Board Meeting
Comprehensive Agenda
February 11, 2016 – 9:00 – Noon
Chateau Louis, Grand Ballroom
11727 Kingsway, Edmonton

1. Call to Order

2. Chair’s Opening Remarks
   a. Capital Region Board – Eight Years In Reflection

Consent Agenda Items:

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the meeting agenda, its previous meeting minutes, the updated CRB Policies along with the Land Use & Planning Committee Terms of Reference; Amended Energy Corridors Master Plan, and the Joint CRB/CRP Regional Transit Policy Workshop Notes.

3. Approval of Agenda

4. Approval of Minutes of December 10, 2015  Pg. 4 of 191

5. Approval of Updated CRB Policies  Pg. 8 of 191

6. Approval of Land Use & Planning Committee Terms of Reference  Pg. 57 of 191

7. Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan  Pg. 64 of 191

8. Joint CRB/CRP Regional Transit Policy Workshop Notes  Pg. 116 of 191

9. Results of Membership Review  Pg. 122 of 191
   a. Town of Lamont

   Recommended Motion: That the Capital Region Board supports the Town of Lamont's request to terminate its status as a “participating municipality” pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012 and request that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation to give effect to the request of the Town of Lamont.
b. Town of Redwater

**Recommended Motion:** That the Capital Region Board supports the Town of Redwater’s request to terminate its status as a “participating municipality” pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012 and request that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation to give effect to the request of the Town of Redwater.

10. Capital Region Board Mandate Review

a. Approval of Mandate with Economic Development Initiative Caveat

**Recommended Motion:** That Capital Region Board writes to the Province, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee.

1) To confirm that we interpret the existing mandate as permissive in areas that the Board may wish to move in over time and in the future;

2) That the CRB ask the Province to list the planning and co-ordination (but not operation) of water, wastewater, and solid waste under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate;

3) That the CRB recognizes the need for regional economic development and wishes to work further with the Province as the CRB determines whether the CRB or a separate institution with other membership is the right vehicle.

11. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee

a. CRB Chairperson Motion – Non Voting Chair

**Recommended Motion:** The Capital Region Board receive the information update regarding the role of CRB Chairperson and no longer pursue this matter at this time, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

12. Growth Plan Update Task Force

a. Chair Update

b. Revised 2014-2044 Employment Forecast

**Recommended Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the revised Employment forecast that includes the most recently available data from Federal and Municipal Census results and reflects the harmonization with the labour force consistent with the population projections for the region, for the purpose of updating the 2015 Growth Plan.
13. Member Motions

a. Sturgeon County - Member Financial Contributions

Motion: That Administration propose a policy for the Capital Region Board’s consideration, and/or change to the Capital Region Board Regulation, that will permit the waiving of financial contributions toward funding a portion of matching grants for municipalities with a population less than 2,500.

14. Board Information Requests Update

15. Committee/Task Force Updates

a. Advocacy & Monitoring Committee – Draft Minutes, Chair Update
b. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee – Draft Minutes, Chair Update
c. Housing Committee – Draft Minutes, Chair Update
d. Land Use & Planning Committee – Draft Minutes, Chair Update
e. Transit Committee – Draft Minutes, Chair Update

16. Administrative Items

a. CEO’s Update
b. October – December 2015 Quarterly Report

17. March Board Meeting Plan

18. Adjournment
Minutes of the meeting of
the Capital Region Board
held at Grand Ballroom, Chateau Louis Conference Centre
on Thursday, December 10, 2015

Delegates in Attendance:
Mayor Nolan Crouse – St. Albert/Chair
Mayor Camille Berube – Beaumont
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord
Mayor Karl Hauch – Bruderheim
Mayor Wally Yachimetz – Calmar
Mayor Stephen Lindop – Devon
Mayor Don Iveson – Edmonton
Councillor Ed Gibbons – Edmonton (alternate)
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Councillor Louise Bauder – Gibbons
Mayor Bill Skinner – Lamont
Reeve Wayne Woldanski – Lamont County
Mayor Greg Krischke – Leduc
Mayor John Whaley – Leduc County
Mayor Carol Tremblay – Legal
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
Mayor Barry Rasch – Thorsby
Mayor Charlene Smylie – Wabamun
Mayor Ralph van Assen – Warburg
Bruce McDonald – Government of Alberta

Absent:

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

- Handout: Updated Abbreviated agenda with slight change to numbering.
- Changes to the Warburg motion will be made by Mayor Ralph van Assen.
- The seating arrangement will be shuffled for the February Board meeting.
- January Board Meeting is declared cancelled.
- The 2015 expense claims deadline is December 18.

Consent Agenda Items:

Moved by Mayor Choy. Accepted by Chair.

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the meetings agenda, its previous meetings minutes and the updated municipal membership for the Housing Committee.

Motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the Agenda of December 10, 2015.

4. Approval of Minutes of October 8, 2015

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the Minutes of October 8, 2015.

5. Approval of Minutes of November 12, 2015

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the Minutes of November 12, 2015.

6. Municipal Membership Update - Housing Committee

Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the updated municipal membership for the Housing Committee.

7. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee

a. 2016/17 Budget

Moved by Mayor Berube. Accepted by Chair.
Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the 2016-2017 Budget as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Motion carried unanimously.

8. Board Information Requests Update

9. Committee/Task Force Minutes

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

10. Other Business

   a. Warburg Motion – Pay to Participate

      Moved by Mayor van Assen. Accepted by Chair.

      Mayor Don Iveson, Edmonton, arrives and takes his seat as the representative at the table.

      Motion: That until the Capital Region Board approves a policy of pay-to-participate; the Villages are only liable for contributions to core funding ($3 million dollars).

      14 in favour, 9 opposed. Not supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the populations. Motion Failed.

11. Administrative Items

   a. CEO’s Update

      Until further refinement on the Provincial Budget is received, the ability to take on new Board initiatives or extend current ones beyond their approved Terms of Reference will be very limited. Board requests will be handled on a case by case basis supported by a Work plan for Board consideration and decision.

   b. Board Successes to date

      Mr. Malcolm Bruce presented a short presentation on the Board successes of 2015.

   c. Expenses

      Reminder that all 2015 expense claims are due to Administration by December 18 for processing.
12. Mandate Review

   a. Facilitated Discussion

   Discussion facilitated by Ken Stewart of Western Management Consultants.

13. Adjournment

   The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

   CRB Chair, Nolan Crouse  CRB CEO, Malcolm Bruce
Capital Region Board Policies

Recommended Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve Policies A001, A002, A005, A006, F001, F002, F004, F005, F006, G001, and G002, as recommended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

Background

The Capital Region Board has established a consistent approach and philosophy for the development, review and approval of policies according to Policy G001 - Policy Development. Since 2010, the Board has approved corporate policies pertaining to administration, finance, governance.

November 26, 2015 – The Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee recommended the Board approve policies A001, A002, A005, A006, F001, F002, F004, F005, F006, G001, and G002.

Of Note: Policy G001 now recommends that policies are reviewed every four years instead of every three years to better align with the election cycle.

Rationale

In 2014, the CRB reviewed and approved 32 corporate policies to update and align with the Capital Region Board’s new committee structure approved in 2013. The CRB policy review updated existing policy with comments from member municipalities and administrative changes.

Current policies and procedures continue to be updated as a result of the 2013 CRB committee structure decision, and new policies are developed based on Board direction and needs.

The attached policies have been reviewed and were amended by the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee on December 14, 2015, and recommended to the Board for approval.

Attachments:

1. A001 - Email Distribution Lists
2. A002 - Appointment of Acting Chief Executive Officer
3. A005 - Access to Public Information
4. A006 - Information Technology
5. F001 - Authorization to Purchase
6. F002 - Procurement
7. F004 - Signing Authorities
8. F005 - Financial Reporting
9. F006 - Investments
10. G001 - Policy Development
11. G002 - Indemnification of CRB Members and Employees
Policy A001

EMAIL DISTRIBUTION LISTS

PURPOSE
To make note of the administration of Board, Committee, and Task Force email distribution lists for the purposes of the distribution of Board, Committee, and Task Force documentation by CRB administration.

POLICY
Email distribution lists are created for Board, Committee, and Task Force members, designated Board, Committee, and Task Force alternates, municipal Chief Administrative Officers (and equivalents) and designated Board, Committee, and Task Force support persons.

GUIDELINES
1. CRB administration has in place distribution lists for the Board, Committees, and Task Forces of the Board, in accordance with their approved memberships, along with appropriate support lists.
2. Requested change(s) to distribution lists are to be received in writing from the office of the CAO or the municipality requesting change.
3. Notwithstanding Guideline 2, CRB administration shall maintain and update all distribution lists within two weeks following the requested change(s).
4. Email distribution lists are to be used for Capital Region Board purposes only.
5. A broadcast distribution list will include all elected officials from member municipalities. The broadcast distribution list will be notified with an attached agenda for Board, Committee and Task Force meetings and a link to the complete agenda package available on the Capital Region Board website and/or any other purpose deemed important by the CRB Chair or CEO.
6. Public access to the email distribution lists will be dealt with administered consistent with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October 5, 2015</th>
<th>Amend</th>
<th>Cleaned up language. Allow provision for Chair and CEO to trigger a broadcast email.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effective date: September 9, 2010
Approved by: Capital Region Board

Policy A001

EMAIL DISTRIBUTION LISTS

PURPOSE
To describe the administration of Board, Committee, and Task Force email distribution lists for the purposes of the distribution of Board, Committee, and Task Force documentation by CRB administration.

POLICY
Email distribution lists are created for Board, Committee, and Task Force members, designated Board, Committee, and Task Force alternates, municipal Chief Administrative Officers (and equivalents) and designated Board, Committee, and Task Force support persons.

GUIDELINES
1. CRB administration has in place distribution lists for the Board, Committees, and Task Forces of the Board, in accordance with their approved memberships, along with appropriate support lists.

2. Requested change(s) to distribution lists are to be received in writing from the municipality requesting change.

3. Notwithstanding Guideline 2, CRB administration shall maintain and update all distribution lists within two weeks following the requested change(s).

4. Email distribution lists are to be used for Capital Region Board purposes only.

5. A broadcast distribution list will include all elected officials from member municipalities. The broadcast distribution list will be notified with an attached agenda for Board, Committee and Task Force meetings and a link to the complete agenda package available on the Capital Region Board website and/or any other purpose deemed important by the CRB Chair or CEO.

6. Public access to the email distribution lists will be administered consistent with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
### Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Cleaned up language. Allow provision for Chair and CEO to trigger a broadcast email.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy A002

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

PURPOSE

To ensure procedure for appointment of an Acting Chief Executive Officer.

POLICY

Capital Region Board requires an Acting Chief Executive Officer in the absence of the Chief Executive Officer.

GUIDELINES

1. The Chief Executive Officer shall appoint in writing an Acting Chief Executive Officer in his/her absence.

2. The Chief Executive Officer shall notify the Chair/Interim Chair and the Board of an appointment period greater than three weeks.

3. If the Chief Executive Officer is unable to appoint an Acting Chief Executive Officer, then the Chair/Interim Chair or the Board shall appoint an Acting Chief Executive Officer for three weeks or until the following Board meeting.

____________________________
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPONTMENT OF ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

PURPOSE
To ensure procedure for appointment of an Acting Chief Executive Officer.

POLICY
Capital Region Board requires an Acting Chief Executive Officer in the absence of the Chief Executive Officer.

GUIDELINES
1. The Chief Executive Officer shall appoint in writing an Acting Chief Executive Officer in his/her absence.
2. The Chief Executive Officer shall notify the Chair/Interim Chair and the Board of an appointment period greater than three weeks.
3. If the Chief Executive Officer is unable to appoint an Acting Chief Executive Officer, then the Chair/Interim Chair or the Board shall appoint an Acting Chief Executive Officer for three weeks or until the following Board meeting.

______________________________
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
To provide procedures and guidelines with respect to requests for information from the public.

POLICY
Subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (“FOIP”), the Capital Region Board will, within a reasonable time after receiving a request from any person, furnish him or her with copies of the minutes of any public meeting allowable information from the Capital Region Board.

GUIDELINES

1. Access to minutes and agendas of the CRB are available to the public in following ways:
   a. Any person may, at all reasonable times, inspect the minutes of the said meetings online.
   b. Agendas and minutes of the CRB will be made available on the CRB’s website as per Policy G004 – Board Meeting Minutes.
   c. Copies of the CRB’s adopted meeting minutes or regular agenda information may be provided at no cost if requests are made on a one-time basis only and the copies are picked up at the CRB Office.

2. Access to all or any documents, correspondence, and information that is in the possession of the CRB may be provided, unless determined by the Chief Executive Officer that the document, correspondence, and/or the information should be withheld in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

3. FOIP request fees are determined by Provincial Legislation and will be:
   • $25 for the initial request
   • $50 for a continuing request

4. The fee will be $6.75 per fifteen minutes to:
   • Prepare and handle a record for disclosure
   • Search, locate, retrieve, and copy a record
   • Supervise the examination of a record

5. Costs associated with FOIP requests, such as hardcopy requests, shall be born by the individual or organization submitting the FOIP request at a cost of 25 cents per page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 20, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Clarified and added cost for FOIP requests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effective date: September 9, 2010  
Approved by: Capital Region Board

**ACCESS TO PUBLIC INFORMATION**

**PURPOSE**

To provide procedures and guidelines with respect to requests for information from the public.

**POLICY**

Subject to the provisions of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (“FOIP”), the Capital Region Board will, within a reasonable time after receiving a request from any person, furnish him or her with copies of allowable information from the Capital Region Board.

**GUIDELINES**

1. Access to minutes and agendas of the CRB are available to the public in following ways:
   a. Any person may, at all times, inspect the minutes of the said meetings online.
   b. Agendas and minutes of the CRB will be made available on the CRB’s website as per Policy G004 – Board Meeting Minutes.

2. Access to all or any documents, correspondence, and information that is in the possession of the CRB may be provided, unless determined by the Chief Executive Officer that the document, correspondence, and/or the information should be withheld in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

3. FOIP request fees are determined by Provincial Legislation and will be:
   - $25 for the initial request
   - $50 for a continuing request

4. The fee will be $6.75 per fifteen minutes to:
   - Prepare and handle a record for disclosure
   - Search, locate, retrieve, and copy a record
   - Supervise the examination of a record

5. Costs associated with FOIP requests, such as hardcopy requests, shall be born by the individual or organization submitting the FOIP request at a cost of 25 cents per page.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
### Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 20, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Clarified and added cost for FOIP requests</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose

To ensure proper use of information technology on Capital Region Board systems and equipment.

Policy

The Capital Region Board (CRB) promotes information technology that assists users in performing their work duties. All data created or stored on CRB systems and equipment is the absolute property of the CRB. Security procedures shall be implemented to ensure the confidentiality, integrity and availability of such data. CRB uses software only in compliance with license agreements. No unlicensed software shall be installed on CRB systems and equipment.

Guidelines

1. CRB's information technology includes, but is not limited to, electronic mail (e-mail) and the Internet. This technology provides an efficient and effective means of internal and external communications to improve work productivity.

2. CRB has an obligation to provide accurate, reliable information to authorized recipients, and preserve records. CRB is increasingly dependent on the accuracy, availability, and accessibility of information technology and on the computing and networking resources that store, process and transmit this information.

3. Records are to be protected from unauthorized modification, disclosure and destruction. Information, including data, hardware and software, is to be protected regardless of the form or medium that carries the information. Protection will be commensurate with the risk of exposure and with the value of the information and of the system or equipment.

4. Employees may use the Internet and e-mail:
   a. to access technical and other information on work related topics to increase job knowledge;
   b. to communicate with others relevant to their work; and
   c. for incidental and occasional personal use within reasonable limits.

5. Systems and equipment are provided to employees for their use in performing their duties. Employees may take their equipment home or other offsite locations to conduct CRB business; however, employees must adhere to all guidelines as if they were using the systems and equipment in the CRB office. All employees of the CRB are responsible for using these systems in an effective, ethical and lawful manner. These systems should be used for the benefit of the CRB. All use should be congruent with the CRB’s overall corporate policies and governance.
6. Inappropriate uses of CRB information technology includes:
   a. attempting to defeat or circumvent any security measures, controls, accounting or record keeping systems;
   b. using systems for unauthorized access;
   c. intentionally altering, misappropriating, dismantling, disfiguring, disabling, or destroying any computing information and/or services;
   d. using computing services for unlawful purposes including fraudulent, threatening, defamatory, harassing or obscene communications;
   e. invading the privacy rights of anyone;
   f. disclosing or using non-public information for unauthorized purposes; and
   g. violating copyright laws.

7. The CRB reserves the right to monitor and/or log all network activity, with or without notice, including all website communications. Users should have no expectations of privacy in the use of these resources. Use of information technology in violation of this policy is prohibited and may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

8. Incidental and occasional personal use of CRB information systems is permitted. The overriding principle governing personal use of these resources is that reasonable and incidental unofficial use of CRB electronic resources is authorized only so long as:
   a. CRB incurs no additional cost from that use, other than the minimal cost incurred from ordinary wear and tear and the use of minimal amounts of ink, toner or paper;
   b. The use does not inappropriately interfere with official business;
   c. It is not used in an illegal, offensive or inappropriate manner; and
   d. At no time can any of the CRB’s information technology be used for personal gain.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE

To ensure proper use of information technology on Capital Region Board systems and equipment.

POLICY

The Capital Region Board (CRB) promotes information technology that assists users in performing their work duties. All data created or stored on CRB systems and equipment is the absolute property of the CRB. Security procedures shall be implemented to ensure the confidentiality, integrity and availability of such data. CRB uses software only in compliance with license agreements. No unlicensed software shall be installed on CRB systems and equipment.

GUIDELINES

1. CRB’s information technology includes, but is not limited to, electronic mail (e-mail) and the Internet. This technology provides an efficient and effective means of internal and external communications to improve work productivity.

2. CRB has an obligation to provide accurate, reliable information to authorized recipients, and preserve records. CRB is increasingly dependent on the accuracy, availability, and accessibility of information technology and on the computing and networking resources that store, process and transmit this information.

3. Records are to be protected from unauthorized modification, disclosure and destruction. Information, including data, hardware and software, is to be protected regardless of the form or medium that carries the information. Protection will be commensurate with the risk of exposure and with the value of the information and of the system or equipment.

4. Employees may use the Internet and e-mail:
   a. to access technical and other information on work related topics to increase job knowledge;
   b. to communicate with others relevant to their work; and
   c. for incidental and occasional personal use within reasonable limits.

5. Systems and equipment are provided to employees for their use in performing their duties. Employees may take their equipment home or other offsite locations to conduct CRB business; however, employees must adhere to all guidelines as if they were using the systems and equipment in the CRB office. All employees of the CRB are responsible for using these systems in an effective, ethical and lawful manner. These systems should be used for the benefit of the CRB. All use should be congruent with the CRB’s overall corporate policies and governance.
6. Inappropriate uses of CRB information technology includes:
   a. attempting to defeat or circumvent any security measures, controls, accounting or record keeping systems;
   b. using systems for unauthorized access;
   c. intentionally altering, misappropriating, dismantling, disfiguring, disabling, or destroying any computing information and/or services;
   d. using computing services for unlawful purposes including fraudulent, threatening, defamatory, harassing or obscene communications;
   e. invading the privacy rights of anyone;
   f. disclosing or using non-public information for unauthorized purposes; and
   g. violating copyright laws.

7. The CRB reserves the right to monitor and/or log all network activity, with or without notice, including all website communications. Users should have no expectations of privacy in the use of these resources. Use of information technology in violation of this policy is prohibited and may lead to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

8. Incidental and occasional personal use of CRB information systems is permitted. The overriding principle governing personal use of these resources is that reasonable and incidental unofficial use of CRB electronic resources is authorized only so long as;
   a. CRB incurs no additional cost from that use, other than the minimal cost incurred from ordinary wear and tear and the use of minimal amounts of ink, toner or paper;
   b. The use does not inappropriately interfere with official business;
   c. It is not used in an illegal, offensive or inappropriate manner; and
   d. At no time can any of the CRB’s information technology be used for personal gain.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
To ensure authorized staff are purchasing on behalf of the Capital Region Board.

POLICY
Only authorized staff may purchase or commit to the procurement of goods and services.

GUIDELINES
1. All purchasing activities must be approved through the budgetary process or by Board resolution.

2. Only designated positions, as per this policy, will be authorized to conduct purchasing activities on behalf of the Capital Region Board.

3. In consideration of sound budgetary and purchasing practices, the Board approves purchasing authorization levels.

4. The Office Manager is authorized to purchase up to and including $5,000 for operational items that are included in the current budget.

5. The Chief Executive Officer is authorized to purchase all operational and capital items which are included in the current budget.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE

PURPOSE
To ensure authorized staff are purchasing on behalf of the Capital Region Board.

POLICY
Only authorized staff may purchase or commit to the procurement of goods and services.

GUIDELINES
1. All purchasing activities must be approved through the budgetary process or by Board resolution.

2. Only designated positions, as per this policy, will be authorized to conduct purchasing activities on behalf of the Capital Region Board.

3. In consideration of sound budgetary and purchasing practices, the Board approves purchasing authorization levels.

4. The Office Manager is authorized to purchase up to and including $5,000 for operational items that are included in the current budget.

5. The Chief Executive Officer is authorized to purchase all operational and capital items which are included in the current budget.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

---

Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
To conduct the purchasing and tendering activities of the Capital Region Board in the most effective, transparent, fair, and efficient manner possible.

POLICY
The Capital Region Board will purchase goods and services in an effective, expedient, transparent, fair, and efficient manner and at the best overall value.

GUIDELINES
1. The Capital Region Board will adhere to the highest possible standards of business ethics, professional courtesy, and technical competence in all its purchasing practices.

2. The Capital Region Board will provide fair and equitable treatment to all suppliers and maintain the confidentiality of specifications and price quotations as permitted under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, RSA 2000 Alberta and amendments.

3. PURCHASES – GENERAL
   a. Purchasing methods, regardless of whether the purchase is for goods, services or a combination of goods and services will be determined by the total dollar value category.
   b. The total dollar value category will always be a combination of “like items” (i.e. screen, keyboard, and processor or a computer). Under no circumstances are items to be separated or split into two or more contracts.
   c. All purchases, when received, will be included in the current year’s budget or as otherwise approved by the Capital Region Board and will be authorized in accordance with Policy F001 - Authorization to Purchase.

4. COMPETITIVE PROCESS
   a. The purpose of the competitive process is to ensure that CRB’s needs are identified to the widest market possible. Any competitive process should include at least three (3) solicited or unsolicited (Section 15) vendor responses.
   b. In identifying CRB’s needs to the widest market base, we are ensuring the acquisition of goods and or services or a combination of goods and services will be at the lowest cost to the CRB keeping in mind service standards, quality, and time.

5. DEFINITION OF COMPETITIVE BID PROCESS
   a. Any competitive bid process has the following common characteristics:
      i. Closed competition amongst bidders as opposed to an open competition (i.e. an auction).
      ii. Implication that there will be a fair and equal process for both the evaluations and award of a contract to all submissions.
      iii. The terminology and process in documents is similar to that of tendering (i.e. bid, award, tender, closing date and time, etc.).
b. Any of the bid formats are generally comprised of two (2) separate contracts:
   i. Contract A (also known as the Bid Contract A) – This contract is automatically formed between the Owner and each of the bidders who respond to the call of bids be it invitation to tender, request for proposal, or request for information and quotation. This part of the contract contains the terms and references for the call of bids.
   ii. Contract B – This is part of the contract is formed by the successful bidder’s bid being accepted by the Owner’s Notification of award. The terms of Contract B are a combination of the terms contained in the original call (Contract A), the successful bidder’s bid and the notification of award letter. The actual project work will be completed under this contract.

6. COMPETITIVE FORMATS
   a. It is imperative that exactly the same information, regardless of which of the following format is used to relay the information, is provided to all vendors requested to provide a response/bid/quote/information.
   b. The information should always be as clear and concise as possible and should include as much information about the product or service to be provided as possible.

7. PURCHASING METHODS
   a. Purchases less than $100,750.00 – At the discretion of the Chief Executive Officer whether to utilize a formal quote or informal quote.
   b. Purchases over $100,750.00 – All procurement of goods or services or a combination of goods and services over $100,750.00 with the exception of construction, will be subject to the formal competitive process and must be advertised under the requirements of the Agreement on Internal Trade Annex 502.4 and the New West Partnership Trade Agreement (NWPTA).
   c. Construction $250,200.00 and Over – All construction projects $250,200.00 and over will be subject to the formal competitive process and must be advertised under the requirements of the Agreement on Internal Trade Annex 502.4.
   d. Formal quotes will follow one of the following competitive bid formats:
      i. Request for Quotation (RFQ);
      ii. Request for Quotation and Contract Form;
      iii. Request for Proposal (RFP);
      iv. Invitation to Tender (ITT); or
      v. Request for Information (RFI).
   e. Supplier Catalogues (Internet included) – Implies products that are researched by “looking through” supplier catalogues or the Internet to determine the most appropriate product, price and delivery. All pertinent information such as supplier name, catalogue year, page number, etc. should be documented or the Internet page printed. This information should be attached to the purchase order and any other information should be filed.
   f. Email – If the exact product is known, an email clearly identifying all pertinent information can be forwarded to the applicable suppliers. Exact same information must be provided to all suppliers.
   g. Telephone Quotes – All vendors should be provided exactly same information. It will be the issuers’ responsibility to ensure that one vendor does not have more information than another. All pricing and pertinent information should be documented.
   h. Request for Quotation (RFQ) – The Request for Quotation process is normally used where cost and other factors are considered in the award. Specifications may not be conclusive and an element of review may be required to ascertain lowest net cost and appropriate quality prior to award. Quotations are open to review with the vendor. Electronic submissions will be accepted. If a closing date (and time) is provided for the “RFQ”, submissions after this date (and time) will not be accepted and will be returned to the vendor.
i. Request for Proposals (RFP) – The Request for Proposals process may be used as an alternative method to the tender process. Normally used for the provision of services or completion of a specific project. This method provides the vendor with an opportunity to bid on work or a service using their unique skills. Specifications are general in nature. The selection of the successful supplier is based on the CRB’s appreciation of the proposal and the supplier’s ability to complete the project or provide the service. Electronic submissions will be accepted. If a closing date (and time) is provided for the RFP, submissions after this date (and time) will not be accepted.

j. Invitation to Tender (ITT) – This format details, very specifically, the what, why, when, where and how the work/project/product will be provided or completed. Providing that all tender terms and conditions have been met the only determining factor for the award, unless stated otherwise, is price. There is no negotiation of price (but could be with the scope of work) with the successful bidder. Other items of consideration may be past contractor performance with the CRB, reference checks, or whether the contractor has previous experience in the project in which the bid has been made. If these criteria are to be considered in the evaluation process they should be clearly indicated in the tender documents. Award is made to the best evaluated compliant bidder based on the published evaluation criteria. The criterion provides the CRB with opportunity to exercise its right to reject a proponent if the CRB feels it is not in the best interest of the organization to award a contract to the lowest bidder. If the lowest bidder is not chosen based on one or more of the outlined criteria, it must be documented and approved by the Chief Executive Officer.

k. Request for Information (RFI) – This format is similar to the RFP but less “formal”. The RFI is used to solicit information from potential vendors for any of one or combination of the following:
   i. Vendor availability;
   ii. Market conditions;
   iii. Industry / Technology;
   iv. Pricing; or
   v. Any other “missing” information.
A RFI should include the basic requirements of any competitive format in terms of closing date and time, contact person, solicitation number, etc. Depending upon the nature of the RFI, the option of process/next steps upon closing can be varied. The issuer can choose to go to RFP or an ITT process or they can choose to negotiate with only one supplier. Whatever the decision, it must be disclosed in the RFI documents.

l. Tender Notice — The tender notice is done through paper advertisement (local or otherwise), on the internet or on the Alberta Purchasing Connection website, or any combination of the above. In any instance, the tender notice should include the following information:
   i. A brief description of the purpose of the tender;
   ii. Where or from whom the tender documents or further information can be obtained;
   iii. The conditions for obtaining the tender documents (i.e. if there is a cost for obtaining the tender);
   iv. Place where the tenders are to be submitted;

NOTE: When developing any of the above formats, the use of the words “must” and “shall” should only be used when the requirement is mandatory. Otherwise words like “may” or “should” should be used.
v. Date and time for submitting tenders should follow the format, May 26, 2010, 14:00:00 hours Mountain Daylight Savings time; and
vi. Time and place of opening (type of bid opening) if applicable (Section 11).

8. CONTRACT PERIOD
a. The length of a contract will be dependent upon the nature of the acquisition, the market conditions, and industry standard for the product/service being acquired.
b. A contract can be as short as a onetime service or as long as 5 years. Option years may also be added to a contract if the contract will extend beyond one year. (i.e. 1 year plus 2 single option years or 3 years plus 2 single option years).
c. The purpose of the option years is to provide additional single years without having to re-tender if the market conditions are such that it is to the CRB’s benefit to maintain the existing contract. The supplier must also be in agreement in the exercising of one or more of the option years. A contract should never, or very seldom, extend beyond 5 years.
d. Each contract, in particular, those that are more than 1 year in duration, need to be individually evaluated to determine appropriate contract terms and approval.
e. The length of the contract (if applicable) should be included in the tender documents.
f. If a contract is to be used after the award, a sample of the contract should be included in the tender documents. This informs the supplier what is expected from them for the service or products. The contract is generally an extension of the tender, but includes any addendums that may be issued, any minutes from supplier meetings, and any other pertinent documentation that is applicable to the contract.
g. Upon completion of the contract negotiation (if applicable) and agreement by all parties, where, if at all possible, the CRB should be the one to write/ initiate the contract. The purpose of this is to keep the interest of the CRB in the forefront.

9. PROCESS
a. All suppliers, whether they were successful or not, will be notified through written communication.
b. The successful supplier will be notified by letter of award.
c. The unsuccessful supplier will be notified with a standard response letter. If the opening was public, a spreadsheet indicating supplier name and total bid amount may be attached. If the opening was restricted or private, no other information is to be released.

10. RECEIPT OF COMPETITIVE TENDERS, PROPOSALS OR QUOTATIONS
a. All tenders, proposals and quotations, solicited or unsolicited, must include a closing date and time and compliant with Tender requirements. Time must be indicated as in the following example: 14:00:00 hours Mountain Daylight Savings time, May 26, 2010.
b. All solicitations must indicate the format in which they will be received:
   Facsimile – If a facsimile is to be used as an acceptable format for the receipt of bids, normally, for quotations (RFQ), then it must be indicated as to whether or not a hard copy is also required.
   Sealed Envelope – If the solicitation is to be in a sealed envelope, it must indicate the tender number on the outside as well as the supplier’s name and complete address on the upper left hand corner. As each solicitation is received, the date, time, and the first initial and complete last name of person who physically receives the tender must be written on the envelope. All bids will be forwarded, unopened, to the Chief Executive Officer as indicated in the instruction to bidders.
   Email – Email may be considered if the tender or RFQ is a straightforward document and does not require bid bonds, brochures, etc. If email is to be an acceptable form of receiving tenders or RFQ’s, then again, a closing time should be identified.
The computer-received time will be the determining factor as to whether the bid was received on time or not. Printed emailed quotes must include the receiving time for the bid to be considered.

c. Upon the closing time, all submissions will be “opened”. Opening will be dependent upon whether it is open (public) or closed.

d. Every bid will be reviewed to ensure it is completed in its entirety. Depending on the nature of incompleteness, a bid not completed in its entirety may be either disqualified, with the submission returned to the bidder with an explanation, or accepted.

Examples of an acceptable incompleteness and not acceptable incompleteness:

- Acceptable: A pricing extension is not carried through.
- Not acceptable: Unit price is not completed.

e. Any submissions that are received after the closing date and time will not be accepted and are to be returned unopened to the originator with a letter explaining why it was returned.

11. BID OPENINGS

a. “Tenders” will not be opened prior to the indicated closing time. Any bid or submission received should be placed in the file with the original tender request until the “tender closing time”.

b. Bid openings are only openings and not the time in which an award will be made.

c. Bid openings can be classified as follows:

Public – This is an advertised Opening. The Opening is advertised on Alberta Purchasing Connection or on the internet/electronically with the date, time and place of Opening. All bidders are to be advised in the instruction to bidders;

Restricted – Bidders are invited to attend; all bidders must be advised of the date, time and place of the Opening in the instruction to bidders; or

Private – In the presence of the Owner only.

d. There are no restrictions on the dollar value that must be adhered to before a competitive bid process should be considered for an opening forum. However, any bid that falls within the Agreement on Internal Trade will be subject to public openings.

e. The time, location, and conditions of the opening shall be included in the original tender documents that are sent to each potential supplier. Two Capital Region staff members will be present at the public opening. One will record the bids; the other will open and read each bid.

f. The only items that will be made “public” will be the supplier’s name and the bid amounts required in the tender documents. No other details will be disclosed. No decision will be made at the opening and all suppliers present at the opening will be instructed of the same. There will be no exceptions.

g. Upon the completion of the opening, the evaluation process, as outlined in the original documents, will be used to determine the most suitable supplier.

h. All submissions will remain confidential as to each submission’s content. No information will be made known until the awarded supplier has been contacted.

i. At no time will the details of any submission, before, during, or after the tender closing, be made known to any other supplier. The only information that is provided is the awarded contractor’s name and the total dollar value.

12. SOLE SOURCE

a. The term “sole source” applies to goods or services where no competitive market exists by reasons of uniqueness of the goods or services or by vendor limitations or time limitations.

b. The decision to “sole source” is at the discretion of the Chief Executive Officer with a maximum limit defined in section 7.

c. The best price, delivery, service and any other relevant factors should always be negotiated with the supplier.
13. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
   a. Professional services are generally considered as a contract for service. (i.e. need for specialized services such as a consultant, architect, or auditor). These types of services are generally required over a short period of time.
   b. Each of these types of services is very unique and may be required to be formalized through the competitive bid process as determined under Section 6.
   c. Each service should be evaluated as to the extent of the competitive process required. Criteria that may be considered: industry standard (as in dollar value), normal or abnormal; availability of suppliers; type of service/work required, knowledge of the person(s)/department requesting the work.

14. VENDOR SELECTION FOR TENDERS
   a. CRB will endeavour to make the needs of the CRB made known to the widest potential market. This can be done either through current suppliers as well through advertisements.
   b. All suppliers will be given equal opportunity regardless of the suppliers’ location. Specifications cannot be indicative of any preference to location, unrealistic time, or requesting that local resources be utilized.
   c. When suppliers are not known, suppliers can be sourced through the Internet or through Letters/Expression of Interest, which has been advertised both locally and regionally.
   d. Suppliers should provide, at minimum, the following information:
      i. A company resume;
      ii. Resumes of key staff who will be working/assigned to the project;
      iii. Experience in similar projects or services;
      iv. Understanding of the project or requirements;
      v. References;
      vi. Bond ability; and
      vii. Time availability.
   e. Potential suppliers may then be short listed and then invited to participate in the tender process.

15. SOLICITATION OF BIDS
   a. Solicited – These are tenders, RFP’s or RFQ’s that are done by invitation only. These types of tenders are indicated as such through the letter of invitation. Any bid that is advertised or posted to Alberta Purchasing Connection does not qualify as a solicited bid. Any unsolicited bids in this process will not be accepted. An invited bidder cannot reassign their bid to another vendor without the CRB’s permission. All unsolicited bids will be returned to the supplier by courier.
   b. Unsolicited – These types of bids are advertised either through the paper, local or otherwise, and the Alberta Purchasing Connection website. Therefore, the bids that will be received are not by invitation. When a supplier requests a copy of the bid, the supplier should provide the following information:
      i. Company name;
      ii. Contact name;
      iii. Company phone number;
      iv. Company fax number; and/or
      v. Email address of the contact person (if available).
      The purpose of the above information is that, should there be an addendum, each bidder can be contacted and provided the information.
      NOTE: Addendums should be posted on the Alberta Purchasing Connection websites.
16. CONFIDENTIALITY
   a. All information acquired through the tender process will be held in the strictest confidence.
   b. At no time will the tender be discussed with any supplier other than the awarded supplier.
   c. Until such time that the actual award has been formalized, suppliers will not be informed of any
      such decision.
   d. Upon the finalization of the award only the awarded supplier name and total dollar value will be
      released. This information can be provided in the standard response letter.
   e. Any inquiries from suppliers regarding such inquiries should be directed to the Regional Project
      Manager responsible for the tender process or the Chief Executive Officer.

17. PURCHASING ETHICS
   a. It is the aim of the CRB to treat all suppliers in a fair and equal manner. At no time will any
      individual responsible for purchasing jeopardize the CRB’s reputation with the supplier community
      as a whole.
   b. Any information that is given to one supplier will be given to all suppliers in the tendering process.
      Such information will be undertaken via formal notification. This is to help reduce or eliminate any
      potential confusion that may occur.
   c. At no time will any individual imply any commitment of any kind to any supplier until such time
      that the CRB is in a position to formally do so.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2015</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Clarified ‘Opening’ process, adjusted purchase amounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>GPF amendment to refer 12.b. back to section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
To conduct the purchasing and tendering activities of the Capital Region Board in the most effective, transparent, fair, and efficient manner possible.

POLICY
The Capital Region Board will purchase goods and services in an effective, expedient, transparent, fair, and efficient manner and at the best overall value.

GUIDELINES
1. The Capital Region Board will adhere to the highest possible standards of business ethics, professional courtesy, and technical competence in all its purchasing practices.

2. The Capital Region Board will provide fair and equitable treatment to all suppliers and maintain the confidentiality of specifications and price quotations as permitted under the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act, RSA 2000 Alberta and amendments.

3. PURCHASES – GENERAL
   a. Purchasing methods, regardless of whether the purchase is for goods, services or a combination of goods and services will be determined by the total dollar value category.
   b. The total dollar value category will always be a combination of “like items” (i.e. screen, keyboard, and processor or a computer). Under no circumstances are items to be separated or split into two or more contracts.
   c. All purchases, when received, will be included in the current year’s budget or as otherwise approved by the Capital Region Board and will be authorized in accordance with Policy F001 - Authorization to Purchase.

4. COMPETITIVE PROCESS
   a. The purpose of the competitive process is to ensure that CRB’s needs are identified to the widest market possible.
   b. In identifying CRB’s needs to the widest market base, we are ensuring the acquisition of goods and or services or a combination of goods and services will be at the lowest cost to the CRB keeping in mind service standards, quality, and time.

5. DEFINITION OF COMPETITIVE BID PROCESS
   a. Any competitive bid process has the following common characteristics:
      i. Closed competition amongst bidders as opposed to an open competition (i.e. an auction).
      ii. Implication that there will be a fair and equal process for both the evaluations and award of a contract to all submissions.
      iii. The terminology and process in documents is similar to that of tendering (i.e. bid, award, tender, closing date and time, etc.).
   b. Any of the bid formats are generally comprised of two (2) separate contracts:
i. Contract A (also known as the Bid Contract A) – This contract is automatically formed between the Owner and each of the bidders who respond to the call of bids be it invitation to tender, request for proposal, or request for information and quotation. This part of the contract contains the terms and references for the call of bids.

ii. Contract B – This is part of the contract is formed by the successful bidder’s bid being accepted by the Owner’s Notification of award. The terms of Contract B are a combination of the terms contained in the original call (Contract A), the successful bidder’s bid and the notification of award letter. The actual project work will be completed under this contract.

6. COMPETITIVE FORMATS
   a. It is imperative that exactly the same information, regardless of which of the following format is used to relay the information, is provided to all vendors requested to provide a response/bid/quote/information.
   b. The information should always be as clear and concise as possible and should include as much information about the product or service to be provided as possible.

7. PURCHASING METHODS
   a. Purchases less than $75,000 – At the discretion of the Chief Executive Officer whether to utilize a formal quote or informal quote.
   b. Purchases over $75,000 – All procurement of goods or services or a combination of goods and services over $75,000 with the exception of construction, will be subject to the formal competitive process and must be advertised under the requirements of the Agreement on Internal Trade Annex 502.4 and the New West Partnership Trade Agreement (NWPTA).
   c. Construction $200,000 and Over – All construction projects $200,000 and over will be subject to the formal competitive process and must be advertised under the requirements of the Agreement on Internal Trade Annex 502.4.
   d. Formal quotes will follow one of the following competitive bid formats:
      i. Request for Quotation (RFQ);
      ii. Request for Quotation and Contract Form;
      iii. Request for Proposal (RFP);
      iv. Invitation to Tender (ITT); or
      v. Request for Information (RFI).
   e. Supplier Catalogues (Internet included) – Implies products that are researched by “looking through” supplier catalogues or the Internet to determine the most appropriate product, price and delivery. All pertinent information such as supplier name, catalogue year, page number, etc. should be documented or the Internet page printed. This information should be attached to the purchase order and any other information should be filed.
   f. Email – If the exact product is known, an email clearly identifying all pertinent information can be forwarded to the applicable suppliers. Exact same information must be provided to all suppliers.
   g. Telephone Quotes – All vendors should be provided exactly same information. It will be the issuers’ responsibility to ensure that one vendor does not have more information than another. All pricing and pertinent information should be documented.
   h. Request for Quotation (RFQ) – The Request for Quotation process is normally used where cost and other factors are considered in the award. Specifications may not be conclusive and an element of review may be required to ascertain lowest net cost and appropriate quality prior to award. Quotations are open to review with the vendor. Electronic submissions will be accepted. If a closing date (and time) is provided for the “RFQ”, submissions after this date (and time) will not be accepted and will be returned to the vendor.
i. Request for Proposals (RFP) – The Request for Proposals process may be used as an alternative method to the tender process. Normally used for the provision of services or completion of a specific project. This method provides the vendor with an opportunity to bid on work or a service using their unique skills.
Specifications are general in nature. The selection of the successful supplier is based on the CRB’s appreciation of the proposal and the suppliers ability to complete the project or provide the service. Electronic submissions will be accepted.
If a closing date (and time) is provided for the RFP, submissions after this date (and time) will not be accepted.

j. Invitation to Tender (ITT) – This format details, very specifically, the what, why, when, where and how the work/ project/product will be provided or completed. Providing that all tender terms and conditions have been met the only determining factor for the award, unless stated otherwise, is price. There is no negotiation of price (but could be with the scope of work) with the successful bidder.
Other items of consideration may be past contractor performance with the CRB, reference checks, or whether the contractor has previous experience in the project in which the bid has been made. If these criteria are to be considered in the evaluation process they should be clearly indicated in the tender documents.
Award is made to the best evaluated compliant bidder based on the published evaluation criteria.

k. Request for Information (RFI) – This format is similar to the RFP but less “formal”. The RFI is used to solicit information from potential vendors for any of one or combination of the following:
   i. Vendor availability;
   ii. Market conditions;
   iii. Industry / Technology;
   iv. Pricing; or
   v. Any other “missing” information.
A RFI should include the basic requirements of any competitive format in terms of closing date and time, contact person, solicitation number, etc.
Depending upon the nature of the RFI, the option of process/next steps upon closing can be varied. The issuer can chose to go to RFP or an ITT process or they can choose to negotiate with only one supplier. Whatever the decision, it must be disclosed in the RFI documents.
NOTE: When developing any of the above formats, the use of the words “must” and “shall” should only be used when the requirement is mandatory. Otherwise words like “may” or “should” should be used.

l. Tender Notice –on the Alberta Purchasing Connection website.. In any instance, the tender notice should include the following information:
   i. A brief description of the purpose of the tender;
   ii. Where or from whom the tender documents or further information can be obtained;
   iii. The conditions for obtaining the tender documents (i.e. if there is a cost for obtaining the tender);
   iv. Place where the tenders are to be submitted;
      NOTE: it is important to be very specific as where the documents are to be submitted (i.e.: main reception at Capital Region Board, #1100 Bell Tower, 10104 -103 Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H8);
   v. Date and time for submitting tenders should follow the format, May 26, 2010, 14:00:00 hours Mountain Daylight Savings time; and
   vi. Time and place of opening (type of bid opening) if applicable (Section 11).
8. CONTRACT PERIOD
   a. The length of a contract will be dependent upon the nature of the acquisition, the market conditions, and industry standard for the product/service being acquired.
   b. A contract can be as short as a onetime service or as long as 5 years. Option years may also be added to a contract if the contract will extend beyond one year. (i.e. 1 year plus 2 single option years or 3 years plus 2 single option years).
   c. The purpose of the option years is to provide additional single years without having to re-tender if the market conditions are such that it is to the CRB’s benefit to maintain the existing contract. The supplier must also be in agreement in the exercising of one or more of the option years. A contract should never, or very seldom, extend beyond 5 years.
   d. Each contract, in particular, those that are more than 1 year in duration, need to be individually evaluated to determine appropriate contract terms and approval.
   e. The length of the contract (if applicable) should be included in the tender documents.
   f. If a contract is to be used after the award, a sample of the contract should be included in the tender documents. This informs the supplier what is expected from them for the service or products. The contract is generally an extension of the tender, but includes any addendums that may be issued, any minutes from supplier meetings, and any other pertinent documentation that is applicable to the contract.
   g. Upon completion of the contract negotiation (if applicable) and agreement by all parties, where, if at all possible, the CRB should be the one to write/ initiate the contract. The purpose of this is to keep the interest of the CRB in the forefront.

9. PROCESS
   a. All suppliers, whether they were successful or not, will be notified through written communication.
   b. The successful supplier will be notified by letter of award.
   c. The unsuccessful supplier will be notified with a standard response letter. If the opening was public, a spreadsheet indicating supplier name and total bid amount may be attached. If the opening was restricted or private, no other information is to be released.

10. RECEIPT OF COMPETITIVE TENDERS, PROPOSALS OR QUOTATIONS
    a. All tenders, proposals and quotations, solicited or unsolicited, must include a closing date and time and compliant with Tender requirements. Time must be indicated as in the following example: 14:00:00 hours Mountain Daylight Savings time, May 26, 2010.
    b. Upon the closing time, all submissions will be “opened”.
    c. Every bid will be reviewed to ensure it is completed in its entirety. Depending on the nature of incompleteness, a bid not completed in its entirety may be either disqualified, with the submission returned to the bidder with an explanation, or accepted. Examples of an acceptable incompleteness and not acceptable incompleteness:
       • Acceptable: A pricing extension is not carried through.
       • Not acceptable: Unit price is not completed.
    d. Any submissions that are received after the closing date and time will not be accepted and are to be returned unopened to the originator with a letter explaining why it was returned.

11. BID OPENINGS
    a. “Tenders” will not be opened prior to the indicated closing time. Any bid or submission received should be placed in the file with the original tender request until the “tender closing time”.
    b. Bid openings are only openings and not the time in which an award will be made.
c. Upon the completion of the opening, the evaluation process, as outlined in the original documents, will be used to determine the most suitable supplier.

h. All submissions will remain confidential as to each submission’s content. No information will be made known until the awarded supplier has been contacted.

i. At no time will the details of any submission, before, during, or after the tender closing, be made known to any other supplier. The only information that is provided is the awarded contractor’s name and the total dollar value.

12. SOLE SOURCE

a. The term “sole source” applies to goods or services where no competitive market exists by reasons of uniqueness of the goods or services or by vendor limitations or time limitations.

b. The decision to “sole source” is at the discretion of the Chief Executive Officer with a maximum limit defined in section 7.

c. The best price, delivery, service and any other relevant factors should always be negotiated with the supplier.

13. PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

a. Professional services are generally considered as a contract for service. (i.e. need for specialized services such as a consultant, architect, or auditor). These types of services are generally required over a short period of time.

b. Each of these types of services is very unique and may be required to be formalized through the competitive bid process as determined under Section 6.

c. Each service should be evaluated as to the extent of the competitive process required. Criteria that may be considered: industry standard (as in dollar value), normal or abnormal; availability of suppliers; type of service/work required, knowledge of the person(s)/department requesting the work.

14. VENDOR SELECTION FOR TENDERS

a. CRB will endeavour to make the needs of the CRB made known to the widest potential market. This can be done either through current suppliers as well through advertisements.

b. All suppliers will be given equal opportunity regardless of the suppliers’ location. Specifications cannot be indicative of any preference to location, unrealistic time, or requesting that local resources be utilized.

c. When suppliers are not known, suppliers can be sourced through the Internet or through Letters/Expression of Interest, which has been advertised both locally and regionally.

d. Suppliers should provide, at minimum, the following information:
   i. A company resume;
   ii. Resumes of key staff who will be working/assigned to the project;
   iii. Experience in similar projects or services;
   iv. Understanding of the project or requirements;
   v. References;
   vi. Bond ability; and
   vii. Time availability.

e. Potential suppliers may then be short listed and then invited to participate in the tender process.

15. SOLICITATION OF BIDS
a. Solicited – These are tenders, RFP’s or RFQ’s that are done by invitation only. These types of tenders are indicated as such through the letter of invitation. Any bid that is advertised or posted to Alberta Purchasing Connection does not qualify as a solicited bid. Any unsolicited bids in this process will not be accepted. An invited bidder cannot reassign their bid to another vendor without the CRB’s permission. All unsolicited bids will be returned to the supplier by courier.

b. Unsolicited – These types of bids are advertised either through the paper, local or otherwise, and the Alberta Purchasing Connection website. Therefore, the bids that will be received are not by invitation. When a supplier requests a copy of the bid, the supplier should provide the following information:
   i. Company name;
   ii. Contact name;
   iii. Company phone number;
   iv. Company fax number; and/or
   v. Email address of the contact person (if available).
   The purpose of the above information is that, should there be an addendum, each bidder can be contacted and provided the information.
   NOTE: Addendums should be posted on the Alberta Purchasing Connection websites.

16. CONFIDENTIALITY
   a. All information acquired through the tender process will be held in the strictest confidence.
   b. At no time will the tender be discussed with any supplier other than the awarded supplier.
   c. Until such time that the actual award has been formalized, suppliers will not be informed of any such decision.
   d. Upon the finalization of the award only the awarded supplier name and total dollar value will be released. This information can be provided in the standard response letter.
   e. Any inquiries from suppliers regarding such inquiries should be directed to the Regional Project Manager responsible for the tender process or the Chief Executive Officer.

17. PURCHASING ETHICS
   a. It is the aim of the CRB to treat all suppliers in a fair and equal manner. At no time will any individual responsible for purchasing jeopardize the CRB’s reputation with the supplier community as a whole.
   b. Any information that is given to one supplier will be given to all suppliers in the tendering process. Such information will be undertaken via formal notification. This is to help reduce or eliminate any potential confusion that may occur.
   c. At no time will any individual imply any commitment of any kind to any supplier until such time that the CRB is in a position to formally do so.
Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2015</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Clarified ‘Opening’ process, adjusted purchase amounts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>GPF amendment to refer 12.b. back to section 7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purposes
To provide proper signing authority to Capital Region Board officials.

Policy
Capital Region Board (CRB) shall delegate signing authority to the Chair (Interim Chair) and the Chief Executive Officer.

Guidelines
1. Every cheque under $10,000 issued by the Capital Region Board will require one two signatures, both CRB administration with approved signing authority, either the Chair (Interim Chair) or the Chief Executive Officer.
2. Every cheque of $10,000 or greater issued by the Capital Region Board will require two signatures, both the Chair (Interim Chair) and the Chief Executive Officer.
3. All other legal documents will require one signature, either the Chair (Interim Chair) or the Chief Executive Officer.
4. In the absence of the Chair (Interim Chair), the Vice-Chair (Vice Interim Chair) shall be authorized to sign.
5. In the absence of the Chief Executive Officer, the Acting Chief Executive Officer shall be authorized to sign.
6. Every cheque payable to Chief Executive Officer will require a signature from the Chair/Interim Chair or in his/her absence, by the Vice-Chair/Interim Vice-Chair.
7. Every cheque payable to the Chair must be signed by the Vice-Chair.
8. All policies and terms of reference, once approved, shall be signed by the Board Chair.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2015</td>
<td>Updated</td>
<td>Added double signature for amount under $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>GPF amendment, Vice chair must sign cheques payable to chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
To provide proper signing authority to Capital Region Board officials.

POLICY
Capital Region Board (CRB) shall delegate signing authority to the Chair (Interim Chair) and the Chief Executive Officer.

GUIDELINES
1. Every cheque under $10,000 issued by the Capital Region Board will require two signatures, both CRB administration with approved signing authority.

2. Every cheque of $10,000 or greater issued by the Capital Region Board will require two signatures, both the Chair (Interim Chair) and the Chief Executive Officer.

3. All other legal documents will require one signature, either the Chair (Interim Chair) or the Chief Executive Officer.

4. In the absence of the Chair (Interim Chair), the Vice-Chair (Vice Interim Chair) shall be authorized to sign.

5. In the absence of the Chief Executive Officer, the Acting Chief Executive Officer shall be authorized to sign.

6. Every cheque payable to Chief Executive Officer will require a signature from the Chair/Interim Chair or in his/her absence, by the Vice-Chair/Interim Vice-Chair.

7. Every cheque payable to the Chair must be signed by the Vice-Chair

8. All policies and terms of reference, once approved, shall be signed by the Board Chair.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2015</td>
<td>Updated</td>
<td>Added double signature for amount under $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>GPF amendment, Vice chair must sign cheques payable to chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
To ensure that the Capital Region Board and the Province of Alberta receive accurate and regular financial reports as required.

POLICY
The Capital Region Board will receive financial reports quarterly at a CRB meeting.

The Capital Region Board will receive and approve an annual audited financial statement for the period January 1 to December 31.

The Capital Region Board will receive and approve an annual unaudited financial statement for the period April 1 to March 31.

The Province of Alberta will receive an annual audited financial statement for the period January 1 to December 31 and an annual unaudited financial statement for the period April 1 to March 31.

The Capital Region Board will prepare an annual financial information return respecting the financial affairs of the CRB for the period April 1 to March 31.

GUIDELINES
1. The financial year end for the Capital Region Board will be December-March 31.

2. The Chief Executive Officer will present financial reports to the Capital Region Board and the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee that will include all revenue and expenditures for both operations and capital. The financial reports will include budget forecasts and the percentage of budget remaining.

3. The appointed auditors will annually present to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee, for approval and recommendation to the Capital Region Board, the audited financial statements for the year ended December 31. The appointed auditors for the Capital Region Board will annually present to the Board for approval the audited financial statements for the year ended December 31.

4. The appointed auditors will annually provide the unaudited financial statements for the period April 1 to March 31 to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee for approval and recommendation to the Capital Region Board. The Capital Region Board, upon approval, will submit a copy to the Province of Alberta as per grant agreements.

5. The financial information return will include requirements respecting the accounting principles and standards to be used in preparing the return and any other requirements established by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.
6.5. The Capital Regional Board must submit its annual financial information return and annual audited financial statements to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and each member of the Capital Region Board by May 1 of the year following the year for which the return and statements have been prepared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2015</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjust year end date to match Province’s year end date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td></td>
<td>GPF amendment, paragraph 2 under Policy, unaudited changed to audited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
PURPOSE

To ensure that the Capital Region Board and the Province of Alberta receive accurate and regular financial reports as required.

POLICY

The Capital Region Board will receive financial reports quarterly at a CRB meeting.

The Capital Region Board will receive and approve an annual audited financial statement for the period April 1 to March 31.

The Province of Alberta will receive an annual audited financial statement for the period April 1 to March 31.

The Capital Region Board will prepare an annual financial information return respecting the financial affairs of the CRB for the period April 1 to March 31.

GUIDELINES

1. The financial year end for the Capital Region Board will be March 31.

2. The Chief Executive Officer will present financial reports to the Capital Region Board and the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee that will include all revenue and expenditures for both operations and capital. The financial reports will include budget forecasts and the percentage of budget remaining.

3. The appointed auditors will annually provide the unaudited financial statements for the period April 1 to March 31 to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee for approval and recommendation to the Capital Region Board. The Capital Region Board, upon approval, will submit a copy to the Province of Alberta as per grant agreements.

4. The financial information return will include requirements respecting the accounting principles and standards to be used in preparing the return and any other requirements established by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

5. The Capital Regional Board must submit its annual financial information return and annual audited financial statements to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and each member of the Capital Region Board by May 1 of the year following the year for which the return and statements have been prepared.
## Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2015</td>
<td>Update</td>
<td>Adjust year end date to match Province’s year end date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>GPF amendment, paragraph 2 under Policy, <em>unaudited</em> changed to <em>audited</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE

To provide direction on the investment of Capital Region Board funds.

POLICY

Investing CRB funds in a manner that will provide security of principal while satisfying cash flow requirements, providing optimum returns and conforming to Section 250(2)(a) to (d) of the Municipal Government Act.

GUIDELINES

1. Investments should be purchased taking into account the following:
   a. Compliance with the MGA – This means that each investment purchased complies with Section 250 (2)(a) to (d) of the MGA Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter M-26 or any subsequent update.
   b. Capital Preservation – This means that the principal amount of each investment is safe from losses arising from changes in market conditions or issuer default. CRB will ensure that sufficient diversification exists within its investment portfolio.
   c. Cash flow requirements – This means that investments mature when cash is needed to meet operating and capital obligations which might reasonably be foreseen in the short and longer term. Use of cash flow forecasts and matching of such to maturity dates will avoid interim borrowing costs.
   d. Investment earnings – This means that the portfolio will be managed such that an optimum rate of return is achieved while adhering to this policy’s guidelines.

2. The Chief Executive Officer must approve all investment activity.

3. The Chief Executive Officer will report the following information to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee and the Capital Region Board at a minimum on a quarterly basis:
   a. Specific investments including nature, maturity, amount, yield, percent of total portfolio.
   b. Total investment portfolio.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Provide coverage for future MGA updates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pursuant to Section 250(2)(a) to (d) of the Municipal Government Act, Investing CRB funds in a manner that will provide security of principal while satisfying cash flow requirements, providing optimum returns and conforming to Section 250(2)(a) to (d) of the Municipal Government Act.

GUIDELINES

1. Investments should be purchased taking into account the following:
   a. Compliance with the MGA – This means that each investment purchased complies with Section 250(2)(a) to (d) of the MGA Revised Statutes of Alberta 2000, Chapter M-26 or any subsequent update.
   b. Capital Preservation – This means that the principal amount of each investment is safe from losses arising from changes in market conditions or issuer default. CRB will ensure that sufficient diversification exists within its investment portfolio.
   c. Cash flow requirements – This means that investments mature when cash is needed to meet operating and capital obligations which might reasonably be foreseen in the short and longer term. Use of cash flow forecasts and matching of such to maturity dates will avoid interim borrowing costs.
   d. Investment earnings – This means that the portfolio will be managed such that an optimum rate of return is achieved while adhering to this policy’s guidelines.

2. The Chief Executive Officer must approve all investment activity.

3. The Chief Executive Officer will report the following information to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee and the Capital Region Board at a minimum on a quarterly basis:
   a. Specific investments including nature, maturity, amount, yield, percent of total portfolio.
   b. Total investment portfolio.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Provide coverage for future MGA updates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
To establish the process for development and approval of Capital Region Board policies and ensure consistent and regular review of policies.

POLICY
Capital Region Board shall establish a consistent approach and philosophy for the development and approval of policies.

GUIDELINES

1. Policies shall be developed using a standard format to provide consistency of information.

2. Policies shall be consistent with relevant Federal and Provincial government legislation and related regulations, the Capital Region Board Regulation as well as with the Capital Region Board’s Growth Plan and the Vision, Mission and Value statements, by-laws and policies.

3. Policies shall be reviewed and then recommended by the Chief Executive Officer before submitting to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee for its consideration.

4. The Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee shall review and consider recommending all corporate policies to the Capital Region Board for approval. Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee reserves the right to refer policies to the Chief Executive Officer, or any other committee or task force, for further review and/or amendments.

5. Approved policies are to be formally reviewed at least once every three years.

6. New policies will be reviewed one year from date of approval.

7. At the discretion of the Chief Executive Officer, proposed policies may be referred to Legal Counsel for review and comments.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Amendment Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Change policy review schedule from three to four years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>GPF amendment to add clause regarding review of new policy, and expanded purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PURPOSE
To establish the process for development and approval of Capital Region Board policies and ensure consistent and regular review of policies

POLICY
Capital Region Board shall establish a consistent approach and philosophy for the development and approval of policies.

GUIDELINES
1. Policies shall be developed using a standard format to provide consistency of information.
2. Policies shall be consistent with relevant Federal and Provincial government legislation and related regulations, the Capital Region Board Regulation as well as with the Capital Region Board’s Growth Plan and the Vision, Mission and Value statements, by-laws and policies.
3. Policies shall be reviewed and then recommended by the Chief Executive Officer before submitting to the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee for its consideration.
4. The Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee shall review and consider recommending all corporate policies to the Capital Region Board for approval. Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee reserves the right to refer policies to the Chief Executive Officer, or any other committee or task force, for further review and/or amendments.
5. Approved policies are to be formally reviewed at least once every four years.
6. New policies will be reviewed one year from date of approval.
7. At the discretion of the Chief Executive Officer, proposed policies may be referred to Legal Counsel for review and comments.

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Change policy review schedule from three to four years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 2015</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>GPF amendment to add clause regarding review of new policy, and expanded purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effective date  September 9, 2010
Approved by  Capital Region Board
Revised date  May 8, 2014

INDEMNIFICATION OF CRB MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES

PURPOSE
Capital Region Board is prepared to indemnify or to reimburse its members and employees from and against the payment of the deductible portion of any claim arising as a result of any action brought or judgment obtained against the member or employee and, to the extent provided by law, imposed in those instances where:

1. all but the deductible portion of any claim is covered under the insurance coverage held by the Capital Region Board;
2. the claim exceeds the insurance coverage limit; and/or
3. the expense is a fine.

POLICY
Capital Region Board shall maintain adequate insurance to provide coverage for the reimbursement or indemnification of any members and employees performing any duty for the Capital Region Board, whether remunerated or not, (hereinafter collectively referred to as “the named Party”) against any losses or expenses which he/she incurs as a result of any injury relating to, or any action brought, prosecution of or judgment obtained against him/her, arising out of his/her duties in that position; provided always that the legal liability for losses or expenses arises out of any act, error or omission during the performance of his/her duties which are or which he/she believes in good faith to be, within the scope of his/her position or employment with the Capital Region Board. The Capital Region Board retains the right to add additional insureds to the insurance policy as required.

GUIDELINES
The Capital Region Board shall indemnify or reimburse any named Party against any losses or expenses incurred by a named Party notwithstanding that those losses or expenses may exceed the limits of liability coverage available under the Capital Region Board Comprehensive General Liability Policy and subject to the following conditions:

1. Reimbursement or indemnification will be provided for the payment of the deductible portion of any claim covered by insurance, any claim in excess of the insurance coverage limits and any fines or penalties levied or imposed against the named Party by reason of the named Party being charged with a violation of any statute or by-law, PROVIDED the named Party acted in good faith and within the course and scope of his/her authority in whatever actions resulted in the commission of an offence.
2. The Capital Region Board’s insurers shall have the right to defend in the name of and on behalf of the named Party and make such investigation, negotiation and settlement of any claim as they may deem necessary or expedient.
3. The named Party, upon being notified that any legal action may be or is being commenced against him/her, shall immediately notify the Chief Executive Officer.
4. Insurance coverage maintained by the Capital Region Board extends to cover the named Party who has left his/her employment or position with the Capital Region Board; provided the incident out of which a claim or demand arises, actually occurred during the time the named Party was employed or performing duties for the Capital Region Board.

5. Insurance coverage shall be reviewed with the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee every two years. Any changes, if necessary, shall be recommended to the Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
INDEMNIFICATION OF CRB MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES

PURPOSE

Capital Region Board is prepared to indemnify or to reimburse its members and employees from and against the payment of the deductible portion of any claim arising as a result of any action brought or judgment obtained against the member or employee and, to the extent provided by law, imposed in those instances where:

1. all but the deductible portion of any claim is covered under the insurance coverage held by the Capital Region Board;
2. the claim exceeds the insurance coverage limit; and/or
3. the expense is a fine.

POLICY

Capital Region Board shall maintain adequate insurance to provide coverage for the reimbursement or indemnification of any members and employees performing any duty for the Capital Region Board, whether remunerated or not, (hereinafter collectively referred to as “the named Party”) against any losses or expenses which he/she incurs as a result of any injury relating to, or any action brought, prosecution of or judgment obtained against him/her, arising out of his/her duties in that position; provided always that the legal liability for losses or expenses arises out of any act, error or omission during the performance of his/her duties which are or which he/she believes in good faith to be, within the scope of his/her position or employment with the Capital Region Board. The Capital Region Board retains the right to add additional insureds to the insurance policy as required.

GUIDELINES

The Capital Region Board shall indemnify or reimburse any named Party against any losses or expenses incurred by a named Party notwithstanding that those losses or expenses may exceed the limits of liability coverage available under the Capital Region Board Comprehensive General Liability Policy and subject to the following conditions:

1. Reimbursement or indemnification will be provided for the payment of the deductible portion of any claim covered by insurance, any claim in excess of the insurance coverage limits and any fines or penalties levied or imposed against the named Party by reason of the named Party being charged with a violation of any statute or by-law, PROVIDED the named Party acted in good faith and within the course and scope of his/her authority in whatever actions resulted in the commission of an offence.
2. The Capital Region Board’s insurers shall have the right to defend in the name of and on behalf of the named Party and make such investigation, negotiation and settlement of any claim as they may deem necessary or expedient.
3. The named Party, upon being notified that any legal action may be or is being commenced against him/her, shall immediately notify the Chief Executive Officer.
4. Insurance coverage maintained by the Capital Region Board extends to cover the named Party who has left his/her employment or position with the Capital Region Board; provided the incident out of which a claim or demand arises, actually occurred during the time the named Party was employed or performing duties for the Capital Region Board.

5. Insurance coverage shall be reviewed with the Governance, Priorities, and Finance Committee every two years. Any changes, if necessary, shall be recommended to the Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Land Use & Planning Committee Terms of Reference

Recommended Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the revised Land Use & Planning Committee Terms of Reference as recommended by the Land Use & Planning Committee.

Background

- On May 8, 2014, the Capital Region Board approved the Land Use & Planning Committee Terms of Reference (TOR).

- On December 17, 2015, following a review the TOR, CRB Administration recommended to the Committee that the Energy Corridors Task Force sub-section of the Mandate section of the TOR be deleted. The Energy Corridors Task Force completed its work in 2014 and is no longer needed by the Committee. The Committee approved the revised TOR and recommended that the revised TOR be forwarded to the Capital Region Board for approval.

Attachments:

1. Track Changes - Revised Land Use & Planning Committee Terms of Reference – December 17, 2015
2. Revised Land Use & Planning Committee Terms of Reference – December 17, 2015
BACKGROUND

This committee will provide leadership in the development and enhancement of integrated land use policy and planning through the completion of projects authorized by the Board.

MANDATE

Reporting to the Board, this standing committee will be responsible for the following:

*Business and Budget Planning*
- On an annual basis, recommend a rolling four year business plan and budget for the committee and its task forces to the Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee for consideration in the Board’s annual business plan update

*Land Use Policy Leadership*
- Guide and oversee the implementation of the Land Use Plan through a policy framework that includes the integration of all strategic priorities of the Growth Plan
- Recommend suitable land use policies that are consistent with the Growth Plan
- Provide strategic advice to the Board for municipalities implementing regional Land Use Plan policies at the municipal level within the existing municipal planning processes
- Ensure that regional and community priorities guide decision-making and implementation

*Energy Corridors Task Force:*
- Provide policy oversight and guidance to the task force
- Recommend intermediate updates and final reports to the Board

MEMBERSHIP

The committee will consist of 11 members: Edmonton, two Cities, three Counties, four Towns, and one Village as determined by the Board or as approved by the Board. Membership will be reviewed by the Board every two years.

LEADERSHIP

At its first meeting, the committee will select its Chair and Vice-Chair from amongst its membership. If there is a change in the committee’s membership, the committee should review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair. 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.

SUPPORT/RESOURCES

The CEO will support this Committee drawing upon CRB staff as required.
The committee will also be supported by consultant resources, and others as determined by its mandate and the Board’s approved business plan and budget. The Chief Executive Officer may establish an administrative working or advisory group as deemed necessary to support a committee project.

**MEETING FREQUENCY**

This committee shall meet bi-monthly or at the call of the Chair as warranted.

**AUTHORITY**

All meeting groups established by the Board are considered advisory bodies to the Board and therefore must, by a passed motion, provide recommendation(s) to the Board for decision.

**EX-OFFICIO**

Non-voting ex-officio: CRB Chair.

Whenever viable, Provincial and/or key stakeholder representatives will be invited to attend committee meetings as ex-officio members to contribute their expertise and knowledge towards a particular outcome.

**DECISION-MAKING**

Decisions, recommendations and actions determined by the committee will be driven by the desired outcome to do what is in the best interest of the Capital Region. Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the committee, or their designated alternate, may vote. Each member will have one vote.

All motions must be moved by a voting member. Motions require a majority of members in attendance to pass (50 percent plus one).

**QUORUM**

Quorum is defined as 50 percent plus one of standing membership.

**DISPUTE RESOLUTION**

The committee Chair is accountable for ensuring effective and collaborative committee operations and decision-making. Where the Chair’s efforts are unable to resolve a dispute, the matter will be brought to the Board for discussion and resolution.

**COMMUNICATIONS**

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

Committee meetings are open to the public including all members of the CRB (elected officials and their alternates), administrative representatives from all CRB member municipalities and members of the public. Individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/committee members may be invited to participate in specific agenda items. Committee minutes are public records.

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

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

REPORTING

The committees is expected to provide the Board, through established communication channels and schedules, sage advice, descriptions and recommendations to resolve existing issues, status and progress as it relates to its mandate and expected deliverables.

MEETING AGENDAS & MINUTES

All meeting agendas, minutes, reports, briefings and supporting documentation will be provided in an electronic format.

In general, meeting agendas and pre-read materials, where available, will be provided at least one week in advance of a scheduled meeting.

The committee will include its meeting minutes with the next Board meeting agenda package.

---

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
BACKGROUND

This committee will provide leadership in the development and enhancement of integrated land use policy and planning through the completion of projects authorized by the Board.

MANDATE

Reporting to the Board, this standing committee will be responsible for the following:

Business and Budget Planning

- On an annual basis, recommend a rolling four year business plan and budget for the committee and its task forces to the Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee for consideration in the Board’s annual business plan update

Land Use Policy Leadership

- Guide and oversee the implementation of the Land Use Plan through a policy framework that includes the integration of all strategic priorities of the Growth Plan
- Recommend suitable land use policies that are consistent with the Growth Plan
- Provide strategic advice to the Board for municipalities implementing regional Land Use Plan policies at the municipal level within the existing municipal planning processes
- Ensure that regional and community priorities guide decision-making and implementation

MEMBERSHIP

The committee will consist of 11 members: Edmonton, two Cities, three Counties, four Towns, and one Village as determined by the Board or as approved by the Board. Membership will be reviewed by the Board every two years.

LEADERSHIP

At its first meeting, the committee will select its Chair and Vice-Chair from amongst its membership. If there is a change in the committee’s membership, the committee should review and select its Chair and Vice-Chair. 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.

SUPPORT/RESOURCES

The CEO will support this Committee drawing upon CRB staff as required.

The committee will also be supported by consultant resources, and others as determined by its mandate and the Board’s approved business plan and budget. The Chief Executive Officer may establish an administrative working or advisory group as deemed necessary to support a committee project.
MEETING FREQUENCY
This committee shall meet bi-monthly or at the call of the Chair as warranted.

AUTHORITY
All meeting groups established by the Board are considered advisory bodies to the Board and therefore must, by a passed motion, provide recommendation(s) to the Board for decision.

EX-OFFICIO
Non-voting ex-officio: CRB Chair.

Whenever viable, Provincial and/or key stakeholder representatives will be invited to attend committee meetings as ex-officio members to contribute their expertise and knowledge towards a particular outcome.

DECISION-MAKING
Decisions, recommendations and actions determined by the committee will be driven by the desired outcome to do what is in the best interest of the Capital Region. Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of the committee, or their designated alternate, may vote. Each member will have one vote.

All motions must be moved by a voting member. Motions require a majority of members in attendance to pass (50 percent plus one).

QUORUM
Quorum is defined as 50 percent plus one of standing membership.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION
The committee Chair is accountable for ensuring effective and collaborative committee operations and decision-making. Where the Chair’s efforts are unable to resolve a dispute, the matter will be brought to the Board for discussion and resolution.

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

STATUS OF MEETINGS
Committee meetings are open to the public including all members of the CRB (elected officials and their alternates), administrative representatives from all CRB member municipalities and members of the public. Individuals from the Province, industry, the general public or other Board/committee members may be invited to participate in specific agenda items. Committee minutes are public records.
Section 602.08 (1) of the Municipal Government Act (MGA) states that the committee may close all or part of their meetings to the public if a matter to be discussed is within one of the exceptions to disclosure in Division 2 of Part 1 of the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

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

**REPORTING**

The committee is expected to provide the Board, through established communication channels and schedules, sage advice, descriptions and recommendations to resolve existing issues, status and progress as it relates to its mandate and expected deliverables.

**MEETING AGENDAS & MINUTES**

All meeting agendas, minutes, reports, briefings and supporting documentation will be provided in an electronic format.

In general, meeting agendas and pre-read materials, where available, will be provided at least one week in advance of a scheduled meeting.

The committee will include its meeting minutes with the next Board meeting agenda package.

---

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan

Recommended Motions

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

2. That the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan be sent to the Province and Alberta Energy Regulator for information.

3. That the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan be referred to the Advocacy and Monitoring Committee to pursue the support of the Province in implementation of the Plan’s recommendations and further actions.

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 November 12, 2015 the Board referred the proposed Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan back to the Land Use & Planning Committee to address concerns with the proposed alignment of a priority pipeline corridor south of Bruderheim.

- On December 17, 2015, the Land Use & Planning Committee approved a revised priority pipeline corridor alignment south of Bruderheim, and recommended that the revised Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan be forwarded to the Capital Region Board for approval.

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.

With respect to the corridor south of Bruderheim, Figure 2 – Priority Pipeline Corridors Map has been revised: The corridor has been widened with Highway 15 at the centre and a note added indicating that “Final alignment to be agreed to by affected municipalities”. A note at the bottom of the map has also been added advising that “All corridor alignments are conceptual and subject to change based on further detailed investigation and study”.

Attachments:

1. Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan
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Executive Summary

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

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

and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Corridor Strategy

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

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

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

Short Term – 0 to 5 years

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

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

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

Medium Term – 5 to 20 years

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

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

Long Term – 20 plus years

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

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

Recommendations and Further Actions

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

Recommendations

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

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

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

Further Actions

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AER</td>
<td>Alberta Energy Regulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESO</td>
<td>Alberta Electrical System Operator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>Alberta Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIH</td>
<td>Alberta’s Industrial Heartland - A 582 km² heavy industrial zoned area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>northeast of Edmonton that has become the largest hydrocarbon processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>region in Canada.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB</td>
<td>Capital Region Board – is a non-profit corporation consisting of an elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>official from the 24 member municipalities from within the Greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edmonton Metropolitan Region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>Defined in the Growth Plan Addendum as ‘A corridor designed to accommodate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>multiple infrastructure facilities such as roads, transmission lines and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pipelines within and beyond the Region’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constraint</td>
<td>- Physical constraints – constraints related to corridor capacity, or existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development footprint, airports, coal extraction areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Policy constraints – growth areas (PGAs, CCRAs, Alberta’s Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heartland), lands outside local jurisdiction (reserves, CFB Edmonton)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Natural constraints – hydrology, parks, protected areas, environmentally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sensitive areas; would result in fragmentation/disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>A right-of-way across land supported by regulatory approvals that grants the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>owner rights to install and operate their energy facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>Long-term Transmission Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland Pipeline</td>
<td>Regionally significant corridors that are identified and protected as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>conceptual locations of multiple new energy sectors’ inter-connecting and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intra-connecting pipelines necessary in conveying product to processors and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to the market in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland. These corridors function to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minimize risk, land fragmentation and the impact on the environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEB</td>
<td>National Energy Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCB</td>
<td>Natural Resources Conservation Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGA</td>
<td>Priority Growth Areas as defined in the Capital Region Growth Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum Pipeline</td>
<td>Petroleum Pipeline Infrastructure consists of Transmission Pipelines and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Feeder Lines that move petroleum across the province and internationally and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>between storage and processing facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Based Regulation</td>
<td>Through the play-based regulation initiative (PBR), the AER will be piloting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a new framework to govern unconventional oil and gas development. The play-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>based regulation pilot project aims to encourage applicants to collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on surface development plans and participate in the pilot in order to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minimize the number of facilities and other surface impacts during the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pilot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>Power Infrastructure consists of Electricity Transmission lines that provide the bulk transfer of electricity on regional 138, 240 and 500 kV Transmission Corridors and their Substations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<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
   - amongst potential corridor routes within the Region
   - against the principles of the Growth Plan to assess the overall impact of the Region
3. Identify priority corridors
4. Identify protection approaches and models for priority corridors

4.1 Identify Existing Regional Energy Corridors

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

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

Regional Corridors

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

**Petroleum Pipeline Corridors**
- **Brazeau/Drayton Valley** – Shipping products from the Pembina and Drayton Valley fields and others into the refineries and storage facilities in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.
- **Hardisty Connectors** – Shipping products from refineries and storage facilities in Alberta’s Industrial Heartland to the United States and eastern Canada.
- **Cold Lake/Southern Athabasca Oilsands/Fort McMurray** – Shipping bitumen into the refineries and storage facilities of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland and diluent in return.
- **Heartland – Fort McMurray** - Shipping bitumen into the refineries and storage facilities of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland and diluent in return.
- **Vancouver** – Shipping oil to Vancouver via Jasper from the refineries and storage facilities of Alberta’s Industrial Heartland.
**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) Corridor</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></td>
<td>To ship oil, gas and liquids from Swan Hills, Rainbow Lake, Norman Wells etc. to the Heartland</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></td>
<td></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>
</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/Ow nership**

- *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 (ie. 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>Ranking</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Protection Option</th>
<th>NEPC</th>
<th>Heartland Connector Corridors</th>
<th>Southeast Heartland Ring</th>
<th>AIH Intersite Connector</th>
<th>Redwater Bypass</th>
<th>EETP</th>
<th>NW Alberta Connector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 +</td>
<td></td>
<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>20 – 29</td>
<td></td>
<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>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<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>10-14</td>
<td></td>
<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>5-9</td>
<td></td>
<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>0-4</td>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<td></td>
<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>Alberta Transportation</td>
<td>Shaan Hammond</td>
<td>ADM Safety, Policy and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Affairs</td>
<td>Gary Sandberg</td>
<td>ADM Municipal Services and Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria Brown</td>
<td>Manager, Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
<td>Neal Samecki</td>
<td>Manager Regional Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephanie Chai</td>
<td>Regional Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipalities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>Rick Sloan</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor, Office of the General Manager, Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kate Gibson</td>
<td>Senior Consultant, Office of the General Manager, Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kunal Sharma</td>
<td>Strategic Initiatives Coordinator, Business Strategy and Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly Greenfield</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 Stog</td>
<td>Manager, Enforcement and Surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Helmer</td>
<td>Director, Pipeline Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Industrial Heartland Association</td>
<td>Neil Shelly</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garret Matteotti</td>
<td>Business Development Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pipeline Companies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransCanada Pipelines</td>
<td>Scott Clark</td>
<td>Capital Projects Land Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ryan Goggyelka</td>
<td>Sr Land Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enbridge Pipelines Inc.</td>
<td>Brent Kaup</td>
<td>Sr. Manager, Land Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kara Schwabe</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>InterPipeline 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, Stint, 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>
Appendix B  References

Note – All weblinks accessed March through June 2015.


http://www.albertalandfacts.ca/default.htm
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Stantec (2004) AIHA Regional Pipeline Corridor and Setback Study.
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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><strong>North East Penetrator Corridor (NEPC)</strong></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 130^th^ 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  
  - 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.  
  - 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 |
1.0 North East Penetrator Corridor (NEPC)

- Edmonton MDP
  - 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);
  - 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;
  - Policy 9.3.1.5 – Plan pipelines in corridors with other utilities where possible.

common corridors wherever possible in order to protect these lands for their intended purpose.
## Heartland Connectors

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

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

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

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

**Corridor**
A by-pass access around the core of the AIH area for raw products coming from the NE portion of the province

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

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

**Protection Status and Options**
- Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor
- Strathcona County MDP
  - Policy 7.24 – requires new pipelines or utilities to follow existing corridors, quarter sections or rights of way, in accordance with Map 2;
  - Policy 7.25 – ensure that new or expanded pipelines or utility corridors do not impact high or medium priority environment management areas, wherever possible;
  - Policy 16.2 – work with surrounding municipalities and utility companies to ensure integrated utility corridors are created and maintained;
  - Policy 16.3 – support the rationalization and development of pipeline/utility corridors in consultation with industry, utility companies, federal, provincial and municipal governments;
  - Policy 16.4 – Use pipeline/utility corridors as multiple use corridors to accommodate oil, natural gas, municipal utilities, electrical transmission lines, communications infrastructure, and pedestrian linkages;
  - Policy 16.4(a) – encourage that regional corridors and infrastructure as identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan will be integrated into common corridors wherever possible in order to protect these lands for their intended purpose.
- Lamont County MDP
  - Policy 10.8(d) – use corridors to integrate a number of utilities;
  - Policy 10.13 – when planning for future residential development in the areas near pipelines and powerlines, the County will require rights-of-way to contain sufficient width to ensure adequate buffers or setbacks between the proposed residential development and adjoining uses.
### 4.0 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.

#### 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;
  - Policy 16.4(a) – encourage that regional corridors and infrastructure as identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan will be integrated into common corridors wherever possible in order to protect these lands for their intended purpose.
### 5.0 Redwater Bypass

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Corridor</strong></th>
<th>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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constraints/Design Considerations</strong></td>
<td>• Determining around the Redwater oil and gas fields&lt;br&gt;• Redwater River crossing&lt;br&gt;• Land alienation impact southeast of the Redwater Town site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protection Status and Options</strong></td>
<td>• Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor&lt;br&gt;• Strathcona County MDP&lt;br&gt;  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;&lt;br&gt;  o Policy 7.24 – requires new pipelines or utilities to follow existing corridors, quarter sections or rights of way, in accordance with Map 2;&lt;br&gt;  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;&lt;br&gt;  o Policy 16.2 – work with surrounding municipalities and utility companies to ensure integrated utility corridors are created and maintained;&lt;br&gt;  o Policy 16.3 – support the rationalization and development of pipeline/utility corridors in consultation with industry, utility companies, federal, provincial and municipal governments;&lt;br&gt;  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;&lt;br&gt;  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.&lt;br&gt;• Sturgeon County MDP&lt;br&gt;  o Policy 5.4.9 – should identify utility corridors that promote efficient use of land and that maximize development potential;&lt;br&gt;  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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>EETP Connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor</strong></td>
<td>Connecting the EETP in NE Edmonton to the NW corner of the AIH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>• To link the EETP into the AIH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Constraints/Design Considerations** | • Identification of connection to the AIH west of the North Saskatchewan River  
• Topography of Sturgeon valley and river  
• Future location of petrochemical facilities within the AIH |
| **Protection Status and Options** | • Corridor supported by existing Pembina ROW into NW corner of the EETP  
• Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.0</th>
<th>Northwest Alberta Connector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corridor</strong></td>
<td>Shipping oil, gas and natural gas lines from the Swan Hills, Rainbow Lake, Norman Wells fields and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>• To link NW Alberta and NE BC into the AIH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Constraints/Design Considerations** | • Identification of connection to the AIH west of the North Saskatchewan River  
• Future location of facilities within the AIH |
| **Protection Status and Options** | • Existing linear right of ways will influence future development applications along corridor |
### Appendix E  Priority Energy Corridors - Growth Plan Land Use Principles and Policies Review

#### Legend

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Corridor has a high level of consistence with Growth Plan Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Corridor has a medium level of consistence with Growth Plan Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Corridor has a low level of consistence with Growth Plan Policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<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.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preserve and Protect the Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preserve Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimize the Impact of Heavy Industrial Developments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- NEPC: North Edmonton Planning Committee
- Heartland Connectors
- Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor
- AIH Intersite Connectors
- Redwater Bypass
- EETP Connector
- Northwest Alberta Connector

- Traverses PGA B and F; land area F is currently undeveloped
- Fragments G and F; most land area is undeveloped
- Fragments land

**Table Columns Explanation:**
- **Principle:** Describes the principle being considered.
- **NEPC:** Score ranging from 1 to 3, indicating the level of consistency with growth plan policies.
- **Heartland Connectors:** Score ranging from 1 to 3, indicating the level of consistency with growth plan policies.
- **Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor:** Score ranging from 1 to 3, indicating the level of consistency with growth plan policies.
- **AIH Intersite Connectors:** Score ranging from 1 to 3, indicating the level of consistency with growth plan policies.
- **Redwater Bypass:** Score ranging from 1 to 3, indicating the level of consistency with growth plan policies.
- **EETP Connector:** Score ranging from 1 to 3, indicating the level of consistency with growth plan policies.
- **Northwest Alberta Connector:** Score ranging from 1 to 3, indicating the level of consistency with growth plan policies.
Core Principle V: Ensure Efficient Provision of Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>NEPC</th>
<th>Heartland Connectors</th>
<th>Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor</th>
<th>AIH Intersite Connectors</th>
<th>Redwater Bypass Connector</th>
<th>EETP Connector</th>
<th>Northwest Alberta Connector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Design Integrated Physical Infrastructure with the Region</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes an existing power transmission corridor (north-south portion); no adjacent infrastructure on east-west portion</td>
<td>Adjacent to some existing pipeline corridors</td>
<td>Southern portion includes existing pipeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Maximize Utilization of Existing Infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjacent to some existing pipeline corridors</td>
<td>Southern portion includes existing pipeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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
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Edmonton Energy and Technology Park (EETP)
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Priority Pipeline Corridors

1. Northeast Penetrator Corridor
2. Heartland Connector
3. Southeast Heartland Ring Corridor
4. AIH Inter-site Connector
5. Redwater Bypass
6. EETP Connector
7. Northwest Alberta Connector

*Note - All corridor alignments are conceptual and subject to change based on further detailed investigation and study

Final alignment to be agreed to by affected municipalities

FIGURE 2.0: PRIORITY PIPELINE CORRIDORS*
FIGURE 4.0: PRIORITY POWER TRANSMISSION CORRIDORS
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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
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CRB/CRP Regional Transit Policy Workshop
December 4, 2015
Black Knight Inn, Red Deer, AB
10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Attendees:

**CRB Transit Members:**
- Wes Brodhead, *City of St. Albert, Chair*
- Dave Anderson, *Strathcona County*
- Wayne Bokenfohr, *Sturgeon County*
- Brian Botterill, *Strathcona County*
- Bill Steinburg, *City of Spruce Grove*
- Dana Smith, *City of Leduc*
- Michael Walters, *City of Edmonton*
- Susan Evans, *Sturgeon County*

**CRP Transportation Members:**
- John Borrowman, *Town of Canmore, Chair*
- Lora Peterson, *Town of Irricana*
- Richard Pootmans, *City of Calgary*
- Bob Sobol, *Town of Strathmore*
- Ray Watrin, *Town of Okotoks*
- Gail Smith, *City of Chestermere*
- Dona Fluter, *Town of Turner Valley*
- Michel Jackson, *Town of Black Diamond*
- Candice Kolson, *City of Airdrie*
- Jim Stevenson, *City of Calgary*
- Ruth Goodwin, *Town of Black Diamond*

**Capital Region Board:**
- Mayor Nolan Crouse, *City of St. Albert, Chair of CRB*
- Malcolm Bruce, *CEO*
- Neal Sarnecki, *Manager, Regional Projects*
- Sharon Shuya, *Manager, Regional Projects*
- Amanda Borman, *Executive Assistant, CRB*

**Calgary Regional Partnership:**
- Mayor Bill Robertson, *Town of Okotoks, Chair of CRP*
- Colleen Shepherd, *Executive Director*
- Ettore Iannacito, *Manager of Regional Transportation, CRP*
- Alison Graf, *Program Coordinator*
- Cheryl Knapp, *Program Coordinator*

**Alberta Transportation:**
- Honourable Brian Mason, *Minister*
- Greg Bass, *Deputy Minister*
- Shaun Hammond, *ADM*
- Ashley Bhatia, *Director, Next Generation Transportation Systems*
- Joan Mmbaga, *Policy Advisor*

**Guests:**
- Representatives from Capital Region and Calgary Region Municipalities
Meeting Notes:

10:00 a.m.  Welcome
CRB Chair, Mayor Nolan Crouse and CRP Chair, Mayor Bill Robertson welcomed members from the CRB Transit Committee and CRP Transportation Committee and guests to the workshop.

10:10 a.m.  Introductions
CRB Transit Committee Chair, Councillor Wes Brodhead, and CRP Transportation Committee Chair, Mayor John Borrowman, introduced themselves as co-chairs of the workshop and then invited attendees to the workshop to introduce themselves.

10:20 a.m.  Regional Transit Updates
Neal Sarnecki, Regional Projects Manager with the CRB provided an overview of the recent work being undertaken by the Transit Committee of the Capital Region Board. Ettore Iannacito, Manager of Regional Transportation at the CRP gave a brief presentation of the On-It Regional Transit Pilot Project and Alison Graf, Program Coordinator presented an overview of the public engagement program for the pilot project.

11:10 a.m.  Regional Transit Roundtable
Minister Mason thanked members for inviting him to the Workshop. He congratulated the successful municipal applicants on recent GreenTRIP grant funding. He advised the Workshop that the 2015 provincial budget included $330 million dollars for new Transit Initiatives – next version of GreenTRIP, program yet to be established. The new program needs to establish the criteria that supports Regional Collaboration. Also, they will be announcing a 3rd call for submissions for GreenTRIP funding. $415 Million is left in the GreenTRIP program, $150 Million for CRP, $285 Million for other municipalities within the Province. The CRB has exhausted its allocation of GreenTRIP funding.

The Minister then opened up the floor to questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Comment</th>
<th>Minister Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provincial Transit Strategy; Desire for municipalities to partner with Province, key cornerstone in Transit and Economic Development; Kneeling Buses, Overnight changes</td>
<td>• Working on long range Transportation Plan, going through/reviewing directions for Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Focus on emerging technologies and needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regional Public Transit Priority in the Long Range Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commented on the Federal Transit Funding and its possible application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenTRIP funding 3rd call, When?</td>
<td>Open January, closed by spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$330 million in new Transit funding - for operating costs?</td>
<td>That’s the idea but no decision on what the new criteria will be&lt;br&gt;Remaining money in GreenTRIP will follow the original criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities want to be an active Partner - 3 year Business Plan, Policy Initiatives, 11 are Transit related. Are you going through consultation on funding policy?</td>
<td>Excellent suggestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Transit Needs Assessments, it’s about Health Care. How do we use Health Money to support?</td>
<td>Air quality is a Health issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$415 Million uncommitted GreenTRIP dollars. Will you revisit previously rejected submissions?</td>
<td>Yes, please resubmit original applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandate, use to work together</td>
<td>Carrots not sticks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenTRIP funding?</td>
<td>$330 million is NEW money and will not go out yet&lt;br&gt;Edmonton Region is already paid out for their portion from the original GreenTRIP funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GreenTRIP, how do you weight out something collaboratively and/or direct to municipalities?</td>
<td>Political decisions have to be made, hard decision need to be made&lt;br&gt;Can’t promise anything, will be fair and takes into consideration the collaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenline (Calgary LRT leg) still being considered? Have several smaller projects</td>
<td>Could suck up the money left but we need to be fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When will Provincial Public Transit Policy be available for review?</td>
<td>Will be developed with the Long Range Plan&lt;br&gt;Political review is ongoing&lt;br&gt;Green light for formal consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>happening the next 60/90 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CRB/CRP first then to smaller communities moving people into major areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use (TUC), access to TUC land for transit purposes such as Park n Ride facilities - Policy decision would be appreciated</td>
<td>Allocation of 16 million for specifically rural transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following up on Seniors Transportation, Medical Transportations high priority for rural areas...chemo, dialysis etc.</td>
<td>Metropolitan proponents providing buses in the sector, one is for medical reasons, hoping to supplement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralleled Transit for seniors in rural/hamlets needed/identified</td>
<td>Please send information to Ministers Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need paralleled or funding infrastructure, getting off the farms and into the major systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary transportation system to get remote seniors to municipalities then into the major systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of desire to do it but no funding stream.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV lanes and encouraging people to use them. Two different jurisdictions, conversations to allow both groups to continue discussion.</td>
<td>It’s a part of the Long Range Plan study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Want to see the Transit Plan integrated with the Infrastructure Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work together to plan the future, don’t want wall to wall with a million interchanges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUMA &amp; AAMDC involved in conversation design and cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Range Plan study timeline clarification - Early 2016 to review, fall 2016 for comments back from CRB/CRP?</td>
<td>Sounds about right, also want some public consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$330 Million of new funding - same kind of criteria as GreenTRIP? Should be biggest bang for buck, smart dense communities, planning as criteria. It’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
about smart planning and makes us accountable

- Increasing need for the Greenline (Calgary LRT leg), stabilize growth and energy. Transit is vital to our economy.

11:50 a.m.  Lunch

12:50 p.m.  Joint Transit Initiatives & Transit Advocacy Priorities

Joint Transit Initiatives

Through a facilitated discussion the members explored the opportunities for the CRB and CRP to work together on joint transit initiatives and studies that further support regional transit.

Most of the discussion revolved around educating the various transit stakeholders on the value of transit, the cost to maintain transit systems, the link between infrastructure cost/cost to public, making transit convenient/attractive, etc.

Transit Advocacy Priorities

Through a facilitated discussion the members discussed future advocacy priorities that should be pursued with other levels of government.

The discussion was summarized into four priorities:

1. A Provincial Strategy that sets the vision and provides the support for long term planning (transit corridors) that prevent costly obstacles in the future.
2. Tools that empower regional and municipal levels to achieve funding goals that support sustainable transit (capital and operations).
3. Advocate for the benefits transit provides for health and wellness including rural transit which allows residents to stay in their communities but have access to services.
4. Educate public, municipal councils, provincial and federal leaders on the costs and benefits of transit.

2:00 p.m.  Provincial Direction on Public Transit

Deputy Minister Greg Bass briefly commented on the work being undertaken by Alberta Transportation. Heard loud and clear message from members to make sure the O&M conversation is hammered out.
ADM Shaun Hammond added comments regarding a Fraser Institute study article. Just because you build the transportation does not mean people would/will use it. There is a need to have a system wide approach in consultations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions/Comments for Deputy Minister</th>
<th>Deputy Minister Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Public consultations but at some point we need to get something going | Ears are ringing  
One more round of consultation and moving quickly  
There is much desire to see this completed using the original timelines |
| Education and awareness on transit | There is certainly a place  
Transportation safety plan and drive down on fatalities significant reduction despite increase in drivers, roads and vehicles – education is key  
Will not be able to accomplish without municipalities |
| No consultation that we are a part of currently, that needs to be updated. We hope that the previous consultations were not in waste. |  |

2:40 p.m.  Closing Comments
- Canadian Urban Transit Association (CUTA) - approach for funding and support
- FCM 2017 – Collaborate to Compete (Regional Forum at FCM), consider using Ottawa to focus on transit as a theme for 2017 event. This year’s Collaborate to Compete will be held the day before FCM in Winnipeg on June 2, 2016.
- Next meeting – Unanimous support to meet again after consultation with province in the spring of 2016

2:45 p.m.  Adjournment

Mayor John Borrowman  
CRP Committee Chair

Councillor Wes Brodhead  
CRB Committee Chair

Prepared: January 8, 2016
Revised: January 25, 2016
Capital Region Board Membership Review

Recommended Motions

a. That the Capital Region Board supports the Town of Lamont’s request to terminate its status as a “participating municipality” pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012 and request that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation to give effect to the request of the Town of Lamont.

b. That the Capital Region Board supports the Town of Redwater’s request to terminate its status as a “participating municipality” pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012 and request that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation to give effect to the request of the Town of Redwater.

Background

July 11, 2013: The Town of Redwater identified itself as a member municipality that, by an approved Council motion, should not be a member of the CRB. The Town of Redwater put forward the motion, which failed;

That the Capital Region Board supports the Town of Redwater’s request to the Minister of Municipal Affairs to be removed as a member municipality of the Capital Region Board.

At the same Board meeting, the City of Fort Saskatchewan put forward the following Notice of Motion;

That CRB Administration be directed to present a report with possible changes to the CRB membership based on criteria, for the Board’s consideration at the September Board meeting and ultimate recommendation to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

July 15, 2013: The Minister of Municipal Affairs responded to the Town of Redwater’s request to withdraw its membership from the Board indicating that the department was not in the position to undertake a review of the CRB regulation at that time but may consider doing so after the 2013 municipal election.

September 12, 2013: The Board received, for information, a Review of CRB Membership Report prepared by George Cuff & Associates. The Board acknowledged that approaching the Province with the Review at that time was not opportune and that waiting until after the election would bring better results.

On November 14, 2013, the Board passed the following motion;
That the Capital Region Board postpone any discussion on the Membership Review until sometime later in 2014.

On October 9, 2014, the Board passed the following motion;

That the Capital Region Board receive the Membership Review report for information.

March 12, 2015, The Advocacy & Monitoring Committee passed the following motion;

That the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee receive the membership review process report and refer the matter to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

April 13, 2015, The Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee passed the following motion;

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

On May 14, 2015, The Capital Region Board passed the following motion;

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

On September 10, 2015, the Capital Region Board approved Policy G019 - Capital Region Board Membership Review;

On October 8, 2015, the Capital Region Board passed the following 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.

The membership review period began after the motion was passed by the Board and concluded January 6, 2016. The policy criteria allows for 10 participating municipalities to review their membership. Out of the 10 municipalities, two – the Town of Lamont and the Town of Redwater – made successful motions supporting their withdrawal from the Capital Region Board.

Attachments:

1. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Town of Lamont, October 27, 2015
2. Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Town of Redwater, September 15, 2015
3. CRB Membership Review – Table of Eligible Members
4. Policy G019 - Capital Region Board Membership Review
November 12, 2015

Capital Region Board
#1100 Bell Tower
10104-103 Ave.
Edmonton, AB.
T5J 0H8

Dear Mr. Bruce

This letter is to inform you that at the Regular Meeting of Council held October 27, 2015 Council approved a motion to change their membership status.

The approved motion read as follows:

That the Town of Lamont wishes to terminate its status as a “participating municipality” pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation, Alta. Reg. 38/2012, and request that: (a) the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation to give effect to this request, and; (b) the Capital Region Board pass a resolution to support this request by the Town of Lamont.

If you have any further questions regarding this matter please call (780) 895-2010.

Sincerely,

Sandi Maschmeyer
CAO

SM/bm
Town of Lamont

October 27, 2015
Regular Meeting of Council

Town Council Chambers

PRESENT: Bill Skinner
         Gail Hrehorets
         Debra Dunsmore
         Wayne Field
         Dave Taylor
         Steven Sharun
         Doug Pewarchuk
         Sandi Maschmeyer
         Betty Malica

Mayor
Councillor
Councillor
Councillor
Councillor
Councillor
Councillor arrived late 8:17 p.m.
Chief Administrative Officer
Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER: Mayor Skinner; called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

ADOPTION OF AGENDA:

MOTION: 147/15 Councillor Dunsmore: that the agenda be accepted as amended:
Business: f) Beaverhill Lodge information
g) RFD – Knights Roofing – arena roof repair

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

DECLARATION OF PECUNIARY INTEREST: None

IN-CAMERA: None

DELEGATION: None

ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING:

MOTION: 148/15 Councillor Hrehorets: that the Regular Meeting of Council be adjourned at 7:32 p.m.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION: 149/15 Councillor Taylor: that the Organizational Meeting of Council be opened at 7:33 p.m.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Organizational Meeting

Council

Members: All Councillors (or a Council quorum)

Role: Decision making body for all Corporate, Municipal and Public Service issues.

Meetings: 2nd & 4th Tuesday of the month 7:30 P.M.
Schedule of Appointments

The Mayor is an ex officio member of all Committees of Council except for Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (SDAB) and the Emergency Advisory Committee.

DEPUTY MAYOR

Douglas Pewarchuk - November 1, 2015 – April 30, 2016
Steven Sharun - May 1, 2016 – October 31, 2016

COMMITTEES OF COUNCIL

Corporate Services

Members: Debra Dunsmore, Gail Hrehorets, David Taylor, Financial Officer, CAO

Role: Recommending body to Council on all Corporate Services issues which include: financial and general government, human resources, personnel policy, remuneration and compensation, benefits, computer systems, bylaw management.

Meetings: As required

Public Services

Members: Gail Hrehorets, Wayne Field, Steven Sharun, Public Works Foreman, Colin Peddle

Role: Recommending body to Council on all Public Services issues, which include; public works, capital projects, road and street maintenance, transportation and community services, communication systems, facility and parks maintenance and coordination, culture, recreational programming, special events coordination, cemetery.

Meetings: As required

Protection of Persons and Property

Members: Douglas Pewarchuk, David Taylor, Steven Sharun, Richard Chernyk, CAO

Role: Recommending body to Council on all issues relating to the protection of persons and property including fire protection, ambulance services, the Town disaster plan, and policing issues.

Meetings: As required

Parks and Recreation

Members: Gail Hrehorets, David Taylor, Recreation Manager with a minimum of three (3) members at large

Role: Recommending body to Council on all issues relating to planning, design and development of parks and recreational use areas within the municipality.

Emergency Advisory Committee

Members: Douglas Pewarchuk, Gail Hrehorets, Bill Skinner

Role: Review the Municipal Emergency Management Program and related plans on a regular basis. Advise Council, duly assembled, on the status of the Municipal Emergency Management Program and related plans at least once each year.
COMMISSIONS AND APPEAL BOARDS

Municipal Planning Commission (MPC)

Members: Wayne Field, Gail Hrehorets, Douglas Pewarchuk
Secretary: CAO

Role: Development Approval Authority. Approval body for any developments that are; a) discretionary b) do not comply with the Land Use Bylaw c) variances that cannot be approved by the Development Authority Officer D) any development issues which the Development Authority Officer deem should be decided by the MPC. Subdivision approvals are done through the Town's Subdivision Authority, Jane Dauphinee of Municipal Planning Services. Decisions can be appealed to the Subdivision and Development Appeal Board.

Meetings: As required

Subdivision and Development Appeal Board (SDAB)

Members: Steven Sharun, Debra Dunsmore, three (3) members at large
Secretary: Elaine Milliken

Role: Hear appeals of subdivision and development decisions. Their decision is final for the Town. Any further appeals must be directed to the Alberta Court of Queen's Bench.

Meetings: As required

EXTERNAL COMMITTEES, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Role of the Town of Lamont Councillors is limited to representation of the Town and voting as per the regulations and guidelines of these External Committees, Boards and Commissions. Each Board sets its own meeting schedule. (A-Alternate)

Lamont Catering Club

Members: Wayne Field, Steven Sharun, CAO, three (3) members at large

Lamont County Housing Foundation

The Foundation looks after the Old Age Homes and self-contained units in the County.

Members: Mayor, A - Steven Sharun

Lamont Public Library Board

Members: Debra Dunsmore, A - Gail Hrehorets

Northern Lights Library System Board

Members: Steven Sharun, A – Douglas Pewarchuk

St. Michael Regional Solid Waste Commission

Members: Wayne Field, A – Douglas Pewarchuk

John S. Batiuk Regional Water Commission

Members: Steven Sharun, A - Gail Hrehorets
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Lamont County Regional Mayors and Administrators Committee

Members: Mayor, CAO, A - Deputy Mayor

Lamont County Regional Economic Development Initiative

Members: Mayor, CAO, A - Deputy Mayor

Lamont County Oil & Gas Energy Exploration, Extraction and Transportation Committee

Members: Douglas Pewarchuk, CAO, A - Steven Sharun, one (1) member at large

Capital Region Board

Members: Mayor, A - Gail Hrehorets

Educational Liaison:

Members: Elementary – Debra Dunsmore, A – Douglas Pewarchuk
          Secondary – David Taylor, A - Steven Sharun

Lamont & District Chamber of Commerce Liaison:

Members: Debra Dunsmore, A – Douglas Pewarchuk

Professional Appointments

Town Auditor
Wilde & Company Chartered Accountants

Town Engineers
Select Engineering Ltd.

Town Solicitors
Ronald W. Poitras, Professional Corporation
Brownlee LLP

Town Assessor
Tanmar Consulting Inc.

MOTION: 150/15 Councillor Dunsmore: that council accepts the representation on the Committees, Boards, Commissions and Professional Appointments as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION: 151/15 Councillor Field: that the Organizational Meeting of Council is adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION: 152/15 Councillor Taylor: that council return to the Regular Meeting of Council at 7:40 p.m.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
ADOPTION OF MINUTES:  
a) Regular Meeting of Council – October 13, 2015

MOTION: 153/15 Councillor Dunsmore: that the minutes of the Regular Meeting of Council held October 13, 2015 is adopted as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

b) Public Services Committee - October 1, 2015

MOTION: 154/15 Councillor Hrehorets: that the minutes of the Public Services Committee held October 1, 2015 is adopted as presented.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

FINANCE: None

BYLAW: None

CORRESPONDENCE:

a) RCMP 3rd Quarter Report
Council information

b) Meet Author Doug Griffiths
Council information

c) Lamont High School Remembrance Day
Councilor Taylor will be attending the November 6 Remembrance Day Ceremony on behalf of the town.

d) Council Information Binder
Council information

BUSINESS:  
a) RFD – Municipal Emergency Plan

The Municipal Emergency Plan is a critical component of the Emergency Management Agency for the Town. The plan outlines proper procedures in the event of an emergency or disaster. With approval from council the next steps of completing the plan can begin.

MOTION: 155/15 Councillor Hrehorets: that council approves the Municipal Emergency Plan to continue filling in the blank spaces and contact information to complete the plan.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

b) CRB Membership Review

In accordance with Policy G019-Capital Region Board Membership Review Process, eligible participating municipalities have 90 calendar days to notify the CRB of their wish to change membership status. Based on the criteria in Policy G019 the Town of Lamont has been identified as having an opportunity to request a change of membership status.
Council discussed the pros and cons of the CRB and felt that in the best interest of the town it would more beneficial to change our membership status.

**MOTION: 156/15**

Councillor Taylor: that the Town of Lamont wishes to terminate its status as a "participating municipality" pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation, Alta. Reg. 38/2012, and requests that: (a) the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation to give effect to this request, and; (b) the Capital Region Board pass a resolution to support this request by the Town of Lamont.

CARRIED

c) Tactical Plan

Reminder to the committees to meet and begin reviewing their objectives within the plan.

d) Lamont Elementary School Advisory Council Request

CAO Maschmeyer reminded council that this request does not follow the criteria of the Town policy.

e) Beaverhill Lodge Development

The developer is proposing to install 12 angle parking spaces and 3 landscape islands within the 52nd Street right of way. These parking spaces will provide direct access to both the Lodge and the New Horizons Seniors Centre. Since the proposed parking stalls would be developed on town owned land it poses the question of who pays for the construction and the long term maintenance to these areas. The developer is suggesting that this project would be developed and maintained by the centre. By allowing a 3rd party improvement on Town owned lands this would allow the 3rd party access to these lands which could cause issues in the future for the Town financially.

The industry norm is for the developer to install the improvement and Town ultimately take over the maintenance. There is no tax base from this facility so the financial burden becomes the Towns.

CAO stated that a development agreement needs to be in place before construction can begin. She will discuss with the Town development officer to incorporate a cost share clause on the long term maintenance of the curbs, paving, potholes, engineering and any other related costs to this development in the agreement.

f) RFD - Knights Roofing – Arena Roof Repair

In 2014 this project was budgeted for but not completed. The balance that remained in the budget was transferred to an investment account without the accountant knowing that it was not complete. Since the project has been completed and Knights Roofing is requesting payment which include the hold back for a total of $96,418.00.

**MOTION: 157/15**

Councillor Hrehorets: that council authorizes the Town management to transfer $96,418.00 from investment account/reserve back to the Town’s operating account.

CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
STAFF AND COUNCIL
REPORTS:

Councillor Hrehorets

October 1 – attended Public Services meeting
October 26 – attended Fair meeting
October 29 – will be attending Public Services

Councillor Dunsmore

Attended the Lamont County’s Wine and Cheese for small business
Attended the Chamber of Commerce meeting

Councillor Field

Attended Fair meeting October 26
Attended Public Services Meeting October 1
Catering Club meeting October 29

Councillor Taylor

Attended Lamont High School Parent Advisory meeting October 20
Attended Lamont High School Awards Ceremony October 22

Councillor Sharun

The water commission will be servicing the line on November 3 and the line will be shut down for approximately 72 hrs.

Councillor Pewarchuk

Attended the Citizens on Patrol meeting in Bruderheim October 27 the meeting is November 24 in Lamont at 7:00 p.m.
Thank you to Public Works and Border Paving on a job well done on the paving of the streets
Congratulations to Shannon Stubbs on her election win

Mayor Skinner

Attended LCREDI meeting in Chipman on October 15
Attended Lamont High School Awards Ceremony October 22
Attended Fair Committee meeting October 26

Action Register

Council information

ADJOURNMENT: Mayor Skinner adjourned the meeting at 9:15 p.m.
October 27, 2015

Malcom Bruce, CEO
Capital Region Board
#1100 Bell Tower, 10104 - 103 Avenue
Edmonton, AB
T5J 0H8

Dear Mr. Bruce:

This letter is in response to your letter dated October 9, 2015 in reference to Capital Region Board Membership.

Please find enclosed, a copy of the Town of Redwater Council Meeting Minutes from September 15, 2015. The enclosed minutes show the approved motion as required to request a change of membership status.

If any further information is required, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Deb Hamilton
Town Manager
Town of Redwater

Enclosure: September 15, 2015, Town of Redwater Council Meeting Minutes
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF REDWATER  
HELD IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
September 15, 2015  

Present  
Mayor Mel Smith  
Councillor Connie Butcher  
Councillor Jack Dennett  
Councillor Les Dorosh  
Councillor Dody Kluttig  
Councillor Lori Lumsden  
Councillor Rob Olsen  

Staff  
Debbie Hamilton, Town Manager  
Jodi Brown, Community Services Manager  
Kylie Rude, Recording Secretary  

CALL TO ORDER  
Mayor Smith called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm.  

APPROVAL OF AGENDA  

15-164 Moved by Councillor Butcher that “Don Oborowsky Land Agreement” be added to the agenda as In-camera item 12.1.  

CARRIED  

15-165 Moved by Councillor Dorosh that the agenda be adopted as circulated.  

CARRIED  

DELEGATIONS  
Colin Piquette  
6:30 pm – 6:45 pm  
Honourable Colin Piquette dialogued with Council on various concerns. Discussions included upcoming updates to the Municipal Government Act and traffic concerns.  

Jennifer Martinoski, Pool Manager  
Pool Report  
6:46 pm – 7:15 pm  
Jennifer Martinoski presented Council with an overview of the 2015 pool season. Highlights of her report included:  
- Various maintenance was completed  
- Staff recruitment was a challenge  
- Various inspections occurred to ensure safety standards were met  
- Program numbers were slightly down from 2014
ADOPTION OF MINUTES

15-166 Moved by Councillor Dennett that the minutes of the September 1, 2015 Regular Council Meeting be adopted as circulated.

CARRIED

NEW BUSINESS

Golf Course Rental Fee
The Town of Redwater and the Redwater Community Golf Club have a Memorandum of Understanding including provisions for the annual rental fee which is to be reviewed by Council prior to November 1 each year. Setting the 2016 rental rate now, provides the Redwater Golf Club the opportunity to plan their 2016 program rates and membership fees.

The rental rate charged to the Redwater Golf Club is for the use of the clubhouse, cart storage, office area and store room area. The rate increased by 5% in 2015. Based on anticipated increases in annual operating costs at Pembina Place, a 2.5% to 5% increase for the 2016 season was recommended.

15-167 Moved by Councillor Olsen that Council approves the increase to the 2016 Redwater Community Golf Club annual rental fee by 2.5% for a total rental fee of $7,475.37 plus GST.

Councillor Butcher requested a recorded vote on the motion.
In favor: Smith, Dorosh, Kluttig, Lumsden, Olsen
Opposed: Butcher, Dennett

CARRIED

Off Season Power Cart Storage
Included in the Memorandum of Understanding between the Town of Redwater and the Redwater Community Golf Club is a provision regarding fees for the off season storage of private golf carts. 2014/2015 personal power cart storage rate was $110.00 plus GST; this was a 5% increase over the 2013/2014 rates.

In order to help cover administrative and utility costs associated with administrating the golf cart storage option for facility users, administration recommended that Council give consideration to a 2.5% to 5% increase in the storage fee.

15-168 Moved by Councillor Olsen that Council approves a 5% increase to the current golf cart storage rental fee thereby setting the 2015/2016 rental fee at $115.50 plus GST for the off season rental period.

CARRIED

At the 2015 Council retreat, a full review of the policy manual was conducted. The proposed amendments incorporate the recommendations from the retreat:
Utility Policy Amendments
Policy 502.4 Utility Rates, Fees & Billings
  • Bulk sales of water & sewer dumping clarified.
  • Service connection and disconnection fees updated and details clarified.
  • Service Disruption fee for disconnect/reconnect combined to one fee for clarity.

Policy 504.1 Installation of Utility Services
  • Section 1(e) and 2(e) expanded to address requests to the on-call employee that occur out
    of hours.
  • Frozen ground surcharge added (was previously only on the application form).

15-169 Moved by Councillor Lumsden that the following Utility Works policies be amended as
        presented:
        o Policy 502.4 Utility Rates, Fees & Billings
        o Policy 504.1 Installation of Utility Services

        CARRIED

Public Works Policy Amendments
Policy 407.2 Employee Use of Town Vehicles
  • Added provision for a designate

Policy 412.6 Handicapped Parking
  • Amended to state “Dental Office”

15-170 Moved by Councillor Dorosh that the following Public Works policies be amended as
        presented:
        o Policy 407.2 Employee Use of Town Vehicles
        o Policy 412.6 Handicapped Parking

        And further that Policy 412.6 Handicapped Parking be amended to remove all
        reference to specific business names.

        CARRIED

Fire Policy Amendments
  • Amended to address if the department is run by the Town or under contract.
  • Definitions added.
  • Salaries to be determined annually by budget rather than listed.
  • Provisions on subsistence updated.

In addition, a new policy, Policy 1005 Town Employee Fire Response, was recommended to
outline parameters for Town of Redwater employees who are also members of the Redwater Fire
Department. Policy 1005 was reviewed by the Corporate Services Policy Committee on
September 9, 2015.

15-171 Moved by Councillor Dennett that Policy 1004.1 Fire Honorarium be accepted as
        amended and that Policy 1005 Town Employee Fire Response be implemented as
        presented.

        CARRIED
Video Surveillance Policy
All of the Town buildings and facilities have a security camera system installed in some form. As per the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FOIP), it is important that a policy is in place that establishes procedures to follow when collecting images on any camera surveillance system.

15-172 Moved by Councillor Kluttig that Policy 013 Video Surveillance in Public Areas Policy be implemented as presented.

CARRIED

Christmas Break
As per Employment Policy 003, December 25 (Christmas day), December 28 (in lieu of Boxing Day) and January 1 (New Year’s day) are statutory holidays and therefore the Town Administration Office will be closed. In addition, Administration is requesting that consideration be given to also close on December 24.

15-173 Moved by Councillor Lumsden that the Town Office close on Thursday December 24, 2015 for the Christmas holidays for the full day.

CARRIED

Mayor Smith declared a recess at 7:59 pm.
Mayor Smith reconvened the meeting at 8:04 pm.

Economic Development Board Appointments
Economic Development Board Bylaw (826) outlines the membership requirements of the Economic Development Board. There are currently three expired Board Member terms and one Board Member vacancy.

Dan Schesnuk, Nicole Krill and Karen Schneberger all expressed interest in being re-appointed for another term; therefore, the Economic Development Board moved that Dan Schesnuk, Nicole Krill and Karen Schneberger all be recommended to Council to be re-appointed for additional three year terms.

To fill the existing Board Member vacancy, the Board reviewed three existing letters of interest. The Board moved that Cory Kurylo from JLG Ball Enterprises be recommended to Council to be appointed for a three year term.

15-174 Moved by Councillor Kluttig that Dan Schesnuk, Nicole Krill, and Karen Schneberger be re-appointed to the Economic Development Board as members-at-large for three (3) year terms, ending September 1, 2018 and further that Cory Kurylo be appointed to the Economic Development Board as a member-at-large for a three (3) year term, ending September 1, 2018.

CARRIED
Fire Hall Electrical Work
The Municipal Sustainability Initiative Operating grant was uncertain at the time the 2015 budget was passed. Because the Town of Redwater has received funding from this grant, a change of scope of the Fire budget is requested.

A quote for $6,545 has been received to replace light fixtures that are currently not working. This could be offset by the unbudgeted revenue received from MSI Operating grant; the bottom line will not be affected. The Fire Department has also requested that the 10 amp circuits where the trucks are plugged into be upgraded to 20 or 30 amp, as the breakers are constantly tripping.

15-175 Moved by Councillor Dorosh that the change of scope of the Fire budget be approved and the electrical work required for bay lighting be completed in 2015 for an estimated cost of $6,545.

CARRIED

Capital Region Board Membership
There continues to be a great deal of discussion regarding the value and impact the smaller jurisdictions have on the region and the value the Capital Region Board (CRB) has on the smaller jurisdictions. On September 10, 2015 the CRB passed Policy G019 setting out the process for requests to be removed from the CRB. This is only available for municipalities under 5,000 population and can only be done in year two or three of a municipal term.

Membership in the (CRB) takes a great deal of the Mayor’s and the Town Manager’s time as well as impacts the Town financially. Additionally, any statutory plans or statutory plan amendments (MDP & ASP) must go to the CRB for approval through the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF) process.

Over the past few years, overall concerns with the CRB have been discussed in Council a number of times. In 2013, a letter was sent to Minister of Municipal Affairs outlining the Town’s concerns, including a request to be removed from the board.

Currently $3 million dollars comes from the province for the operation of the CRB and some collaboration funds have also been assigned for special projects. This year, for the first time, not all projects could be funded through provincial grants. $315,000 was required from municipal contributions. Redwater’s portion was $913. There are currently many uncertainties with the direction of the CRB. Two options were presented for consideration; to remain in the CRB or to request terminating participation.

15-176 Moved by Councillor Lumsden that the Town of Redwater wishes to terminate its status as a “participating municipality” pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation, Alta. Reg. 38/2012, and requests that:

a) the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation to give effect to this request, and
b) the Capital Region Board pass a resolution to support this request by the Town of Redwater.

CARRIED

REPORTS

Council Reports

Councilor Lumsden – CRB meeting, Meet the Community Night, football game
Councilor Dorosh – CiB presentation, Strathcona ceremony, Library Board meeting, Library Farewell Tea, Meet the Community Night, NLLS Board meeting
Councilor Butcher – Corporate Services Policy Committee meeting, Roseridge meeting
Councilor Dennett – Sturgeon County Fire Services Awards, CiB presentation, Corporate Services Policy Committee, Meet the Community Night
Councilor Kluttig – CRNWSC tour, Economic Development Board meeting, Meet the Community Night
Councilor Olsen – Corporate Services Policy committee, football game
Mayor Smith – CRB meeting, CRNWSC tour, Sturgeon County Fire Services Awards, Corporate Services Policy committee, Economic Development Board meeting, Meet the Community Night, provincial pre-budget meeting

15-177 Moved by Councilor Butcher that all reports be accepted as information.

CARRIED

COUNCIL CORRESPONDENCE & INFORMATION ITEMS

AIHA Stakeholder Luncheon
Devon’s 65th Anniversary
Business Mixer
Career Day BBQ

15-178 Moved by Councilor Butcher that all correspondence be accepted as information.

CARRIED

IN CAMERA ITEMS

15-179 Moved by Councilor Dorosh that Council move in-camera at 8:58 pm (Section 16 of the FOIP Act).

CARRIED

15-180 Moved by Councilor Dennett that Council move out of camera at 9:10 pm.

CARRIED
15-181 Moved by Councillor Dennett that Council proceed with the sale of Lot 2, Block 2, Plan 2943 HW, that:

- the sale be advertised for no less than three weeks
- a reserved bid be set at $72,000
- sealed bids be accepted and addressed to the Town Manager in the prescribed format
- a security of 10% must accompany the bid

ADJOURNMENT

15-182 Moved by Councillor Olsen that the Regular Council Meeting adjourn at 9:25 pm.

CARRIED

MAYOR

TOWN MANAGER
Please note: All results are unofficial until after January 6, 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Council Meeting Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Bon Accord</td>
<td>1,488 (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Bruderheim</td>
<td>1,348 (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td>November 4, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Lamont</td>
<td>1,753 (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 27, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Legal</td>
<td>1,225 (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 21, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2014 population numbers provided by GIS Coordinator.

**Table Legend**

- Council motion to apply to opt out.
- Council motion to remain a member, or motion to leave CRB failed, or motion to leave never made.
PURPOSE

The Capital Region Board (CRB) Regulation established the Board and stipulates the participating municipalities and it is within the Province’s authority to designate participating municipalities. This policy establishes a process for review of the Capital Region Board’s participating municipalities and outlines steps to request joining or leaving the CRB.

POLICY

1. The Capital Region Board’s participating municipalities are mandated through the Capital Region Board Regulation, Alta. Reg. 38/2012.
2. A participating municipality of the Capital Region Board must be contiguous to another participating municipality.

Membership Review

1. The Capital Region Board may conduct a membership review of participating municipalities once every four years upon the Board passing a motion to do so.
2. A membership review cannot take place within the one year period leading up to a municipal election, or within the one year period after a municipal election.
3. Municipalities designated as a County, or specialized municipality, or with an urban population of 5,000 or greater, within the Capital Region Board boundary, must participate in the Capital Region Board’s activities.

PROCESS

Upon the passing of a motion to conduct a membership review;

1. The Capital Region Board shall notify the Minister of Municipal Affairs that the Capital Region Board is undergoing a membership review.
2. The Capital Region Board Chair shall request eligible participating municipalities—who do not meet the criteria in the Membership Review section above—to provide a written position supported by a Council motion, if they wish to seek support from the Capital Region Board for a change in membership status. If an eligible participating municipality does not submit a written position supported by a Council motion, it will be assumed the participating municipality wishes to remain a participating municipality of the Capital Region Board.
3. The Capital Region Board shall request that municipalities, which are not participating municipality, that fall within the Capital Region Board Boundary, and have crossed the urban population threshold of 5,000, join the Capital Region Board.
4. Municipalities wishing to gain Capital Region Board support to change their membership status shall provide their written position, supported by a Council motion, within 90 calendar days of the Capital Region Board motion to review its membership.
5. Motions to join or withdraw must be worded as follows:
### Comprehensive CRB Agenda Pkg. February 11/16

#### JOIN

- **That the _____ of _____ wishes to become a "participating municipality" of the Capital Region Board pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012, and requests that: (a) the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation to give effect to this request.**

- **That the _____ of _____ wishes to terminate its status as a "participating municipality" pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012, and requests that: (a) the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation to give effect to this request, and; (b) the Capital Region Board pass a resolution to support this request by the _____ of _____.

### REMAIN

- **No motion needed.**

### WITHDRAW

- **That the _____ of _____ wishes to terminate its status as a "participating municipality" pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012, and requests that: (a) the Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation to give effect to this request, and; (b) the Capital Region Board pass a resolution to support this request by the _____ of _____.

#### 6.

- A participating municipality may withdraw its motion requesting to change its Capital Region Board membership status, within the 90 calendar day window, with another council motion requesting a withdraw of the original motion.

#### 7.

- Upon completion, the CEO shall present the results of the membership review to the Capital Region Board at the next scheduled Board meeting.

#### 8.

- The Capital Region Board may make the following motions in support:

### JOIN

- **That the Capital Region Board supports _____ of _____'s request to become a "participating municipality" of the Capital Region Board pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012, and request that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation to give effect to the request of _____ of _____.

### REMAIN

- **No motion needed.**

### WITHDRAW

- **That the Capital Region Board supports the _____ of _____'s request to terminate its status as a "participating municipality" pursuant to the Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012 and request that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending the Capital Region Board Regulation to give effect to the request of _____ of _____.

### Voting Structure

1. If the Board supports a change in Board membership, the Board shall review the voting structure taking the proposed membership into account.
2. The CEO shall undertake a voting structure review and propose a modified voting structure with the same ratio (75% of population and 66% +1 of participating municipalities) as the voting structure outlined in Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012.

3. The proposed amendments to the Board voting structure shall be reviewed by Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee.

4. The final voting structure shall be presented to the Board for review.

5. Recommendation to the Province shall occur based on the Board’s approved motion.

**Notifying the Province**

1. If the Board supports a change in Board membership, the Board must request that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a regulation replacing or amending Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012 Part 5 Schedule – Participating Municipalities with an updated list of participating municipalities.

2. If the Board supports a change in voting structure, the Board must request that the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Lieutenant Governor in Council take such steps as are required to enact a Ministerial Order replacing or amending Capital Region Board Regulation, ALTA. Reg. 38/2012 Part 1 Section 5(2) – Voting rights of representatives, with an updated voting structure.

**Actions upon Membership Change**

1. The CEO shall notify municipalities within the Capital Region Board boundary of any change in membership.

2. The CEO shall conduct a Committee structure review within a six month period of any membership change occurring and present the results to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee through to the Board.

3. The CEO shall conduct a policy review within a six month period of any membership change occurring and present the results to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee through to the Board.

**UNDERSTANDING MEMBERSHIP**

**Obligation of Participating Members**

1. Participating Municipalities shall adhere to the Capital Region Board Regulation.

2. Participating Municipalities shall adhere to Capital Region Board Policies.

3. Participating Municipalities shall act in good faith and in accordance with decisions of the Board.

4. Participating Municipalities shall be required to finance Board initiatives, subject to a cost sharing formula, if the Board approves funding above and beyond core funding.

---

Nolan Crouse, Board Chair

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revisions</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 26, 2015</td>
<td>Created</td>
<td>Created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 25</td>
<td>Amended</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amended with comments made by Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 10,</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved by the Capital region Board with the change to size of municipality to 5,000 and clarifying calendar day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital Region Board Mandate

Recommended Motion

That Capital Region Board writes to the Province, as recommended by the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee.

1) To confirm that we interpret the existing mandate as permissive in areas that the Board may wish to move in over time and in the future;
2) That the CRB ask the Province to list the planning and co-ordination (but not operation) of water, wastewater, and solid waste under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate;
3) That the CRB recognizes the need for regional economic development and wishes to work further with the Province as the CRB determines whether the CRB or a separate institution with other membership is the right vehicle.

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 Board 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.
- November 12, 2015 - The Board passed the following 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.
• December 10, 2015 – The Board engaged in a facilitated discussion regarding mandate. At that time, it was illustrated that all of the items mentioned by the Board can be covered by the current mandate, less Economic Development, which is currently undergoing a parallel process.

The task of continuing to develop and refine this approach to finding CRB Consensus on CRB Mandate for the future was delegated to the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee, with a recommendation to be brought back to The Board.

• January 21, 2016 – The Advocacy & Monitoring Committee passed the following motion:

  That the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee recommends the Capital Region Board write to the Province;

  4) To confirm that we interpret the existing mandate as permissive in areas that the Board may wish to move in over time and in the future;

  5) That the CRB ask the Province to list the planning and co-ordination of water, wastewater, and solid waste (but not operation) under section 12(1)(a) of the current mandate;

  6) That the CRB recognises the need for regional economic development and wishes to work further with the Province as the CRB determines whether the CRB or a separate institution with other membership is the right vehicle.

Assumptions

• Any new mandate area for CRB will come with new provincial funding.

Board Next Steps

**APPROACH to Finding CRB Consensus on CRB Mandate for the Future**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks/Milestones</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>February 11, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development recommendation to the Board</td>
<td>March 10, 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provincial Next Steps

**APPROACH to Finding CRB Consensus on CRB Mandate for the Future**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks/Milestones</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRB facilitates discussion among membership with general agreement that:</td>
<td>Nov. 2015 – Feb. 2016 (or earlier)</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>
</tbody>
</table>
- Membership policy in process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government of Alberta policy deliberation</th>
<th>March 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consequential legislative amendments:</td>
<td>April/May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Amendments proposed that MGA require mandatory growth boards in Edmonton/Calgary regions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Big City Charters?</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>• Growth Plan 2.0 complete with recommendation to the Province</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachments:

- Capital Region Board Regulation – Alberta Regulation 38/2012
Province of Alberta

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT ACT

CAPITAL REGION BOARD REGULATION

Alberta Regulation 38/2012

With amendments up to and including Alberta Regulation 39/2015
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Definitions

1 In this Regulation,

(a) “Act” means the *Municipal Government Act*;

(b) “Capital Region” means the lands lying within the boundaries of the participating municipalities;

(c) “Capital Region Board” means the Capital Region Board established by section 2;

(d) “Capital Region Growth Plan” means an integrated growth management plan for the Capital Region, including any amendments to that plan, approved by the Minister under section 13;

(e) “Framework” means the Regional Evaluation Framework, including any amendments to the Framework, established by the Minister under section 21;

(f) “Minister” means the Minister responsible for the Act;

(g) “municipal agreement” means an agreement entered into by a participating municipality;

(h) “participating municipality” means a municipality listed in the Schedule;

(i) “representative” means a representative on the Capital Region Board;

(j) “statutory plan” means

(i) a statutory plan as defined in section 616(dd) of the Act, or
(ii) an amendment to a statutory plan referred to in subclause (i).

Part 1
Capital Region Board

Establishment of Board

2(1) The Capital Region Board is established.

(2) The Capital Region Board is a corporation consisting of

(a) the participating municipalities, as represented by the persons appointed by the participating municipalities under subsection (3) or designated by subsection (5),

(b) the persons appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council under subsection (7), and

(c) if applicable, the interim chair appointed under section 4(2).

(3) Each participating municipality shall appoint

(a) a person to represent the participating municipality on the Capital Region Board, and

(b) a person to act in the representative’s place in the event of the representative’s temporary absence or temporary inability to act.

(4) A representative appointed under subsection (3) must be a councillor of the participating municipality that appointed that representative.

(5) Until a participating municipality appoints a representative under subsection (3), the chief elected official of the participating municipality is designated as that municipality’s representative.

(6) If the representative of a participating municipality that is a town or village is unable to attend a meeting of the Capital Region Board, the Capital Region Board, on the request of the participating municipality, shall provide for an alternative method of representation for the participating municipality at that meeting.

(7) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may appoint one or more persons to represent the Government of Alberta on the Capital Region Board, but those persons do not have voting rights.
Mandate of Board

The Capital Region Board shall

(a) prepare a proposed Capital Region Growth Plan in accordance with Part 2,

(b) advise and make recommendations to the Minister regarding the preparation and implementation of the Capital Region Growth Plan,

(c) facilitate the resolution of issues arising from the preparation and implementation of the Capital Region Growth Plan,

(d) implement policies for the sharing of costs among the participating municipalities for regional projects of the Capital Region, and

(e) carry out any other functions and duties as the Minister directs.

Chair of Board

The representatives appointed under section 2(3) or designated by section 2(5) shall elect from among themselves a chair of the Capital Region Board, whose term expires on the date the chair’s current term as a councillor expires.

Despite subsection (1), the Minister may by order appoint an interim chair of the Capital Region Board for a term specified by the Minister.

If the Minister appoints an interim chair, the term of the chair elected under subsection (1) commences on the day after the day the interim chair’s term expires.

The interim chair does not have voting rights.

Voting rights of representatives

Subject to sections 2(7) and 4(4), each representative has one vote.

If a decision of the Capital Region Board is to be made by a vote, the decision must be supported by not fewer than 17 representatives from participating municipalities that collectively have at least 75% of the population in the Capital Region.

Subject to section 2(6), if a representative is not present when a vote of the Capital Region Board is taken, or abstains from voting, the representative is deemed to have voted in the affirmative.
Powers and duties of Board

6 Section 602.08 of the Act applies with any necessary modifications in respect of the Capital Region Board as if it were a regional services commission.
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Part 2
Preparation of Capital Region Growth Plan

Preparation of Plan

10 The Capital Region Board shall, within the time and in the form and manner specified by the Minister, prepare and submit to the Minister a proposed Capital Region Growth Plan.

Objectives of Plan

11 The objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan are

(a) to promote an integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth in the Capital Region;

(b) to identify the overall development pattern and key future infrastructure investments that would

(i) best complement existing infrastructure, services and land uses in the Capital Region, and

(ii) maximize benefits to the Capital Region;

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

Contents of Plan

12(1) Except as otherwise specified by the Minister, a proposed Capital Region Growth Plan must contain the following:

(a) a comprehensive, integrated regional land use plan for the Capital Region that includes the following:

(i) population and employment projections;

(ii) the identification of

(A) priority growth areas,
(B) land supply for residential, commercial and industrial purposes,

(C) agricultural lands,

(D) buffer areas,

(E) density of development, and

(F) the development and location of infrastructure;

(iii) the identification of corridors for recreation, transportation, utilities and intermunicipal transit;

(iv) policies regarding environmentally sensitive areas;

(v) policies for the co-ordination of planning and development among the participating municipalities;

(vi) specific actions to be taken by the participating municipalities to implement the land use plan;

(b) a regional intermunicipal transit network plan for the Capital Region that includes the following:

(i) the decision-making process to approve the regional intermunicipal transit network;

(ii) procedures for implementing the delivery of regional intermunicipal transit services;

(iii) provision for special transit services for persons with disabilities;

(iv) methods for reviewing and monitoring the regional intermunicipal transit network plan;

(c) a plan to co-ordinate geographic information services for the Capital Region that includes the following:

(i) the protocols and the methods for collecting, storing and accessing data;

(ii) the protocols and the methods for compiling and analyzing information;

(iii) standardized terminology and standards for mapping capabilities for the participating municipalities;

(d) a plan regarding social and market affordable housing requirements for the Capital Region that includes recommendations with respect to the following:
(i) the general location of social housing;

(ii) options to increase market affordable housing.

(2) In preparing a proposed Capital Region Growth Plan, the Capital Region Board may also have regard to any matter relating to the physical, social or economic development of the Capital Region.

13 and 14 Repealed AR 39/2015 s3.

Part 3

Effect of Capital Region Growth Plan

Application of Part

15 This Part applies only after the Capital Region Growth Plan takes effect.

Limitation of Plan

16 Despite anything to the contrary in this Regulation, the Capital Region Growth Plan is of no effect to the extent it directs the Government of Alberta to expend funds, to commit to funding arrangements or to undertake particular actions or adopt particular policies or programs.

17 and 18 Repealed AR 39/2015 s3.

Conformity with Plan

19(1) The council of a participating municipality shall amend every statutory plan and bylaw as necessary to conform with the Capital Region Growth Plan no later than the date specified by the Minister.

(2) If the council of a participating municipality fails to amend a statutory plan or bylaw in accordance with subsection (1), the statutory plan or bylaw is deemed to be invalid to the extent that it conflicts with the Capital Region Growth Plan.

(3) The Minister may, in respect of a municipal agreement entered into by a participating municipality that conflicts with the Capital Region Growth Plan, require the council of the participating municipality, to the extent possible under the terms of the municipal agreement,

(a) to amend the municipal agreement so that it conforms to the Capital Region Growth Plan, or
(b) to terminate the municipal agreement.

(4) If the council of a participating municipality fails to amend or terminate a municipal agreement when required to do so by the Minister under subsection (3), the municipal agreement is deemed to be invalid to the extent that it conflicts with the Capital Region Growth Plan.

(5) This section applies only to statutory plans adopted, bylaws made and municipal agreements entered into after April 15, 2008.

Part 4  
Approval of Statutory Plans

Application of Part
20 This Part applies to statutory plans only after a Regional Evaluation Framework is established by the Minister under section 21.

Regional Evaluation Framework
21(1) The Minister may by order establish a Regional Evaluation Framework containing

(a) criteria to be used to determine whether a statutory plan must be submitted for approval under section 22(1),

(b) procedures for submitting statutory plans for approval under section 22(1), and

(c) the criteria and procedures to be followed by the Capital Region Board in evaluating and approving statutory plans.

(2) If the Minister establishes a Framework, the Minister shall provide a copy of it to each participating municipality.

(3) The Framework is not a regulation within the meaning of the Regulations Act.

Approval of statutory plans
22(1) Statutory plans to be adopted by a participating municipality that meet the criteria set out in the Framework must be submitted to the Capital Region Board for approval.

(2) The Capital Region Board may, in accordance with the Framework, approve or reject a statutory plan.
(3) A statutory plan referred to in subsection (1) has no effect unless it is approved by the Capital Region Board under subsection (2).

(4) Except as provided in the Framework, a participating municipality has no right to a hearing before the Capital Region Board in respect of its approval or rejection of a statutory plan.

(5) A decision of the Capital Region Board under this section is final and not subject to appeal.

(6) This section applies only to statutory plans to be adopted by a participating municipality after the establishment of the Framework.

### Part 5

#### General Matters

**Effect of Regulation on existing statutory plans**

23 For greater certainty, except as provided in Parts 3 and 4 of this Regulation and Part 17 of the Act, all statutory plans of a participating municipality that were in effect on April 15, 2008 and have not been repealed before the coming into force of this Regulation remain in full force and effect.

**Information must be provided**

24(1) A participating municipality must, when required in writing by the Capital Region Board to do so, provide the Capital Region Board with information about the participating municipality that the Capital Region Board requires.

(2) A participating municipality that contravenes subsection (1) is guilty of an offence and liable to a fine of not more than $10 000.

(3) This section does not apply to information acquired by a participating municipality that is subject to any type of legal privilege, including solicitor-client privilege.

Dispute resolution

25(1) A participating municipality may make a complaint in writing to the Capital Region Board if the participating municipality is of the view that there has been a breach of process, improper administration or discriminatory treatment by the Capital Region Board.
(2) On receipt of a complaint under subsection (1), the Capital Region Board shall attempt to resolve the complaint informally with the participating municipality.

(3) If a complaint cannot be resolved under subsection (2), the Capital Region Board may refer the matter to mediation.

(4) If the parties are not able to resolve the matter through mediation, the Capital Region Board may refer the matter to arbitration under the *Arbitration Act*.

**Matters before the Municipal Government Board**

26(1) If under the Act

(a) a matter relating to land within the Capital Region is appealed to the Municipal Government Board, or

(b) the Municipal Government Board is considering an application for an annexation involving 2 or more participating municipalities,

the Minister may by order direct the Municipal Government Board to defer its consideration of the matter.

(2) When the Minister makes an order under subsection (1), all steps in the appeal or application, as the case may be, are stayed as of the date of the order until the Minister gives notice to the Municipal Government Board that the appeal or application may be continued.

(3) This section applies to an appeal or application commenced after April 15, 2008.

**Limitation of actions**

27 No cause of action arises as a result of

(a) the enactment of this Regulation,

(b) the making of an order under this Regulation, or

(c) anything done or omitted to be done in accordance with this Regulation.

**No remedy**

28 No costs, compensation or damages are owing or payable to any person, and no remedy, including in contract, restitution or trust, is available to any person in connection with anything referred to in section 27.
Proceedings barred

29 No proceedings, including any proceedings in contract, restitution or trust, that are based on anything referred to in section 27 may be brought or maintained against any person.

30 Repealed AR 39/2015 s3.

Regulation prevails

31 In the event of a conflict between this Regulation and any other enactment, other than the Act, this Regulation prevails.

Ministerial orders

32 (1) In addition to any other orders the Minister may make under this Regulation, the Minister may make any one or more of the following orders:

(a) an order providing for transitional matters related to the coming into force of this Regulation;

(b) an order respecting the requisition of operating and capital costs of the Capital Region Board;

(c) an order respecting the management, duties and functions of the Capital Region Board;

(d) an order respecting the records to be kept by the Capital Region Board and the manner in which they are to be kept and respecting which reports are to be submitted to the Minister;

(e) an order providing for any other matter that the Minister considers necessary for carrying out the purposes of this Regulation.

(2) In addition to the orders the Minister may make under subsection (1), the Minister may by order take any action that the Capital Region Board may or must take under this Regulation.

(3) If there is a conflict between an order made by the Minister under subsection (2) and an action taken by the Capital Region Board, the Minister’s order prevails.

(4) The Regulations Act does not apply to an order made under this Regulation.
Section 33  AR 38/2012
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Expiry

33 For the purpose of ensuring that this Regulation is reviewed for ongoing relevancy and necessity, with the option that it may be repassed in its present or an amended form following a review, this Regulation expires on November 30, 2018.

AR 38/2012 s33;SA 2013 c17 s12

Coming into force

34 This Regulation comes into force on April 1, 2012.

Schedule

Participating Municipalities

(a) Town of Beaumont;
(b) Town of Bon Accord;
(c) Town of Bruderheim;
(d) Town of Calmar;
(e) Town of Devon;
(f) City of Edmonton;
(g) City of Fort Saskatchewan;
(h) Town of Gibbons;
(i) Lamont County;
(j) Town of Lamont;
(k) City of Leduc;
(l) Leduc County;
(m) Town of Legal;
(n) Town of Morinville;
(o) Parkland County;
(p) Town of Redwater;
(q) City of St. Albert;
(r) City of Spruce Grove;
(s) Town of Stony Plain;
(t) Strathcona County;
(u) Sturgeon County;
(v) Village of Thorsby;
(w) Village of Wabamun;
(x) Village of Warburg.
Motion of September 10, 2015 regarding CRB Chairperson

Recommendation to the CRB:

On September 10, 2015, the Capital Region Board (CRB) passed the following motion:

“That the Capital Region Board refers discussion on the review of Board policy G014 and refer to the Governance, Priorities and Finance Committee to get further information on the requirements needed to remove the voting rights of the CRB Chairperson at the Board and assigning that right to another representative from the same Municipality.”

Capital Region Board administration contacted the Government of Alberta (GOA) seeking clarification regarding the chair position as outlined in Capital Region Board Regulation, Alta. Reg. 38/2012.

The GOA stated that to accomplish the desired outcome contained in the motion, the regulation must be updated.

In accordance with the original motion, this information was brought to the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee for further discussion. After receiving this information, The Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee passed the following motion at its December 14, 2015 meeting.

“That the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee recommend the Capital Region Board receive the information update and no longer pursue this matter at this time.”
Revised 2014-2044 Employment Forecast

Recommended Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the revised Employment forecast that includes the most recently available data from Federal and Municipal Census results and reflects the harmonization with the labour force consistent with the population projections for the region, for the purpose of updating the 2015 Growth Plan.

Background

- September 11, 2013, the Capital Region Board, accepted the revised Population and Employment Forecast 2014-2044 prepared by Stokes Economic Consulting September 2013, with the understanding that the Population & Employment Projections be used as a guideline as part of its decision making process.
- Since then, several Municipalities have undertaken Municipal Census reporting changes as well as new data coming available from Statistics Canada.
- Several Board members have requested that where better information exists to inform the planning by the Board, it should be taken into consideration.

Rationale

- The Growth Plan’s Population and Employment projections provide guidance to CRB municipalities and other regional agencies to better understand and respond to anticipated growth. The projections are intended to provide a common base of reference for CRB municipalities and other agencies engaged in infrastructure planning and land use planning.
- The changes in employment have been identified in the 2014 base year numbers. Then the previously established annual growth rates for those municipalities were applied to the remaining years of the forecast to 2044.
- Additionally, the 2014 adjusted employment forecast took into consideration recent analysis and employment studies known to the Consultants.
- The overall impact to the Region’s total employment forecast is an additional 100,745 jobs under the High Growth Scenario.

Attachment:

Edmonton Metropolitan Region 2014-2044

DRAFT

October 2015
Background

To inform the analysis of major employment areas in the Edmonton Capital Region, the base year information has been updated to include the most recent available data from Federal and Municipal Census results. In addition, the employment projections for the Capital Region have been harmonized with the labour force consistent with the population projections for the region.

In 2014, the Edmonton Capital Region is estimated to total 725,545 jobs. This 2014 employment estimate, prepared by Applications Management Consulting, adds 100,745 jobs to the CRB 2014 figure of 624,800. This adjustment results from a determination of the labour force that is implied by the working age population in the CRB approved population for 2014, and assumptions regarding labour force participation and unemployment rate as applicable in 2014.

- The total labour force estimated for 2014 from the approved CRB 2014 population figure is 768,477 This figure is based upon the following:
  - The CRB approved 2014 population figure for the Capital Region is 1,254,500
  - The implied labour force for this population is estimated at approximately 768,477 people. Assuming a labour force participation rate of 73% and an unemployment rate of approximately 5.5%, the total number of employed workers in 2014 would be 725,545.

The adjusted total employment figure of 725,545 for the Capital Region in 2014 aligns with Statistics Canada labour force survey estimates the 2014 employment reported for the Edmonton CMA of 749,000. While the boundary for the Edmonton CMA is not exactly the same as the Edmonton Capital Region, the two geographies are similar.

---

1 CRB Population and Employment Projections, 2014-2044 (with population adjustments to reflect 2014 municipal census results). This is an update to the Capital Region Population and Employment Projections prepared by Stokes Economic Consulting in September 2013.

2 Participation rate and unemployment rate for 2014 Edmonton CMA based on Statistics Canada, CANSIM, table 282-0135.

Employment Breakdown by Municipality

The 2014 adjusted total employment for the Edmonton Capital Region has been disaggregated by municipality. As part of this update, recent analysis and studies on employment in the region have been taken into consideration. This includes the following:

- In late 2013, Applications Management Consulting prepared an updated 35 year population and employment projection for the City of Edmonton. This analysis was prepared to align with the Capital Region Board High Scenario population and employment projections. The employment projections were modified to be internally consistent with population using a similar methodology as described above.

- In 2014, as part of the Alberta Transportation Regional Transportation Model, Applications Management Consulting generated various growth scenarios for Strathcona County. These included growth options in Bremnar and Colchester. The base year for the analysis was 2014 and as part of this work, Applications prepared an estimate of the 2014 employment in Strathcona County.

- Early 2015 Leduc County engaged Applications Management Consulting to assist in development of the Leduc Growth Management Strategy. As part of this work, a baseline assessment of employment in the County was undertaken. This included a review of the recent Edmonton International Airport Economic Impact Study. Employment at the airport includes jobs related to airline, aviation operations, ground transportation, aviation support, cargo, food and beverage, inspection and policing services, car rental and parking, non aviation services, accommodation and retail. In addition, recent information on the number of businesses and employees in the Nisku Industrial Park and Leduc Industrial Park was reviewed and incorporated in the 2014 employment estimate for Leduc County.

- Parkland County recently conducted an Employment and Industrial Land Strategy that reported an estimated 11,700 jobs in 2014 in the County.

- A review of the Sturgeon County 2011 estimate of employment from Statistics Canada National Household Survey reports the estimated employment to be 7,180. Based on this estimate for 2011, the employment has been advanced to 2014 using the 2014 population estimate for Sturgeon County, and a similar employment/population ratio as in 2011. In 2014 it is estimated the employment for Sturgeon County is 7,555.

The above provide context for recent employment information and studies that have occurred in the region that help to inform the 2014 employment estimate for municipalities across the Capital Region. Figure 1 below presents the CRB approved 2014 employment in comparison to the adjusted 2014 employment by municipality.

---

1 Edmonton International Airport Economic Impact Study, InVISTAS, 2015.
4 CRB Population and Employment Projections, 2014-2044 (with population adjustments to reflect 2014 municipal census results). This is an update to the Capital Region Population and Employment Projections prepared by Stokes Economic Consulting in September 2013.
Figure 1: Employment by Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2014 CRB Employment</th>
<th>2014 Employment Update</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>2044 Employment Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,474</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>8,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmar</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Leduc</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>16,230</td>
<td>4,530</td>
<td>23,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Parkland</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>20,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>484,900</td>
<td>564,098</td>
<td>79,198</td>
<td>909,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>12,341</td>
<td>4,541</td>
<td>21,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>2,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>20,339</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>46,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,779</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>4,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwater</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>11,348</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>19,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>21,140</td>
<td>1,740</td>
<td>35,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>6,755</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>12,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>38,200</td>
<td>39,888</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td>68,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>7,555</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>12,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsby</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>1,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Lamont</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburg</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>624,800</td>
<td>725,545</td>
<td>100,745</td>
<td>1,197,345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Member Financial Contributions**

**Recommended Motion**

*That Administration propose a policy for the Capital Region Board’s consideration, and/or change to the Capital Region Board Regulation, that will permit the waiving of financial contributions toward funding a portion of matching grants for municipalities with a population less than 2,500.*

**Background**

On January 13, 2016, CRB Administration was asked to include this motion in the February Board Package, on behalf of Tom Flynn, Mayor of Sturgeon County.

**As submitted by Sturgeon County:**

Sturgeon County supports collaboration, choice, and finding innovative ways to ensure that communities who are interested in participating in the CRB can continue to do so.

The County is also conscious of the need to balance a community’s desire to participate with the means available.

While providing proportionate funding for available matching grants may be accommodated by larger CRB member communities, some smaller communities have indicated that they may face challenges finding the required contributions.

The County suggests that lack of resources should not act as a barrier to a community’s involvement.

The County suggests that the value of inclusion of those communities in the CRB and its activities offsets the costs that may need to be redistributed amongst the larger CRB members.

Currently, there are seven CRB member communities with populations less than 2,500, according to the most recent municipal census results. If the CRB were to match a hypothetical $700,000 provincial grant, the total potential financial impact of the CRB waiving the requirement to contribute matching funds for all seven communities under 2,500 would total approximately $3,000 based on the CRB’s general cost sharing formula.

The County also suggests that, if a community with a population less than 2,500 does not wish to provide matching contributions on a specific initiative, it may be appropriate that that community abstain from debating or voting on that initiative.

The County suggests that the value of ensuring small communities can continue to participate outweighs waiving this modest sum.
<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>IR #</td>
<td>Request Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<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>Request Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Topic Description</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</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>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></td>
<td>to determine if this motion was formally accepted for debate previously</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advocacy & Monitoring Committee

Thursday, January 21, 2016
1:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
Capital Region Board – Large Boardroom
1100 Bell Tower, 10104 – 103 Avenue, Edmonton, AB

Members:
Greg Krischke, City of Leduc (Chair)
Camille Berube, Town of Beaumont
Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair (Ex Officio)
Dwight Ganske, Town of Stony Plain
Don Iveson, City of Edmonton

Regrets:
Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County

Guests:
Roxanne Carr, Strathcona County
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Susan Evans, Sturgeon County
Greg Hofmann, City of Edmonton
Lisa Holmes, Town of Morinville
Marnie Lee, Strathcona County
Craig Mahovsky, Sturgeon County
Patty Walker, City of Fort Saskatchewan

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Stephanie Chai, Project Manager

Lorenten Lennon, Communications Manager
Leslie Chivers, Operations Manager
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant
Kent Stewart, WMC

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair, Mayor Krischke, called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m.

2. Chair Opening Remarks

3. Approval of Agenda

It was approved by unanimous consensus that the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee approve the January 21, 2016 agenda.
4. Mandate Review

  a) Review of December 10, 2015 Board Mandate Discussion
  b) Interim Activity Report
  c) Recommendation for Board – February 11, 2016

**Motion 2:** That the Advocacy & Monitoring Committee recommend the Capital Region Board write to the Province:

a) To confirm that we interpret the existing mandate as permissive in areas that the Board may wish to move in over time and in the future;

b) To ask the Province to list the functions of the planning and coordination of water, wastewater, and solid waste (but not operation) under Section 12 (1)(a) of the current mandate;

c) To confirm that the CRB recognizes the need for regional economic development and wishes to work further with the Province as the CRB determines whether the CRB or a separate institution with other membership is the right vehicle.

**Moved by:** Mayor Don Iveson, *City of Edmonton*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

5. Growth Plan Update Project

  a) Introductory Remarks
  b) Presentation on Current Status
  c) Advocacy Options and Engagement Framework Discussion
  d) The Way Ahead

6. ADJOURNMENT

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.
Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee

Monday, December 14, 2015
9:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Capital Region Board Office, Large Boardroom
1100 Bell Tower, 10104 103 Avenue, Edmonton

Members:
Camille Berube, Town of Beaumont (Chair)
Art Erickson, Village of Wabamun
Glen Finstad, City of Leduc
Phyllis Kobasiuk, Parkland County
Tim Osborne, City of St. Albert
Karen Shaw, Sturgeon County
Michael Walters, City of Edmonton
Wayne Woldanski, Lamont County

Regrets:
Randy Boyd, Town of Bon Accord
Wally Yachimetz, Town of Calmar

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Leslie Chivers, Operations Manager

Guests:
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Michael Laveck, Town of Devon
Marnie Lee, Strathcona County

Stephanie Chai, Project Manager
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Amanda Borman, Executive Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair, Mayor Camille Berube called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

2. Chair’s Opening Remarks

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the agenda of December 14, 2015 be approved.
Moved by: Councillor Michael Walters, City of Edmonton
Decision: Carried unanimously
4. Approval of Minutes of November 30, 2015

Motion: That the minutes of November 30, 2015 be approved.
Moved by: Councillor Art Erickson, Village of Wabamun
Decision: Carried unanimously

5. Budget 2016/17 Review, if needed

6. Policy Updates

Motion: That the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee recommend Policy A001, A002, A005, A006, F001, F002, F004, F005, F006, G001, and G002 to the Capital Region Board for approval as amended.
Moved by: Councillor Karen Shaw, Sturgeon County
Decision: Carried unanimously

7. Motion of September 10, 2015 regarding CRB Chairperson

Motion: That the Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee recommend that the Capital Region Board receive the information update and no longer pursue this matter at this time.
Moved by: Councillor Phyllis Kobasiuk, Parkland County
Decision: Carried unanimously

8. CEO Update

a. Board Membership Review
b. Board Mandate

9. Next Meeting

February 25, 2016 at 2:00 p.m., Large Boardroom, CRB Office

10. ADJOURNMENT

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 10:12 a.m.

Committee Chair, Camille Berube
Housing Committee

Friday, January 29, 2016
10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Pembina Place – Cultural Centre
4944 - 53 Street, Redwater, AB

Members:
Dwight Ganske, Town of Stony Plain (Parkland Sub-Region (Chair)
Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton (Edmonton Sub-Region) (Vice Chair)
Carla Howatt, Strathcona County (Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region)
Mel Smith, Town of Redwater (Sturgeon Sub-Region)
Ralph van Assen, Village of Warburg (Leduc Sub-Region)
Dan Warawa, Lamont County (Lamont Sub-Region)

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Barb Bamble, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Louise Baxter, City of Spruce Grove
Fiona Beland-Quest, Strathcona County
Greg Christenson, Christenson Group of Companies
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Judy Koschade, Town of Bruderheim
Daryl Kreuzer, City of Edmonton
Marnie Lee, Strathcona County
Lynn Olenek, H.H. Foundation
Nisha Patel, Town of Bruderheim
Dennis Peck, CHBA - Edmonton
Lory Scott, City of St. Albert

Regrets:

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Stephanie Chai, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Leslie Chivers, Operations Manager
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant
Russell Dauk, Rohit Group of Companies
Gary Gordon, Gordon & Associates

1. Call to Order

Committee Chair, Councillor Dwight Ganske called the meeting to order at 10:03 a.m.

2. Chair Opening Remarks
3. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Housing Committee Agenda for January 29, 2016 be approved.
Moved by: Councillor Dan Warawa, Lamont County (Lamont Sub-Region)
Decision: Carried unanimously

4. Approval of Minutes, November 27, 2015

Motion: That the Housing Committee minutes of November 27, 2015 be approved.
Moved by: Mayor Ralph van Assen, Village of Warburg (Leduc Sub-Region)
Decision: Carried unanimously

5. Housing Committee Membership

6. Education and Awareness

6.1 Non-Market & Subsidized Housing

Presentation to Committee members by Russell Dauk, Rohit.

7. 2015/16 Housing Work Plan Updates

7.1 Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessment

Motion #1: That the Housing Committee receive the Sub-Regional Housing Needs Assessments update for information.
Moved by: Councillor Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton (Edmonton Sub-Region)
Decision: Carried unanimously

Motion #2: That the Housing Committee direct administration to draft housing policies to achieve the CRB housing vision for review by the committee in March 2016.
Moved by: Councillor Carla Howatt, Strathcona County (Strathcona/Fort Saskatchewan Sub-Region)
Decision: Carried unanimously

7.2 2016 ReEnvision Symposium

Motion: That the Housing Committee approve the 2016 ReEnvision Symposium direction as an update for information.
Moved by: Councillor Dan Warawa, Lamont County (Lamont Sub-Region)
Decision: Carried unanimously
7.3 Our Affordable Future Implementation

**Motion:** That the Housing Committee approve the Our Affordable Future: Implementation priorities of Recommendation #6 Innovative Development Plans, Product Design, and Built-Forms and #9 Pilot Projects, with an understanding that a community approach engagement (Recommendation #8) should be an integral component of specific projects.

**Moved by:** Mayor Mel Smith, *Town of Redwater (Sturgeon Sub-Region)*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

8. Growth Plan Update 2.0

8.1 Task Force Update

**Motion:** That the Housing Committee receive the Growth Plan Update 2.0 update for information.

**Moved by:** Mayor Ralph van Assen, *Village of Warburg (Leduc Sub-Region)*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

9. July 29, 2016 Housing Committee Meeting

9.1 Location

To be confirmed.

10. Adjournment

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Housing Committee meeting be adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 12:37 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** March 24, 2016 at 1:30 p.m., La Cite Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger

Committee Chair, Councillor Dwight Ganske
Land Use & Planning Committee

Thursday, December 17, 2015
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
La Cite 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
David MacKenzie, City of Leduc
Clay Stumph, Leduc County
Patricia Lee, Town of Bruderheim
Amber Harris, Town of Gibbons
Dwight Ganske, Town of Stony Plain
Lloyd Jardine, Village of Thorsby

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Benjamin Ansaldo, Leduc County
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Ryan Hall, Strathcona County
Michael Laveck, Town of Devon
Marnie Lee, Strathcona County
Sylvain Losier, City of Leduc
Craig Mahovsky, Sturgeon County
Audrey Rogers, City of Edmonton
Matthew Siddons, City of Fort Saskatchewan

Regrets:
Barry Turner, Town of Morinville

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant

1. Call to Order

Chair, Mayor Flynn, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. Chair Opening Remarks

3. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force agenda of December 17, 2015 be approved.
Moved by: Councillor Amber Harris, Town of Gibbons
Decision: Carried unanimously
4. **Approval of Minutes of October 22, 2015**

   **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force minutes of October 22, 2015 be approved.
   **Moved by:** Mayor Gale Katchur, *City of Fort Saskatchewan*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

5. **Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan**

   5.1 **Final Master Plan, as amended**

   **Motion:** That the Land Use & Planning Committee recommend the Capital Region Board approve the revised conceptual Figure 2 of the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan with implementation subject to consultation with affected municipalities.
   **Moved by:** Councillor David MacKenzie, *City of Leduc*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

   **Motion:** That the Land Use & Planning Committee rescind the previous motion.
   **Moved by:** Mayor Gale Katchur, *City of Fort Saskatchewan*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

   **Motion:** That the Land Use & Planning Committee approve the revised conceptual Figure 2 of the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan with implementation subject to consultation with affected municipalities.
   **Moved by:** Councillor David MacKenzie, *City of Leduc*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

   **Motion:** That the Land Use & Planning Committee recommend the Capital Region Board approve the Capital Region Energy Corridors Master Plan as revised, and refer the approved plan to the Provincial Government.
   **Moved by:** Councillor Ed Gibbons, *City of Edmonton*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously

6. **Land Use & Planning Committee Terms of Reference**

   6.1 **Review of Terms of Reference**

   **Motion:** That the Land Use & Planning Committee recommend the Capital Region Board approve the revised Land Use & Planning Committee Terms of Reference.
   **Moved by:** Councillor Dwight Ganske, *Town of Stony Plain*
   **Decision:** Carried unanimously
6.2 Review of Chair and Vice Chair

Motion: That the Land Use & Planning Committee keep Mayor Tom Flynn as Committee Chair and Mayor Rod Shaigec as Committee Vice Chair.
Moved by: Councillor Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton
Decision: Carried unanimously

7. Growth Plan Update 2.0

7.1 Committee Consultation Summary

Motion: That the Land Use & Planning Committee Growth Plan Update 2.0 Committee Consultation Summary be referred to the Growth Plan Update Task Force for information.
Moved by: Mayor Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Decision: Carried unanimously

8. Adjournment

Motion: That the Land Use & Planning Committee meeting be adjourned.
Moved by: Councillor Clay Stumph, Leduc County
Decision: Carried unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 9:47 a.m.

Next Meeting: February 25, 2016 at 9:00 a.m., La Cite Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger

Committee Chair, Tom Flynn
Transit Committee

Thursday, January 28, 2016
9:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Strathcona County Community Centre – Rooms 3 & 4
401 Festival Lane, Sherwood Park, AB

Members:
Wes Brodhead, City of St. Albert (Chair)
Dave Anderson, Strathcona County
Susan Evans, Sturgeon County
Glen Finstad, City of Leduc (alternate)
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Andrew Knack, City of Edmonton (alternate)
Searle Turton, City of Spruce Grove

Regrets:

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant

Guests:
Ashley Bhatia, GOA - Transportation
Brian Botterill, Strathcona County
Wade Coombs, Strathcona County
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Brianna Franz, GOA - Transportation
Ettore Iannacito, CRP/GOA - Transportation
Patrick Inglis, City of Spruce Grove
Judy Koschade, Town of Bruderheim
Mike Koziol, WSP/MMM
Marnie Lee, Strathcona County
Kathy Lewin, Town of Beaumont
Kasey Machin, City of Edmonton
Chad Paddick, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Nisha Patel, Strathcona County
Glenn Tompolski, City of St. Albert
Karl Tracksdorf, WSP/MMM
Mike Vivian, City of Edmonton
Tim Vrooman, Town of Morinville
Kevin Wenzel, City of Leduc
Forest Yang, Strathcona County

1. Call to Order

Chair, Wes Brodhead called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

2. Chair Opening Remarks
3. Approval of Agenda

It was approved by unanimous consensus that the Transit Committee agenda of January 28, 2016 be approved.

4. Approval of Minutes, November 26, 2015

Motion: That the Transit Committee minutes of November 26, 2015 be approved as amended.
Moved by: Mayor Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Decision: Carried unanimously

5. Transit Committee Terms of Reference

5.1 Review of Terms of Reference

It was approved by unanimous consensus that the CRB Administration will review adding a clause with respect to the bi-annual review of the Chair and Vice Chair in accordance with CRB Policy G012 section 4.

6. CRB/CRP Transit Policy Workshop

6.1 December 4, 2015 Workshop Meeting Notes

Motion: That the Transit Committee receive the CRB/CRP Transit Policy Workshop meeting notes for information, and refer them to the Capital Region Board for information.
Moved by: Councillor Dave Anderson, Strathcona County
Decision: Carried unanimously

7. Project Updates

7.1 Specialized Transit Needs Assessments
7.2 Transit Priorities List
7.3 HOV/Transit Priority Study
7.4 Household Travel Survey

Motion: That the Transit Committee receive the Transit Committee project updates for information.
Moved by: Alderman Searle Turton, City of Spruce Grove
Decision: Carried unanimously
8. Growth Plan Update 2.0

8.1 Task Force Update

Motion: That the Transit Committee receive the Growth Plan Update 2.0 update for information.
Moved by: Councillor Dave Anderson, Strathcona County
Decision: Carried unanimously

9. Adjournment

Motion: That the Transit Committee meeting be adjourned.
Moved by: Councillor Dave Anderson, Strathcona County
Decision: Carried unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

Next Meeting: March 24, 2016 at 9:00 a.m., La Cite Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
Growth Plan Update Task Force

Friday, December 11, 2015
8:30 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.
La Cite Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
8627 rue Marie-Anne-Gaboury (91 Street), Edmonton

Members:
Roxanne Carr, Strathcona County (Chair)
Lisa Holmes, Town of Morinville (Vice Chair)
Don Iveson, City of Edmonton
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan (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
Peter Vana

Strategic Advisor:
Barry Huybens

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

CRB Staff:
Malcolm Bruce, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Stephanie Chai, Project Manager
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager
Leslie Chivers, Operations Manager
Brandt Denham, GIS Coordinator
Amanda Borman, Executive Assistant
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant

Guests:
Nolan Crouse, Board Chair
Grant Bain, Leduc County
Jerry Bouma, Bouma & Toma Consulting
Laura Bruno, UDI-Edmonton Region
Lindsey Butterfield, City of Edmonton
Sherry Cote, Town of Bruderheim
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Linton Delainey, Strathcona County
Susan Evans, Strurgeon County
Troy Fleming, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton
Connie Gourley, ISL
Ryan Hall, Strathcona County
Michelle Hay, City of Leduc
Debra Irving, City of Spruce Grove
Greg Krischke, City of Leduc
Jeff Laurien, Government of Alberta
Michael Laveck, Town of Alberta
Marnie Lee, Strathcona County
Sylvain Losier, City of Devon
Craig Mahovsky, Strurgeon County
Gilles Prefontaine, City of St. Albert
Bonnie Riddell, Strathcona County
Kelly Rudyk, Strathcona County
Adryan Slaght, City of St. Albert
Janel Smith, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Collin Steffes, Strurgeon County
Pamela Steppan, Strathcona County
Peter Tarnawsky, Strurgeon County
Ken Woitt, City of Leduc
Patty Walker, City of Fort Saskatchewan
1. **Call to Order**

   Vice Chair, Mayor Lisa Holmes called the meeting to order at 8:43 a.m.

2. **Chair’s Opening Remarks**

3. **Approval of Agenda**

   Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force agenda of December 11, 2015 be approved.
   
   Moved by: Councillor John Schonewille, Leduc County
   
   Decision: Carried unanimously

4. **Approval of Minutes, October 2, 2015**

   Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force minutes of October 2, 2015 be approved.
   
   Moved by: Mayor Don Iveson, City of Edmonton
   
   Decision: Carried unanimously

   Mayor Ralph van Assen arrived at 8:52 a.m.

5. **CAO Consultation Review**

   a. **Review of CAO Consultation Feedback/Input**

      Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept the CAO Consultation input as information to further inform the Growth Plan 2.0 update.
      
      Moved by: Councillor John Schonewille, Leduc County
      
      Decision: Carried unanimously

6. **CRB Committee Consultation**

   a. Land Use & Planning Committee
   b. Housing Committee
   c. Transit Committee
   d. Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee

      Motion: That the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept the CRB Committee Consultation input as information to further inform the Growth Plan 2.0 update.
      
      Moved by: Councillor John Schonewille, Leduc County
      
      Decision: Carried unanimously
7. **Carry Over Items from October 2, 2015 Task Force Meeting**

   a. **Naming of Transportation & Transit Policy Area**

      **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept the Consultants recommendation to change the names of the Transportation Policy Area to Transportation Systems and to remove the word ‘choices’ from the Communities & Housing Policy Area to avoid over use of the word ‘choice’.

      **Moved by:** Mayor Don Iveson, *City of Edmonton*

      **Decision:** Carried unanimously

8. **Supporting Analysis**

   a. **Revised 2014-2044 Regional Employment Analysis**

      **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force approve the methodology for revising the 2014-2044 Regional Employment forecast for the purpose of updating the Growth Plan.

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

      **Decision:** Carried

   b. **2014 Baseline Land Need Analysis**

      **Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force accept the Baseline Land Need Analysis as information.

      **Moved by:** Mayor Don Iveson, *City of Edmonton*

      **Decision:** Carried

   Mayor Carr (Task Force Chair) and Mayor Katchur arrived at 9:58 a.m.

9. **Coffee Break**

10. **Metropolitan Structure**

11. **Lunch**

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

12. **Policy Objectives & Policy Directions**

    a. **Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure**

    b. **Community & Housing**

    c. **Agriculture**

    d. **Transportation Choice**
**Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force support the initial draft Policy Objectives and Policy Directions for *Integration of Land Use & Infrastructure, Communities & Housing, Agriculture and Transportation Systems* as the basis for developing policies for the Growth Plan 2.0 update.

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

A recorded vote was requested by Councillor John Schonewille, Leduc County.

**Voted in Favor:** Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Morinville, St. Albert, Strathcona County, Warburg

**Voted not in Favor:** Leduc County

**Decision:** Carried

---

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

**Moved by:** Mayor Lisa Holmes, *Town of Morinville*

A recorded vote was requested by Councillor John Schonewille, Leduc County.

**Voted in Favor:** Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Morinville, St. Albert, Strathcona County, Warburg

**Voted not in Favor:** Leduc County

**Decision:** Carried

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

---

13. **Next Steps**

a. **Provincial Engagement – Cross Ministerial Committee**

b. **Initial draft Table of Contents for GPU 2.0**

14. **Adjournment**

**Motion:** That the Growth Plan Update Task Force meeting be adjourned.

**Moved by:** Councillor John Schonewille, *Leduc County*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 4:04 p.m.

**Next Meeting:** The Task Force requested CRB Administration to find an alternate date for the next meeting to be held early in February – TBC.
# Quarterly Financial Report as at December 31, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-16 Annual Budget</th>
<th>Actual 31-Dec-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA Regular Grant</td>
<td>$3,315,000</td>
<td>$3,365,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA RCP Regional Competitive Analysis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA RCP Growth Plan update</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA RCP Sub-Regional Housing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA Housing symposium</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$38,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOA ACP GIS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Contribution-Matching</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$305,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue/project Carryover from 2014</td>
<td>$1,130,832</td>
<td>$1,130,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$284,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit Interest</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$23,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>$6,678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td>$4,760,832</td>
<td>$5,154,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Expenditures**       |                       |                  |
| Board and Committees   | $266,900              | $188,628         |
| Honoraria              | $139,000              | $92,079          |
| Travel                 | $37,900               | $19,138          |
| Meetings               | $66,000               | $59,410          |
| Chair Retainer         | $24,000               | $18,000          |
| **Administration**     | $2,206,000            | $1,539,716       |
| Salaries/Benefits      | $1,619,000            | $1,243,219       |
| Office Lease/Utilities | $290,000              | $203,476         |
| Legal & Professional Fees | $60,000         | $17,919          |
| Communications         | $49,000               | $21,721          |
| Travel                 | $80,000               | $22,200          |
| Office Supplies        | $35,000               | $14,414          |
| Information Technology | $25,000               | $11,854          |
| Insurance              | $8,000                | -                |
| Meetings               | $30,000               | $1,967           |
| Bank Chgs and Interest | $2,000                | $1,804           |
| Other expenses         | $8,000                | $1,142           |
| **Consulting Fees**    | $2,019,449            | $986,807         |
| REF                    | $100,000              | $19,002          |
| Carry over projects    | $721,949              | $481,609         |
| Consulting Fees        | $1,197,500            | $486,196         |
| **Regional Projects**  | -                     | -                |
| Planning Intern        | -                     | -                |
| **Capital**            | $10,000               | -                |
| Office Furniture/Equipment | $10,000        | -                |
| **Total Expenditures** | $4,502,349            | $2,715,151       |
| Unallocated Project Funds | $258,483            |                  |
| **Surplus (Deficit)**  | -                     | $2,439,000       |