional partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to program the cost of these spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Support public transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ The Acheson ASP includes a policy (Policy 6.3.2.24) to undertake a transit feasibility study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to explore the potential to develop a future transit network for Acheson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Support innovative and affordable housing options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a No new residential uses are permitted in the proposed Acheson Industrial ASP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Increase Transportation Choice

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Integrate transportation systems with land use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ The proposed Acheson ASP proposes to complete a Transportation Master Plan (Policy 6.3.2.5) to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incorporate all proposed transportation improvements required by Alberta Transportation. The ASP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>also encourages the creation of potential future spur lines (Policy 6.3.2.22) by promoting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>businesses that require rail transport to locate adjacent to the CNR main line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Support the expansion of transit services in various forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ The Acheson ASP includes a policy (Policy 6.3.2.24) to undertake a transit feasibility study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to explore the potential to develop a future transit network for Acheson.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ensure Efficient Provision of Services

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Design integrated physical infrastructure within the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ The proposed Acheson ASP includes objectives for servicing including one objective to locate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>future servicing infrastructure into regional corridors that may be identified by the Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region Board and to protect such corridors from incompatible development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Maximize utilization of existing infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ The Acheson Industrial ASP includes policies that support the logical and effective extension of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>servicing infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy 5.8 Servicing Extension into Acheson (from the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
MDP amendment) identifies that the County will continue to encourage the extension of piped water and sewer services into the Acheson Business Industrial Park.

Existing policies in the Parkland County MDP support the regional water and wastewater services with no changes proposed to these policies through this proposed amendment to the Parkland County MDP.

### Support Regional Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Support Regional Economic Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Ensure a supply of land to sustain a variety of economic development activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Attract and retain individuals and families with a diverse range of skills to the Capital Region to satisfy the region’s economic development goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Support regional prosperity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Position the Capital Region competitively on the world stage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Request to Change Fiscal Year End

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves the request to Alberta Municipal Affairs to change the CRB’s financial year end from December 31 to a financial year end of March 31.

Background

- As per the Municipal Government Act and the Capital Region Board regulation, the CRB financial year end is December 31.
- The CRB prepares an audited financial statement as of December 31.
- As per our funding agreement with the Province of Alberta, the CRB is required to prepare unaudited financial statements for the year ended March 31 which coincides with the Province.

Rationale

- The Capital Region board would save time and funds with the auditor preparing one financial year end and performing one audit.
- Having different financial year ends creates confusion with the amount of funding under the Provincial funding agreement.
Committee’s Terms of Reference

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves the changes to the Committee’s terms of reference as approved by the Governance Committee.

Rationale

- Changes were made to clarify the selection of the Chair of all CRB Committee’s and committee composition.

- Changes were made to clarify the role of the Vice Chair.
BACKGROUND

The Capital Region Growth Plan identifies an ongoing role for a Governance Committee to provide guidance to the Capital Region Board and oversight on matters related to the management and performance of the Board, the implementation of the Capital Region Growth Plan, the governance of the Board and its Committees, and the fulfillment of the Board’s legal, ethical, functional responsibilities and legislative/regulatory/by-law requirements.

RATIONALE

The Capital Region Growth Plan identifies a Vision for the Region’s future. The Capital Region Board (CRB), in partnership with the provincial and the federal governments, industry stakeholders and its residents, has a shared responsibility to ensure the Capital Region’s Vision is realized. Collaboration, coordination and prioritization of regional initiatives among all stakeholders will be required to ensure effective management of growth while enhancing a liveable region for future generations.

The Capital Region Growth Plan identifies a Vision that defines a framework and outcomes for the Region’s future. The Plan also provides for the future governance of the Board, its activities and the “evergreening” of the Plan. Collaboration, coordination and prioritization of regional initiatives among all stakeholders will be required to ensure effective management of growth while ensuring a liveable region for future generations.

The implementation of the Growth Plan across the four principle component areas – Land Use, Intermunicipal Transit, Housing and Geographic Information Services (GIS) will be complex. The Governance Committee will provide an oversight role and source of advice to the Board to ensure that activities are coordinated across all four components of the Growth Plan and future components. This may include the review and development of operational policies and procedures, a Corporate Policy Governance Framework, corporate by-laws and a rolling three-year and annual Business Plan and Budget.

The Board is also required to provide the Minister of Municipal Affairs with an Annual Report on its activities, progress in implementing the Growth Plan and financial performance. As well, the terms of a Grant Agreement from the Provincial Government requires the Board to monitor and report on its performance on a quarterly basis and provide audited financial statements. The Governance Committee, reporting to the Capital Region Board, will be responsible to undertake and oversee the preparation of the Board’s performance and financial reporting documents.

Mandate

The Governance Committee exists to ensure that the Board fulfills its legal, ethical, and functional responsibilities through governance policy development, resourcing, monitoring and reporting on Board activities. It also oversees the performance of the Board and its Committees and their compliance with the Board’s legislative/regulatory mandate, corporate policies and by-laws.
Reporting to the Board, the Governance Committee has the following mandate:

- Provide advice to the Capital Region Board on governance issues.
- Provide advice to guide the development of policy and procedures for the Capital Region Board (i.e. corporate policy and by-laws).
- Oversee the monitoring and reporting of the Board and its Committees performance in implementing the Capital Region Growth Plan.
- On behalf of the Board, coordinate the development and implementation of a rolling three-year Business Plan and Budget, including annual updates.
- Support the Board in meeting its reporting requirements with respect to the legislative/regulatory framework (i.e. Annual Report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs) and any Grant or other legal agreements (i.e. quarterly reporting required by Grant Agreement with the Minister of Municipal Affairs).
- Advise the Board on its resource requirements to implement the Capital Region Growth Plan and the Board’s Business Plan.
- Monitor and review the annual audit and also report to the Board regarding financial performance on a regular basis.
- Assist with the selection of the CRB Chair / Interim Chair and Chief Executive Officer.

This Terms of Reference document defines the current mandate of the Governance Committee. The roles and responsibilities of the Governance Committee may evolve as the legislative/regulatory requirements of the Board change and as the Board’s rolling three-year Business Plan and Budget is developed, approved and implemented.

**COMPOSITION**

The Governance Committee is accountable to the Capital Region Board. It is composed of elected officials from a subset of Board member municipalities. The Capital Region Board will approve which municipalities will be members of the Governance Committee at its initial meeting following a municipal election. This will ensure that community and regional priorities guide decision making and implementation. All elected official Committee members are voting members.

A CRB administrative leader manages the Committee to ensure coordination with Land Use, Housing, Geographic Information Services (GIS) and Regional Transit priorities, other potential regional priorities as identified by the Capital Region Board.

The Chair/Interim Chair of the Board and the Chief Executive Officer attend Committee meetings as non-voting members.

See Appendix 1 for list of Committee members.

**SUPPORT/RESOURCES**

The Governance Committee will be supported by the Chief Executive Officer, Capital Region Board staff and consultant resources, and others as determined through the Board’s annual Business Plan and budget development as approved and allocated by the Capital Region Board. The committee may appoint a sub-
committee(s) to focus on areas of priority. At the request of the Committee, the Chief Executive Officer may establish a working or advisory group as deemed necessary to support the Committee.

**LEADERSHIP**

*Choosing a Committee Chair*

The selection of a new Chair will be administered by the Chief Executive Officer following a municipal election. The Capital Region Board will approve which municipalities will be members of the Governance Committee at its initial meeting following a municipal election.

The Chief Executive Officer will chair the initial meeting of the Governance Committee following a municipal election. The Committee will select a Chair from among the municipalities which are members of the Committee and recommend the appointment of the Chair to the Capital Region Board. The Capital Region Board will ratify the Committee Chair at its next meeting. The Committee Chair’s appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Chair will be reviewed at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Chair or select a new Chair.

If a Committee Chair is required at any other time, the Board may choose a new Committee Chair from members of the Board. The Board may delegate the responsibility to identify a candidate for Chair to the Committee itself, with the Committee’s recommendation to be brought forward to the Board for ratification.

The Chief Executive Officer will chair the initial Governance Committee meeting following an election and will administer the selection of a new Chair at the initial meeting. The Committee will select a Chair from among the municipalities which are members of the Committee.

The Committee Chair’s appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Chair will be reviewed at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Chair or select a new Chair. If a Committee Chair resigns or is unable to act as Chair, is required at any other time, the Committee may choose a new Committee Chair from within the members of the Committee.

*Choosing a Vice Chair*

To maintain continuity and ensure effective and informed Committee leadership during required absences of the Committee Chair, it is advised that a Vice Chair be selected by nomination and vote of the Committee. The Committee’s Vice Chair appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Vice Chair will be reviewed at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Vice Chair or select a new Vice Chair. In the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair will assume all the duties of the Chair.

*Members’ Terms*

The participation of Capital Region municipalities on the Governance Committee is effective until next General Municipal Election. The Board will ratify the Committee’s membership by municipality. Member municipalities will then be able to determine specific elected representatives to Committees once Committee membership is approved by the Board.

It is encouraged that representation by specific elected officials from municipalities remain consistent during General Municipal Election cycle and that rotation of members from a municipality occur no more frequently than once annually to maintain continuity and ensure effective Committee operation.

*Representation to CRB and/or other CRB Committees*
The Chair of the Governance Committee will be responsible for representing the views of the Governance Committee at Board meetings and to other CRB Committees. In the absence of the Chair, the Committee’s Vice Chair will represent the Governance Committee. Other Committee members may be asked to represent the Governance Committee at Board meetings and to other CRB Committees at the request of the Chair.

Further Role of Governance Committee Chair – Vice Chair/Vice Interim Chair of Capital Region Board

According to Capital Region Board Policy G010 – Selection of Chair & Vice Chair/Interim Chair & Vice Interim Chair:

“If there is an Interim Chair of the CRB, the Vice Interim Chair of the CRB is the Chair, Governance Committee”; and

“If there is a Chair of the CRB, the Vice Chair of the CRB is the Chair, Governance Committee”.

The Chair, Governance Committee, as selected by the Committee members and ratified by the Board, has the position of Vice Chair/Vice Interim Chair of the Capital Region Board.

MEETINGS

Schedule of Meetings

Meetings will be held monthly, with additional meetings as required and convened by the Chair. Efforts will be taken to coordinate Committee meeting schedules with the Board’s meeting schedule to ensure timely review and voting of Committee Motions. Quorum is required in order to hold a Committee meeting. Meetings may be called or rescheduled by the Committee Chair as required.

Content of Meeting Agenda

In general, Committee meeting agendas will be determined by the Committee Chair based on delegation of the Board, outstanding Committee motions, decisions, bring forward items as well as the relevance of potential topics to the Committee mandate, Capital Region Board Business Plan, and consistency with intent of the overall mandate identified for the Governance Committee.

Meeting Agendas

In general, meeting Agendas and pre-read materials, where available, are provided one week in advance of a scheduled Governance Committee meeting.

Conduct of Meetings

Committee meetings will be conducted in a manner consistent with the agreed to Norms and Protocols as established by the Committee and with reference to Robert’s Rules of Order.

Status of Meetings

Governance Committee meetings are open to the public including all members of the CRB (elected officials and their alternates), administrative representatives from all CRB member municipalities and members of the public. The Governance Committee may invite individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/Committee members to participate in specific agenda items. Matters emerging from the Committee and voted on will become a matter of public record.
Section 602.08 (1) of the Municipal Government Act (MGA) states that the Committee may close all or part of
their meetings to the public if a matter to be discussed is within one of the exceptions to disclosure in Division
All members (elected and administrative) attending the in camera session shall respect the confidentiality of the in camera items.

Representations from the Public
The Chair of the Governance Committee will approve requests to make representations to the Committee if they believe the presentation content will assist the Committee in its deliberations.

Quorum
A quorum of voting members (fifty percent plus one) which includes designated Committee alternates is required for a valid vote by the Governance Committee.

Voting
Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the Governance Committee, or their designated alternate may vote. Voting by conference call is an acceptable alternative method of voting. Motions require a majority (fifty percent plus one of the members in attendance) vote to pass.

Motions
Motions can be brought forward to the Governance Committee at any time. They can be used to begin the process of achieving understanding and support from Committee members. All motions must be moved by voting member of the Governance Committee. Where the Committee is not prepared to vote on a matter, it can be postponed to a subsequent or special Governance Committee meeting.

Meeting Minutes
Meeting minutes will reflect the decisions and action items taken at each Governance Committee meeting. The actual vote of each Governance Committee voting member will be recorded for future reference at the request of any one Committee member.

ACCOUNTABILITY TO CAPITAL REGION BOARD

Recommendations to CRB
Capital Region Board Committees have no final decision making power. All policy decisions arising from Committees must be reviewed and approved by the Capital Region Board. Committee motions are brought forward to the Capital Region Board where there is a majority of Committee members in support, or where there is consensus that broader Board involvement in a decision is required.

Amendments to the Terms of Reference
The Committee may consider changes to the Terms of Reference and recommend the proposed changes to the Capital Region Board for review and approval, at any time.

Reporting
The Governance Committee will advise the CRB of key activities and progress regularly, primarily at Capital Region Board meetings.
**Dispute Resolution**
The Committee Chair is accountable for ensuring effective and collaborative Committee operations and decision making. Where the Chair’s efforts are unable to resolve a dispute, the matter will be brought to the Capital Region Board for discussion and resolution.

**APPENDIX 1: COMPOSITION**

The Governance Committee includes the following member municipalities as approved by the CRB.

**Voting members:**
- Member – City of Edmonton
- Member – City of St. Albert
- Member – Lamont County
- Member – Strathcona County
- Member – Sturgeon County
- Member – Town of Beaumont
- Member – Town of Redwater
- Member – Village of Wabamun

*As elected by Committee:*
- Committee Chair – Town of Beaumont, Mayor Camille Berube
- Committee Vice-Chair – Strathcona County, Mayor Linda Osinchuk

**Non-Voting members:**
- Capital Region Board Chair/Interim Chair
- Capital Region Board Chief Executive Officer

Capital Region Board staff support/staff resources as designated by the Chief Executive Officer
BACKGROUND

The Capital Region Growth Plan identifies an ongoing advocacy and communications role for the Capital Region Board (Board) to ensure the successful implementation of the Capital Region Growth Plan and any other related matters in support of the Board’s mandate and its legislative requirements.

RATIONALE

The Capital Region Growth Plan identifies a Vision for the Region’s future. The Capital Region Board (CRB), in partnership with the provincial and the federal governments, industry stakeholders and its residents, has a shared responsibility to ensure the Capital Region’s Vision is realized. Collaboration, coordination and prioritization of regional initiatives among all stakeholders will be required to ensure effective management of growth while enhancing a liveable region for future generations.

The implementation of the Growth Plan across the four principle component areas – Land Use, Intermunicipal Transit, Housing and Geographic Information Services (GIS) - is complex. Additional strategic areas of importance may also arise and be identified for action by the CRB. This requires the Board to identify regional priorities and undertake proactive actions to ensure the Board and the Growth Plan receives required support from all stakeholders and vice versa.

A regional Advocacy & Communications Committee, reporting to the Board, will provide the leadership and oversight to coordinate the CRB’s advocacy and communications functions. This Committee is responsible for the development, implementation and where appropriate, execution, of strategic components of the Board’s Advocacy & Communications Strategy. The Committee also complements other Board Committees by operating in an advisory capacity to them. The Advocacy & Communications Committee will provide strategic direction and coordination for the Board’s Advocacy & Communications Strategy consistent with the direction identified in the Growth Plan and annual priorities identified by the Board in its Business Plan.

MANDATE

The Advocacy & Communications Committee exists to coordinate, develop, implement, recommend, execute and monitor the Board’s advocacy and communications activities based on identified priorities within the Board’s Business Plan, and includes the following roles and responsibilities:

  - Strategic Direction
    - To develop an effective Advocacy & Communications Strategy based on regional priorities approved by the Board.
  - Education and Awareness Building
    - To build awareness and understanding amongst regional stakeholders of the Board’s Vision, role and mandate with respect to regional planning and growth management through the development and staged implementation of an education and communications strategy.
Advocacy & Communications Committee – Terms of Reference

- To advise the Board on matters related to intergovernmental relations affecting regional issues of concern to the Board and its mandate.

**Build Partnerships**
- To build effective working relationships with stakeholders which enable progress toward regional priority initiatives, implementation of the Capital Region Growth Plan as well as the achievement of the Board’s mandate and Vision.

**Capacity Building**
- To support Board committees in their advocacy and communications requirements.
- To work with the Board and its committees to formulate positions and responses to provincial and federal issues (legislative, policy and program) affecting the Board.
- To monitor both stakeholders and the public’s general awareness and perception of the Board, its strategic direction, priorities and the Capital Region Growth Plan.
- The Committee may participate in gathering data, resources or partners to implement an advocacy and communications strategy.

**Funding**
- To advocate to orders of government (Provincial and Federal) to ensure adequate and sustainable funding is available for regional priorities as approved by the Board.

**Public Policy**
- To inform and provide recommendations regarding legislative, policy and program issues and opportunities affecting the Board’s mandate and priorities to key federal and provincial governments.

**Priority Setting**
- To collaborate with the Board and its committees to establish regional priorities requiring advocacy or public policy representation based on the Capital Region Growth Plan and the Board’s Business Plan.

**Communications Messages**
- To oversee the development of communications messages representing the Board and committee positions on matters of regional interest and strategic priority in support of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

**Reporting and Evaluation**
- Report to the Board regularly on the status of advocacy and communications initiatives and their outcomes. Evaluation of the Committee and its outcomes will be measured annually based on the approved Advocacy and Communications Strategy.

**Operating Budget**
- To develop annual funding requirements for this Committee to implement the Advocacy and Communications Strategy and other Board approved communications and advocacy activities.

This Terms of Reference defines the mandate of the Advocacy & Communications Committee. The roles and responsibilities of the Committee may evolve as the legislative/regulatory requirements of the Board change and as the Board’s Business Plan is updated.

**COMPOSITION**

The Advocacy & Communications Committee is accountable to the Capital Region Board. It is composed of Chairs of the Board Committees which oversee the Capital Region Growth Plan strategic priorities of Land Use, Housing, Regional Transit and Geographic Information Services (GIS) as well as and three to six members...
at large from the Board’s member municipalities. This representation ensures that community and regional priorities guide decision making and implementation. CRB administration will recommend to the Board which municipalities will be members at large of this Committee in order to represent the region accurately. The Capital Region Board will approve the members of the Advocacy and Communications Committee at its initial meeting following a municipal election. All elected official Committee members are voting members.

A representative from CRB administrative assists the Committee to ensure coordination with Land Use, Housing, Geographic Information Services (GIS) and regional Transit priorities, stakeholders, orders of government and the Board.

The Interim Chair/Chair of the Board and the Chief Executive Officer can attend Committee meetings as non-voting members.

elected officials from a subset of Board member municipalities. All elected official Committee members are voting members.

The membership of the Advocacy & Communications Committee includes the Chairs of the Board Committees which oversee the Capital Region Growth Plan strategic priorities of Land Use, Housing, regional Transit and Geographic Information Services (GIS) as well as and three to six members at large from the Board’s member municipalities. This membership composition ensures that the advocacy and communications needs of the Board in support of its mandate represent the Region. provides for regional representation of all Board members will be represented and allows for regional representation on the Advocacy & Communications Committee.

See Appendix 1 for list of Committee members.

**SUPPORT/ RESOURCES**

The Advocacy & Communications Committee will be supported by the Chief Executive Officer, Capital Region Board staff and consultant resources, and others as determined through the Board’s annual Business Plan and budget development as approved and allocated by the Capital Region Board. The Committee may appoint a sub-committee(s) to focus on areas of priority. At the request of the Committee, the Chief Executive Officer may establish a working and or advisory group as deemed necessary to support the Committee.

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

**LEADERSHIP**

*Choosing a Committee Chair*

The Chief Executive Officer will chair the initial Advocacy & Communications Committee meeting following an election and will administer the selection of a new Chair at the initial meeting. The Committee will select a Chair from among the municipalities which are members of the Committee.

The Committee Chair’s appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Chair will be reviewed at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Chair or select a new
Chair. If a Committee Chair resigns or is unable to act as Chair, is required at any other time, the Committee may choose a new Committee Chair from within the members of the Committee.

The Capital Region Board will approve which municipalities will be members of the Advocacy & Communications Committee at its initial meeting following a municipal election.

The Chief Executive Officer will Chair the initial meeting of the Advocacy & Communications Committee following a municipal election. The Committee will select a Chair from among the municipalities which are members of the Committee and recommend the appointment of the Board. The Capital Region Board will ratify the Committee Chair at its next meeting. The Committee Chair’s appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Chair will be reviewed at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Chair or select a new Chair.

At its initial meeting following an election, the Capital Region Board will approve which municipalities will be members of each of its Committees. Subsequently, each CRB Committee will recommend their own Committee Chair to the Board, which endorses the recommendation. Each of the Board’s Committee Chairs will be members of the Advocacy & Communications Committee. The Advocacy & Communications Committee will also consist of three to six members at large from the Board’s member municipalities. CRB administration will recommend to the Board which municipalities will be members at large of this Committee in order to represent the region accurately.

Choosing a Vice Chair
To maintain continuity and ensure effective and informed leadership during the required absences of Committee Chair, it is recommended that a Vice Chair be selected by nomination and vote of the Committee. The Committee’s Vice Chair appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Vice Chair will be reviewed at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Vice Chair or select a new Vice Chair. In the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair will assume all duties of the Chair.

Members’ Terms
The participation of Capital Region municipalities on the Advocacy & Communications Committee is effective until the next General Election. The Board will approve its Committee Structure and committee membership by municipality. Member municipalities will then be able to determine specific elected representatives to each committee.

It is encouraged that representation by specific elected officials from municipalities remain consistent during the General Municipal Election Cycle and that rotation of members from a municipality occur no more frequently than once annually to maintain continuity and ensure effective Committee operation.

Representation to CRB and/or other CRB Committees
The Chair of the Advocacy & Communications Committee will be responsible for representing the views of the Committee at Board meetings and to other Board committees. In the absence of the Chair, the Advocacy & Communications Committee’s Vice Chair will represent the Committee. Other Committee members may be asked to represent the Committee at Board meetings and to other Board Committees at the request of the Chair.

**MEETINGS**

*Schedule of Meetings*
In general, meetings will be held monthly, with additional meetings convened, rescheduled or cancelled as determined by the Chair. Efforts will be taken to coordinate Committee meeting schedules with the Board’s meeting schedule to ensure timely review and voting of Committee Motions. Quorum is required in order to hold a Committee meeting.

*Content of Meeting Agenda*
In general, Committee meeting agendas will be determined by the Committee Chair based on delegation of the Board, outstanding committee motions, decisions, bring forward items as well as the relevance of potential topics to the Committee’s mandate, Board’s Business Plan, and consistency with the intent of the overall mandate identified for this Committee.

*Meeting Agendas*
In general, meeting Agendas and pre-read materials, where available, are provided at least one week in advance of a scheduled Committee meeting.

*Conduct of Meetings*
Committee meetings will be conducted in a manner consistent with the agreed to Norms and Protocols as established by the Committee and with reference to Robert’s Rules of Order.

*Status of Meetings*
Advocacy & Communications Committee meetings are open to the public including all members of the CRB (elected officials and their alternates), administrative representatives from all CRB member municipalities and members of the public. The Advocacy & Communications Committee may invite individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/Committee members to participate in specific agenda items. Matters emerging from the Committee and voted on will become a matter of public record.

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

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

*Representations from the Public*
The Chair of the Advocacy & Communications Committee will approve requests to make representations to the Committee if they believe the presentation content will assist the Committee in its deliberations.

*Quorum*
A quorum of voting members (fifty percent plus one) which includes designated Committee alternates is required for a valid vote on motions at the Advocacy & Communications Committee.

**Voting**
Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of this Committee, or their designated alternate, may vote. Voting by conference call is an acceptable alternative method of voting. Motions require a majority (fifty percent plus one of the members in attendance) vote to pass.

**Motions**
Notices of motion are not required at the Advocacy & Communications Committee; however, they can be used to initiate the process of achieving understanding and support from Committee members. All motions must be moved by a voting member of the Advocacy & Communications Committee. Where the Committee is not prepared to vote on a matter, it can be postponed to a subsequent or special Committee meeting.

**Meeting Minutes**
Meeting minutes will reflect the decisions and action items taken at each Advocacy & Communications Committee meeting. The actual vote of each Committee member will be recorded for future reference at the request of any one Committee member.

**ACCOUNTABILITY TO CAPITAL REGION BOARD**

**Recommendations to CRB**
Board Committees have no final decision making authority. All policy decisions arising from Committees must be reviewed and approved by the Capital Region Board. Committee motions are brought forward to the Capital Region Board where there is a majority of Committee members in support, or where there is consensus that Board involvement in a decision is required.

**Amendments to the Terms of Reference**
At any time, the Committee may consider changes to the Terms of Reference and recommend the proposed changes to the Board for review and approval.

**Reporting**
The Advocacy & Communications Committee will advise the Board of key activities and progress regularly, primarily at Board meetings.

**Dispute Resolution**
The Committee Chair is accountable for ensuring effective and collaborative Committee operations and decision making. Where the Chair’s efforts are unable to resolve a dispute, the matter will be brought to the Board for discussion and resolution.
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The regional Advocacy and Communications Committee includes the following member municipalities, as approved by the CRB.

Voting members:
- Member – Chair, Land Use Committee
- Member – Chair, Transit Committee
- Member – Chair, Housing Committee
- Member – Chair, Governance Committee
- Member – City of Leduc
- Member – City of St. Albert
- Member – Strathcona County
- Member – Sturgeon County
- Member – Town of Gibbons
- Member – Town of Wabamun

Committee Chair – Mayor Greg Krischke, City of Leduc
Committee Vice-Chair – Councillor Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton

Non-Voting members:
- Capital Region Board Chair/Interim Chair
- Capital Region Board Chief Executive Officer

Capital Region Board staff support/staff resources as designated by the Chief Executive Officer
BACKGROUND

The Capital Region Growth Plan identifies an ongoing role for the Regional Transit Committee (RTC) as the most appropriate governance structure to guide and oversee the implementation of the Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan. The RTC has responsibility to oversee the successful implementation of the recommendations identified in the Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan for intermunicipal transit service planning and delivery in the Region.

RATIONALE

The Capital Region Growth Plan identifies a Vision for the Region’s future. The Capital Region Board (CRB), in partnership with the provincial and the federal governments, industry stakeholders and its residents, has a shared responsibility to ensure the Capital Region’s Vision is realized. Collaboration, coordination and prioritization of regional initiatives among all stakeholders will be required to ensure effective management of growth while enhancing a liveable region for future generations.

The Regional Transit Committee plays a pivotal role in providing guidance and strategic oversight to member municipalities regarding intermunicipal transit services in the Region. Regional coordination is a key enabler to the delivery and expansion of intermunicipal transit. The RTC will advance the Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan’s Vision of a convenient and competitive transportation alternative while supporting broader Capital Region Board outcomes of social, economic and environmental benefit.

MANDATE

The Regional Transit Committee’s mandate is to:

- Advocate and continually promote the Capital Region’s Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan.
- Represent regional transit interests while respecting and giving due consideration to local issues and preferences.
- Provide strategic direction for the development of a 30 year service plan for intermunicipal transit service to support the goals of the Capital Region Growth Plan. The 30 year service plan will include 3, 10, 15 and 30 year milestones.
- Provide oversight and guidance to ensure the deployment of intermunicipal transit facilities and services are integrated and aligned with the region’s transportation needs and the Capital Region Board’s Land Use Plan.
- Set priorities for deployment of regional capital and operating resources for regional transit projects.
- Develop and seek approval of a three year Business Plan which includes a three year capital and operating plan/budget.
- Provide strategic direction for the development of regional service standards and regional oversight for the adherence to those standards.
- Provide regular updates to the Capital Region Board on the Committee’s work.
• Seek approval from the Board for the intermunicipal transit business plan and regional transit projects.

This Terms of Reference document defines the initial mandate of the Regional Transit Committee. The roles and responsibilities of the Committee may evolve as the legislative/regulatory requirements of the Board change and as the Board’s rolling three-year Business Plan is developed, approved and implemented.

COMPOSITION

The RTC is an entity accountable to the CRB. It is composed of elected officials from a subset of Capital Region Board member municipalities. The Capital Region Board will approve which municipalities will be members of the Regional Transit Committee at its initial meeting following a municipal election. All elected official Committee members are voting members. This will ensure that community and regional priorities guide decision making and implementation.

A CRB administrative leader manages the Committee to ensure coordination with Land Use, Geographic Information Services and Housing priorities, other potential regional implications and the broader Capital Region Board process and agenda.

Finally, a representative of the Government of Alberta is on the Committee as a non-voting member and will ensure that regional interests are understood and that the Province is equipped to support the implementation of the Capital Region Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan.

See Appendix 1 for list of Committee members.

SUPPORT/RESOURCES

The Regional Transit Committee will be supported by the Chief Executive Officer, Capital Region Board, staff and consultant resources, and others as determined through the Board’s annual Business Plan and budget development, as approved and allocated by the Capital Region Board. The Committee may appoint a sub-committee(s) to focus on areas of priority. At the request of the Committee, the Chief Executive Officer may establish a working or advisory group as deemed necessary to support the Committee.

The RTC is supported by a regional Transit Advisory Group (TAG). The Transit Advisory Group’s membership includes member municipalities’ administration representative responsible for transit programs and/or planning. The Transit Advisory Group’s role is to provide advice and recommendations to the Committee on matters before them. TAG has a Terms of Reference to guide its operations. The Terms of Reference is overseen by the RTC. The Transit Advisory Group will be supported by CRB Administration.

LEADERSHIP

Choosing a RTC Chair

The selection of a new Chair will be administered by the Chief Executive Officer following a municipal election. The Capital Region Board will approve which municipalities will be members of the Regional Transit Committee at its initial meeting following a municipal election.
The Chief Executive Officer will chair the initial Regional Transit Committee meeting following an election and will administer the selection of a new Chair at the initial meeting. The Committee will select a Chair from among the municipalities which are members of the Committee.

The Committee Chair’s appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Chair will be reviewed at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Chair or select a new Chair.

Choosing a Vice Chair
To maintain continuity and ensure effective and informed Committee leadership during required absences of the Committee Chair, it is advised that a Vice Chair be selected by nomination and vote of the Committee. The Committee’s Vice Chair appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Vice Chair will be reviewed at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Vice Chair or select a new Vice Chair. The absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair will assume all duties of the Chair.

Members’ Terms
The participation of Capital Region municipalities on the Regional Transit Committee is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The Board will ratify the Committee’s membership by municipality. Member municipalities will then be able to determine specific elected representatives to Committees once Committee membership by municipality is approved by the Board.

It is encouraged that representation by specific elected officials from municipalities remain consistent during the three year term and that rotation of members from a municipality occur no more frequently than once annually to maintain continuity and ensure effective Committee operation.

Representation to CRB and/or other CRB Committees
The Chair of the Regional Transit Committee will be responsible for representing the views of the RTC at Board meetings and to other CRB Committees. In the absence of the Chair, the Committee’s Vice Chair will represent the RTC. Other Committee members may be asked to represent the Regional Transit Committee at Board meetings and to other CRB Committees at the request of the Chair.

Meetings
Schedule of Meetings
Meetings will be held monthly, with additional meetings as required and convened by the Chair. Efforts will be taken to coordinate Committee meeting schedules with the Board’s meeting schedule to ensure timely review and voting of Committee Motions. Quorum is required in order to hold a Committee meeting.

Meetings may be called or rescheduled by the Committee Chair as required.

**Content of Meeting Agenda**

In general, Committee meeting agendas will be determined by the Committee Chair based on delegation of the Board, outstanding Committee motions, decisions, bring forward items as well as the relevance of potential topics to the Committee mandate, CRB Business Plan, and consistency with the intent of the overall mandate identified for the RTC, including the Intermunicipal Transit Network Vision and Plan.

**Meeting Agendas**

In general, Meeting Agendas and pre-read materials, where available, are provided at least one week in advance of a scheduled RTC meeting.

**Conduct of Meetings**

Committee meetings will be conducted in a manner consistent with the agreed to Norms and Protocols as established by the Committee and with reference to Robert’s Rules of Order.

**Status of Meetings**

Transit Committee meetings are open to the public including all members of the CRB (elected officials and their alternates), administrative representatives from all CRB member municipalities and members of the public. The Transit Committee may invite individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/Committee members to participate in specific agenda items. Matters emerging from the Committee and voted on will become a matter of public record.

**Representations from the Public**

The Chair of the Regional Transit Committee will approve requests to make representations to the Committee if they believe the presentation content will assist the Committee in their deliberations.

**Quorum**

A quorum of voting members (fifty percent plus one) which includes designated Committee alternates is required for a valid vote by the Regional Transit Committee.

**Voting**

Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the Regional Transit Committee, or their designated alternate, may vote. The approved Governance Model requires a majority vote (i.e. six of ten) including unanimous support from the three current Transit Operators (City of Edmonton, Strathcona County and St. Albert). Voting by conference call is an acceptable alternative method of voting. Motions require a majority (fifty percent plus one of the members in attendance) vote to pass.

**Motions**

Motions can be brought forward to the RTC at any time. Notices of motion are not required at the Committee; however, they can be used to start the process of achieving understanding and support from Committee members. All motions must be moved by a voting member of the Regional Transit Committee. Where the Committee is not prepared to vote on a matter, it can be postponed to a subsequent or special RTC Committee meeting.
**Meeting Minutes**
Meeting minutes will reflect the decisions and action items taken at each Committee meeting. The actual vote of each RTC voting member will be recorded for future reference at the request of any one Committee member.

**ACCOUNTABILITY TO CAPITAL REGION BOARD**

**Recommendations to CRB**
Capital Region Board Committees have no final decision making power. All policy decisions arising from Committees must be reviewed and approved by the Capital Region Board. Committee motions are brought forward to the Board where there is a majority of Committee members in support, or where there is consensus that broader Board involvement in a decision is required.

**Amendments to the Terms of Reference**
The Committee may consider changes to the Terms of Reference and recommend the proposed changes to the Capital Region Board for review and approval.

**Reporting**
The Regional Transit Committee will advise the CRB of key activities and progress regularly, primarily at Capital Region Board meetings.

**Dispute Resolution**
The Committee Chair is accountable for ensuring effective and collaborative Committee operations and decision making. Where the Chair’s efforts are unable to resolve a dispute, the matter will be brought to the Capital Region Board for discussion and resolution.
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The Regional Transit Committee includes the following member municipalities, as approved by the Capital Region Board.

Voting members:

- Member – City of Edmonton
- Member – City of Leduc
- Member – City of Spruce Grove
- Member – City of Fort Saskatchewan
- Member – City of St. Albert
- Member – Leduc County
- Member – Strathcona County
- Member – Sturgeon County
- Member – Town of Beaumont
- Member – Town of Morinville
- **Member – Parkland County**

*As elected by Committee:*

- Committee Chair – City of Edmonton, Councillor Don Iveson
- Committee Vice Chair – County of Strathcona, Peter Wlodarczak

Non-Voting members:

- Government of Alberta transit representative from Alberta Transportation.
- Capital Region Board staff support/staff resource as designated by the Chief Executive Officer
BACKGROUND

The Capital Region Growth Plan identifies an ongoing role for the Land Use Committee (“the Committee”) as the most appropriate governance structure to complete regional land use planning work, Geographic Information Services (GIS) planning, strategic planning, and further monitoring and reporting as identified under Capital Region Board (CRB) legislative and regulatory requirements. The Land Use Committee will guide and oversee the implementation of the CRB’s Land Use Plan and Geographic Information Services Plan.

RATIONALE

The Capital Region Growth Plan identifies a Vision for the Region’s future. The Capital Region Board (CRB), in partnership with the provincial and the federal governments, industry stakeholders and its residents, has a shared responsibility to ensure the Capital Region’s Vision is realized. Collaboration, coordination and prioritization of regional initiatives among all stakeholders will be required to ensure effective management of growth while enhancing a liveable region for future generations.

Determining the future pattern of land use in the Capital Region, pursuant to the Capital Region Growth Plan, is a key foundational CRB activity. The Land Use Committee is ideally positioned to discuss and resolve important land use issues facing the Capital Region. The Committee is best suited to advance the Vision of the Growth Plan through the implementation of the Land Use Plan. The Committee will direct and provide leadership through integrated planning and implementation of Capital Region Board land use and GIS endeavours.

The establishment and maintenance of Regional Geographic Information Services is an integral and critical function to support regional decisions going forward by the Capital Region Board and the participating municipalities. The Land Use Committee has been identified as the most appropriate committee to provide the strategic oversight necessary to identify and develop the data, information and analytical capability needed to support evidenced based decision making across all Policies identified in the Land Use Plan. With the development of the Growth Plan, it has been identified that to successfully measure the region’s progress and the effectiveness of Policies on regional sustainability, data and information on a regional level is required. This currently does not exist across the Capital Region municipalities.

MANDATE

The Land Use Committee mandate consists of the following:

- Guide and oversee the implementation of the Land Use Plan through a policy framework that includes the integration of all strategic priorities of the Growth Plan.
- Represent the regional Vision and regional interests, while recognizing and giving due consideration to municipal issues and perspectives.
- Ensure that regional and community priorities guide decision making and implementation.
- Advocate for and promote Land Use Plan policies to the CRB.
• Provide strategic direction for municipalities implementing regional Land Use Plan policies at the municipal level within the existing municipal planning processes.
• Set priorities for future projects and initiatives to address regional land use issues.
• Provide the leadership and guidance to CRB on the development and implementation of geo spatial decision making tools to support regional decision-making and reporting requirements of the Capital Region Growth Plan.
• Determine and recommend to the CRB the appropriate resources, mechanisms, policies and priorities for development and implementation of the Capital Region Geographic Information Services (CRGIS). The Committee will also oversee the implementation of CRGIS projects (including policies, standards, applications, services) as approved by the CRB.
• Provide leadership for the identification of business requirements for each of the CRB Committees to ensure data and information is available to support evidence based decisions.
• Ensure the appropriate alignment with and coordination with the GeoDiscover Alberta. This includes consideration for industry best practices as identified by GeoDiscover Alberta relative to terminology, protocols, methods and standards.
• Report regularly to the CRB.
• Develop and seek approval of a three-year Business Plan which includes a three-year capital and operating plan/budget.

This Terms of Reference document defines the current mandate of the Land Use Committee. The roles and responsibilities of the Committee may evolve as the legislative/regulatory requirements of the Board change and as the Board’s rolling three-year Business Plan is developed, approved and implemented. The Committee’s mandate will evolve to reflect the Board’s strategic priorities and focus.

COMPOSITION

The Land Use Committee is an entity accountable to the CRB. It is composed of elected officials from a subset of Capital Region Board member municipalities. The Capital Region Board will approve which municipalities will be members of the Land Use Committee at its initial meeting following a municipal election. All elected official Committee members are voting members. This will ensure that community and regional priorities guide decision making and implementation.

A CRB administrative leader manages the Committee to ensure coordination with regional Transit and Housing priorities, other potential regional implications and the broader Capital Region Board process and agenda.

Finally, a non-voting representative of the Government of Alberta is on the Land Use Committee. The representative from Municipal Affairs will ensure that regional interests are understood and that the Province is provided with the information to support the implementation of the Regional Land Use Plan.

See Appendix 1 for list of Committee members.

SUPPORT/RESOURCES

The Committee will be supported by the Chief Executive Officer, Capital Region Board, staff and consultant resources, and others as determined through the Board’s annual Business Plan and budget development, as approved and allocated by the Capital Region Board. The Committee may appoint a sub-committee(s) to
focus on areas of priority. At the request of the Committee, the Chief Executive Officer may establish a working and/or advisory group as deemed necessary to support the Committee.

**LEADERSHIP**

*Choosing a Committee Chair*

The selection of a new Chair will be administered by the Chief Executive Officer following a municipal election. The Capital Region Board will approve which municipalities will be members of the Land Use Committee at its initial meeting following a municipal election.

The Chief Executive Officer will Chair the initial Land Use Committee meeting following a municipal election. The Committee will select a Chair from among the municipalities which are members of the Committee and recommend the appointment of the Chair to the Capital Region Board. The Capital Region Board will ratify the Committee Chair at its next meeting. The Committee Chair’s appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Chair will be reviewed annually at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Chair or select a new Chair.

If a Committee Chair is required at any other time, the Board may choose a new Committee Chair from members of the Board. The Board may delegate the responsibility to identify a candidate for Chair to the Committee itself, with the Committee’s recommendation brought forward to the Board for ratification.

The Chief Executive Officer will chair the initial Land Use Committee meeting following an election and will administer the selection of a new Chair at the initial meeting. The Committee will select a Chair from among the municipalities which are members of the Committee.

The Committee Chair’s appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Chair will be reviewed at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Chair or select a new Chair. If a Committee Chair resigns or is unable to act as Chair, is required at any other time, the Committee may choose a new Committee Chair from within the members of the Committee.

*Choosing a Vice Chair*

To maintain continuity and ensure effective and informed Committee leadership during required absences of the Committee Chair, it is advised that a Vice Chair be selected by nomination and vote of the Committee. The Committee’s Vice Chair appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Vice Chair will be reviewed annually at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Vice Chair or select a new Vice Chair. In the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair will assume all duties of the Chair.

*Members’ Terms*

The participation of Capital Region municipalities on the Land Use Committee is effective until the next General Municipal Election. The Board will ratify the Committee’s membership by municipality. Member municipalities will then be able to determine specific elected representatives to Committees once Committee membership by municipality is approved by the Board.

It is encouraged that representation by specific elected officials from municipalities remain consistent during the General Municipal Election cycle and that rotation of members from a municipality occur no more frequently than once annually to maintain continuity and ensure effective Committee representation.
Representation to CRB and/or other CRB Committees
The Chair of the Land Use Committee will be responsible for representing the views of the Committee at Board meetings and to other CRB Committees. In the absence of the Chair, the Committee’s Vice Chair will represent the Land Use Committee. Other Committee members may be asked to represent the Land Use Committee at Board meetings and to other CRB Committees at the request of the Chair.

MEETINGS

Schedule of Meetings
Land Use Committee meetings will be held monthly, with additional meetings as required and convened by the Chair. Efforts will be taken to coordinate Committee meeting schedules with the Board’s meeting schedule to ensure timely review and voting of Committee Motions. Quorum is required in order to hold a Committee meeting. Meetings may be called or rescheduled by the Committee Chair as required.

Content of Meeting Agenda
In general, Land Use Committee meeting agendas will be determined by the Committee Chair based on delegation of the Board, outstanding Committee motions, decisions, bring forward items as well as the relevance of potential topics to the Committee mandate, CRB Business Plan, and consistency with the intent of the overall mandate identified for the Land Use Committee.

Meeting Agendas
In general, Meeting Agendas and pre-read materials, where available, are provided at least one week in advance of a scheduled Land Use Committee meeting.

Conduct of Meetings
Committee meetings will be conducted in a manner consistent with the agreed to Norms and Protocols as established by the Committee and with reference to Roberts Rules of Order.

Status of Meetings
Land Use Committee meetings are open to the public including all members of the CRB (elected officials and their alternates), administrative representatives from all CRB member municipalities and members of the public. The Land Use Committee may invite individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/Committee members to participate in specific agenda items. Matters emerging from the Committee and voted on will become a matter of public record.

Section 602.08 (1) of the Municipal Government Act (MGA) states that the Committee may close all or part of their meetings to the public if a matter to be discussed is within one of the exceptions to disclosure in Division 2 of Part 1 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. All members (elected and administrative) attending the in camera session shall respect the confidentiality of the in camera items.

Representations from the Public
The Chair of the Land Use Committee will approve requests to make representations to the Committee if they believe the presentation content will assist the Committee in their deliberations.
Quorum
A quorum of the voting members (fifty percent plus one) which includes designated Committee alternates is required for a valid vote by the Land Use Committee.

Voting
Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the Land Use Committee, or their designated alternate may vote. Voting by conference call is an acceptable alternative method of voting. Motions require a majority (fifty percent plus one of the members in attendance) vote to pass.

Motions
Notices of motion are not required at the Land Use Committee; however, they can be used to start the process of achieving understanding and support from Committee members. All motions must be moved by a voting member of the Land Use Committee. Where the Committee is not prepared to vote on a matter, it can be postponed to a subsequent or special Committee meeting.

Meeting Minutes
Meeting minutes will reflect the decisions and action items taken at each Land Use Committee meeting. The actual vote of each Land Use Committee voting member will be recorded for future reference at the request of any one Committee member.

ACCOUNTABILITY TO CAPITAL REGION BOARD

Recommendations to CRB
Capital Region Board Committees have no final decision making power. All policy decisions arising Committees must be reviewed and approved by the Capital Region Board. Committee motions are brought forward to the Capital Region Board where there is a majority of Committee members in support, or where there is a consensus that broader Board involvement in a decision is required.

Amendments to the Terms of Reference
The Committee may consider changes to the Terms of Reference and recommend the proposed changes to the Capital Region Board for review and approval, at any time.

Reporting
The Land Use Committee will advise the CRB of key activities and progress regularly, primarily at Capital Region Board meetings.

Dispute Resolution
The Committee Chair is accountable for ensuring effective and collaborative Committee operations and decision making. Where the Chair’s efforts are unable to resolve a dispute, the matter will be brought to the Capital Region Board for discussion and resolution.
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The Land Use Committee includes the following member municipalities, as approved by the Capital Region Board.

Voting members:
- Member - City of Edmonton
- Member - City of St. Albert
- Member - City of Fort Saskatchewan
- Member - City of Spruce Grove
- Member - City of Leduc
- Member - Leduc County
- Member - Sturgeon County
- Member - Parkland County
- Member - Strathcona County
- Member - Lamont County
- Member – Town of Beaumont
- Member - Town of Morinville
- Member - Town of Redwater
- Member - Town of Devon
- Member – Town of Stony Plain

As elected by Committee
- Committee Chair – Town of Devon, Mayor Anita Fisher
- Vice Chair – Leduc County, Councillor Jocelyn MacKay

Non-voting members:
- Government of Alberta representative from Municipal Affairs
- Capital Region Board staff support/staff resources as designated by the Chief Executive Officer
BACKGROUND

The Capital Region Growth Plan identifies an ongoing role for the Housing Committee ("the Committee") as the most appropriate governance structure to guide and oversee the implementation of the Capital Region Housing Plan. The Committee has responsibility for strategic planning and monitoring and reporting, as identified under the Capital Region Board (CRB) legislative and regulatory requirements, to ensure the successful implementation of the recommendations identified in the Housing Plan for Non Market and Market Affordable Housing.

RATIONALE

The Capital Region Growth Plan identifies a Vision for the Region’s future. The Capital Region Board (CRB), in partnership with the provincial and the federal governments, industry stakeholders and its residents, has a shared responsibility to ensure the Capital Region’s Vision is realized. Collaboration, coordination and prioritization of regional initiatives among all stakeholders will be required to ensure effective management of growth while enhancing a liveable region for future generations.

The Housing Committee plays a pivotal role in providing guidance and strategic oversight to both the provincial government and member municipalities. This guidance is to ensure more effective planning and program implementation of non-market and market-affordable housing initiatives throughout the Capital Region, to meet changing demographics and socioeconomic needs. An adequate supply of a diverse range of housing type and affordability is critical to the Region’s ability to attract and retain people to support the Region’s global competitiveness and economic growth potential.

The Housing Plan identifies housing gaps for both types of non-market and market-affordable housing throughout the Region. The Plan proposes a collective and coordinated approach among all orders of government, the CRB, the building industry and not-for profit housing providers to increase the supply of housing, to meet existing housing type backlogs and future needs of the Region.

Mandate

The Housing Committee’s mandate is to:
- Guide and oversee the implementation of the Housing Vision and Plan through a policy framework that includes the integration of all strategic priorities of the Growth Plan.
- Provide leadership for the development and implementation of an effective regional planning model to facilitate a greater supply, of non-market and market affordable housing, based on need and priority, throughout the Region.
- Provides leadership on behalf of the region to identify and recommend to the province, appropriate mechanisms needed to affect the supply of housing. This may include, but not limited to funding
models, legislative or regulatory changes, programs, policies and priorities to effectively address the supply and distribution of non-market and market affordable housing in the Region.

- Provides leadership on behalf of the Region to work with other orders of government to advocate for policy changes affecting the supply of non-market and market-affordable housing.
- Responsible to oversee the development of a monitoring and measurement framework to measure the effectiveness of housing programs in meeting regional housing priorities and needs.
- Establish a process to monitor housing trends, housing needs and changes in affordability as a basis to update the Housing Strategy and Plan.
- Work collaboratively with the Land Use and Transit Committees to ensure greater coordination and integration of planning occurs to ensure Housing Plan goals are being met.
- Facilitate education and sharing of best practices among municipalities.
- Provides regional leadership in developing strategic partnerships with all stakeholders involved in enabling non market and market affordable housing in the region.
- Develop and seek approval of a three year Business Plan which includes a three year capital and operating plan/budget.

This Terms of Reference document defines the current mandate of the Housing Committee. The roles and responsibilities of the Housing Committee may evolve as the legislative/regulatory requirements of the Board change and as the Board’s rolling three-year Business Plan is developed, approved and implemented. The Committee’s mandate will evolve to reflect the Board’s strategic priorities and focus.

**Composition**

The Housing Committee is an entity accountable to the CRB. It is composed of elected officials from a subset of Capital Region Board member municipalities. The Capital Region Board will approve which municipalities will be members of the Housing Committee at its initial meeting following a municipal election. All elected official Committee members are voting members. This will ensure that community and regional priorities guide decision making and implementation.

A CRB administrative leader manages the Committee and is responsible to ensure coordination with Land Use and Regional Transit priorities, and other regional priorities as identified by the Capital Region Board.

Finally, a non-voting representative of the Government of Alberta is on the Housing Committee. This representative from Municipal Affairs will ensure that regional interests are understood and that the Province is equipped to support the implementation of the Housing Plan.

See Appendix 1 for list of Committee members.

**Support/Resources**

The Housing Committee will be supported by the Chief Executive Officer, Capital Region Board, staff and consultant resources, and others as determined through the Board’s annual Business Plan and budget development, as approved and allocated by the Capital Region Board. The Committee may appoint a subcommittee(s) to focus on areas of priority. At the request of the Committee, the Chief Executive Officer may establish a working and or advisory group as deemed necessary to support the Committee.
LEADERSHIP

Choosing a Committee Chair

The selection of a new Chair will be administered by the Chief Executive Officer following a municipal election. The Capital Region Board will approve which municipalities will be members of the Housing Committee at its initial meeting following a municipal election.

The Chief Executive Officer will Chair the initial Housing Committee meeting following a municipal election. The Committee will select a Chair from among the municipalities which are members of the Committee and recommend the appointment of the Chair to the Capital Region Board. The Capital Region Board will ratify the Committee Chair at its next meeting. The Committee Chair’s appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Chair will be reviewed at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Chair or select a new Chair.

If a Committee Chair is required at any other time, the Board may choose a new Committee Chair from members of the Board. The Board may delegate the responsibility to identify a candidate for Chair to the Committee itself, with the Committee’s recommendation to be brought forward to the Board for ratification.

The Chief Executive Officer will chair the initial Housing Committee meeting following an election and will administer the selection of a new Chair at the initial meeting. The Committee will select a Chair from among the municipalities which are members of the Committee.

The Committee Chair’s appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Chair will be reviewed at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Chair or select a new Chair. If a Committee Chair resigns or is unable to act as Chair, is required at any other time, the Committee may choose a new Committee Chair from within the members of the Committee.

Choosing a Vice Chair

To maintain continuity and ensure effective and informed Committee leadership during required absences of the Committee Chair, it is advised that a Vice Chair be selected by nomination and vote of the Committee. The Committee’s Vice Chair appointment is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The appointment of the Vice Chair will be reviewed at the November meeting of the Committee to confirm the Vice Chair or select a new Vice Chair. In the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair will assume all duties of the Chair.

Members’ Terms

The participation of Capital Region municipalities on the Housing Committee is effective to the next General Municipal Election. The Board will ratify the Committee’s membership by municipality. Member municipalities will then be able to determine specific elected representatives to Committees once Committee membership by municipality is approved by the Board.

It is encouraged that representation by specific elected officials from municipalities remain consistent during the General Municipal Election cycle and that rotation of members from a municipality occur no more frequently that once annually to maintain continuity and ensure effective Committee operation.

Representation to CRB and/or other CRB Committees
The Chair of the Housing Committee will be responsible for representing the views of the Housing Committee at Board meetings and to other CRB Committees. In the absence of the Chair, the Committee’s Vice Chair will represent the Housing Committee. Other Committee members may be asked to represent the Housing Committee at Board meetings and to other CRB Committees at the request of the Chair.

**MEETINGS**

**Schedule of Meetings**
Housing Committee meetings will be held monthly, with additional meetings as required and convened by the Chair. Efforts will be taken to coordinate Committee meeting schedules with the Board’s meeting schedule to ensure timely review and voting of Committee Motions. Quorum is required in order to hold a Committee meeting. Meetings may be called or rescheduled by the Committee Chair as required.

**Content of Meeting Agenda**
In general, Housing Committee meeting agendas will be determined by the Committee Chair based on delegation of the Board, outstanding Committee motions, decisions, bring forward items as well as the relevance of potential topics to the Committee mandate, CRB Business Plan, and consistency with intent of the overall mandate identified for the Housing Committee.

**Meeting Agendas**
In general, meeting Agendas and pre-read materials, where available, are provided at least one week in advance of a scheduled Housing Committee meeting.

**Conduct of Meetings**
Committee meetings will be conducted in a manner consistent with the agreed to Norms and Protocols as established by the Committee and with reference to Robert’s Rules of Order.

**Status of Meetings**
Housing Committee meetings are open to the public including all members of the CRB (elected officials and their alternates), administrative representatives from all CRB member municipalities and members of the public. The Housing Committee may invite individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/Committee members to participate in specific agenda items. Matters emerging from the Committee and voted on will become a matter of public record.

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

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

**Representations from the Public**
The Chair of the Housing Committee will approve requests to make representations to the Committee if they believe the presentation content will assist the Committee in their deliberations.

**Quorum**
A quorum of voting members (fifty percent plus one) which includes designated Committee alternates is required for a valid vote by the Housing Committee.

**Voting**
Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the Housing Committee, or their designated alternate, may vote. Voting by conference call is an acceptable alternative method of voting. Motions require a majority (fifty percent plus one of the members in attendance) vote to pass.

**Motions**
Notices of motion are not required at the Housing Committee; however, they can be used to start the process of achieving understanding and support from Committee members. All motions must be moved by a voting member of the Housing Committee. Where the Committee is not prepared to vote on a matter, it can be postponed to a subsequent or special Committee meeting.

**Meeting Minutes**
Meeting minutes will reflect the decisions and action items taken at each Housing Committee meeting. The actual vote of each Housing Committee voting member will be recorded for future reference at the request of any one Committee member.

**ACCOUNTABILITY TO CAPITAL REGION BOARD**

**Recommendations to CRB**
Capital Region Board Committees have no final decision making power. All policy decisions arising from Committees must be reviewed and approved by the Capital Region Board. Committee motions are brought forward to the Board where there is a majority of Committee members in support, or where there is consensus that broader Board involvement in a decision is required.

**Amendments to the Terms of Reference**
The Committee may consider changes to the Terms of Reference and recommend the proposed changes to the Capital Region Board for review and approval, at any time.

**Reporting**
The Housing Committee will advise the CRB of key activities and progress regularly, primarily at Capital Region Board meetings.

**Dispute Resolution**
The Committee Chair is accountable for ensuring effective and collaborative Committee operations and decision making. Where the Chair’s efforts are unable to resolve a dispute, the matter will be brought to the Capital Region Board for discussion and resolution.
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The Housing Steering Committee includes the following member municipalities, as approved by the Capital Region Board.

Voting members:
- Member – City of Edmonton
- Member – City of Ft. Saskatchewan
- Member – City of Leduc
- Member – City of St. Albert
- Member – Leduc County
- Member – Lamont County
- Member – Strathcona County
- Member – Sturgeon County
- Member – Town of Stony Plain
- Member – Town of Morinville
- Member – Town of Redwater
- Member – Village of Thorsby

As elected by Committee:
- Committee Chair – City of Edmonton, Councillor Ed Gibbons
- Committee Vice Chair – Town of Redwater, Mayor Mel Smith

Non-Voting members:

Government of Alberta housing representative from Municipal Affairs.

CRB staff support/staff resource as designated by the Chief Executive Officer
2012 Audited Financial Statements

Notice of Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves the 2012 calendar year Audited Financial Statements as approved by Governance Committee.

Background

- Section 9 of the CRB Regulation requires the Board to submit an annual report on its activities in the preceding year to the Minister of Municipal Affairs by May 31 each year including audited financial statements. The CRB's 2012 Audited Financial Statements will be included in the 2012 Annual Report document once approved by the Board.

- A Notice of Motion is provided to the Board at its February 14, 2013 meeting. The CRB’s 2012 Audited Financial Statements will be provided for motion for approval at the March 14, 2013 Board meeting.

- The CRB’s 2012 Annual Report will be also be provided, by separate motion, for approval at the March 14, 2013 Board meeting. Once these statements are approved, they will be incorporated into the Annual Report.

Next Steps

- Following approval of the 2012 Audited Financial Statements, CRB administration will add these statements into the 2012 Annual Report to finalize the document. A printed version of the complete Annual Report will be provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in April 2013.

Rationale

- Ensure compliance with section 9 of the CRB Regulation to submit an annual activity report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs by May 1 of each year including audited financial statements.
2012 Annual Report

Notice of Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves the CRB’s 2012 Annual Report as approved by Governance Committee.

Background

- Section 9 of the CRB Regulation requires the Board to submit an annual report on its activities in the preceding year to the Minister of Municipal Affairs by May 31 each year including audited financial statements.

- This Notice of Motion is provided to the Board at its February 14, 2013 meeting. A Motion for the 2012 Annual report will be provided to the Board for approval at its March 14, 2013 meeting.

- The CRB’s 2012 Audited Financial Statements will be also be provided, by separate motion, for approval at the March 14, 2013 Board meeting. Once approved, these statements will be incorporated into the Annual Report.

Next Steps

- Following approval of the 2012 Annual Report and Audited Financial Statements, CRB administration will add these statements into the 2012 Annual Report will finalize the document. A printed version of the complete Annual Report will be provided to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in April 2013.

Rationale

- Ensure compliance with section 9 of the CRB Regulation to submit an annual activity report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs by May 1 of each year.
1. Committee Meeting — January 23, 2013
   • Next Meeting: February 28, 2013, Kings College Rm N101

2. 2012 Land Use Committee Business Plan

   Review REF Administration Report Implementation:

   • Recommendation 7 – Interpretation Guide
     A. Strathcona Motion – CCRA and Non-PGA Policy Clarification
        Representatives from the CCRA and Non-PGA PAG Subcommittees presented their work to date on the policy
        clarification requested in the Strathcona County motion approved by Board in September 2012. The presenters
        indicated that more discussion was necessary at PAG and looked to the Committee to provide direction and
        input into the work. The Committee received the presentation for information and engaged in a discussion of the
        challenges of interpreting the Growth Plan.

     B. Population and Employment Projections Discussion Paper
        The Committee was briefed on the discussion that occurred at the recent Board meeting regarding the new
        Population and Employment Projections Study. Board members indicated they lacked clarity on the use of the
        Population and Employment Projections in the implementation of the Growth Plan. At the PAG meeting after the
        Board meeting the use of the Population and Employment Projections was discussed and the subject discussion
        paper was prepared. The Committee was presented with three approaches to the use of the projections in REF
        for discussion and input: Neutral, Balanced, and Mandatory. The Committee received the discussion paper and
        presentation for information and provided input and feedback for CRB administration and PAG’s continued work
        on the item.

   • Recommendation 8 – Draft CAO Subcommittee Terms of Reference, Selection of CAO Subcommittee and Eligibility
     of Acting CAOs
        The Committee was presented with a brief background on the proposed CAO Subcommittee Terms of Reference
        and the status of the current consultations with the region’s CAOs.

CRGIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project:

The Committee was advised that the motion to approve the CRGIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project Report was
postponed at the recent Board meeting. The motion was postponed until the April meeting of the Board. CRB
Administration presented the next steps with regard to the Project including seeking additional input from PAG, GISAG,
and the Land Use Committee prior to the April Board meeting.
1. Last Committee Meeting - January 25th, 2013
   • Next Committee Meeting: February 22nd, 2013

2. Transit Committee Project Updates

Regional Transit Governance Study – Business Case

The committee has approved the selection of the Consultant to undertake the Regional Transit Business Case. The primary purpose of this study is to develop a business case that will enable the Capital Region Board to assess the feasibility and merits of establishing a Regional Transit Commission. The secondary purpose is to develop a communication strategy and plan to support the engagement of the Province and other stakeholders in understanding the overall intent of this work and their involvement. The announcement of the successful vendor and awarding of the contract will be made once the CRB has received confirmation of provincial funding support. Twelve regional partners will cost share the remaining $85,000. Edmonton, St. Albert, Strathcona, Morinville, Devon, Parkland, Leduc, Leduc County, Fort Saskatchewan, Sturgeon, Spruce Grove and Beaumont. Work is expected to begin in February.

Regional Fare System

Dan Levy of DanTec and Associates presented the highlights of the final report on the Regional Fare Strategy & Implementation Plan. This report explored three different fare integration strategies to achieve a more simplified customer focused regional fare system. The initial work concluded a fully integrated fare system would be the most beneficial approach to achieve a more seamless fare system across the region. The report provides different options for implementing zones based fares and different technology options to support the timing of implementation. Over a 15 year period using conservative assumptions the report identified opportunities for increase revenue and ridership. The report includes nine recommendations that provide direction on the next steps including continuing to explore technology options as part of the implementation plan. The report states that a decision to implement any zones based fare system will depend on the future governance model for regional transit. A copy of the Executive Summary of the report has been included with this report. The RTC will be discussing the implementation of the recommendations at the next committee meeting.

______________________________

Don Iveson, Chair Regional Transit Committee
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Executive Summary

The Capital Region public transit system network consists of a Light Rail system and bus lines within Edmonton. In addition, the region has bus service provided by Strathcona Transit, St Albert Transit and Contracted service operations provided by Edmonton Transit System (ETS) for Leduc, Leduc County, Spruce Grove and Ft Saskatchewan, Sturgeon County and Edmonton International Airport routes.

Today there are more than 150 different ways to pay a transit fare in the Capital Region. Each of the eight transit systems has a unique fare system that meets the needs of the individual municipalities and their riders but on a regional basis is dysfunctional. A modern, automated and integrated fare system will be a logical compliment to any new regional governance model. The new fare system should be seamless and allow customers to freely move about the system regardless of municipal boundaries or artificial barriers. Motorist driving in the Capital Region do not face barriers when they travel between municipalities, however transit passengers face different fare rules, passes are not valid and regional programs such as U-Pass may not be accepted. It must be convenient for users and system, promote inter-municipal use by eliminating artificial barriers and be easier to use, more flexible, improve equity, and contribute to a reduction the level of fare evasion. The City of Edmonton has approved in principle the adoption of an automated fare system for ETS, however it may be dependent on grant applications that will require regional support.

Regional ridership is 85 million and fares collected for the region amount to approximately $115 million annually. This level of business needs modern methods for recording revenue collection, providing the audit trails for accountability of that revenue, and the means to obtain revenue and ridership related data for planning and marketing purposes. Customers in the region expect and deserve an integrated fare system that is region wide, easy to use, not subject to local variations and utilizes modern, convenient technology that is safe and secure.

As the region continues to experience rapid growth, trip patterns are changing along with needs of citizens of the region and increased awareness of providing cost effective options for labour mobility. But the fare system needs to be rationalized with a unified fare structure and fare policy to allow people to seamlessly move around the region. The fare system needs to be updated and improved to make it more equitable so that trips of the same distance and quality generally cost the same, no matter where the service is
provided. It also needs to address the modernization of fare collection procedures of today to collect fare revenue more securely and to transition to an automated fare system for the Region as the ultimate goal. Smartcards and open payment systems can provide the seamless, high security system that is required.

One of the objectives of this Regional Fare System & Implementation Plan is to assess state of the current fare system in the Capital Region and recommend how it should be updated. In recent years many North American transit agencies have undergone similar self-assessment to improve operating performance and customer service quality. This study explores the development of a strategy to simplify the fare system for the Capital Region’s transit system to benefit the riders, the system operators and to ultimately be consistent with any new governance strategy by addressing these issues:

- Develop a customer focused fare system;
- Make fare payment and transfer choices convenient for inter-municipal travel;
- Simplify the current fare structure and rationalize the pricing policies;
- Provide guidance on technology solutions to improve customer experience;
- Outline an approach for a path to transition to a new system;
- Identify the major transitional issues and associated change management needs;
- Comment on potential procurement strategy; and
- Develop a business case to understand the feasibility of a modern fare collection system.

The study’s purpose was also to see if an equitable fare structure could be created, to get a sense for the types of changes required, and an indication of the potential impact on regional revenues and ridership.

**Local Scan**

The local scan reveals a collection of eight independent fare systems that work well individually, but combined create an incompatible regional fare system. Even when legal agreements are in place they lead to policies and practices that can be confusing and inequitable.

Other findings include:

- Each fare system has designed a fare structure appropriate for its particular market including the resources of its taxpayers and users;
The current approach to fares in the Region is based on making it easy to administer and operate for the transit agencies, rather than on customer needs, convenience and seamlessness;
- The manual fareboxes have limited the ability to introduce innovative, integrated and customer friendly products, and revenue sharing;
- With each new service that gets added to the regional system, the complexity grows exponentially including more inter-municipal transfers;
- Regional equity has not been a factor in setting fares or establishing discounts as the decisions are based on local municipal priorities;
- The legal framework for fares generally consists of bilateral rather than multilateral agreements.
- The overall positive public attitudes on the regional fare system likely stem from most passengers not needing to transfer between or among systems.

Today, all transit operators in the Capital Region are using the simplest drop box fare collection systems on board their buses. These fareboxes merely offer a collection point for cash fares. They are unable to count, or verify the cash, and the validity of transfers and passes being used cannot be checked consistently and automatically. The fareboxes in Edmonton are obsolete (circa 1970’s) and nearing the end of their useful life. St. Albert and Strathcona have more modern units but with the same limited functionality. It is estimated that between four and eight percent of fare revenue in the region is being lost to various forms of fare evasion including fraud, improper use of discounts, counterfeiting, fare shorting, use of foreign objects and transfer abuse.

Integration Options

To achieve the goal of providing a customer focused fare system based on simplifying fares and rationalizing fare policies, the Capital Region Board will need to consider the impact of different levels of fare integration. The preliminary findings of the governance review found that the current approved regional governance structure for transit would generally not be able to respond to the need to create a cohesive, seamless network for inter-municipal transit in the Capital Region. As the region, grows the demand for public transit service is also expected to grow, the need for transit fare system reform is urgent and the need is increasing with each new system or service. The need to consider reform of the fare system is further increased, as St Albert Transit service is reoriented to feed the LRT at NAIT by 2015. The options for fare simplification and integration must be designed to work with the types of governance changes being contemplated as well as
improving the seamlessness, convenience, equity and security of the system for both users and operators

Initially three fare policy options were examined based on different levels of fare integration and coordination. The options included Low, Medium and High Integration Scenarios. As the study progressed it was determined that the only long term viable option that would be consistent with the direction of the governance review, is the High Integration Scenario.

The High Integration Scenario was assumed to be implemented under a single regional transit entity although it does not necessarily require complete consolidation of transit service in the Region. Service delivery could continue to be provided by the three municipal operators under contract, or two contracted municipal operators and a third agency outside the control of the regional entity but with fare coordination. In either case a regional decision making body is required for regional fare setting as well as regional planning, coordination and marketing functions. The decision to implement the new fare structure would be taken by the new regional governance organization, once formed and not by the existing municipal councils.

The High Integration Scenario proposes to codify the existing informal zone fare system to simplify and ensure equitable fares within the region. Alternatives such as peak surcharges, premium fares for express services and fare by distance were considered however formalizing the existing zone structure appears to be the best option for passengers and operators. Two options using either a two or three zone structure were developed. The number of discount programs was reduced and the fare system was simplified under both options. The proposed zone fare system significantly improves the equity of fares and seamless travel within the Region. The proposed zone fare system is compatible with smart card and open payment system technologies which will improve security reduce fare evasion and significantly improve customer convenience.

**Revenue and Ridership Benefits**

A fare spreadsheet model was created to test the impact of the proposed zones and integrated fares. The model uses fare elasticity factors developed by ETS and St. Albert Transit based on the ridership effects of past fare changes. The model forecasts that changing the current informal zone system into a formal zone system with either two or three zones will improve ridership and revenue compared to a do nothing base case. A fifteen year analysis designed to match the estimated life of a new automated fare
system found that an integrated, two zone system could generate about 5.5 percent more passengers than the existing system by 2030. Revenue in the High Integration Scenario was significantly greater over the fifteen year period than for continuing with the existing system. In 2030 the base case produced $172 million dollars of revenue compared to almost $189 for the High Integration Scenario. This figure includes four percent from an assumed reduction in fare evasion and fare shorting due to electronic fareboxes and smart cards. If this additional revenue was used entirely to fund new service it could generate in about 5 million additional rides annually by 2030.

**Technology Strategies & Capital Costs**

The report looked at the options for a House Card and an Open Payment System to be adopted in the Capital Region. A House Card is a transit system only smartcard controlled and distributed by the participating transit agencies. An Open Payment System would allow a contactless Bank Card such as VISA or MasterCard to be used for transit fare payment. The report concludes that the best strategy is to implement a full Open Payment System. Two strategies were developed and a capital cost estimate prepared. Both strategies are compatible with an initial adoption of a House Card for bus and rail, and Open Payment on the rail system, followed by the extension of the Open Payment System to all buses.

- Provide a complete smart card system on all Capital Region vehicles and rail stations with new electronic fareboxes for ETS, and continued use of drop boxes at St. Albert and Strathcona at a cost of $47.9 million.
- Provide a full smart card system, but also to continue using drop boxes on ETS at a cost of $28.9 million.

Both options would only require a software upgrade and bank agreements to extend the Open Payment system from the rail system to the bus operation. Not including the electronic fareboxes would make the system less convenient for users as smartcards or products such as day passes or stored value could not be loaded on board buses. For the system the full audit, security and data potential of a new system would be unavailable for cash fares.

Alternate scenarios for implementing the open payment/smart card system would be to include only one suburban operator initially. The cost impact of either St. Albert or Strathcona joining the systems at a later date would be $318,000 and $417,000, respectfully. All three operators need the same hardware and software in order to maintain the limited existing fare integration, and to extend or improve it across all
systems. If ETS, StAT and Strathcona do not all have the same smartcard system the existing integration would no longer be possible.

**Operating costs**

ETS spends about 8 percent of revenue on fare collection with the current system. St. Albert and Strathcona spend less than 2 percent of their total revenue on revenue collection. Regionally about $8.6 million is currently being spent on fare collection operations and maintenance. The higher operating and maintenance costs at ETS are created by need for dispersed ticket vending machines on the LRT and a broader range of fare media products and distribution points. The new automated system will increase regional fare system operating costs by about $3.5 however the percentage of revenue remains the same at about 8 percent. The new total cost is estimated to be about $12.1 million dollars per year (see Appendix 6).

**Business Case**

A new fare system will simplify regional transit fares and make it more convenient for passengers. The system will improve security, reduce fare evasion and provide new data for use in planning and marketing. Implementing a new integrated fare structure will also generate about $230 million in additional revenue over the 15 year life of the equipment and that will more than offset any capital costs after grants, or additional operating and maintenance costs. There are many qualitative benefits to also be achieved with a smart card based system as summarized below. In addition, the system is expected to achieve a return on the investment over a period of five to seven years."

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

The adoption of an integrated regional fare structure and smart card system together with new electronic fareboxes will achieve many significant objectives. These objectives include:

**Key Benefits for Customers**

- Easier to understand fares and discount program choices
- Maximizes convenience and flexibility for payment options at LRT Stations, from home using website and at designated Point of Sales outlets
- Ability to Hotlist lost or stolen smart cards
- Faster transaction time for fare payment
- Improved regional fare equity
Key Benefits for Region’s Fare System Management

- Reduce fare complexity and improved equity for passengers
- Significantly improved revenue and ridership data
- Reduction of cash fares
- Improved verification of passes, cash and discount fares
- Reduced opportunities for fare shorting or evasion
- Improved data for financial, marketing and planning purposes
- Obtain better data from U-Pass Program customers
- Easier to implement new fare policies and innovative products designed to increase ridership and improve convenience

It is recommended that the Capital Region Board support the following:

1. The implementation of a highly integrated fare structure and smart card system;
2. The Business Case for the Governance Structure include integrated fares;
3. In principle, a formal zone fare system for the purpose of improving equity for passengers, based on the principle that trips of similar quality or length and duration require similar fares;
4. Specific zone boundaries and fare levels including discount levels to be determined as part of an implementation study conducted by the new regional governance entity;
5. Future fare levels and discount programs to be confirmed as part of an implementation study done by the entity responsible for Regional Transit, as determined by the Capital Region Board;
6. As a next step, the Capital Region Board prepare a Concept of Operations Plan to move these recommendations to the next level of planning, which would include the identification and potential resolution of issues and concerns. This Plan would be supplemented with a Peer Review Meeting to call upon other Transit Agencies to share their practical experiences in similar transition situations.
7. Subsequent to the Concept of Operations Plan, proposals be developed for furnishing a system wide smart card system based on the initial implementation of a House Card with Open Payments on the rail system, followed by a second phase with Open Payment on all buses;
8. Acknowledgement that a fully integrated fare system will require upgrades to the Light Rail ticket vending machines, installation of additional platform validators and equipping all buses included in the regional fleet with electronic fareboxes;

9. An understanding that if a regional transit entity does not exist at the time procurement is ready to advance, then an administrative committee made up of members of each current transit operator, prepare the specifications to ensure the regional goals are met in the system design.
REGIONAL HOUSING COMMITTEE

Committee Report #19
February 14th, 2013

1. Committee Meeting Dates - Last Meeting: January 17th, 2013
   - Next Committee Meeting: March 21st, 2013

2. 2013 Housing Committee Project Updates

Sub-Regional Planning Model
On behalf of the consulting team, Kent Fletcher presented a project status update. The presentation included brief summaries of the project purpose, scope and approach. The Committee was informed of some preliminary findings from the data gathering phase of the environmental scan. Kent described a general trend of municipal reliance on local or sub-regional management bodies to provide non-market housing. Many of the management bodies surveyed were focused on seniors only. Municipalities cited their lack of resources as a limiting factor for their ability to prepare non-market housing plans. Kent outlined apparent housing gaps, the potential for partnerships at the sub-regional level, as well as the barriers facing municipalities and providers. The consultant explained how potential roles and responsibilities for the CRB could be drawn out of a literature review of regional housing best practices. The consultant clarified potential future project requirements and described the project's next steps. The Committee heard that a draft report outline would be presented to the project steering committee on February 15, before the next update to the Regional Housing Committee would occur.

Integrated Land Use and Affordable Housing Advisory Committee
Following the approval of the Our Affordable Future report at the December 13 CRB meeting, CRB Administration provided an implementation planning update. The Committee was informed of the interest expressed by the professional associations of the development and homebuilding industries. CRB Administration confirmed that it would work with UDI, CHBA and CMHC to explore partnership opportunities related to the implementation of the report's recommendations. The Committee briefly discussed the role of the Integrated Land Use and Housing Advisory Committee and whether or not it would be reconvened. CRB Administration recommended that, for the time being, implementation planning, updates and input proceed through the Regional Housing Committee, rather than reconvening the Advisory Committee or forming a steering committee. While the Committee did not object to this, there was agreement that the Advisory Committee would be apprised of implementation progress by way of a yearly 'check-up'. This understanding was the basis of the following approved motion:

That Housing Committee directs CRB Administration convene a yearly implementation update of the ‘Our Affordable Future’ market affordable housing policy framework to the members of the Integrated Land Use and Housing Advisory Committee.

_____________________________
Ed Gibbons, Chair, Regional Housing Committee
GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Committee Report #35

February 14, 2013

1. Committee Meeting – January 14, 2013

   • Next Meeting: February 25, 2013

2. 2012 Governance Committee Priorities

   Fiscal Year End
   A motion was passed to recommend that Alberta Municipal Affairs change the CRB’s financial year end from December 31st to a financial year end of March 31st.

   Update to CRB Growth Plan
   CRB Administration gave a presentation on the Project Plan for the update to the CRB’s Growth Plan. An overview of the approach taken to develop the Growth Plan in 2008/2009 and the preliminary approach developed for the 2015 Growth Plan update was provided to members. CRB Administration is currently developing a Terms of Reference for the Project and anticipates that it will be finalized in late February or early March. The Committee will review the draft Terms of Reference before going forward to the Board for approval. Administration will provide a progress update on the Project Plan at the next Committee meeting.

   Audited Financial Statements
   A motion was passed to recommend a Notice of Motion to the Board for the approval of the 2012 Audited Financial Statements. At the February Committee meeting the CRB Auditor will present the Financial Statements to the Committee.

   Annual Report
   A motion was passed to recommend a Notice of Motion to the Board for the approval of the CRB’s 2012 Annual Report. The draft Report will be brought forward to the Committee at its February meeting before going to the Board for approval in March.

   CRB Committee’s Terms of Reference
   CRB Administration brought forward the amended Committee’s Terms of Reference noting that the changes were made to clarify the selection of the Chair of all CRB Committee’s and the Committee’s composition. It was suggested that the Terms of Reference should state that if the Committee Chair resigns or is no longer able to act as Chair then a new Committee Chair will be selected. Administration will amend the Committee’s Terms of Reference before going forward to the Board. Administration will also add a statement to clarify that in the absence of the Chair, the Vice Chair will assume all roles and responsibilities of the Committee Chair. A motion was passed to recommend the approval of the amended Committee’s Terms of Reference.
3. Other Business

MDP Compliance with Growth Plan
A Municipal Development Plan (MDP) Status Report was provided to members for their information. A motion was passed that the Committee receive the MDP Status Report as information.

FCM update
Administration noted that an email was sent to the Board providing some initial information regarding the Regional Partnerships meeting, occurring prior to the FCM conference, on May 30, 2013. Further details and a RSVP request will be distributed at a later date once more information is confirmed.

Linda Osinchuk, Vice Chair, Governance Committee
PIPELINE LINKAGES STRATEGY (PLS) COMMITTEE
Committee Report #12
February 14, 2013

1. Committee Meetings—January 10, 2013
   - Next Committee Meeting: To be determined.

2. Committee Mandate and Terms of Reference

   Mandate
   The Committee reviewed the mandate as approved by the Board in 2011 and discussed whether the mandate is still
   relevant and/or if changes should be introduced. Strathcona County presented a proposal for an enhanced mandate
   which the Committee also reviewed and discussed.

   The Committee moved and carried a motion that the “Pipeline Linkages Committee move forward to propose a new
   Committee which has the mandate to support the Government of Alberta in their long-term efforts to add value to
   Alberta’s oil and gas resources and the development of higher value processing and associated facilities, to build
   Alberta’s and Canada’s energy value chain economy.”

   Committee Composition
   The Committee reviewed its current composition and cognizant that the composition of all Committees will be thoroughly
   reviewed by the Board following the October 2013 municipal election, recommended that the Chair, Vice-Chair and
   member municipalities remain the same until that time.

   The Committee moved and carried a motion that CRB Administration update the existing Terms of Reference with the
   changes agreed to by the Committee. The Committee agreed that once the Terms of Reference have been finalized by
   the Committee, the Committee will provide this information to the Governance Committee at the same time it requests a
   three-year 2013-2015 business plan and budget from all CRB Committees.

   A motion was moved to move in-camera which was carried by the Committee.


4. Other Business

   - Strathcona Intervenor Update

   - Advocacy Activities
     i. Vancouver Jan 31-Feb 1
     ii. Alberta Enterprise Luncheon Jan 30
     iii. Federal Edmonton Caucus Presentation

   The Committee moved and carried a motion that the Committee revert to public.

   The Committee moved and carried a motion to approve the 2013-2015 Business Plan and Budget as discussed.
The Committee moved and carried a motion to submit a motion to the Advocacy and Communications Committee requesting their approval for travel and the related expenses of approximately $1,200 to allow the Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee Chair to travel and meet with the media and other stakeholders to coincide with the JRP hearings taking place in Vancouver January 30-February 1, 2013.

The Committee moved and carried a motion that the Committee put forward a motion to the Governance Committee to request a small contingency of $5,000 be provided to the Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee to allow this Committee to continue to meet, at least periodically, until the Board can determine its financial position for the 2013-2015 Business Plan period.

5. **New Business**

Councillor Purdy informed the Committee that the Globe and Mail had interviewed him in relation to the Wabamun oil spill that resulted from a railway accident in August 2005. This interview took place in preparation of an article the Globe and Mail was preparing about shipping oil by rail which was targeted for print for the January 12th edition. The reporter was referred to Mayor Houston as Chair of this Committee.

Stuart Houston, Chair Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee

### 2013 Annual Calendar Year Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>January</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOA Regular Grant - $250,000 x 12 months</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA Planning Intern Grant</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA Economic Roadmap Grant</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Carryover from 2011</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed Services</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Income</td>
<td>$115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,019,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>January</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board and Committees</td>
<td>$305,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria</td>
<td>$21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$4,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>$5,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$1,803,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries/Benefits</td>
<td>$87,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Lease/Utilities</td>
<td>$14,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal &amp; Professional Fees</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>$1,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$1,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>$581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other expenses</td>
<td>$126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Fees</td>
<td>$880,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Fees</td>
<td>$34,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Projects</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Roadmap</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Intern</td>
<td>$125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Furniture/Equipment</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,019,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated Project Funds</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surplus (Deficit)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$577,301</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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