Board Meeting
Comprehensive Agenda
November 12, 2015 – 9:00 – Noon
Chateau Louis, Grand Ballroom
11727 Kingsway, Edmonton

1. Call to Order

2. Chair’s Opening Remarks

Consent Agenda Items:

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the meeting agenda and its previous meeting minutes.

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes of October 8, 2015

5. Review of CRB Committee Memberships

Recommended Motion: That the Capital Region Board direct administration to facilitate the process for selecting committee membership for the Housing Committee.

6. Land Use & Planning Committee

a. Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan

Recommended Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan, as recommended by the Land Use & Planning Committee.

7. Board Information Requests Update

8. Committee/Task Force Minutes

a. Land Use & Planning Committee – Draft Minutes, Chair Update

b. Growth Plan Update Task Force – Draft Minutes, Chair Update

Created: October 19, 2015
Updated: November 4, 2015
9. Administrative Items
   a. CEO’s Update

10. Other Business
   a. Minister of Municipal Affairs Address
   b. Facilitated Mandate Discussion

   **Recommended Motion:** That the Capital Region Board refer the facilitated conversation results to Administration for a recommendation(s) to be brought back to the Board no later than the March 10, 2016 Board meeting for a decision.

11. Adjournment
Minutes of the meeting of the Capital Region Board held at Grand Ballroom, Chateau Louis Conference Centre on Thursday, October 8, 2015

Delegates in Attendance:
Mayor Nolan Crouse – St. Albert/Chair
Councillor Perry Hendricks – Beaumont (alternate)
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord
Mayor Karl Hauch – Bruderheim
Mayor Wally Yachometz – Calmar
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Councillor Louise Bauder – Gibbons (alternate)
Mayor Bill Skinner – Lamont
Reeve Wayne Woldanski – Lamont County
Councillor Dana Smith – Leduc (alternate)
Mayor John Whaley – Leduc County
Councillor Carol Tremblay – Legal (alternate)
Councillor Stephen Dafoe – Morinville (alternate)
Mayor Rod Shaigec – Parkland County
Mayor Mel Smith – Redwater
Mayor Stuart Houston – Spruce Grove
Mayor William Choy – Stony Plain
Mayor Roxanne Carr – Strathcona County
Mayor Tom Flynn – Sturgeon County
Councillor Rick Hart – Thorsby (alternate)
Mayor Art Erickson – Wabamun
Mayor Ralph van Assen – Warburg
Bruce McDonald – Government of Alberta

Absent:
Mayor Stephen Lindop – Devon

CRB Administration:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Stephanie Chai, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Leslie Chivers, Operations Manager
Brandt Denham, GIS Coordinator
Amanda Borman, Executive Assistant
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant
1. **Call to Order**
   Called to order 9:00 a.m.

2. **Chair’s Opening Remarks**
   - Welcome Councillor Perry Hendricks to the table as representative for Beaumont.
   - Congratulations to Mayor Lisa Holmes for being elected AUMA President, and to Town of Lamont Mayor Bill Skinner and CAO Sandi Maschmeyer for being awarded the AUMA Award for Excellence.
   - Thank you to Project Manager, Stephanie Chai for the work on the 2015 Housing Symposium; well done.
   - Brief review of meeting with Minister Bilous regarding the review of the CRB/CRP mandates. Awaiting confirmation of Minister Bilous’ attendance at the November 12, 2015 Board meeting.
   - Time permitting there will be an open discussion regarding the Group of 9 added to the agenda as 12d.

3. **Approval of Agenda**
   
   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the Agenda of October 8, 2015, with the inclusion of a Group of 9 Discussion as 12d – time permitting.
   
   23 in favour, 1 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion carried.**

4. **Approval of Minutes**
   
   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the Minutes of September 10, 2015. **Motion carried unanimously.**

5. **Economic Development Initiative**
   
   **a. Governance, Priorities & Finance Motion**
   
   **Motion:** Moved by Mayor Choy.
Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve and implement the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Strategy and Framework, with a revised cost sharing formula, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

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

b. St. Albert Motion #1

Moved by Mayor Boyd. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve and implement the Edmonton Metropolitan Region Economic Development Strategy and Framework, with a revised cost sharing formula, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee.

Mayor Don Iveson, Edmonton, put forward a friendly amendment to include “and the completion of the report no later than March 31, 2016” in the motion. The friendly amendment was accepted.

Motion: That the Capital Region Board postpone this matter (Economic Development) and that it be reviewed following completion of the work resulting from the Municipal Affairs Minister’s recent announcement relative to the CRB/CRP review, and the completion of the report no later than March 31, 2016.

Mayor Boyd requests a recorded vote on the next two motions.

3 in favour, 21 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. Motion Failed.

In Favour: St. Albert, Leduc County and Devon

Opposed: Beaumont, Bon Accord, Bruderheim, Calmar, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Gibbons, Lamont, Lamont County, Leduc, Legal, Morinville, Parkland County, Redwater, Spruce Grove, Stony Plain, Strathcona County, Sturgeon County, Thorsby, Wabamun and Warburg.

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

Mayor Don Iveson, Edmonton, moved to refer the Economic Development Initiative discussion. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the motion on the floor regarding Economic Development and the proposal be referred back to CRB administration to work (in conjunction with the mandate review) with the Province, EDOs and self-identified municipalities to facilitate preparation of a revised
proposal with two implementation options: one via the CRB and one independent of the CRB and to report back no later than March 31, 2016.

Mayor Boyd requests a recorded vote on the motion.

Mayor Roxanne Carr, Strathcona County, put forward a friendly amendment to include “Economic Development” in the motion. The friendly amendment was accepted.

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

**In Favour:** St. Albert, Beaumont, Bon Accord, Bruderheim, Calmar, Devon, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Gibbons, Lamont, Lamont County, Leduc, Leduc County, Legal, Morinville, Parkland County, Redwater, Spruce Grove, Stony Plain, Strathcona County, Sturgeon County, Wabamun and Warburg.

**Opposed:** Thorsby

c. **St. Albert Motion #2**

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

**Moved by** Mayor Crouse. **Accepted by** Chair.

**Motion:** That a “Pay to Participate Policy” be proposed by Administration to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee and subsequently to the Board in 2016 as a possible enabler for Board-endorsed matters.

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

The vote was recorded as requested by Mayor Randy Boyd, Bon Accord.

**In Favour:** St. Albert, Beaumont, Bon Accord, Bruderheim, Calmar, Devon, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Gibbons, Lamont, Lamont County, Leduc, Leduc County, Legal, Morinville, Parkland County, Redwater, Spruce Grove, Stony Plain, Strathcona County, Sturgeon County, Wabamun and Warburg.

**Opposed:** Leduc County and Thorsby

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

6. **Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee**

a. **Policy Update – G013**
Moved by Reeve Woldanski. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the revised Policy G013, Committee and Task Force Meeting Procedures, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Information Request: What are the parameters for a meeting held with people off-site (i.e. teleconference or videoconference)

Mayor Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County, moved to amend the draft policy G013 wording under section 2 – Application and Interpretation by removing item d. The friendly amendment was accepted.

Amendment: That item d under Application and Interpretation be removed in Policy G013.

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

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the revised Policy G013, Committee and Task Force Meeting Procedures, as amended and recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Motion carried unanimously.

b. Budget – Membership Contributions

Moved by Mayor Erickson. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Capital Region board approve ongoing fixed membership contributions, and, that should provincial matching funding be available, the Board decide on further contributions, based on budgetary needs, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Mayor Roxanne Carr, Strathcona County, requested the recommended motion be broken into two separate pieces.

Split Motion #1: That the Capital Region board approve ongoing fixed membership contributions.

8 in favour, 16 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. Motion Failed.
Split Motion #2: If provincial matching funding is available, the Board will decide on further contributions, based on budgetary needs, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

20 in favour, 4 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion Carried.**

c. 2016/17 First Draft Budget

**Moved by** Reeve Woldanski. **Accepted by** Chair.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board receive the draft 2016/17 Budget as information, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

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

**Information Request:** If there is a change to Board membership, how do we deal with membership contributions?

7. Housing Committee

a. **Housing Symposium Review - verbal**

The Capital Region Board received the Housing Symposium Review as presented by Ms. Stephanie Chai.

b. **Provincial Advocacy on Affordable Housing**

**Moved by** Mayor van Assen. **Accepted by** Chair.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board send a letter from the Board Chair to the Province regarding a Government Loan Program for Housing Foundations to allow direct borrowing from the Alberta Capital Finance Authority without affecting municipal borrowing capacity, as recommended by the Housing Committee.

Mayor Don Iveson, Edmonton, put forward a friendly amendment to include “subject to member support in the case of foundations” to the motion. The friendly amendment was accepted.

Additionally, Mayor Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County, put forward a friendly amendment to include “and other provincial or local non-profit housing organizations” to the motion. The friendly amendment was accepted.
Motion: That the Capital Region Board send a letter from the Board Chair to the Province regarding a Government Loan Program for Housing Foundations and other provincial or local non-profit housing organizations to allow direct borrowing from the Alberta Capital Finance Authority without affecting municipal borrowing capacity, subject to member support in the case of foundations, as recommended by the Housing Committee.

Motion carried unanimously.

8. Growth Plan Update Task Force

9. Board Information Requests Update

10. Committee/Task Force Minutes
   a. Advocacy & Monitoring Committee – draft minutes
   b. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee – draft minutes and update provided
   c. Housing Committee – draft minutes
   d. Transit Committee – draft minutes

11. Other Business
   a. Redwater Motion – CRB Membership Review

      Moved by Mayor Smith. Accepted by Chair.

      Motion: That the Capital Region Board commence a membership review pursuant to Policy G019 – Capital Region Board Membership Review Process, and that the Minister of Municipal Affairs be notified of this undertaking.

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

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

      Motion carried unanimously.

12. Administrative Items
   a. CEO’s Update

      • Budget update: Paperwork has been submitted to the Province, payment is forthcoming.
      • Handout 1: Priority Areas/ Mandate Comparisons for consideration.
      • Handout 2: Abbreviated Agenda package for the Board’s consideration, any comments are requested back to Malcolm before the next Board meeting, November 12, 2015.

b. Strategic Plan Performance Measures

c. July – September Financial Statements
d. Group of 9 Discussion

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

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

13. Adjournment

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 11:58 a.m.
CRB Bi-annual review of Committee Membership

Recommended Motion

That the Capital Region Board direct administration to facilitate the process for selecting committee membership for the Housing Committee.

There has been no expressed desire from participating municipalities to change the municipal representation on the current committees, except for the Housing Committee.

Background

- On August 13, 2015, the Board passed the following motion;

  That the Capital Region Board maintain the current committee membership and direct administration to bring the committee structure review back after the completion of the Growth Plan Update, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

- On October 22, 2015, The Capital Region Board was notified of the upcoming bi-annual committee membership review.
  
  o Member municipalities were asked if they wished to change committee membership.
  o Administration received two responses seeking no change to committee memberships.
  o Administration received one response asking for a change to the Housing Committee membership.

- The Growth Plan Update Task Force Terms of Reference does not include a review of Task Force Membership given the Task Force is working on a specific task over a defined period of time.

Rationale:

There is a benefit in maintaining the current municipal representation moving forward as there would be little to no disruption in committee work. It is administration's recommendation that only the Housing Committee go through the process for selecting members at this time.

Attachments:

1. Overview of committee terms of references
2. Current committee memberships
3. Process for selecting committee membership
## Attachment 1: Overview of committee terms of references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Terms of Membership</th>
<th>Chair review</th>
<th>Next reviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>The Board Chair, the Chairs from the standing committees of Governance, Priorities &amp; Finance, Land Use &amp; Planning, Housing, and Transit, the City of Edmonton and a member at large.</td>
<td>Membership will be reviewed by the Board every two years.</td>
<td>At the end of a two year period, once the committee membership has been reviewed by the Board, the committee will also review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance, Priorities, and Finance</td>
<td>Edmonton, two Cities, three Counties, three Towns and one Village as determined by the Board or as approved by the Board.</td>
<td>Membership will be reviewed by the Board every two years.</td>
<td>At the end of a two year period, once the committee membership has been reviewed by the Board, the committee will also review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Planning</td>
<td>Edmonton, two Cities, three Counties, four Towns, and one Village as determined by the Board or as approved by the Board.</td>
<td>Membership will be reviewed by the Board every two years.</td>
<td>At the end of a two year period, once the committee membership has been reviewed by the Board, the committee will also review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Committee</td>
<td>Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, City of Leduc, St. Albert, Spruce Grove, Strathcona County and Sturgeon County.</td>
<td>Membership will be reviewed by the Board, every two years.</td>
<td>If there is a change in the committee’s membership, the committee should review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Committee</td>
<td>Six members, one from each sub-region. Each sub-region will select its own representative.</td>
<td>Membership will be reviewed by the Board, every two years.</td>
<td>If there is a change in the committee’s membership, the committee should review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment 2: Current committee memberships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Governance, Priorities &amp; Finance Committee</th>
<th>Land Use &amp; Planning Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>Edmonton&lt;br&gt;St. Albert&lt;br&gt;Leduc</td>
<td>Edmonton&lt;br&gt;Fort Saskatchewan&lt;br&gt;Leduc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>Parkland&lt;br&gt;Lamont&lt;br&gt;Sturgeon</td>
<td>Parkland&lt;br&gt;Leduc&lt;br&gt;Sturgeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td>Beaumont&lt;br&gt;Bon Accord&lt;br&gt;Calmar</td>
<td>Morinville&lt;br&gt;Stony Plain&lt;br&gt;Gibbons&lt;br&gt;Bruderheim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages</td>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>Thorsby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Transit Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cities</td>
<td>Edmonton&lt;br&gt;Fort Saskatchewan&lt;br&gt;Leduc&lt;br&gt;St. Albert&lt;br&gt;Spruce Grove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>Strathcona&lt;br&gt;Sturgeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-regions</th>
<th>Housing Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland</td>
<td>1 - Stony Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon</td>
<td>1 - Redwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>1 - Warburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>1 - Lamont County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Advocacy &amp; Monitoring Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>1 - St. Albert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing Committee Chairs</td>
<td>4 - Governance, Finance &amp; Priorities&lt;br&gt;Housing&lt;br&gt;Land Use &amp; Planning&lt;br&gt;Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member at Large</td>
<td>1 - Leduc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other members identified in TOR</td>
<td>1 - Edmonton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 3: Process for selecting committee membership

This process will be used to appoint municipal representation for the various committees. Following this process, municipalities can appoint individual members.

- In instances where there are fewer interested municipalities than available positions, the committee membership will be reduced.
- The Advocacy and Monitoring Committee membership will be comprised of the Board Chair, Committee Chairs, and one member at large selected by the Board.
- The Transit and Housing Committee memberships will not be determined through this process; and
- The City of Edmonton will have representation on the Advocacy and Monitoring Committee, Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee, Land Use & Planning Committee, Housing Committee, and Transit Committee. As a result, Edmonton will not participate in the selection process to determine representation from the remaining cities.

Municipal membership appointments are required for the following committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Member at large</th>
<th>Cities</th>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Towns</th>
<th>Villages</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy and Monitoring Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Standing Committee Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance, Priorities &amp; Finance Committee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use &amp; Planning Committee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Committee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>One from each sub-region; Lamont, Leduc, Parkland, Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan, and Sturgeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Committee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Membership determined by operators, as listed in the TOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process for the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee, and the Land Use & Planning Committee

1. The Board will divide into its various municipal categories: cities, towns, counties and villages.
2. For each committee, the group will be asked the following:
   a. Which municipalities would like to be considered for appointment?
      ➤ In instances where the number of interested municipalities equals the number of positions available, those municipalities will be assigned
      ➤ In instances where the number of interested municipalities is less than the number of positions available, the interested municipalities will be assigned and the group will be polled again to determine if another municipality will consider putting their name forward
      ➤ In instances, where the number of interested is more than the number of positions available, then the group will need to determine if it wishes to conduct an election or draw names

**Appointment by Election:**
1. Each municipality will receive 1 ballot for each committee
2. Each municipality may cast as many votes as there are positions available. However, each vote must go to a different municipality, otherwise the ballot will be deemed invalid
3. The municipality with the most votes will be appointed, followed by the second most votes and so on until all the available positions have been filled
4. Where there is a tie, the tied municipalities’ names will be written on a slip of paper, put in a bowl and one will be drawn by the facilitator. The municipality drawn as required will be appointed and the chart updated

**Appointment by Draw:**
1. Each municipality desiring committee membership will put its name on a slip of paper for that committee into a bowl designated for that committee. One slip will be drawn from each committee bowl by the facilitator. Those drawn will be considered assigned.

Process Description for the Housing Committee

1. The Board will divide into the Housing sub-regions (Lamont, Leduc, Parkland, Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan, and Sturgeon)
2. For each sub-region, the group will be asked the following:
   a. Which municipalities would like to be considered for appointment?
      ➤ In instances where the number of interested municipalities equals the number of positions available, those municipalities will be assigned
      ➤ In instances where the number of interested municipalities is less than the number of positions available, the interested municipalities will be assigned and the group will be polled again to determine if another municipality will consider putting their name forward
      ➤ In instances, where the number of interested is more than the number of positions available, then the group will determine if they wish to conduct an election or draw names – as per steps described for GPF and LUP
Process Description for the Transit Committee

The Transit Committee membership is defined by member municipalities named in the terms of reference. Therefore, in order to review committee membership, the Transit Committee must review and suggest changes to the membership section in the terms of reference, to be approved by the Committee and subsequently by The Board.

Process Description for the Advocacy and Monitoring Committee

The Board selects a member-at-large to sit on the Advocacy and Monitoring Committee.

1. Any interested members must express an interest in sitting on the Advocacy and Monitoring Committee to the CEO before November 15, 2015.
2. In instances where the number of interested members is greater than one, an election will occur at a Board meeting
3. Each interested member will be given five minutes to speak
4. Each municipality will receive 1 ballot
5. Each must write the name of the candidate it supports
6. The ballots will be counted by the CAO and reported to the Board
7. Where there is a tie, the tied candidates’ names will be written on a slip of paper, put in a bowl and one will be drawn by the facilitator. The municipality drawn will be appointed to the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee
Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan

Recommended Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan, as recommended by the Land Use & Planning Committee.

Background

- On September 11, 2014, the Capital Region Board approved the Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework Report. The Report included a framework for establishing future energy corridors policy and recommended that the Board undertake the preparation of an Integrated Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan.

- On October 9, 2014, the Board approved a revised 2014 Business Plan and Budget including the preparation of a Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan by the Land Use & Planning Committee.

- On October 22, 2015 the Land Use & Planning Committee approved a motion recommending that the Capital Region Board approve the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan.

Rationale:

- Energy corridors play a significant role in the regional economy. Without a coordinated approach, the ad hoc planning of corridors runs the risk of unintentionally sterilizing land, impacting the implementation and patterns of growth, and supplanting opportunities to support economic development. The Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan establishes policies and criteria for identification and protection of Regional Energy Corridors within the Capital Region in a manner that is consistent and compatible with the Principles and Policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

- The Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan has received significant stakeholder input including two workshops with representatives from industry, AER, AESO, municipalities and the provincial government. In addition, the Committee sought input on the draft report from Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Association, which was subsequently incorporated into the Master Plan.

- The Growth Plan Update Task Force is currently in the policy development phase of the Growth Plan 2.0 initiative. The Master Plan will inform the development of Growth Plan policies, in particular, those related to the Priority Growth Areas, the overall development pattern, and locations of key future infrastructure.

Attachments:

1. Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan
Executive Summary

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

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

and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Corridor Strategy

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

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

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

Short Term – 0 to 5 years

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

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

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

Medium Term – 5 to 20 years

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

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

Long Term – 20 plus years

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

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

Recommendations and Further Actions

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

Recommendations

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

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

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

Further Actions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.1 Organization of the Master Plan

The Master Plan is organized into six sections:

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

2.1 Capital Region Board Mandate

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

2.2 Growth Plan Objectives

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

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

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

2.3 Growth Plan Principles and Policies

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

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

**Protect the environment and resources**

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

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

Strengthen communities

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

Increase transportation choice

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

Ensure efficient provision of services

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

Support regional economic development

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

2.4 Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.5 Growth and Constraints

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.6 Future Corridor Development

Future Power Transmission Projects

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

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

2.7 Recent Energy Corridor Planning

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

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

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

2.8 Municipal Legislative Limitations

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

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

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

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

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

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

Principle 1 Preserve the Integrity of Priority Growth Areas

Preamble

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

Policy

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

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

Preamble

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

Policy

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

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

3.2 Minimize Land Use Conflicts and Fragmentation of Land

Principle 1 Reduce Land Use Conflicts Associated with Regional Energy Corridors

Preamble

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

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

Policies

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

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

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

Principle 2 Minimize Fragmentation of Growth Areas

Preamble

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

Policies

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

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

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

Preamble

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

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

Policies

A. Regional energy corridors will establish connections to existing and future planned upstream sources, national and global energy markets, and major employment areas within the Region.
B. Regional energy corridor needs will be strategically prioritized in order to efficiently meet current and future demands to move upstream goods, and grow and strengthen the Regional economy.
C. The expansion of existing, and the identification of new regional energy corridors, will be supported by a business case that demonstrates the role of regional energy corridors as a key component of the success of the energy sector and the economic prosperity of the Capital Region. The business case will also be used to assist the Capital Region Board in identifying priorities for regional energy corridor growth.

3.4 Ensure Effective Coordination of Energy Corridors Across and Between Jurisdictions

Principle 1 Coordinate Energy Corridor Planning and Development between Jurisdictions

Preamble

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.1 Identify Existing Regional Energy Corridors

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

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

Regional Corridors

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

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

Power Line Corridors and Rights-of-Way
Heartland Transmission Line
- Western Alberta 500kv Transmission Line
- Eastern Alberta 500kv Transmission Line
- Fort McMurray West 500 kV Transmission Project (Under construction)
- Fort McMurray East 500 kV Transmission Project (Deferred as of Oct 2015)

4.2 Assess Priority Corridor Needs and Options

4.2.1 Corridor Needs

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

The overall needs assessment is summarised on Table 1.0.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The identified Priority Energy Corridors connect four key industrial areas in the northeast portion of the Capital Region:
1. Refinery Row – East of the North Saskatchewan River
2. Alberta’s Industrial Heartland – East of the North Saskatchewan River
3. Alberta’s Industrial Heartland – West of the North Saskatchewan River
4. Edmonton Energy and Technology Park - West of the North Saskatchewan River

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

4.3.1 Priority Energy Corridors:
1. North East Penetrator Corridor - Connecting Refinery Row and the TUC to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland

2. Heartland East Connector Corridor - Connecting the NEPC into AIH following the southern edge of the Canadian Pacific Rail line

3. Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor – An energy corridor around the core of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland for raw products coming from the northeast portion of the province

4. AIH Intersite Connector Corridor - Connecting into and within the chemical cluster, storage and tank farms of the AIH. This is an internal AIH corridor network

5. Redwater Bypass Corridor - To provide access into the northern border of Sturgeon County into and out of the AIH on the west side of the North Saskatchewan River

6. Edmonton Energy and Technology Park (EETP) Connector - Connecting the EETP in northeast Edmonton to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.

7. Northwest Alberta Connector – Shipping petroleum products from the Swan Hills, Rainbow Lake, Norman Wells fields and others in northwest Alberta to the Capital Region.

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

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

**Short Term – 0 to 5 years**

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

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

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

**Medium Term – 5 to 20 years**

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

- **Redwater Bypass Corridor** – An energy corridor from northeast Alberta to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland on north side of the North Saskatchewan River.

- **Northwest Alberta Connector** - An energy corridor from northwest Alberta and northeast British Columbia to Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.

**Long Term – 20 plus years**

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

4.4 Priority Corridor Protection Approaches and Strategy

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

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

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

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

**Land Easement/ Ownership**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Land Use Tools**

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

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

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

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

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

4.4.2 Preferred Corridor Protection Strategy

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

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

Table 2.0: Stakeholder Workshop Corridor Protection Options Feedback

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

5.1 Recommendations

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

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

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

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

5.2 Further Actions

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

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

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

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

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

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

The CRB Energy Corridors Policy Framework commitments are outlined below.

Policy Framework

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

Recommendations

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Connecting the NEPC into the AIH along two parallel Heartland Connector corridors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heartland West – Connecting the NEPC to the SE corner of Fort Saskatchewan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Heartland East – Following the southern edge of the CP Rail line north-east</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>A by-pass access around the core of the AIH area for raw products coming from the NE portion of the province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Purpose** | • To provide access into the AIH for major pipelines in NE Alberta  
• To bypass industrial activities in the AIH and access Refinery Row  
• To connect to the Heartland Corridors |
| **Constraints/Design Considerations** | • To develop an economic and effective alignment into the AIH  
• To find routes around existing oil and gas wells and gathering lines south and west of the Town of Bruderheim  
• To find a suitable crossing of Beaverhill Creek  
• To minimize disturbances and impact on alienation of farm land |
| **Protection Status and Options** | • Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor  
• Strathcona County MDP  
  o Policy 7.24 – requires new pipelines or utilities to follow existing corridors, quarter sections or rights of way, in accordance with Map 2;  
  o Policy 7.25 – ensure that new or expanded pipelines or utility corridors do not impact high or medium priority environment management areas, wherever possible;  
  o Policy 16.2 – work with surrounding municipalities and utility companies to ensure integrated utility corridors are created and maintained;  
  o Policy 16.3 – support the rationalization and development of pipeline/utility corridors in consultation with industry, utility companies, federal, provincial and municipal governments;  
  o Policy 16.4 – Use pipeline/utility corridors as multiple use corridors to accommodate oil, natural gas, municipal utilities, electrical transmission lines, communications infrastructure, and pedestrian linkages;  
  o Policy 16.4(a) – encourage that regional corridors and infrastructure as identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan will be integrated into common corridors wherever possible in order to protect these lands for their intended purpose.  
• Lamont County MDP  
  o Policy 10.8(d) – use corridors to integrate a number of utilities;  
  o Policy 10.13 – when planning for future residential development in the areas near pipelines and powerlines, the County will require rights-of-way to contain sufficient width to ensure adequate buffers or setbacks between the proposed residential development and adjoining uses. |
## 4.0 AIH Intersite Connector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Connecting into and within the chemical cluster, storage and tank farms of the AIH. This is an internal AIH corridor network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Purpose  | • To provide external access to the AIH to connect to key points  
|          |   - East to connect to the NE pipeline corridors from the Oilsands and Cold Lake  
|          |   - Access through to the Suncor/ Fort Hills lands and the EETP  
|          |   - South to connect to the Heartland Connector  
|          | • To provide a main internal access corridor within the AIH |
| Constraints/Design Considerations | • Working around existing oil and gas operations (East of river)  
| | • Impact on Silica Sand operations – north of Bruderheim  
| | • Future space to twin Highway 643  
| | • North Saskatchewan River Crossing  
| | • Access through existing industrial developments |
| Protection Status and Options | • Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor  
| | • Strathcona County MDP  
| |   - Policy 7.24 – requires new pipelines or utilities to follow existing corridors, quarter sections or rights of way, in accordance with Map 2;  
| |   - Policy 7.25 – ensure that new or expanded pipelines or utility corridors do not impact high or medium priority environment management areas, wherever possible;  
| |   - Policy 16.2 – work with surrounding municipalities and utility companies to ensure integrated utility corridors are created and maintained;  
| |   - Policy 16.3 – support the rationalization and development of pipeline/utility corridors in consultation with industry, utility companies, federal, provincial and municipal governments;  
| |   - Policy 16.4 – Use pipeline/utility corridors as multiple use corridors to accommodate oil, natural gas, municipal utilities, electrical transmission lines, communications infrastructure, and pedestrian linkages;  
<p>| |   - Policy 16.4(a) – encourage that regional corridors and infrastructure as identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan will be integrated into common corridors wherever possible in order to protect these lands for their intended purpose. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>Redwater Bypass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor</strong></td>
<td>To provide access into the northern border of Sturgeon County into and out of the Heartland on the west side of the North Saskatchewan River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>• Providing access into the AIH, connecting north east Alberta, the Suncor/ Fort Hills lands into the AIH and the EETP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Constraints/ Design Considerations** | • Determining around the Redwater oil and gas fields  
• Redwater River crossing  
• Land alienation impact southeast of the Redwater Town site |
| **Protection Status and Options** | • Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor  
• Strathcona County MDP  
  o Bremner has been identified as a possible constraint to the expansion of the corridor, however, it is believed that the possible constraint may be in the proposed Cambrian development to the west. An amendment is currently being reviewed by the County that would increase the population in this area from 10,000 to 13,500;  
  o Policy 7.24 – requires new pipelines or utilities to follow existing corridors, quarter sections or rights of way, in accordance with Map 2;  
  o Policy 7.25 – ensure that new or expanded pipelines or utility corridors do not impact high or medium priority environment management areas, wherever possible;  
  o Policy 16.2 – work with surrounding municipalities and utility companies to ensure integrated utility corridors are created and maintained;  
  o Policy 16.3 – support the rationalization and development of pipeline/utility corridors in consultation with industry, utility companies, federal, provincial and municipal governments;  
  o Policy 16.4 – Use pipeline/utility corridors as multiple use corridors to accommodate oil, natural gas, municipal utilities, electrical transmission lines, communications infrastructure, and pedestrian linkages;  
  o Policy 16.4(a) – encourage that regional corridors and infrastructure as identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan will be integrated into common corridors wherever possible in order to protect these lands for their intended purpose.  
• Sturgeon County MDP  
  o Policy 5.4.9 – should identify utility corridors that promote efficient use of land and that maximize development potential;  
  o Policy J.5(d) – working with the Province, the Energy Resources Conservation Board and regional partners to formulate a consolidated pipeline plan for locating new pipeline right-of-ways in the AIH region. |
### 6.0 EETP Connector

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

### 7.0 Northwest Alberta Connector

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Consistency with Growth Plan Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Preserve and Protect the Environment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Preserve Agricultural Lands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Minimize the Impact of Heavy Industrial Developments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

1. **High**
   - Corridor has a high level of consistence with Growth Plan Policies
2. **Medium**
   - Corridor has a medium level of consistence with Growth Plan Policies
3. **Low**
   - Corridor has a low level of consistence with Growth Plan Policies

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

- **a. Preserve and Protect the Environment**
  - NEPC: 2
  - Heartland Connectors: 2
  - Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor: 2
  - AIH Intersite Connectors: 2
  - Redwater Bypass: 1
  - EETP Connector: 2
  - Northwest Alberta Connector: 1

- **b. Preserve Agricultural Lands**
  - NEPC: 1
  - Heartland Connectors: 3
  - Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor: 3
  - AIH Intersite Connectors: 2
  - Redwater Bypass: 1
  - EETP Connector: 3
  - Northwest Alberta Connector: 2

- **c. Minimize the Impact of Heavy Industrial Developments**
  - NEPC: 1
  - Heartland Connectors: 2
  - Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor: 2
  - AIH Intersite Connectors: 2
  - Redwater Bypass: 2
  - EETP Connector: 2
  - Northwest Alberta Connector: 1
Core Principle II: Minimize Regional Footprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Consistency with Growth Plan Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Identify, Protect and Prioritize Lands for Regional Infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Concentrate New Growth Within Priority Growth Areas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Allow Growth Outside of Priority Growth Areas</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Principle V: Ensure Efficient Provision of Services

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

Core Principle VI: Support Regional Economic Development

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

- Coordinate System: 3TM114-83
- Projection: Transverse Mercator
- Datum: North American 1983
- Central Meridian: -114.0000

- Priority Growth Area
- Alberta's Industrial Heartland
- Refinery Row/Clover Bar
- Member Municipality (County)
- Member Municipality (Urban)
- Elk Island National Park
- Provincial Park/Protected Area
- Regional Road (Existing)
- Transportation Utility Corridor
- Heartland Priority Pipeline Corridors
- From Swan Hills/Rainbow Lake/Norman Wells
- From Brazeau/Pembina/Drayton Valley
- To Eastern Canada/USA via Hardisty
- To Vancouver via Jasper
- From/To Fort McMurray (bitumen/diluent)
- From/To Cold Lake/South Athabasca (bitumen/diluent)
- Northeast Pipeline Corridor
- Future Energy Corridor
FIGURE 4.0: PRIORITY POWER TRANSMISSION CORRIDORS

Coordinate System: 3TM 114-83
Projection: Transverse Mercator
Datum: North American 1983
central meridian: -114.0000

Alberta’s Industrial Heartland
Refinery Row/Clover Bar
Member Municipality (County)
Member Municipality (Urban)
Urban Service Area
Elk Island National Park
Provincial Park/Protected Area
Regional Road (Existing)
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Transportation Utility Corridor
Heartland Transmission Corridor
Existing Power Transmission Corridor
Power Corridor Under Construction
AESO Planned Major Transmission Line
FIGURE 5.0: REGIONAL ENERGY CORRIDORS, TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES AND GROWTH AREAS

Coordinate System: 3TM 114-83
Projection: Transverse Mercator
Datum: North American 1983
central meridian: -114.0000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR #</th>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015.01</td>
<td>Feb 12</td>
<td>CRB Chair</td>
<td>Members requested that CRB administration report on whether a position on the <em>Municipal Government Act</em> should be taken by the Board.</td>
<td>Complete Apr 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.02</td>
<td>Mar 12</td>
<td>CRB Chair</td>
<td>Members requested that CRB administration and the Land Use &amp; Planning Committee clarify the rural and urban densities.</td>
<td>Complete May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.03</td>
<td>Apr 9</td>
<td>CRB Chair</td>
<td>What have been the external costs for REFs, broken down by municipality, for the last three calendar years?</td>
<td>Complete May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.04</td>
<td>Apr 9</td>
<td>City of Leduc</td>
<td>Clarification: Are municipalities able to exceed their density targets or would they be denied?</td>
<td>Complete May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.05</td>
<td>Apr 9</td>
<td>Leduc County, Sturgeon County</td>
<td>Who is involved in the Economic Development Initiative?</td>
<td>Complete May 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.06</td>
<td>Apr 9</td>
<td>Town of Bon Accord</td>
<td>Do CRB Committees have the right to send items directly to other Board Committees without going through the Board first?</td>
<td>Complete June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.07</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>Town of Bon Accord</td>
<td>Members request administration report to the Governance, Priorities &amp; Finance Committee the impact that disbanding the Regional Services Committee will have on the Financials, and how the funds, if any, will be allocated?</td>
<td>Complete June 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.08</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>CRB Chair</td>
<td>Clarification: what constitutes a meeting of the Board, its Committees and/or Task Forces</td>
<td>Complete May 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.09</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>Is Alberta Transportation willing to buy the right-of-way if an outer corridor was identified to everyone’s satisfaction?</td>
<td>Complete June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Request Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.10</td>
<td>June 11</td>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>What is the methodology used in reporting density targets?</td>
<td>Complete Aug 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.11</td>
<td>Aug 13</td>
<td>CRB Chair</td>
<td>Identify any discretion that can be given around the AMC Retreat as retreat implies a closed session.</td>
<td>Complete Aug 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.12</td>
<td>Sept. 10</td>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>Why are the density targets reviewed on a five year basis? Can density targets be reviewed on a more regular basis using municipal census data?</td>
<td>Complete Sept 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.13</td>
<td>Sept. 10</td>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>How does the methodology used to calculate target densities apply to the Sturgeon Valley in Sturgeon County?</td>
<td>Complete Sept 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.14</td>
<td>Oct. 8</td>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>What are the parameters for meeting held with people off-site (i.e. teleconference or videoconference)</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015.15</td>
<td>Oct. 8</td>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>If there is a change to Board membership, how do we deal with membership contributions?</td>
<td>Complete Oct 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR #</th>
<th>Request Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014.01</td>
<td>Feb 13</td>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>What will be the process for dispersing these line items in the 2014 Budget:</td>
<td>Complete Feb 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• $250,000 - Special Projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• $50,000 - Board Initiatives?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.02</td>
<td>Mar 13</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>Clarification of REF withdrawal process: What are the parameters for making amendments and/or withdrawing a REF appeal once it's been made?</td>
<td>Complete Mar 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.03</td>
<td>Apr 10</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>Members requested that CRB administration report on the province’s position on Agricultural Land Policy.</td>
<td>Complete May 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.04</td>
<td>June 12</td>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>What is impact of potential CRB REDA on local economic development activities in the region?</td>
<td>Complete Oct 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.05</td>
<td>June 12</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>How is agricultural land consumption being monitored and/or tracked?</td>
<td>Complete Oct 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.06</td>
<td>June 12</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>How does CRB interact with Capital Region Waste Minimization Advisory Committee?</td>
<td>Complete Oct 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.07</td>
<td>July 10</td>
<td>Chair CRB, Bon Accord</td>
<td>Does FOIP demand a minimum time limit or format for keeping Board records?</td>
<td>Complete Oct 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.08</td>
<td>July 10</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>Request that a representative of the Ministry of Transportation be invited to attend a Land Use &amp; Planning meeting.</td>
<td>Complete Oct 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.09</td>
<td>Aug 14</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>How will the Economic Development Summit be communicated to the media?</td>
<td>Complete Sept 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.10</td>
<td>Sept 11</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>How will the Energy Corridors Final Report be communicated?</td>
<td>Complete Sept 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.11</td>
<td>Sept 11</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>How will we move forward with the Energy Corridors Final Report?</td>
<td>Complete Sept 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.12</td>
<td>Oct 9</td>
<td>Morinville, Redwater</td>
<td>What will the extra money ($600K from members) projected in the 2015 budget be used for?</td>
<td>Complete Oct 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.13</td>
<td>Oct 9</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>Can the provincial government requisition funds based on the decisions of the Capital Region Board?</td>
<td>Complete June 2, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.14</td>
<td>Oct 9</td>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>This request serves as clarification for IR.2014.10. How was the Energy Corridors Final Report communicated to Alberta Transportation and how was it accepted?</td>
<td>Complete Oct 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.15</td>
<td>Oct 9</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>What additional provincial departments should the Energy Corridors Final Report be communicated to?</td>
<td>Complete Oct 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.16</td>
<td>Oct 9</td>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>For Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas, what densities are actually being achieved on growth approved and growth built out since the Regional Growth Plan took statutory effect?</td>
<td>Complete Dec 1 Follow-up Mar 4, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.17</td>
<td>Nov 13</td>
<td>Chair CRB to Advocacy &amp; Monitoring committee</td>
<td>How do/should we forward information in the Sift Every Thing Report regarding infrastructure to the Province?</td>
<td>Complete Mar 4, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.18</td>
<td>Nov 13</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>Seeking clarification from archived recordings to determine if a letter to Municipal Affairs re REF Amendment to delete Section 5.4 b) (ii) has been formally accepted for debate previously.</td>
<td>Complete Dec 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014.19</td>
<td>Nov 13</td>
<td>Chair CRB</td>
<td>RE: Warburg Motion: Planning Session to Review CRB Voting Structure</td>
<td>Complete Dec 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 8, 2015</td>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>If there is a change to Board membership, how do we deal with membership contributions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2015</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Membership contributions will be reimbursed based on a prorated and adjusted model according to the Membership Contributions approved through the Board budget process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use & Planning Committee

Thursday, October 22, 2015
8:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
La Cité Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
8627 rue-Marie Gaboury (91 Street), Edmonton

Members:
Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County (Chair)
Rod Shaigec, Parkland County (Vice Chair)
Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Clay Stumph, Leduc County
Patricia Lee, Town of Bruderheim
Amber Harris, Town of Gibbons
Barry Turner, Town of Morinville (alternate)
Dwight Ganske, Town of Stony Plain
Barry Rasch, Village of Thorsby (alternate)

Regrets:
David MacKenzie, City of Leduc

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Stephanie Chai, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Victoria Brown, Government of Alberta
Laura Bruno, UDI Edmonton Region
Lindsey Butterfield, City of Edmonton
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Jacquie Hansen, City of St. Albert
Stephen Hill, Lamont County
Debra Irving, City of Spruce Grove
Craig Mahovsky, Sturgeon County
Elaine Milliken, Town of Lamont
Eleanor Mohammed, Town of Beaumont
Thom Stubbs, Headwater Group
Shauna Kuiper, ISL Engineering & Land Services

1. Call to Order

Chair, Mayor Flynn, called the meeting to order at 8:02 a.m.

2. Chair Opening Remarks

3. Approval of Agenda

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Land Use & Planning Committee accept the agenda as presented.
4. Approval of Minutes of August 20, 2015

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Land Use & Planning Committee accept the minutes of August 20, 2015 as presented.

5. Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan

5.1 Final Master Plan

**Motion:** That the Land Use & Planning Committee recommend the Capital Region Board approve the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan.

**Moved by:** Mayor Gale Katchur, *City of Fort Saskatchewan*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

6. Growth Plan Update 2.0

6.1 Committee Consultation Summary Review

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Land Use & Planning Committee accept those Growth Plan Update Policy Framework items discussed for information, and that the review of the Committee’s input be continued at the next scheduled meeting, and electronically.

7. 2016/17 Land Use & Planning Workplan

7.1 Project Prioritization for Budget Purposes

**Motion:** That the Land Use & Planning Committee prioritize the 3 proposed projects as follows: 1. Transportation Prioritization Report Annual Update, 2. Sustainable Development Index Target Setting, and 3. Recreation/Open Space/Wildlife Corridors Study.

**Moved by:** Councillor Ed Gibbons, *City of Edmonton*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

8. 2015 Committee Meeting Schedule

8.1 December 17, 2015 meeting

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that CRB Administration be directed to research a new meeting date, preferably before the scheduled December 17, 2015 meeting, to continue reviewing the Committee’s Growth Plan Update Consultation Summary.

9. Adjournment

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Land Use & Planning Committee meeting be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.
Next Meeting: December 17, 2015 at 9:00 a.m., La Cite Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger

Committee Chair, Tom Flynn
Growth Plan Update Task Force

Friday, October 2, 2015
9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
Nisku Recreation Centre – Banquet Room
606 – 18 Avenue, Nisku

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

Provincial Liaison:
Victoria Brown

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

Strategic Advisor:
Barry Huybens

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

Regrets:
Peter Vana, Regional Technical Advisor

CRB Staff:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Stephanie Chai, Project Manager
Brandt Denham, GIS Coordinator
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Grant Bain, Leduc County
Laura Bruno, UDI-Edmonton Region
Lindsey Butterfield, City of Edmonton
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Linton Delainey, Strathcona County
Paresh Dhariya, Town of Devon
Cathy Ducharme, Strathcona County
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Susan Evans, Sturgeon County
Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton
Connie Gourley, ISL
Ryan Hall, Strathcona County
Jacquie Hansen, City of Edmonton
Michelle Hay, City of Leduc
Debra Irving, City of Spruce Grove
Michael Klassen, Sturgeon County
Cory Labrecque, City of Leduc
Jeff Laurien, Government of Alberta
Marnie Lee, Strathcona County
Lori Lumsden, Town of Redwater
Craig Mahovsky, Sturgeon County
Eleanor Mohammed, Town of Beaumont
Bonnie Riddell, Strathcona County
Rod Shaigec, Parkland County
Adryan Slaght, City of St. Albert
Collin Steffes, Sturgeon County
Ken Voitt, City of Leduc
Patty Walker, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton
Matthew Wispinski, City of Edmonton
1. **Call to Order**

   Chair, Mayor Roxanne Carr called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

2. **Chair’s Opening Remarks**

3. **Approval of Agenda**

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force agenda of October 2, 2015 be approved.
   **Moved by:** Mayor Lisa Holmes, *Town of Morinville*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

4. **Approval of Minutes, August 27, 2015**

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force minutes of August 27, 2015 be approved.
   **Moved by:** Councillor Cathy Heron, *City of St. Albert*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

   Mayor Iveson arrived at 9:15 a.m.
   Victoria Brown arrived at 9:33 a.m.

5. **External Stakeholder Consultant Review**

   a. **Review of Stakeholder Input**

      **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept the External Stakeholder input as information to further inform the Growth Plan 2.0 update.
      **Moved by:** Councillor Stew Henning, *City of Fort Saskatchewan*
      **Decision:** Carried unanimously

   b. **Transit and Mobility Policy Area**

      **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force direct the consultants to review the naming of the Transportation & Mobility policy area and bring back a recommendation that encompasses the context of a broad range of mobility options.
      **Moved by:** Mayor Don Iveson, *City of Edmonton*
      **Decision:** Carried unanimously

   Mayor Carr relinquished the Chair to Consultant Barry Huybens in order to lead the Task Force through the next agenda item.


   a. **What responsibilities go along with responsible growth?**
   b. **Ag Policies...what needs to be considered?**
   c. **Communities and Housing – Core Housing Need...how to address in Plan update?**
7. Coffee Break

Facilitator Barry Huybens relinquished the Chair back to Mayor Carr following discussion.

8. Lunch Break

Mayor Carr relinquished the Chair to facilitator Barry Huybens in order to continue to lead the Task Force through the agenda item.

Facilitator Barry Huybens relinquished the Chair back to Mayor Carr following discussion.

9. Planning Approach – Tiers and Metropolitan Structure Discussion

Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force support the Metropolitan Structure approach as the basis for developing policies for the Growth Plan 2.0 update.

Moved by: Councillor John Schonewille, Leduc County

Decision: Carried unanimously

10. Next Steps

11. Adjournment

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

Meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Next Meeting: December 11, 8:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m., La Cite Francophone, Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger

Task Force Chair, Roxanne Carr
CRB Mandate

Recommended Motion

That the Capital Region Board refer the facilitated conversation results to Administration for a recommendation(s) to be brought back to the Board no later than the March 10, 2016 Board meeting for a decision.

Background

- September 25, 2015 – The Minister of Municipal affairs announced at AUMA that the Municipal Government Act will legislate mandatory Growth Boards for the Edmonton, and Calgary Regions.
  - The Capital Region Board is already functioning as a Regional Growth Board
- October 21, 2015 - The Capital Region Growth received a letter from The Minister of Municipal Affairs stating:
  - The Mandatory Metro Board will work to manage growth sustainability and explore regional approaches to service delivery.
  - The Capital Region Board provides a strong base from which to create this next evolution in regional collaboration.
  - The Board has a membership review policy in place and the Minister is looking forward to hearing the results, upon conclusion of the Membership Review.
  - The current governance model and voting structure of the CRB is functioning effectively.
  - The Capital Region Board Mandate should be expanded to include recognition that regional assets can be better leveraged to support economic diversification, competitiveness, and prosperity.
  - A concerted regional approach to economic development should be pursued.

Assumptions

- That the Growth Plan and current mandated areas will continue.
- Economic Development needs to be considered and defined in terms of mandate.
- That the previous reports (Radke, Hyndman, CRB Regulation) provide the starting point for discussion.

Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH to Finding CRB Consensus on CRB Mandate for the Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tasks/Milestones</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate Options Matrix with PAST mandate considerations for CRB prepared. An Executive Summary of this Matrix was distributed to Mayors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate Options Matrix – full document circulated to CAOs with request for specific actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive and collate Response Table documents from CAOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated session with the CAOs regarding input on mandate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prepare summative document as input to Mayors session. Illustrate mandate areas rejected and of high priority. Send to Mayors and CAOs. November 6

Board Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH to Finding CRB Consensus on CRB Mandate for the Future</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated 1.5 hour session with Board on mandate.</td>
<td>November 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft input document for Minister and circulate to Mayors and CAOs.</td>
<td>December 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board facilitated mandate discussions.</td>
<td>Nov 2015 – Feb 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek motion from CRB supporting the recommended mandate proposal.</td>
<td>March 10, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development recommendation to the Board</td>
<td>March, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provincial Next Steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH to Finding CRB Consensus on CRB Mandate for the Future</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness of intent and approach</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Affected Municipalities are notified in writing of province’s intent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minister meets with CRB to confirm intent, timelines, and seek feedback on engagement process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB facilitates discussion among membership</td>
<td>Nov. 2015 – Feb. 2016 (or shorter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus will be on mandate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Governance model generally working well and supported by most members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Membership policy recently adopted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mandate motion could be tabled before new year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Alberta policy deliberation</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequential legislative amendments</td>
<td>April/May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amendments made to MGA presented to require mandatory growth boards in Calgary/Edmonton regions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of regulation</td>
<td>June 2016 and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regulation will specify mandate, membership and any other requirements deemed necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New regulation to come into effect by Fall 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments

1. Minister Bilous’ Letter of October 21
2. Summary from November 6 engagement with regional CAOs
   (To be distributed November 6)
October 21, 2015

Members of the Capital Region Board,

I am writing today to follow up on the recent announcement made September 25th that the revised Municipal Government Act will legislate mandatory growth management boards for the metropolitan regions of Calgary and Edmonton.

I understand you are looking for clarity on what exactly will change moving forward. In my address at AUMA, I stated that our government envisions the mandatory metro boards will work to manage growth sustainably and explore regional approaches to service delivery.

In my view, the Capital Region Board offers an exceptional tool to achieve these objectives. The Board has made significant strides since its formation in 2008; in particular, since 2013 the elected leaders within the region have come to the table in a true spirit of collaboration and an obvious desire to serve the best interest of the region as a whole. Our government applauds your work and looks to work with you to build on this track record.

The success of the Capital Region Board provides a strong base from which to create this next evolution in regional collaboration. I believe key discussions around mandate and membership will allow us to move forward together to better serve the Capital Region.

I understand that the Board has already initiated discussions around membership; I look forward to hearing further from you when those discussions have concluded. I also understand that the current governance model and voting structure of the CRB is functioning effectively; therefore, I do not believe any substantial changes are required moving forward.

With respect to mandate, I believe the existing Capital Region Board mandate should be expanded to include recognition that regional assets can be better leveraged to support economic diversification, competitiveness, and prosperity. Thus, moving forward, a concerted regional approach to economic development should be pursued. The horizon is broad in terms of opportunities to explore the Board’s mandate and as leaders we have an opportunity to collaborate on a creative, forward-looking framework to achieve regional success. I look forward to hearing your ideas and working collaboratively to realize this vision.

I hope to complete our conversations on mandate and receive the results of your membership review by March 2016. More information about facilitation of these conversations will be forthcoming from my office. I look forward to working collaboratively with you on establishing an evolved Capital Region Board.

Thank you for your continued service and commitment to Albertans.

Sincerely,

Hon. Deron Bilous
Minister of Municipal Affairs