Meeting Agenda
September 12, 2013 – 8:00 a.m. – Noon
Chateau Louis, Grand Ballroom
11727 Kingsway, Edmonton
Lunch to follow in Julian’s Piano Bar at the Chateau Louis

Open to the Public

1. Chair’s Opening Remarks

2. Approval of Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes of July 11, 2013

4. Other Business
   a. St. Albert Motions
      i. **Motion:** The CRB support a budget allotment of an annual $100,000 fund from the
         $3,000,000 CRB funding be allocated to assist in planning within municipalities <3,500 in
         population, and that the CEO prepare a draft policy in this regard for review by the
         Governance Committee by March 31, 2014 prior to review at the Board.
      
      ii. **Motion:** the Board direct administration to include a $250,000 allowance ‘above the line’
          on the next GreenTRIP list update. These undefined funds could be allocated to assist
          municipalities <3,500 in population with public transit needs such as small buses,
          seniors vans, or other related “group transport” needs.

          and

          Administration recommend to the Province changes to the GreenTRIP criteria that would
          allow for such applications to be considered eligible.

5. Transit
   a. GreenTRIP Priority List
      
      **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the 2013 GreenTRIP project list and
      request a letter be sent to the Minister of Transportation as an update of the Region’s transit
      priorities.

6. Land Use
   a. Regional Evaluation Framework (Ministerial Order L:270/10) Amendment
      
      **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board direct the Board Chair to send a letter to the Minister
      of Alberta Municipal Affairs requesting that the Regional Evaluation Framework (Ministerial
      Order L:270/10) be amended by deleting Section 5.4 b) (ii) relating to the consistency of
      Statutory Plans and Statutory Plan Amendments with the regional population and
      employment forecasts in the Capital Region Growth Plan as recommended by the Land Use
      Committee.
b. Population & Employment Clarification in REF

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the Population and Employment Forecast Variance process and criteria for Regional Evaluation Framework submissions as recommended by the Land Use Committee.

7. Governance
   a. CRB Committee Structure Review

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve Option B as outlined in the Committee Structure Review Report, as recommended by the Governance Committee.

8. Previous Business
   a. Population & Employment Projections

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

9. New Business
   a. Membership Review (City of Fort Saskatchewan)

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board accept the Cuff Report regarding the Membership Review as information.

   b. CRB Chair’s Term

**Motion:** That the current Chair’s term be extended until such time as a new Chair is selected in accordance with the Board’s policy subject to Ministerial approval if necessary.

10. Committee Minutes
    a. Land Use Committee
    b. Transit Committee
    c. Governance Committee

11. In Camera *(if required)*

14. Adjournment

*CRB Luncheon to follow*
Minutes of a meeting of the Capital Region Board held at Chateau Louis, Grand Ballroom on Thursday, July 11, 2013

Delegates in Attendance:
Mayor Nolan Crouse – St. Albert/Chair
Mayor Camille Berube – Beaumont
Mayor Don Rigney – Sturgeon County
Mayor Barry Rasch – Thorsby
Mayor Stephen Mandel – Edmonton
Mayor Gale Katchur – Fort Saskatchewan
Mayor William Nimmo - Gibbons
Councillor Dwight Ganske – Stony Plain
Mayor Dawson Kohl - Warburg
Councillor Betty Glassman – Leduc County
Mayor Lisa Magara - Legal
Mayor Linda Osinchuk – Strathcona County
Mayor Randy Boyd – Bon Accord
Mayor Greg Krischke – City of Leduc
Mayor Don Faulkner - Calmar
Councillor Bill Purdy - Wabamun
Mayor Karl Hauch - Bruderheim
Councillor Lisa Holmes - Morinville
Mayor Rodney Shaigec - Parkland
Alderman Acker – Spruce Grove
Mayor Mel Smith - Redwater
Ivan Moore – Government of Alberta

Absent:
Mayor Bill Skinner – Town of Lamont
Reeve Wayne Woldanski – Lamont County

CRB Administration:
Doug Lagore, Chief Executive Officer
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Kim Wieringa, Project Manager
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Courtney Andrews, Executive Assistant
Open to Public

1. **Call to Order and Chair’s opening remarks**
   Called to order at 9:02 a.m.

   The Chair reminded members to submit any feedback regarding the CEO to him by August 15, 2013. Any feedback will be summarized and reviewed with the Governance Committee Chair, Mayor Berube.

2. **Moment of Silence – The late Mayor Paul Krauskopf, Morinville**
   A moment of silence was held in honor of Mayor Krauskopf.

3. **Approval of Agenda**
   Mayor Crouse requested to add two Notice of Motions to the agenda. Mayor Osinchuk requested to add an item to the agenda to provide an update on the CRB social.

   **Moved by** Mayor Boyd.

   **Motion:** To approve the agenda of July 11, 2013, as amended.

   **Motion carried unanimously.**

4. **Approval of Minutes of June 13, 2013**

   **Moved by** Mayor Berube.

   **Motion:** To approve the minutes of June 13, 2013.

   **Motion carried unanimously.**

5. **REF Applications**

6. **Governance**

   9:09 a.m. Mayor Mandel replaced Councillor Gibbons as the City of Edmonton’s representative.

   Mayor Berube introduced the item. Sharon Shuya gave a presentation providing an overview of the Project Charter developed to give a high level description of the Project’s scope, approach and proposed timelines. Ms. Shuya noted that herself and CEO, Doug Lagore would be willing to make a presentation to any member municipalities’ councils if requested.

   **Moved by** Mayor Berube.

   **Motion:** That the Capital Region Board receive the Project Charter for the 2015 Capital Region Growth Plan update as information.

   22 in favour, 2 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Motion carried.**
b. CRB updated 2013 Budget

Mayor Berube introduced the item. Mr. Doug Lagore provided an overview of the changes to the 2013 Budget.

**Moved by** Mayor Berube.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the 2013 revised budget.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

c. Selection of CRB Interim Chair or Chair

Mayor Berube introduced the item regarding the selection process for an Interim Chair or Chair of the Board.

**Moved by** Mayor Berube.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the selection process for a new Interim Chair or Chair, as approved by the Governance Committee at their meeting on June 17, 2013.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Chair Crouse relinquished the Chair position to Mayor Berube. Mayor Berube conducted the vote for the Board’s decision to choose between an Interim/Appointed Chair or an Elected Chair of the Board following the 2013 Municipal Election. The Board voted in favor of an Elected Chair.

i. Selection of Chair ballots

**Moved by** Mayor Boyd.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board destroy the ballots for the vote of a CRB Interim Chair or Chair.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

7. Land Use

a. Non-Priority Growth Areas Policy Clarification

Mayor Fisher introduced the item. Mr. Neal Sarnecki gave a presentation on the policy clarification for Non-Priority Growth Areas as reviewed by the Land Use Committee, PAG and the PAG Sub-Committee.

**Moved by** Mayor Fisher.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board approve the Non-Priority Growth Areas Policy Clarification as recommended by the Land Use Committee.

Mayor Osinchuk put forward an amendment.
Moved by Mayor Osinchuk.

Amendment: That the interpretation guide be amended by adding the following: Notwithstanding these difficulties in applying a standard criteria for Counties, the criteria outlined for Towns and Villages may be applied in assessing a REF application, at the request of the County submitting the REF application.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mayor Boyd put forward a motion.

Motion: That the Capital Region Board refer this matter back to the Land Use Committee for further clarification with a view of flexibility.

21 in favour, 3 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. Motion carried.

8. Advocacy & Communications
   a. 2013-2016 Advocacy and Communications Strategic Plan
      Mayor Krischke introduced the item. Mr. Godfrey Huybregts from Marcomm Works gave a presentation providing an overview of the Strategic Plan.
      Moved by Mayor Krischke.

      Motion: That the Capital Region Board approve the 2013-2016 Advocacy & Communications Strategic Plan.

      Motion carried unanimously.

9. Other Business
   a. Sturgeon County
      Mayor Rigney introduced the item.
      Moved by Mayor Rigney.

      Motion: Now therefore be it resolved that the CRB invite the CNR, CPR and other rail carriers with connections to port facilities to present to the CRB their case for moving our growing production of crude and refined oil products to national, US and world markets thereby negating the impact, cost and ability of those entities to restrict or ransom our access to national, international and world markets.

      Mayor Katchur put forward an amendment to indicate that the rail carriers present to the Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee instead of the Board.

      Moved by Mayor Katchur.

      Amendment: To change the word CRB to Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee.
19 in favour, 5 opposed. Supported by 17 or more municipalities comprising more than 75 percent of the population. **Amendment carried.**

Mayor Mandel put forward a friendly amendment to delete all wording following “markets” in the motion. The friendly amendment was accepted by the mover.

**Moved by Mayor Rigney.**

**Amended Motion:** Now therefore be it resolved that the CRB invite the CNR, CPR and other rail carriers with connections to port facilities to present to the Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee their case for moving our growing production of crude and refined oil products to national, US and world markets.

**Amended Motion carried unanimously.**

b. **CRB Membership - Redwater**

Mayor Smith introduced the item.

**Moved by** Mayor Smith.

**Motion:** 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.

Alderman Acker put forward a motion.

**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board refer this matter to the Governance Committee for review.

**Motion withdrawn.**

Members voted on the original motion.

In favour: Sturgeon County, Gibbons, Town of Lamont*, Leduc County, Legal, Strathcona County, Bon Accord, City of Leduc, Wabamun, Bruderheim, Parkland County, Spruce Grove, Redwater, Lamont County*.

Opposed: Beaumont, Thorsby, Edmonton, Fort Saskatchewan, Stony Plain, Warburg, Morinville, Calmar, Devon, St. Albert.

*absent

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

Mayor Katchur put forward a Notice of Motion.

**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.
10. Committee Reports
   a. Land Use Committee
   b. Transit Committee
   c. Housing Committee
   d. Governance Committee
   e. Advocacy & Communications Committee

11. CEO’s update
   a. Quarterly Financial Report
      Mr. Doug Lagore introduced the item.

11:44 a.m. Councillor Iveson replaced Mayor Mandel as the City of Edmonton’s representative.

12. New Business
   a. St. Albert Notice of Motions
      Mayor Crouse provided a handout regarding his two Notice of Motions.
      Notice of Motion: The CRB support a budget allotment of an annual $100,000 fund from the $3,000,000 CRB funding be allocated to assist in planning within municipalities <3,500 in population, and that the CEO prepare a draft policy in this regard for review by the Governance Committee by March 31, 2014 prior to review at the Board.

      Notice of Motion: The Board direct administration to include a $250,000 allowance ‘above the line’ on the next GreenTRIP list update. These undefined funds could be allocated to assist municipalities <3,500 in population with public transit needs such as small buses, seniors vans, or other related “group transport” needs and Administration recommend to the Province changes to the GreenTRIP criteria that would allow for such applications to be considered eligible.

   b. CRB social update – Strathcona County
      Mayor Osinchuk advised that in reviewing the costs associated with hosting a CRB social it was suggested that an informal lunch be held following the Board meeting in September. CRB Administration will make arrangements to host a light lunch following the September meeting.

13. Motion: That the CRB move to in camera session (if required)

No In-Camera Items
14. **Motion:** That the CRB move to in camera session.

**In Camera**

15. **Motion:** That the CRB revert to public.

**Open to Public**

16. **Adjournment**

   Meeting adjourned at 11:49 a.m.

---

**CRB Chair, Nolan Crouse**

**CRB CEO, Doug Lagore**
GreenTRIP Priority List

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the 2013 GreenTRIP project list and request a letter be sent to the Minister of Transportation as an update of the Region’s transit priorities.

Background

- On June 22, 2010 the Province announced the details of the $2 billion GreenTRIP Program. The Program will support new and expanded public transit throughout Alberta and provides one-time capital funding assistance for public transit infrastructure and technology.
- The goals of the Program are to provide Albertans a wider range of sustainable public transit alternatives for local, regional and Intermunicipal travel making public transit more accessible. It is also anticipated that this Program will help reduce the number of vehicles on the road and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- The Province announced $800 million of the program funds would be allocated to the Capital Region and applications for round one with a second round to be announced once round one funding applications are completed.
- The Province has approved $514M in GreenTRIP projects for the Capital Region with $266M remaining.
- The Transit Committee requested the GreenTRIP project list be revisited to ensure the region’s project list were current in preparation for round two funding.
- The Transit Committee requested CRB Administration work with the Transit Advisory Group (TAG) to update the Region’s GreenTRIP Project list for approval by the Board.
- An email was sent to all CAO’s requesting GreenTRIP Projects. Responses were received from Edmonton, St. Albert, Strathcona, Beaumont, Fort Saskatchewan, Spruce Grove, Parkland and Bruderheim.
- TAG followed the same project rating and ranking process approved by the RTC in 2010 to determine the ranked list of projects and applied additional criteria to arrive at the final list.
- On August 30th, 2013, the Regional Transit Committee approved the attached project list and recommended it for approval to the Board.

GreenTRIP Criteria

- The GreenTRIP criteria consist of three elements: consistency with GreenTRIP Criteria as identified by the Province; consistent with the Capital Region Growth Plan (Land Use and Intermunicipal Transit) and the following principles.
  - Ensures integration of public transportation and Land Use development
  - Targets regional public investment in priority growth areas
  - Coordinates and aligns with infrastructure planning between municipalities
  - Expands and extends the level, quality and range of public transportation
  - Supports public transportation options that are environmentally friendly and safe
  - Supports expanded transit options through investment in alternate transit modes
• Municipal Priority
• Finally, project readiness, timing of project implementation, fir with 30 year service plan and synergies among other regional transit projects.

Rationale

• The initial GreenTRIP project List was developed in 2010 and since then several projects have been funded and new priorities have emerged that the Regional Transit Committee wanted to ensure were recognized through a formal review of all GreenTRIP projects.
• The revised GreenTRIP Project list has been developed by consensus and reflects new and emerging priorities from across the Region like the Regional Smart Card which will provide benefits to transit riders.
• The Regional Transit Committee with the support of TAG have undertaken a fair and inclusive process and the RTC believe this list of GreenTRIP projects balances the priorities identified by the participating municipalities of the Capital Region and the regional priorities identified within the Capital Region Growth Plan.
## GreenTrip - Round 2 Project Ranking - August 16, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Wtd Score</th>
<th>Shovel Readiness</th>
<th>Project Cost $M</th>
<th>Green Trip $M (66%)</th>
<th>Preliminary RANKING</th>
<th>Municipal Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Valley LRT Line Stage 1</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1800.00</td>
<td>235.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Regional Smart Card (includes Edmonton, St. Albert, Strathcona)</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>Bus Purchases for PnR and Transfer Station.</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.07</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>Transit Service (buses and transit stops, etc.)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Parkn Ride/ Transit Facility</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Transit Growth Bus Purchases (2014-2016)</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>Double Decker Bus Purchases (14 on order)</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>278.8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ROUND 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>266.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>All other Bus System Upgrades (NE Transit Facility)</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>308.0</td>
<td>203.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Transit Garage Expansion</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System (Smart Bus)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>All Other LRT Projects</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4,294.20</td>
<td>2,834.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>LRT Design and Construction (Campbell Rd T.C to Downtown)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>350.0</td>
<td>235.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>LRT Design and Construction (North T.C to Downtown)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>375.0</td>
<td>250.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>Regional Park and Rides</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>71.99</td>
<td>47.51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>St. Albert Transit Bus Purchases (2016-2022)</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>Double Decker Bus Purchases (6 buses in future years)</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>St. Albert North Transit Center and Park and Ride</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>Baseline Road Transit Priority Corridor</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Transit Priority Measures along Mark Messier Trail</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>Strathcona New Bus Storage, maintenance and office facility</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Life Line Service for municipalities &lt;3500 population</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>Downtown Parking Structure (500 Spaces)</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>3913.13</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Definitions:

**Shovel ready** means the project is ready for Tender by 2016 (3 year) and in the case of Bus Purchases, are on order.
Regional Evaluation Framework (Ministerial Order L:270/10) Amendment

Motion

That the Capital Region Board direct the Board Chair to send a letter to the Minister of Alberta Municipal Affairs requesting that the Regional Evaluation Framework (Ministerial Order L:270/10) be amended by deleting Section 5.4 b) (ii) relating to the consistency of Statutory Plans and Statutory Plan Amendments with the regional population and employment forecasts in the Capital Region Growth Plan as recommended by the Land Use Committee.

Background

• Ministerial Order No. L:270/10, being the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF), was approved November 29, 2010. The effective date of the Regional Evaluation Framework is March 31, 2010.

• The purpose of the Regional Evaluation Framework is to confirm that new municipal statutory plans and statutory plan amendments proposed by member municipalities are consistent with the Capital Region Board Regulation and the Capital Region Growth Plan.

• The REF contains evaluation criteria that must be considered in the review of Statutory Plan and Statutory Plan amendments that require approval of the Capital Region Board.

• One of the evaluation criteria in REF is consistency of a Statutory Plan or Statutory Plan amendment with the Population and Employment Forecasts in the Capital Region Growth Plan.

5.4 When evaluating a statutory plan or statutory plan amendment under this section, the Board must consider:

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

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

• On January 10, 2013, the Board was presented with a proposed update to the Population and Employment Forecast in the Growth Plan. The Board referred the item back to CRB Administration with direction to further review the proposed forecasts with municipal administrations. It was also suggested that the Land Use Committee clarify how the forecasts are to be used in evaluating REF applications, especially when a proposed forecast exceeds the Growth Plan Forecast.

• On June 27, 2013, following discussions regarding the interpretation and use of the population and employment forecasts in the evaluation of REF applications, the Land Use Committee approved the subject motion for consideration by the Capital Region Board.

Attachment:
1. Ministerial Order L:270/10 – Regional Evaluation Framework
MINISTERIAL ORDER NO. L:270/10

I, Hector Goudreau, Minister of Municipal Affairs, pursuant to section 21(1) of the Capital Region Board Regulation (AR 17/2010) make the following order:

1. That the Regional Evaluation Framework as attached in Schedule A is hereby established.

2. That the effective date of the Regional Evaluation Framework is March 31, 2010.

3. Ministerial Order No. L:046/10 is hereby rescinded.

Dated at Edmonton, Alberta, this 29 day of NOVEMBER, 2010.

Hector Goudreau
Minister of Municipal Affairs

104 Legislature Building, Edmonton, Alberta T5K 2B6 Canada Telephone 780-427-3744 Fax 780-422-9550
P.O. Box 1054, 035-1 Avenue SW, Falher, Alberta T0H 1M0 Canada Telephone 780-837-3846 Fax 780-837-3849
Toll Free From All Areas 1-866-835-4988

Printed on recycled paper CRB Mtg Pkg1 Sept12/13
Regional Evaluation Framework (REF)

1.0 Purpose

The Capital Region Board (the "Board") has been directed to implement the Capital Region Growth Plan subsequent to its adoption by the Government of Alberta.

The purpose of the Regional Evaluation Framework is to provide criteria to allow the board to evaluate new municipal statutory plans and statutory plan amendments to ensure consistency with the long-term regional interests identified in the Capital Region Growth Plan, and the Capital Region Board Regulation.

2.0 Definitions

In addition to the definitions contained in the Capital Region Board Regulation (the "Regulation"), words defined in the Capital Region Growth Plan shall be given the same meaning for the purposes of this Regional Evaluation Framework.

3.0 Municipality Review

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

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

   a) one or more of the following conditions exist:

      (i) the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment would result in the creation of one or more lots intended and/or designated to accommodate Heavy Industrial Use;

      (ii) the effect of the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment proposes a net residential density that differs from the assigned density target in the Capital Region Growth Plan for the corresponding Priority Growth Area, by 10 per cent or more;

      (iii) the effect of the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment proposes a gross residential density that differs from the assigned density target in the Capital Region Growth Plan for the corresponding Cluster Country Residential Area, by 10 per cent or more;
(iv) the plan boundaries are within 0.8 km. of a road identified in the Regional Transportation Infrastructure map of the Capital Region Growth Plan;

(v) the plan boundaries are within 1.0 km. of an approved Intermunicipal Transit route or Park and Ride facility as identified by the Capital Region Growth Plan (Figures, 8, 9, or 10 of the Capital Region Intermunicipal Transit Plan) or a Transportation Master Plan as approved by the City of Edmonton;

(vi) the plan is located outside a Priority Growth Area or Cluster Country Residential Area as identified on the Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas map in the Capital Region Growth Plan, and at full build-out the plan proposes to vary the municipality's official population as stated in the most recent Alberta Municipal Affairs Official Population List by 10 per cent or more;

and

b) the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment proposes land uses that would add to, alter, interrupt or interfere with:

(i) the land-use development pattern required by the Principles and Policies or residential density targets established in the Capital Region Growth Plan; or

(ii) the distribution, expansion, and/or integrated development of regional infrastructure, and recreation, transportation and utility corridors as identified on the Regional Transportation Infrastructure, Regional Water and Wastewater Infrastructure, Regional Power Infrastructure and Regional Corridors maps in the Capital Region Growth Plan or conservation buffers as shown on the Regional Buffers Areas map of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

3.3 A municipality must refer any other statutory plan or statutory plan amendment where the plan is within 1.6 km. of the boundaries of the Alberta Industrial Heartland Area Structure plans, or the Edmonton International Airport Area Structure Plan.

3.4 Statutory plans or statutory plan amendments referred to the Capital Region Board pursuant to section 3.1, 3.2 or 3.3 must be referred to the Board after 1st reading and before 3rd reading of a bylaw or bylaws.

3.5 A statutory plan or statutory plan amendment referred by a municipality to the Board must include:

a) the proposed statutory plan or statutory plan amendment bylaw;

b) sufficient documentation to explain the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment;
e) sufficient information to ensure that the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment can be evaluated pursuant to the evaluation criteria in section 5.4 of the REF; and

d) a copy of the most recent amended plan without the proposed amendment.

4.0 Board Administration Review

4.1 Within 25 working days of the date on which the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment referral is found to be complete by the Board, the Board Administration must present to the Board a report and recommendation to either approve or reject the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment.

5.0 Board Review and Decision

5.1 At the meeting at which the Board administration report and recommendation are presented the Board must, by consensus, approve or reject the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment.

5.2 In the event that consensus is not achieved a formal vote of the Board must be conducted, in accordance with the voting and notification provisions of the Capital Region Board Regulation and the Board’s procedural bylaw.

5.3 Prior to a vote on a statutory plan or statutory plan amendment the Board must hear:
   i. from the Board administration; and
   ii. from the municipality proposing the statutory plan or statutory plan amendment.

5.4 When evaluating a statutory plan or statutory plan amendment under this section, the Board must consider:

   a) Compatibility of the development with the objectives of the Capital Region Growth Plan as set out in Section 11 of the Regulation;

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

   (i) The Land Use Principles and Policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan including the provisions for:
       i. Buffer areas as shown on the Regional Buffers Area Map in the Capital Region Growth Plan;
       ii. Priority Growth Areas as shown on the Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas map in the Capital Region Growth Plan;
       iii. Cluster Country Residential Areas as shown on the Priority Growth Areas and Cluster Country Residential Areas map in the Capital Region Growth Plan;
       iv. Density targets as outlined in Capital Region Growth Plan; and
       v. Outside Priority Growth Areas.
(ii) The regional population and employment forecasts in the Capital Region Growth Plan.

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

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

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

(vi) The boundaries and policies of Alberta's Industrial Heartland Area Structure plans and the Edmonton International Airport Area Structure Plan.
Population and Employment Clarification in REF

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve the Population and Employment Forecast Variance process and criteria for Regional Evaluation Framework submissions as recommended by the Land Use Committee.

Background

- Ministerial Order No. L:270/10, being the Regional Evaluation Framework (REF), was approved November 29, 2010. The effective date of the Regional Evaluation Framework is March 31, 2010.

- The purpose of the Regional Evaluation Framework is to confirm that new municipal statutory plans and statutory plan amendments proposed by member municipalities are consistent with the Capital Region Board Regulation and the Capital Region Growth Plan.

- The REF contains evaluation criteria that must be considered in the review of Statutory Plan and Statutory Plan amendments that require approval of the Capital Region Board.

- One of the evaluation criteria in REF is consistency of a Statutory Plan or Statutory Plan amendment with the Population and Employment Forecasts as outlined in Capital Region Growth Plan.

- On January 10, 2013, the Board was presented with a proposed update to the Population and Employment Forecast in the Growth Plan. The Board referred the item back to CRB Administration with direction to further review the proposed forecasts with municipal administrations. It was also suggested that the Land Use Committee clarify how the forecasts are to be used in evaluating REF applications, especially when a proposed forecast exceeds the Growth Plan Forecast.

- The matter was referred to the Planning Advisory Group (PAG) for review and recommendations. PAG created a Population and Employment Forecast Subcommittee to consider the use of Population and Employment Forecasts in REF and prepare recommendations for the Land Use Committee.

- At its meeting of June 17, 2013, PAG supported a recommendation by CRB Administration that the Land Use Committee approve the interpretation guideline for Population and Employment Forecast Variances as prepared by the Subcommittee.

- On June 27, 2013, the Land Use Committee approved the Population and Employment Forecast Variances interpretation guideline as recommended by PAG with one amendment. The Committee amended the variance criteria for population and employment forecasts from 5% and 10%, respectively, to 20% for both.
Rationale

- Population and Employment Forecasts are one criteria amongst many that are evaluated in the review of statutory plans and statutory plan amendments as required by the Regional Evaluation Framework. However, REF experience has shown that it remains the most contentious aspect of Growth Plan implementation. Due to the importance placed on the Population and Employment Forecast by member municipalities, PAG supported a process that required Board consideration and approval of all REF applications that varied from the Growth Plan Forecasts regardless of the Third Party Consultant evaluation and the CRB Administration recommendation.

- Presently, the Growth Plan has narrowly defined “single line” forecasts with interval time periods. There is a concern that alignment with the forecast has been too strictly interpreted. The proposed process introduces a variance buffer of 20% to the population and employment forecasts. REF applications within the variance buffer will continue to be processed in accordance with the established REF procedures. However, proposals that fall outside the buffer will be directed to the Board for a final decision regardless of the CRB Administration recommendation.

- It is intended that the 20% forecast variance will be applied to any Growth Plan forecast updates, including forecasts that would include a range. In this regard, the variance percentage will be applied to the top and bottom ends of the range.

- CRB Administration will monitor the implementation of the Population and Employment Forecast Variances process and incorporate any findings into the Growth Plan update.

Attachments:
1. REF Interpretation Guide: Population and Employment Forecast Variances
1. Introduction

The evaluation of a statutory plan or statutory plan amendment includes a review of the impact of the future growth in population and employment proposed by the full implementation of the plan. As required by the REF Ministerial Order, the population and employment forecast in the proposed plan is compared to the municipal forecast in the Growth Plan for consistency.

The purpose of this Interpretive Guide is two-fold: 1) to create a framework for the evaluation of REF applications with forecasts that vary from the Growth Plan; and, 2) to inform municipalities and reviewers on the process and the anticipated content needed to fully evaluate the justification for the forecast variance.

2. Policy Context

The Growth Plan has key objectives to be achieved by its implementation. Section 11 of the CRB Regulation describes the Growth Plan objectives that form the basis for planning towards outcomes that are consistent with Growth Plan principles and policies. In summary the Growth Plan objectives include:

1) the integrated and strategic approach to planning for future growth;
2) development patterns and associated infrastructure investments that complement existing infrastructure and maximize benefits to the Capital Region; and,
3) co-ordination of planning decisions to sustain economic growth and strong, healthy communities.

Population and employment forecasts represent a statistical target to guide planning and to assess performance of the Growth Plan. Individual REF applications with a variance to the population or employment forecast are to be evaluated within this context.
3. REF Process Framework

REF applications will continue to be evaluated by a third party consultant, and CRB Administration will make recommendations to either approve or reject. However, in instances where proposed forecasts vary from the Growth Plan Forecasts in accordance with the criteria outlined below, the REF application and the CRB Administration Recommendation to approve or reject will be referred directly to the Board for final consideration and a decision (see Figure 1).

![Regional Evaluation Framework Review Process](image)

**Figure 1** – Process for REF Proposal that vary from Growth Plan Population and Employment Forecasts

**Population and Employment Forecast Criteria**

Presently, the Growth Plan has narrowly defined “single line” forecasts with interval time periods. As a guideline, a REF application with a 20% variance or more to the average annual change between 2009 and 2044 forecast as per the population and employment forecast tables in the Growth Plan Addendum December 2009 will trigger the need for additional evaluation and direct consideration and decision by the Board. Where plan proposals do not extend the forecast to 2044, the nearest interval time period will be used as the comparative measure.
To illustrate the implementation of the process, the following chart includes examples of forecasts that would and would not trigger the process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>GP 2044</th>
<th>REF 2044</th>
<th>GP ±20%</th>
<th>REF directed to Board for decision?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community A</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>No – Less than 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community B</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>Yes – More than 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community C</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>112,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>No – Less than 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community D</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>Yes – 20% variance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- For Community A the process would not be triggered because the forecast variance is less than 20%.
- For Community B the process would be triggered because the proposed forecast exceeds the Growth Plan Forecast by the 20% variance.
- For Community C the process would not be triggered because the proposed forecast variance does not exceed Growth Plan Forecast by the 20% variance.
- For Community D the process would be triggered because the proposed forecast is 20% or more than the Growth Plan Forecast.

**Future Growth Plan Population and Employment Forecasts**

It is intended that the 20% forecast variance will be applied to any forecast updates, including forecasts that would include a range. In this regard, the percentage will be applied to the top and bottom ends of the range.

**4. REF Submission Content**

Appendix 1 is a guideline with an outline of information that is recommended for submission with the REF application to support the proposed variance. The purpose of the guideline is to assist the applicant municipality in preparing information for the Board’s review. The guideline is provided for information only and submission with the REF application is optional. The applicant municipality is under no obligation to provide the information in the guideline with the REF application.

**5. Growth Plan Update**

It is understood that the Forecast Interpretation Guide will be considered during review of the Growth Plan Update.
Appendix 1

REF SUBMISSION GUIDELINE
Population and Employment Forecast Variances

Applications are treated on a case by case basis within the context of the full implementation of the Growth Plan. Below is a guideline for submitting information that will assist in the evaluation of the application. It is advisable that the applicant municipality contact the CRB Administration prior to submission of the REF application to discuss their particular circumstance and to receive additional guidance regarding the level of detail required. The onus is on the applicant municipality to justify and present the rationale for a forecast variance, including explanations describing local circumstances.

For the Board to understand the forecast variance request and implications of the proposed variance to the Growth Plan Forecast it is recommended that the applicant municipality provide the following discussion in its submission:

1) a description of need and justification for the forecast variance, including a description of the local circumstances and underlying forecast assumptions that may not have been considered at the time the Growth Plan forecast was prepared;
2) a description of impact providing an understanding of the implications for neighbouring municipalities and the Capital Region as a whole; and
3) a description of how the proposed forecast variance will ensure, that on full implementation of the Statutory Plan, the CRB Regulation objectives and Growth Plan principles and policies are achieved.

Below is additional guidance regarding the provision of detailed information in support of the discussion items noted above.

1. Forecast Variance

The information below will provide the essential information to understand the scope of the variance with the Growth Plan Forecast.

1.1 Forecast Variance Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth Plan Forecast (absolute number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Plan Forecast (absolute number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance to the Growth Plan Forecast (absolute number)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent variance to the Growth Plan Forecast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Capacity / Resources

The evaluation should include an analysis of the municipality’s ability to support the additional population and/or employment, the impact to adjacent municipalities and implications for the Capital Region as a whole.

2.1 Land Supply / Demand and Capacity

a) What are the historic land absorption rates or development permits for the municipality and implications for land supply and expected demand over the timeframe of the proposed plan?

b) What are the proposed densities compared to existing densities within the municipality and, if applicable, density targets in the Growth Plan?

c) What is the impact on development footprint?

d) How will the increase in population and/or employment, be accommodated within the municipal / community boundaries?

2.2 Infrastructure

a) Provide confirmation that existing infrastructure is able to support additional population/employment without adding capacity.

b) If additional infrastructure capacity is required, indicate the nature of the additional infrastructure, the impact to adjacent municipalities, including any requirement to upgrade or provide infrastructure (e.g. connections, over-sizing, etc.).

c) What are the implications for other levels of government or agencies to provide infrastructure support and services (i.e. to build transportation infrastructure, upgrade water or sewer capacity, etc.).

2.3 Coordination with adjacent municipalities

a) Describe the efforts to coordinate the provision of hard and soft infrastructure required from adjacent municipalities (i.e. transit, fire protection, education, recreation facilities, sharing of intermunicipal costs, etc.).

b) Is there an IDP or other joint planning agreement with adjacent municipalities? If yes, does the IDP or agreement address the coordination of hard and soft infrastructure?

c) Describe and qualify the benefits of approving the statutory plan to the region.

3. Financial

One of the core objectives of the Growth Plan is the identification of key infrastructure investments that maximize benefits to the region. Assuming an increase in the population
and/or employment forecast, the assessment should include an analysis of costs to support the increase and identify what are the implications from a regional perspective.

a) Estimated costs of the increase in population and/or employment.

b) Estimated costs of the increase in population and/or employment to regional/external partners (ie. highway upgrades, new schools, waste water treatment, etc.)

c) Anticipated funding sources (ie. Developer/municipal/provincial/federal/other).
CRB Committee Structure Review

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approve Option B as outlined in the Committee Structure Review Report, as recommended by the Governance Committee.

Background

- The following motion was approved at the June 13, 2013 Board meeting:

  That the Capital Region Board’s Chief Executive Officer be instructed to review all the Boards’ Committees/Structure with a view to utilize the resources of the Board most efficiently and report back to the Governance Committee with potential recommended changes with a view to come to the Board prior to the Municipal Election, 2013 (for implementation following the election).

- George B. Cuff & Associates Ltd. was engaged to undertake the CRB Committee Structure Review and Mr. Cuff presented his report to the Governance Committee on August 13, 2013 with the above recommendation coming from the Committee.
August 12th 2013
Capital Region Board
#1405 Bell Tower
10104-103 Avenue
Edmonton, Alberta T5J 0H8
Attention: Doug Lagore, CEO

We are pleased to provide our Report on the Review of the CRB’s Committee Structure. Our Review has covered all of the aspects germane to this inquiry and reflects where possible the views/inputs received.

We would be pleased to present the Report to the Governance Committee and Board as requested.

The assistance from the Board members and your own administration which we have received right from the outset of this Review has been greatly appreciated.

Thank you for the opportunity to work on this important engagement.

Yours Very Truly,

George B Cuff, FCMC
President

c.c. Ken Hoffman, CA, Senior Associate
    Jeff Nixon, B. Comm., Associate
1.0 Background

The question as to the genesis of the Capital Region Board could be answered in various ways depending on who was being asked and in what context. The need for regional cooperation has long been discussed and has resulted in various attempts under a variety of umbrellas, both informal and formal. Regional planning was formalized in 1963 across much of the urbanized areas of the Province and included the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission. The ERPC was replaced by a later iteration the Edmonton Metropolitan Regional Planning Commission (1981) wherein the then regional boundaries were tightened and which also resulted in the creation of the then Yellowhead Regional Planning Commission.

As well, discussions regarding the annexation of the industrial core of Strathcona County led to a number of meetings regarding regional cooperation in the late 1970s and early 80s. Increased development pressures also led to discussions about the need for a regional water and sewer strategy during that same time frame which reflected serious divisions in the vision for the region. At a later date, about the mid-1980s, an Edmonton Regional Mayors Committee was formed, soon to be replaced by a Northern Alberta Mayors Caucus. With the dissolution of regional planning commissions in 1995 the notion of regional cooperation and any formal approach was set aside for several years. However, a new voluntary inter-municipal agency called the Capital Region Forum was initiated which ran into many of the same issues and obstacles resulting in its dissolution in 1997. It was also replaced by the Alberta Capital Region Alliance (ACRA) which says something about either the undeniable need for regional cooperation or at least the dogged determination of some to have a degree of formalized cooperation in the Capital region.

After a period of very little perceived progress regarding regional cooperation the Province initiated a major review under the guidance of former Provincial Treasurer Lou Hyndman who authored a report “An Agenda for Action” in December 2000. As the Report recommended voluntary buy-in to a formalized regional structure, its main messages fell on what were perceived as deaf ears although ACRA carried on in its attempts to move forward a regional agenda. It managed to make good progress on
several fronts while still being handicapped by less than unanimous support from all quarters.

1.1 The Radke Report
That subsequently led to an updated regional report (“Working Together: Report of the Capital Region Integrated Growth Management Plan Project Team”) under the guidance of former Deputy Minister Doug Radke in December 2007. This Report commissioned under the then Premier Stelmach provided some real impetus for action through a series of focused recommendations:

“1. Establish the first Board for the Capital Region effective January 2008.
2. Provide the necessary start-up funding and operational support for the first three years of the Board’s operations. That should include support for a portion of the costs of developing an integrated regional plan for the Capital Region, which should be in place by January 2010.
3. Adopt and legislate the governance model recommended in this report including the specific roles and functions, authority of the Board, voting model, the cost sharing approach, and the dispute resolution process.
4. Implement the key steps outlined in the transition section of this report.
5. Address and resolve the provincial issues identified in this report including providing a ten year provincial roads and highways plan, resolving the issue of responsibility for ambulance services, and addressing the critical issue of use of water for proposed upgraders in the Industrial Heartland.
6. Given the significant returns that could be received by the federal government as a result of economic activity in the region, the Province should engage in serious dialogue with the federal government to ensure that this fact is addressed in future federal infrastructure funding programs.”

1.2 Terms of Reference Approved
The Province of Alberta through a press release dated June 12th 2007 announced that:

- Terms of reference for a Capital Region Integrated Growth Plan were approved and the Plan was to be completed by January 2008
- The terms of reference would allow the 24 municipalities in the Capital Region and the Industrial Heartland to develop a long term, integrated management plan to support economic growth, with particular attention to the economic, social and environmental impacts on all residents of the region
• Cooperation between the 24 regional municipalities was key to efficient, cost-effective delivery of services
• There was approximately $46 billion in construction projects planned, recently completed or underway in the Capital Region; demands for public sector infrastructure were expected to be in the billions; meeting those requirements would require concerted and co-ordinated effort from municipal, provincial and federal governments as well as industry to minimize the impact on taxpayers.

1.3 Scope of the Region

As the Radke Report pointed out, the region is large and as a result carries considerable clout:

“Together, the Capital Region encompasses over 1.2 million hectares (close to 12,400 square kilometres) and is home to 1.05 million people. The 25 municipalities in the region include Edmonton - with over 70 percent of the population - combined with four smaller cities, five counties (one of which is a specialized municipality), eleven towns, and four villages. The geographical region also includes another twelve small urban municipalities (mostly summer villages), several hamlets, three First Nation reserves and a major military base. A significant portion of the Capital Region’s heavy industrial and petrochemical facilities is located in the municipalities outside of Edmonton. In the recent past, much of the growth in the region has also occurred outside of the City of Edmonton.”

That Report also expresses the view that the region encompasses much more than what has been described as the CRB mandate emanating from the Growth Plan.

“In addition to the various municipalities and their elected Councils, the Capital Region also includes a regional airports authority, the Greater Edmonton Economic Development Team, a regional sewage commission, and five regional water service commissions. A number of sub-regional arrangements are in place covering solid waste management, recreation, the river valley, water systems, libraries, and emergency response services authorities outside of Edmonton. School authorities are not regional, although some consolidation did take place in the mid 1990s. The region includes ten postsecondary institutions serving not only students in the region but from across the province and around the world. Capital Health provides health services to most of the Capital Region. A number of other voluntary cooperative arrangements exist, including a regional chamber of commerce.”
1.4 The Regulation

The Alberta Government (as represented in this matter by Municipal Affairs) established the Capital Region Board (CRB) by Regulation under the Municipal Government Act on April 15, 2008. The first task of the Board was to develop a Growth Plan. The Plan was completed in March 2009 and referred to the Province for its review. It was sent back to the CRB with a request for some changes and was then subsequently approved by the Province on March 11th 2010.

1.5 Current Committee Structure

The current committee structure, in part, reflects key areas of focus set out in the Plan. Currently the CRB has five standing committees. Two of these are focused on governance-related activities and the other three on areas as set out in the Plan. In addition, one sub-committee has been established under a standing committee. The current committees are:

- Governance
- Advocacy and Communication
  - Regional Energy Infrastructure sub-committee
- Land Use
  - GIS
- Regional Transit
- Housing

The Board established four standing committees in the development of the Growth Plan and in 2010 following the approval of the Growth Plan established a Governance and Advocacy and Communications Committee. In 2011, the Board approved dissolution of the GIS Committee and approved Land Use Committee oversight responsibility for GIS. The Regional Energy Committee was established in 2013 to continue to specifically address issues affecting market access for regional energy resources.

2.0 Terms of Reference

The terms of reference for this project were established in a recommendation by the CEO to the Board which resulted in the following motion:
“**Motion:** That the Capital Region Board’s Chief Executive Officer be instructed to review all the Boards’ Committees/Structure with a view to utilize the resources of the Board most efficiently and report back to the Governance Committee with potential recommended changes which will be reviewed by the current Board prior to the Municipal Election, 2013.

The primary purpose of this project is **to review the current Board and committee structure**, and develop recommendations for review and feedback by the Governance Committee in August 2013 followed by the Board on September 12th 2013. The intent of the recommendations will be to utilize the resources of the Board and CRB administration in the most efficient manner possible and complement the governance model.”

### 3.0 Our Process

To undertake the review of the Capital Region Board Committee structure, the services of George B. Cuff and Associates Ltd. were retained to provide an assessment of the Board’s current committees and recommend potential changes to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Board.

In conforming to the requirements of the Review, we undertook the following processes:

- Reviewed the request with the CEO
- Requested and received background documentation
- Established interviews
- Met with the senior staff of the CRB
- Conducted individual interviews with all Board members
- Attended two committee meetings
- Interviewed the Province of Alberta representative to the Board
- Interviewed the Board’s original chair
- Reviewed extensive background materials
- Sought clarification on various issues from CRB staff members
- Developed this Report.
4.0 A Summary of the Interview Comments

We believe that there is value in trying to provide some context to what follows by also outlining in a cryptic summary from what we heard during the course of this engagement. As a result, we have drafted a brief summary of the themes that we heard in response to the questions asked. The more complete summary of comments is provided in Appendix A. The actual wording of the commentary (both this brief summary as well as the more complete account in the Appendices) is ours but in all instances they are built on the comments we received:

- There was a general sentiment that the committees have added real value to the Board’s governance processes; while that (along with most other comments) was not unanimous it was clearly the overwhelming reflection of views received; some pointed to the impending municipal elections as adding a degree of tension to the discussions
- The intangible values of being at the table were frequently cited as being of sufficient merit to support the continuance of some model that ensured the key issues were being discussed
- A number of questions were asked by both large and small communities as to the continued relevance of membership by the very small communities
- A fundamental question relative to the requirements placed on Board and committee members to place CRB focus ahead of their own local commitments and biases has not been fully understood or addressed
- In addition to the predictable large-small, rural-urban, power of Edmonton splits and angst there was some degree of question relative to the role of the CRB being expanded to address other related issues; some argued that the role is sufficiently broad as is; others felt that the committee system did not cover all the salient issues
- The objectives of the Province for the CRB and how that impacts the committee system came up; members felt that this discussion needs to occur
- Committee functioning (terms of reference, role of chairs, meeting processes) were viewed as workable but could be enhanced
• Trust, turf wars, understanding the Growth Plan and lack of a Board-endorsed strategic plan cited as the biggest inhibitors to moving forward
• There was some sense that meeting frequency and completion of agenda issues has resulted in the committees losing some of their energy/focus
• Others voiced the view that the next orientation (following the election) would be critical to future success; would be a number of new faces
• Work of the administration generally seen as a positive; committee members recognize that there has been a lot of pressure on staff due to number of issues, reports expected and relatively few staff to do the work.

5.0 Legal Basis
The legal basis of the CRB lies in Regulation 38/2012. It provides a description of the powers of the CRB and how those powers are to be determined. It does assert that only the Board can delegate any of its powers and duties but that only the Board can do certain things (Section 7) as follows:

(1) Subject to subsection (2), the Capital Region Board may delegate any of its powers, duties or functions under this Regulation to another person.

(2) The Capital Region Board may not delegate
   (a) the power to make bylaws;
   (b) the power to borrow money;
   (c) the power to adopt budgets;
   (d) the power to approve financial statements.

6.0 CRB Objectives/Business Plan

6.1 Process
The CRB objectives are developed on an annual basis by the Board and administration through the following process:
• The administration prepares an annual Business Plan in consultation with the committees to fit the available project funding envelope and then presents the overall plan to the Governance Committee
The Governance Committee then presents the Business Plan to the Board for approval (There is no strategic planning done by the Board as a whole).

6.2 Objectives

- The objectives for 2013 include a number of specific projects being addressed by the standing committees to support different aspects of implementation of the Growth Plan:
  - Regional Energy Corridors Study
  - Transportation Master Plan Prioritization
  - Transit Governance Study
  - Capital Region Growth Plan Update
  - Advocacy & Communications Strategy
  - Sub-Regional Housing Assessment
  - Integrated Inter-municipal Planning Framework

These objectives impact the Board’s governance model and business plan in the following ways:

- The Regional Energy Corridors Study has been referred to the Land Use Committee
- The Transportation Master Plan Prioritization has been referred to the Land Use Committee
- The Transit Governance Study has been referred to the Transit Committee
- The Capital Region Growth Plan Update has been referred to the Governance Committee
- The Sub-Regional Housing Assessment has been referred to the Housing Committee
- The Advocacy & Communications Strategy is being led by the Advocacy & Communications Committee on behalf of the Board.
- The Integrated Inter-municipal Planning Framework was initiated by the Land Use Committee with the intent to develop a strategy to provide direction to the members on how to approach planning from a regional perspective.

The Business Plan is one of the tools used by the Board’s to monitor the progress of the implementation of the growth plan. The development of a 3 year business plan is also a legislative requirement of the Province to support ongoing funding of the Board and its operations. The Plan has been established largely through the work of the CRB
administration in consultation with its committees to identify implementation priorities identified in the respective plans that make up the Growth Plan.

7.0 Current Governance Structure

Every board-governed organization exists within a governance system which impacts how decisions are made. In some organizations, the impact is almost immediate and is clearly discernible. As a general rule, and in most board-governed systems, committees are established by the board and are provided certain terms of reference; they tackle issues within their sphere of influence and recommend strategies or solutions; the board receives and reviews the input; and in many instances, the board accepts the advice as presented or with some degree of change.

Further, and on an ongoing basis, the governance model is normally impacted by the board’s strategic direction as it attempts to drive forward the “agenda” or mandate as it is understood. One of the ways this happens is to ensure that the broader agenda issues are lodged within the mandate of one or more committees, likely with some oversight by a “senior” executive committee. In effect, a Board governs through its resolutions, policies and bylaws which are influenced by whatever decision-making (i.e. governance) structure it establishes.

7.1 Assessment Criteria

In this instance, the governance structure of the CRB is affirmed by the Board and may be changed by the Board. (Such authority is common to a governing body). In our view, the governance model (the committee structure being a part of it) ought to be assessed and if necessary changed based on:

> Is the Board assured of the comprehensiveness and independence of the inputs into its decisions?
> Does the Board have confidence that its decisions reflect the best available information and its own understanding of those issues?
> Does the governance model enable or frustrate the Board in terms of the decisions to be made?
If committees or task forces are established are these providing a worthwhile purpose and are they adding to the clarity of Board decisions? Have these been regularly and purposely assessed as to their “value-added”?

Is the Board’s “agenda” being furthered by the committees/task forces (i.e. the governance model) or hindered by it?

Does the Board effectively guide the committee responsibilities and processes in any meaningful manner?

7.2 Current Structure

As we understand it, the CRB decision-making model features:

- Five standing committees (Governance, Housing, Land Use, Transit, Advocacy & Communications)
- One sub-committee (Energy)
- CAO Advisory Committee
- Four Advisory/Working Committees
  - Housing Advisory Working Committee (Housing)
  - Planning Advisory Group (Land Use)
  - Geographic Information Services Advisory Group (Land Use)
  - Transit Advisory Group (Transit).

7.3 Standing Committees

The current governance structure reflects five standing committees which report directly to the Board and four advisory/administrative committees which report to their respective standing committees. In each instance these committees have met and believe that they have accomplished certain objectives. The standing committees were also asked for input as to each committee’s current projects for the year and what future projects they would anticipate as indicated through the Business Plan. These are outlined as follows:

Regional Housing Committee

a) Committee Accomplishments

Previous work and studies completed through the Regional Housing Committee:

- The Capital Region Housing Plan: Strategy and Implementation Plan
Review of Committee System (Capital Region Board)

- 2011 Regional Housing Symposium - Encouraged a broader mix of housing, and increased residential density within the Region
- 2012 Regional Housing Symposium - Examined the transformational potential of infill housing
- Housing Education and Awareness Program: Communications and Marketing Plan
- Our Affordable Future: Market Affordable Housing Policy Framework report
- Sub-regional planning model: Environmental scan report
  
  b) Current Projects
  - Sub-regional Planning Model: assessment framework and reporting
  - Implementation of Our Affordable Future report recommendations
  - 2014 Regional Housing Symposium
  
  c) Future Projects - per the Business Plan
  - Sub-regional planning model: planning process/ framework and implementation
  - Affordable Housing education and awareness strategy - development and implementation
  - Alternative funding model for Affordable Housing
  - Regional housing policy development to address legislative gaps

- Land Use Committee
  
  a) Committee Accomplishments

  Previous work and studies completed through the Land Use Committee:
  - The Capital Region Land Use Plan
  - Municipal Planning Toolkit
  - Integrated Regional Transportation Systems Study
  - Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan
  - Review of Regional Evaluation Framework Administration Report
  - Integrated Regional Housing and Land Use Policy Framework and Implementation Plan
  - Capital Region Geographic Information Services Spatial Data Demonstration Project
  - Land Use Plan +5 Year Review Process
  
  b) Projects currently underway:
  - GIS - *Incremental implementation of the Capital Region Geographic Information Services in support of the Growth Plan Update.*
• **Regional Energy Corridors Study** - The purpose of the Regional Energy Corridors Study is to define a framework for accommodating Regional Energy Corridors within the Capital Region.

• **Integrated Intermunicipal Planning Framework** - Development of a regional planning framework that promotes and supports integrated regional intermunicipal planning, coordination, and cooperation in the context of the policies and principles of the Capital Region Land Use Plan.

• **Implementation of the Review of Regional Evaluation Framework Administration Report Recommendations** - the Land Use Committee is being kept informed as to the status of the implementation of the report’s recommendations.

• **Prioritization of Transportation Master Plan** - Review and development of a three year capital transportation plan list of priorities based on the Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan.

### Future Projects per the Business Plan

- Implementation of the Land Use Plan +5 Year Review Process in coordination with the Growth Plan Update (2014)
- Regional Infrastructure Corridors Study (2014)
- Regional Recreation Corridors Study (2014)
- Municipal Planning Toolkit Update (2014)

### Regional Transit Committee

#### Committee Accomplishments

Previous work and studies completed through the Regional Transit Committee:

- The Capital Region Intermunicipal Transit Network Plan
- Regional Transit Services Standards
- 30 Year Transit Service Plan
- Integrated Regional Fare Strategy and Implementation Plan
- Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan
- Intermunicipal Transit Governance Study and Implementation Plan - Interim Report
- GreenTRIP Program - Regional Prioritization

Projects currently underway:

- Transit Governance Study - To be completed in March 2014. This project will examine the feasibility and merits of forming a regional transit commission. Green TRIP Project Prioritization - To be completed in September (for Board Approval-
September 2013). This work is being completed by the Transit Advisory Group, TransitExecutive and CRB administration and will result in a new list of regional transit capital projects.

- **Transit Regional Fare Strategy** - while the project has been completed. The three operators are working together on the procurement of the smart fare technology. The Transit Committee is being kept informed on the progress.

- **Provincial Bus Modernization Policy** - the Transit Committee is being kept informed through the three operators as to the status of any implementation issues. In the past CRB administration has been involved to represent the Transit Committee at some meetings with Alberta Transportation.

- **Transit Executive**

**Future Projects per the Business Plan**

- **Next Phase of Work for Transit Governance - 5 year Business Plan and Service Plan (2014)**
- **Specialized Transit Service (2015)**

❖ **Advocacy & Communications Committee**

**Committee Accomplishments**

**Previous activities completed through the Advocacy and Communications Committee:**

- Board Advocacy Strategy
- CRB Presentations to the Edmonton Area Federal and Provincial Caucus’
- Communications materials: key messages and presentations for the Board
- 2013-2016 Advocacy & Communications Strategic Plan

**Projects currently underway:**

- Implementation of the 2013-2016 Advocacy & Communications Strategic Plan

**Future Projects per the Business Plan**

- **Annual update of Advocacy & Communications Strategic Plan**

❖ **Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee** (Previously Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee)

**Committee Accomplishments**

- Developed a Committee strategy
- Background document and key messages for the Northern Gateway Pipeline Project
- Communications documents: fact sheet, brochure, and executive presentation
• Various outreach and advocacy activities with the media, provincial and federal governments, BC municipalities, FCM and AUMA

Projects currently underway:
• Inventory of Regional Energy Infrastructure within the region
• Development of a strategic focus and work plan for the sub-committee

Future Projects per the Business Plan
• To be determined

7.4 Advisory Committees

To support the board standing committees four Technical advisory committees made up of regional staff have been established and a CAO committee is in place.

7.4.1 Administrative Advisory Committees

The four (4) administrative advisory committees are:
- Housing Advisory Working Committee (Housing)
- Planning Advisory Group (Land Use)
- Geographic Information Services Advisory Group (Land Use)
- Transit Advisory Group (Transit).

While our comments follow relative to observations on all CRB committees there seems to be some consensus that the foregoing committees have added value and ought to be sustained as venues for administrative input.

7.4.2 CAO Committee

The Region has reached out to the CAOs of the various municipalities to seek their representation and input on various themes. For example, the need to update the Growth Plan has led to the formation of an advisory CAO committee as follows:

Role of CAO Advisory Committee

Mandate
This committee exists to provide advice and strategic guidance for the overall development of the update to the CRGP, at the request of the CRB Chief Executive Officer. This committee has no independent decision making powers or authority. This committee will provide direction to the project terms of reference and project work plan based on the scope and direction determined by the Advisory Committee. This committee will review the final report and supporting documents for completeness and to ensure and project goals have been met. Review and comment
of the implementation plan and provide advice on the communication of the plan, following the approval of the plan by the Province.

The Advisory Committee membership includes 2 Cities, 2 Counties, 2 Towns, 2 Villages and Edmonton. It is expected that the members will make every effort to consult with their peers to ensure the project is inclusive of the Region.

7.5 Committee Charters

Each of the committees is guided by a “charter” or at minimum terms of reference. The information provided indicates that the standing committees were advised of:

- **The background and rationale: how did this committee come into being; what caused the CRB to establish it?**
- **The fact that the committee reports to the Board**
- **The mandate of the committee**
- **Committee composition/membership**
- **Role of the CRB administration**
- **Chair and CEO of the Board being ex officio to the committee**
- **Committee will be supported by the Chief Executive Officer, Capital Region Board staff and consultant resources, and others as determined through the Board’s annual Business Plan and budget development as approved and allocated by the Capital Region Board**
- **At request of the Committee, the CEO may establish a working and or advisory group as deemed necessary to support the Committee**
- **Committee may appoint a sub-committee(s) to focus on areas of priority**
- **How a chair and vice-chair of the committee are chosen**
- **The Board will approve which municipalities will be members of the Advocacy & Communications Committee at its initial meeting following a municipal election**
- **Terms of members; right of member municipalities to appoint their members**
- **The Chair of the Advocacy & Communications Committee responsible for representing the views of the Committee at Board meetings and to other Board committees**
- **Meetings will be held monthly, with additional meetings convened, rescheduled or cancelled as determined by the Chair**
- **Agendas will be determined by the Committee Chair based on delegation of the Board, outstanding committee motions, decisions, bring forward items as well as the**
relevance of potential topics to the Committee’s mandate, Board’s Business Plan, and consistency with the intent of the overall mandate identified for this Committee

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

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

- 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

- 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

- Chair of the Advocacy & Communications Committee will approve requests to make representations to the Committee if they believe the presentation content will assist the Committee in its deliberations

- A quorum of voting members (fifty percent plus one) which includes designated Committee alternates is required for a valid vote on motions

- Only elected officials that are designated as voting members of this Committee, or their designated alternate, may vote.

- Notices of motion are not required at the Advocacy & Communications Committee

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

- Committees have no final decision making authority. All policy decisions arising from Committees must be reviewed and approved by the Capital Region Board

- Committee may consider changes to the Terms of Reference and recommend the proposed changes to the Board for review and approval
Committee will advise the Board of key activities and progress regularly, primarily at Board meetings.

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.

The descriptions (i.e. charters) provided relative to each standing committee are comprehensive and useful. We note that any such charters ought to be reassessed by the Board on an annual basis to ensure that the expected mandate is being followed and the committee is adding the value expected.

### 7.6 Committee and Board Results

We have reviewed the Board and committee minutes for the period of July 2011 to July 2013. We arbitrarily chose a two year window and recorded from your minutes the type of issues being discussed and actioned at these meetings. While motions do not always capture the flavour or intensity of debate and discussion they do give an accurate account of what items actually moved forward. Our “research” reflects the following activity by committee (we have summarized to reflect the flavor of the meetings as opposed to all of the actual motions and Board response):

- **Governance Committee**
  - Business Planning and Budgeting
  - Work Plan Projects
  - MDP Report/Compliance with Growth Plan
  - Allocation of Funding
  - CRB Scorecard
  - CRB Organizational Chart
  - Financial Reporting
  - Monitoring and Reporting Framework
  - Auditing Services
  - Economic Roadmap Discussion/Presentations
  - Cost Sharing Formula
  - CRB Meeting Procedure Review
Committee Structure Review

CRB Interim Chair/Chair Selection/Appointment

Submission of CRB Approved Plans to Province

Terms of Councillors/Mayors

Vision and Long Term Funding Strategy

Terms of Reference Review

Annual Reports

Voting Structure

Responses to Requests for Interest

Policy Review and Approval

Recruitment of CRB Chief Executive Officer

FOIPP and MGA Requirements for CRB Committee Meetings

Small Municipality Funding/Issues

New Member/CAO workshop

Population & Employment Forecast/Projection Models

Fiscal Year End Change

Growth Plan Update

FCM Update

Alternative REF Process

Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee

Advocacy and Communications Committee

Advocacy Priorities of CRB Committees

AUMA Advocacy

Advocacy Toolkit

Advocacy & Communications Strategy

Work Plan Projects

Business Planning

Committee Chair/Vice Chair Appointments

Committee Remuneration

Committee Meeting Schedule

Committee Membership
Review of Committee System (Capital Region Board)

- Terms of Reference Review
- Council Briefings and Economic Roadmap
- FCM Resolution/Regional Organizations Gathering
- Housing Committee Marketing and Communications Program
- Key Messages
- Leduc Intermunicipal Bus Service
- Long-Term Funding Strategy
- MGA Meeting Requirements
- Ministerial Meetings/Requests/Updates
- Pipeline Linkages - CRB Committee Strategy
- Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee Travel Request
- Provincial Budget (2011)
- Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee Terms of Reference
- 2013 - 2016 Advocacy and Strategic Plan
- St. Alberta Transit Centre and Park and Ride

➢ Transit Committee
  - 30 Year Transit Service Plan
  - Regional Transit Governance Study
  - Regional Fare Strategy and Implementation Plan
  - Intermunicipal Transit Governance Study & Implementation Plan
  - Bus Modernization Regulation
  - Committee/Board priorities
  - Committee Meeting Schedule
  - Terms of Reference Review
  - GreenTRIP Program/Projects
  - Committee Chair/Vice Chair Appointments
  - FCM Resolution

➢ Land Use Committee
  - Advisory Group Reports
  - Outer Regional Ring Road
  - Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan
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- Integrated Land Use and Affordable Housing Policy Framework and Implementation Plan
- Business Planning
- Land Use Framework
- North Saskatchewan Regional Plan (NSRP)
- Regional Advisory Council (RAC)
- North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance
- Review REF Administration - Terms of Reference
- Capital Region Board GIS Plan Presentation
- Work Plan Projects
- Proposed Parkland County Amendment to the Growth Plan
- Capital Region Air Quality Management Framework
- Confirmation/Appointment of Committee Chair/Vice Chair
- Capital Region Growth Plan Review Process
- Integrated Land Use And Affordable Housing Policy Framework
- Land Use Plan +5 Year Review Process
- Regional Energy Corridors Study Terms of Reference
- CRGIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project
- Wagner Natural Area Society and Big Lake Environment Support Society
- Goods Movement Strategy Presentation (City of Edmonton)
- Regional Energy Corridors Study
- Intermunicipal Planning Framework
- CCRA Policy Clarification

➢ Housing Committee
  - Sub Regional Planning Model/ Alternate Funding Models
  - Information & Awareness Program - Marketing & Communications Strategy
  - Integrated Land Use and Affordable Housing Policy Framework
  - Capital Region Housing Symposium
  - Business Planning - Priorities
  - Purchasing Ability of Households (Regional)
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- Sub Regional Non-Market Housing Governance Models Study & Recommendations
- GOA Organizational Changes and Committee Impacts
- Community Plan - Homeward Trust
- Confirmation/Appointment of Committee Chair/Vice Chair
- New Committee Members
- Integrated Land Use and Affordable Housing Advisory Committee
- Terms of Reference Review
- Regional Housing Progress Report and Regional Housing Issues Discussion
- Industry Representation
- “Our Affordable Future”

- GIS Committee
  - Overview of GIS Systems Across the Region
  - Available Technology Review
  - Short Term and Long Term Recommendations for Minimum Standards
  - Glossary of Common Terms
  - FOIP Implications
  - Vision and Guiding Principles (incl. workshop)
  - Work Plan and Next Steps for Building the GIS Plan
  - CR Ortho Photography Initiative
  - Lessons Learned from a Successful Multijurisdictional Geospatial Collaborative (Twin Cities GIS Collaborative)
  - Governance Model
  - GIS Plan Outline, Plan and Work Plan Priorities
  - Capital Region Growth Plan Provincial Response
  - Terms of Reference Review
  - International GIS Day
  - Re-naming of Committee, Sub-Committees
  - Review RFPs for Consulting Services
  - City of Edmonton Open Data Strategy
  - Business Planning
Alberta Industrial Heartland GIS Presentation
  - Merged with Land Use Committee in November 2010

➢ Energy Sub-Committee
  - Created from Pipeline Linkages Strategies Committees
    - PLSC Approved by Board in 2011
    - Primary Focus - Northern Gateway Pipeline Project
    - Active December 2011 - January 2013
  - Board Approved TOR May 2013 (Under Advocacy & Communications)
    - Same membership, Chairman and Vice-Chairman as the PLSC
    - Broader, energy related mandate
    - Met once in June 2013 where the following was covered:
      - 2013 Sub-Committee Strategy and Work Plan
      - Enbridge Invitation: Video Conference Outreach Opportunity with BC Municipality Burns Lake
      - FCM Resolution: Building Canada’s Energy Value Chain Economy
      - Invitation to speak at the Northern Alberta Mayors Meeting June 21 (Rutherford Room, Sutton Place Hotel, Edmonton)

7.7 Our Assessment of Committees

Any assessment of a committee/governance system needs to be based on some clear principles or “yard-markers” which set out the basis on which sound judgment can be made. While what follows is not intended as a precise form of measurement, these descriptors/principles can be utilized based on our experience in examining boards and committees in other contexts.

- Clarity of mandate and authority
  - The mandate of any committee needs to be properly and fully described or it will soon outreach what the formers of the committee had in mind.
  - Its authority to advise the Board, make decisions on its own, meet independently with key officials, speak to the media, spend funds, direct consultants should also be described in some depth.

- Clarity of goals, priorities
Each committee ought to be guided by the Board’s strategic plan and its own sense of priorities. That is, what the committee undertakes ought to be linked to what the Board sees as its broader mission.

Committee goals and priorities should flow from the broader mandate in order for there to be consistency and cohesion.

- **Orientation/briefing**
  - Committee members hope to be able to add value as soon as they are appointed to a committee. If that has any hope of happening, the administrative leadership and the Board has to build in a thorough orientation designed to outline expectations, rules of procedure, protocols, expected results, etc.

- **Rules of Procedure Clear to All**
  - The rules governing committee meetings ought to parallel those for a Board meeting where relevant.
  - The rules ought to enable the committee to function responsibly and effectively and thus the rules ought to be designed by the Board for the committees.

- **Comprehensive, sound & transparent processes**
  - The committee way of doing business should enable each member to identify where the process is at and how an intervention could be made.
  - The reporting process of the administration or its agents should be understandable and consistent.

- **Agenda Building**
  - The responsibility for building the agenda should be made clear to all committee members. That should involve the Chair and Vice-Chair of the committee together with the senior administration attached to that committee.

- **Full Disclosure of Relevant Information**
  - All reports coming to the committee should be clear, comprehensive and concise. There should not be any deliberate attempt to hide critical information from the committee.
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- All relevant information is to be made available to the committee in its agenda packages. New material at the committee meeting should only be accepted with reluctance.

  - Focus on Results
    - The committee exists because it has a mandate; it is expected to deliver on that mandate and report at the end of each year as to the progress made.

  - Accountability
    - The committee is established as an advisory body to the Board. That is the sum of its allegiance.

  - Policy Orientation
    - The focus of the committee should not be on how the administration gets its work done and how interesting that is (which it may well be) but rather on what solid policy advice the committee can present to the Board.

  - Focus on the Good of the Whole
    - Committee work is or should be designed in such a way that the “good of the whole” is what is paramount. That is, there should be no attempt within a committee discussion to favour one party over another.

  - Mandated Turnover of Membership
    - Every committee needs to be refreshed from time to time. New ideas are far more likely to come out of fresh faces that approach familiar topics and themes with inquiring minds.
    - The turnover might, for example, be at the conclusion of two years thereby permitting two different representatives to add their value during the course of any term.

  - Advice Expected by Board
    - Any committee will lose heart if it is not consulted on matters within its jurisdiction. While the Board in its wisdom may determine to not accept the advice of a committee that it has created, it would be most unwise for the Board not to ask for the advice.
• Input of Administration Valued (trust relationship to CEO & direct reports)
  o Committee members benefit from a close relationship with its administrative resources which is based on common respect. The professionalism of the administration and any external consultants should be appreciated even when not accepted.

• Input of Outside Others Welcomed
  o Sometimes a committee may feel it would be useful to seek the advice of experts external to the administration or to usual consulting resources. These folks might come from the academic world or industry and will be of some value provided that the request for advice is clear.

• Independence of the Committee
  o The committee members are expected to see themselves as independent from outside influence and able to think for themselves.

• Add Value
  o The problem with many committees is not in establishing them; it lies in getting rid of them! Some just seem to take on a life of their own: the attitude may become one of “we have been established and therefore we shall always continue”. That may be the case in some instances but will eventually result in frustration and a sense of “spinning the wheels”. Creating a sunset clause is preferable.

• Appreciation
  o The Board would be wise to at least annually extend its formal appreciation for the able work of those serving on its committees.

7.8 Some Overview Comments

7.8.1 At the Table

The number of those attending committee meetings is a factor of several things:
  o The size of the Board
  o The variety of the issues
  o The significance of those issues to a particular community
  o Availability to attend
  o The fear as to what might happen if “my” community is not there
Compensation (both positively and negatively).

The Board is comprised of 24 members which reflects the following make-up:

- 5 cities
- 1 Specialized Municipality
- 4 counties
- 11 towns
- 3 villages.

The population disparity between these communities is quite remarkable. This ranges from that of the City of Edmonton (approximately 840,000) to the village of Wabamum (about 680). While there is some comfort in size there has also been questions raised regarding the degree of input from the very small communities and the potential impact or advantage of membership to such communities which are a distance from the inner core. Some of the issues may not be of any interest to a small municipality other than the impact on its residents should they drive into the City of Edmonton or access services on one of the surrounding communities.

The concerns related to size and variable impact on some of the smaller members of the CRB have led to the executive considering a review of membership. Given that the original 25 member (now 24) CRB was assembled in 2008 and with the passage of time and the expressed desire for opting out by one of the smaller communities, it may be time to review whether or not the Region’s membership ought to be adjusted.

There has also been some concern voiced that considerable time has been spent dealing with the criticism of projects from small communities who may in fact not be in the circle of potential influence by that particular project. This is in part because issues at the table do not have anything to do with them. It was noted that if they choose not to attend or abstain then they are counted as a positive vote for any motion. They therefore attend and may well vote against a motion rather than be forced be considered as supporting a motion. In one case the municipality has written a letter to the Minster asking to be removed from the CRB.
7.8.2 What Allegiance?

We were advised that CRB members may vote based on what is best for their municipality interest rather than what is best for the Region. Also, some members vote often in the negative if they see no value or gain to their municipality. This mindset is at odds with the fiduciary duty owed to the CRB once a member has been appointed. The CRB is not an extension of the local municipality. It is a distinct legal entity which has been created by Provincial legislation. The members who are appointed to this body owe their allegiance, while sitting on it and while in session, to this body. The premise is that all appointed members will seek to do their best in serving the agency to which they have been appointed regardless of their obvious allegiance to the sending municipality.

This is a delicate matter and requires considerable maturity of judgment. It would be impossible to expect a locally-elected Councillor to set aside his/her views as crafted and influenced by their experience serving on a local council. Discussions are held locally and in some instances a policy or resolution on an issue might have been passed. Is the local representative directed by that resolution or can he/she be expected to be independent in their thinking taking into consideration the discussions at the Board table and the input of the Board’s administration. Are the committees truly independent or are they tools/instruments of the sending municipalities?

It is our view that there is a fiduciary duty to the body (in this instance the CRB) to which the Council representative has been appointed. This duty supersedes that of any other legal obligation (a position that should be verified with CRB’s legal counsel). The idea is that the fiduciary duty owed requires that the director always be acting with that corporation’s interests at the forefront of his or her mind. Thus, by definition, the director cannot have the best interests of the municipality in mind at any vote, discussion or other involvement in matters related to that society or corporation.

7.8.3 Progress Being Made

When one looks at the governance framework of any organization it should essentially reveal what the directors feel are the important issues to be addressed in order to move forward the business of the organization. That is, the governance framework
ought to enhance the final decision-making process so that the ultimate decision-makers are assured that the key issues have been adequately addressed and that the “agenda” of the organization is being respected. Committees ought not to exist because they always have nor should they be utilized from a governance perspective in order to become more familiar with the day to day activities of the administration. Committees need to add value. While there are advantages to simply meeting (for example, increased understanding of the issues and each other) the momentum of a committee quickly fades if little to no observable progress is being made. Committees are expected to add clarity to the key issues; to probe in sufficient depth so that greater understanding of potential progress is shared; to address troublesome questions which will arise at some juncture if not asked at this level; to draw everyone up to a common ground such that when the final debate begins, the issue is one of “where do we see ourselves making progress towards our objectives?”

We understand that there is also some value in simply being on a committee. Depending on the size of municipality and its access to professional resources, those in attendance at regional committees often come away impressed by the ready access to bright people who possess expertise far in excess of anything they might have access to locally. This is not a criticism of local talent: simply an honest assessment that the local CAO and office staff are generally hired based on their breadth as administrators and thus are not expected to have the in-depth expertise that a highly skilled engineering or planning consultant would have on particular issues of concern to the CRB. Further, the presence on the committee of members of other Councils who come at issues from their own experience (and Council backgrounds) adds considerable value to the degree of understanding of the committee members. In other words, as one of the CRB members articulated “I always come away from such meetings really impressed by the seriousness and quality of the debate”.

The general assessment of CRB members weighted heavily in favour of the work of the committees. Most were of the opinion that the CRB would have not made the progress it has without some form of “extra-Board” activity, such as the current committee system. This general belief was based on the perception that the number and complexity of issues augurs in favour of some process which breaks down the issues
into more manageable bites. Further, there is also some disparity in terms of what each representative knows about the issues and that before these are moved forward to the Board, talking them through has allowed to a degree more comfort in mutual understanding.

### 7.8.4 Scope of Committees

The committees are not all the same in our view. The largest one (Land Use) has a disproportionate impact on the Board agenda based on the number of issues within its purview and their perceived impact. As a result, these meetings are very well-attended and reflect the most members. It has been described as a quasi-Board due to its size and the range of issues under its consideration. The Transit and Housing Committees on the other hand are very focused in their mandate with more perceived progress being made due to their more defined or limited agenda. Advocacy and Communications while seemingly broader in scope has a fairly limited mandate in terms of the scope and thus less expected deliverables. The Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee is more technical in nature and are viewed as “owning” a portion of a broader committee agenda.

Some Committees are more effective than others, usually because members are more committed to the issue or the issue is better defined e.g. Transit (effective) versus Land Use (ineffective).

Standing Committees tend to have a broad mandate, a seemingly unlimited agenda, a series of expected deliverables which do not change much from year to year (e.g. produce a budget, oversee the CEO’s performance review, etc) and often a rotating membership in order to inhibit both staleness and power-mongering. These can be and are quite useful providing the matters on the agenda continue to be refreshed and the focus is kept at a policy level.

Task forces on the other hand are viewed as more time sensitive, limited in their terms of reference with clearly defined deliverables. In many instances they are guided as well by a sunset clause which requires their demise once a report has been produced and policy advice (or a specific project) rendered. Task forces (sometimes referred to as ad hoc committees) enjoy greater favour in some board governance circles because there are more defined results. Projects are undertaken and
delivered; budgets are met. The organization is able to move on to other issues sometimes of equal importance.

The CRB also utilizes “technical/administrative” advisory working committees. These committees which were struck in December 2012 were designed to assist each of the standing committees. The mandate and membership of these committees was intended to be quite far-reaching and included senior administrative staff from various municipalities, elected officials, representatives from other levels of Government, industry representatives and CRB staff. The advisory working committees were established as the source of good advice and input to the CRB standing committees.

These advisory working committees have added value to the CRB decision-making process given that they:

- Assisted in providing a higher degree of technical understanding to the issues under discussion
- Provided a good range of perspectives on these issues
- Responded for technical input as requested
- Added in commentary that CRB administrative staff would not normally had access to otherwise.

The advisory working committee terms of reference and charters, which are quite comprehensive, need to be refined to ensure that no authorization has been given to any elected official to serve on these administrative groups. Such confusion built into any terms of reference will simply serve to enhance the confusion that damages the clarity of elected-appointed relationships. Further, if the group chair is to be the CRB senior staff member for that portfolio that person should be identified as responsible to the CEO for reporting purposes and not the committee. We note that:

- Housing Advisory Working Group - this committee is still active and meets at the request of the project manager based on project needs and committee direction.
- GIS Advisory Working Group - this committee is currently not active but has been involved more recently providing technical advice for the GIS
demonstration project. This committee is engaged when there is an active GIS project underway.

- Planning Advisory Group - the intent of this committee is to provide advice to the Project Manager on various land policies/matter and continues to meet on a monthly basis. While there is a role for this committee, the Project Manager struggles at times to keep the committee to the items on the agenda. Some of the committee members feel that their role is to review all CRB matters.

Transit Advisory Group - this committee is still in place and meets at the request of the Transit Committee to support specific projects. The advisory group will be involved in the prioritization of the Green TRIP projects for approval by the Transit Committee and then the Board. On a go forward basis there will be a need for the Housing Advisory Working Group, the Planning Advisory Group and the Transit Advisory Group however the membership of the committees needs to be addressed.

7.8.5 Responsibility for Agenda Development

The responsibility to develop the Board’s “agenda” lies in two camps: the Board’s executive leaders or key players; and the senior administration. This is largely achieved, we believe, through discussion with CEO, the Board Chair and the comments/or issues raised by other members. That is, there is no formal agenda setting process which directs which issues or projects individual committees ought to be tackling at a particular point in time. The reins in effect appear to be held largely by the administration who recommends projects and the resources needed to bring those to fruition based on the recommendations and future work identified in the approved growth plan to support implementation of the plan. We acknowledge that the committee chairs and Board discussions also impact the direction taken by the committees and therefore the Board.

The approach appears to be “bottom-up”. That is, we do not find that the Board directs but rather that it responds. The absence of any formal attempt to plan strategically speaks to this more informal style which may in the final analysis work given the seeming respect which the Board as a whole has for the work of its committees.
7.8.6 Selection/Appointment of Committee Members

The selection of committee members does not emphasize the appointment of members who are most relevant. Rather, the last appointment process was based on who put up their hands at the organizational meeting. As a result some committees are too large with people at the table who may not be overly interested. Committee members are often alternates to the CRB members. Where the CRB members are a Mayor or Reeve, the Mayor or Reeve may choose to identify a Councillor to serve on the committee. It was also noted that the appointed Councillor may not attend and a replacement will attend, and this individual will not likely know the issues. The factors considered in selecting committee members are ensuring that representation comes from:

- County, city, town, etc.
- Balance amongst north, east, west, south.

7.8.7 Voting Structure

The voting structure at the committee level is fundamentally different than the voting structure at the CRB. In all cases a simple majority of members present at the Committee meeting will pass a motion. Given that a committee has no decision-making authority, its motions are generally considered a recommendation to the Board. When these recommendations go to the Board, the voting rules of the Board apply and these are that a motion needs support from communities which represent 75% of the population (essentially Edmonton) and support of 17 of the 24 members. As a result, cases exist where an issue passed the committee stage and yet was defeated at the Board level. In fact, we were advised that in one recent case staff knew that this would occur, because of the position Edmonton was going to take on the subject. These situations have led to conflict between member communities who believe that if it passes at the committee level it should pass at the Board. Such a view is not consistent with good governance.

Unfortunately, there is some belief that voting at the Board has been predetermined based on conflict with another municipality on totally unrelated issues. Thus, issues which may seem straight-forward are less certain than perhaps supposed simply because community A is in conflict with community B on other matters. This style of
governance, while perhaps both historic and understandable as a knee-jerk reaction is not in keeping with sound board governance. It reflects a style of politics which has resulted in a lack of progress in regional cooperation over past decades and which could serve to derail this initiative. The key of course is to keep the focus on the longer term “best interests” of the region in the expectation that the regional good will also impact and benefit the local advantage.

7.8.8 Frequency of Meetings
Standing Committee meeting are currently held monthly which has been the practice since the CRB came into existence. This has been changed somewhat lately as both the staff and committee chairs have noted less need to meet on such a frequent basis particularly where there does not appear to be reason to meet. The issue of meeting frequency has both intended and unintended consequences. Intentionally there would be less pressure on the administration to generate agendas and background supporting documentation on such a frequent basis particularly wherein there may not be any need to meet other than perhaps to provide an update or status report (which could be done electronically). Unintentionally, there is a factor of compensation which though it may appear small can be a driver wherein the meeting fees paid becomes an incentive to meet. It was pointed out that members are paid to attend each meeting ($200 per meeting) and for smaller municipalities, this may be more than they get from the municipality for its Council and committee meetings. We note that expense account information is not on the website, therefore there may be a risk of double dipping whether inadvertently or not. That is, a member may submit a claim to both their municipality and the CRB.

It is a standard rule of thumb for committees and boards to meet when there is justification to meet. Holding to a rigid schedule not only adds to the cost burden of CRB but it also has the potential to irritate those who expect to be asked for their judgment on issues which are fully baked, not which have recently been placed in the oven. Some of the larger policy issues require discussion between members of the CRB administration and their colleagues at the municipal level (or at the Provincial level). These cannot always be expeditiously scheduled and thus time becomes a major factor. If the current committee system was retained, it would be better to call for a
minimum number of standing committee meetings per year (say four) and then to meet at the call of the Chair of each committee who will be guided by discussions both with committee members and members of the CRB administration.

**7.8.9 Chairs of Committees**

One of the central components of effective organizations is their leadership. In this instance some of the leadership quotient is fulfilled by the activities and actions of the chair of each committee. These five people play an important role in:

- Guiding the formation of the agenda with the relevant CRB staff advisor
- Focusing the committee members on the agenda issues
- Moving the meeting to a successful conclusion while not eliminating the value that comes from a good discussion
- Ensuring that those who wish to speak to an issue are allowed to do so
- Ensuring that no one voice is allowed to “hijack” the meeting or an issue
- Maintaining a level of decorum/respect during the meetings
- Seeking consensus and a formal motion to take forward to the Board.

The Chairs also serve on the Advocacy & Communication Committee which has other duties as defined.

We note that the CRB has not provided the chairs with any direction in terms of expectations of their role. Given that each has a different style of chairing, the meetings reflect considerable differences. While differing styles are to be expected, the role description for chairs should be generic and provided to chairs as part of the orientation at the outset of a new Board year.

**8.0 Role of the Provincial Representative**

Alberta Government representatives (usually at the ADM level) attend committee meetings although they typically sit as observers only and do not contribute to the discussion unless specifically asked for some input. Their role (as we were advised) is to act as a liaison only on behalf of the Alberta Government. When asked for their opinion the response is generally one of “we will get back to you once the appropriate policy position has been clarified by the Government”. Regardless of the cautious
response to questions by these senior officials, there is value in getting information from the relevant ministry. There is also some value in “off line” discussions that might be held during coffee and lunch breaks. Committee members are able to get some sense of what the Province may be thinking or if it is amenable to this or that initiative. This “human side” of Provincial-municipal relations often carries more weight than often thought.

The Provincial representative from Alberta Municipal Affairs also meets (along with his DM) with the CEO of the CRB on a monthly basis. (The Chair has also attended on occasion). These exchanges are also useful in ensuring common ground or in encouraging the Board to explore matters on a broader front. The Province has a considerable financial stake in the success of this model and in fact contributes the full annual operating budget, in 2012 this amounted a payment of $3,310,009 (2012). The Province is, however, well aware that the municipalities provide considerable services “in kind” through the advice and research capabilities of the administration of various municipalities.

9.0 Change in Committee Model

Based on our understanding as a result of the input of the Board/committee members (and of the administration) it seems clear that a change of model would be worthwhile to consider at this point in time. Reconsideration of the model is being suggested as a result of:

- The recognition of the need for the Board to take an integrated and strategic approach to addressing regional issues associated from systemic growth pressures
- The recognition of the fiscal pressure facing all orders of government in keeping pace with infrastructure needs and priorities and for the Board to have influence over what the Region’s infrastructure priorities are
- The passing of 4 years since the current committee system was implemented; need to apply best practices to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the Board in addressing its mandate
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- The progress made by the committees in terms of addressing their mandates and future challenges in facilitating greater integration of planning, implementation and overall collaboration across the current priority areas
- Assess the Board’s capacity to address new priority areas impacting the region’s growth and global competitiveness e.g. Regional Transportation
- The need to address the relationship with the Province as a partner in success of the Board, and also with businesses and industry in support of the vision for the Region
- The sense that meetings may now be held because of date rather than need/agenda
- The belief that the “agenda” of the committees ought to be re-set based on work accomplished and thus a “slowing down” of impetus and new ideas
- The fact that there looms an imminent municipal election which provides a useful divide and should encourage new thinking relative to mandate and process.

There are options to be sure. The Board and administration could:

- Place the current committee model on hold and conduct a formal post-election review of objectives and desired results
- Continue with the status quo until sometime past the election and the appointment to the Board of possibly new members
- Await any changes until a formal CRB orientation has taken place (however this would delay the implementation of any changes in the model)
- Withhold changes pending a strategic planning session by the Board and committee membership
- Consider changes now based on the experience of current Board and committee members recognizing the value and currency of their insights.

At the same time, we are not unmindful of the successes and therefore advantages of the current system. These have been enunciated as follows:

- The current CRB committees have been useful in assisting the Board move the corporate agenda forward
The list of accomplishments (as stated in this Report and provided to us by the CRB) is fairly impressive and speaks volumes with respect to the commitment of members to seeing that their energies have not been ill-spent.

Not only have there been actual projects delivered and issues resolved, there have been other intangible “successes” as well.

Committees have been a forum for discussion of issues which are regional in scope and impact.

Relationships between neighbours have, for the most part, improved over the time of the CRB: Mayors are speaking to each other over coffee as well as over issues; personal rapport has increased as personal relationships have been allowed to form.

CAOs (and senior staff) from the various member municipalities have added in their expertise (and that of their staff) on numerous issues and have supported their political leaders.

Committees were formed to address the mandate of the Growth Plan; the resulting committees have appropriate terms of reference; their mandates are relatively clear.

9.1 The Impetus for Change

This review would not be on the Board agenda if there was not any sense that now might be an opportune time to consider options with respect to current decision-making processes. The question arises: does the current committee model need to be changed and refreshed? Has the approach run its course and is there now some fear that the type of systemic, age-old thinking that has frequently plagued municipal councils will result in less productive results in this board governance environment. There is some merit to that perception.

The robust nature of prior agendas seems to have been replaced with an increasing focus by those governing on “updates”. Meetings appear in some instances at least to be held because of a schedule more than a convincing need. While some of this may be due to the sounds of an approaching election where attention is readily and understandably focused elsewhere, it may also be a reflection of a work agenda that is being depleted.
The policy mindset which is or should be the primary thrust of such committees is in danger of being replaced by a detail-focus that, while of interest to be sure, is less productive and counter to what a governance body needs to have as its primary intent. That is, the “how” certain issues will now unfold replaces or supplants the “what” we will do to address the issue. This scenario begins to become observable when committee members consider the fact that most argue that the mandate of the Transit Committee has been the most productive of the committees to date. The focus of Transit is clear; the policy range to be considered is fairly narrow; and the goals or deliverables are in sight. Similarly, Housing has also gained traction due to its narrow (by comparison to Land Use for example) mandate and the clarity of its objectives.

Committee members are or ought to be focused on the over-riding question: what is the policy at stake here? That is at the core of solid board governance. The discussions at the table need to address concepts and issues which drive “on the ground” decisions and actions. This is why governors are brought to the table: to focus on aspects of the decision-making matrix that only those elected to decide can.

There is also concern that the representation of municipalities at the committee level is not necessarily replicated at the Board and thus the potential for a disconnect looms rather large. What has been thrashed through at the committee stage of decision-making and has been recommended to the Board is presumed to be what will be supported by similar numerical representation at the Board. This has not always been the case and in fact Board members may represent a point of view that is foreign to the committee position. While the Board member is not necessarily guided by their “stand-in” or alternate or colleague on the committee, one would think that the position being reflected would be much the same. This point also begets the earlier discussion as to who the Board member represents and whether or not their role is to reflect that of their sending municipality or the best interests of the organization in which membership is held.

While standing committees have merit in some circumstances, particularly wherein the focus of the organization remains relatively still and resistant to much change, the ebbing of energy may place the overall focus of CRB in greater jeopardy if it is
allowed to become “just another agency”. The challenge is to keep a clear and energized focus with “markers” that define progress and which provide both focus and accomplishment.

9.2 Our Summary Observations

1. The current committee structure appears to reflect key areas of focus set out in the Growth Plan.

2. The committee system has worked relatively well to date. Issues have been discussed; recommendations have been moved forward to the Board; committee members for the most part seem pleased with their committee.

3. This committee model is showing signs of having fulfilled its mandate. Committee members report that issues appear to either have been dealt with or else are moving to a somewhat different stage.

4. Management advises that several issues are at more of a “project” stage wherein reporting could be facilitated by project deliverables.

5. The CRB wants to stay invigorated and active on the issues as they arise or are determined by CRB leadership and has the capacity to address new issues as they arise.

6. The absence of any strategic planning/thinking by the Board as a whole hinders the development of a cohesive strategic set of priorities. Committees and management are left to determine on their own the work priorities and to move those forward as they are addressed by each committee.

7. Committee chairs have for the most part been effective and have managed to stay neutral in terms of keeping their committee focused on the issues at hand without directing the resolution to a pre-determined solution.

8. With some exceptions the interviews revealed that there is a general sense that the CRB has kept sight of the direction that has been established and that some progress has been made. Also expressed was the view that the current pre-election season is influencing the degree of progress.

9. The committees do not appear to be standardized in terms of scope, approach, background research, degree of informality, agendas or minute-taking.
10. The frequency of meetings was cited as a concern, particularly by the administration that is tasked with trying to keep up.

11. Administrative support and the supporting documentation made available to the committees are generally well-regarded; the calibre of external agents (largely consultants with expertise on various topics) is respected.

12. While the argument for change in approach has been heard, the current committee model has been useful. Committees have been established; issues are tackled; recommendations to the Board are submitted; the Board has dealt with these; and the organization has moved ahead on some key issues.

13. Each committee appears to have added value to the CRB agenda.

14. The committees which have been established have been well-defined by some form of “committee charter”. These charters are, for the most part, quite descriptive and comprehensive.

15. Our review and assessment of committee and Board meeting agendas and minutes over a two year period reveals a considerable bulk of work which (as we have tracked to the Board table) has generally had an impact on the Board.

16. We developed and presented a series of committee principles. We note that these have generally been followed by your committees and could be standardized as a mechanism for future evaluation.

17. The “advisory working committees” have provided additional technical grounding for the standing committees and are generally well-regarded.

18. The responsibility for developing the committee agendas appears to be a mutual one between the committee chair and attending staff member. An “Agendas Committee” would help to place clearer emphasis and pressure on Board priorities (assuming that these are established).

19. Committee and Board membership is not the same. As a result, there is a strong likelihood that the two may not be on the same page on the issues. This makes it very difficult for committee chairs to ensure that their messages are being fully received and regarded. Further, conflict between municipalities increases the risk that the dynamics at the Board table will be considerably different than the apparent more casual, comfortable dynamics at the committee level.
20. The CRB decision-making model reflects five standing committees which report directly to the Board; four advisory/administrative committees which report to their respective standing committees; two sub-committees which report to their respective standing committees; and a CAO committee (to assist with the CGRP Update). The question which we have been tasked with answering is this: will the present model serve the CRB requirements as it moves into the next stage or is there a preferred model?

9.3 Ensure Clear Governance Roles for Board

Albeit beyond the scope of this assignment, it is important to place what follows in a logical context. Committees function within a board umbrella. They are not stand-alone entities. As a consequence, it is critical that everyone understand and be committed to pragmatic board governance. This governance ought to reflect the following which is based on roles which are not necessarily legislated but rather determined from a review of the literature and what might be accepted as “best practice”.

❖ Board Role Descriptors

○ The Legal Basis

▪ Ensuring compliance with policies & legal requirements
  • The CRB is expected to monitor for compliance to the Regulation, Board-approved policies and any legal constraints placed on the CRB by the Province of Alberta

○ Strategic Leadership

▪ Developing strategic direction; updating annually
  • The Board should be expected to establish a clear sense of direction and to review that on an annual basis

○ Board-CEO Dynamic

▪ Oversight & Monitoring
  • The Board has the obligation to provide a “once over” to the CEO and ensure that his decisions are within the scope and authority of his mandate

▪ Hiring, compensating, evaluating the CEO
• Again, the Board is ultimately responsible for who it chooses as its chief officer; how he/she is reviewed and compensated

  o Governance Model
  ▪ Determining best approach to decision-making (governance)
    ▪ The Board needs to assess its governance model on at least an annual basis
  ▪ Establishing responsibilities & authority of Board committees; responsible for committee performance
    ▪ Board committees can and do play a role in how well the Board as a whole functions; clarity of their mandates is important
  ▪ Maintaining terms of reference for members; orienting each member
    ▪ Each time a new Board member is appointed, the Board has the opportunity to assess whether its own roles are clear and whether or not the new member is fully oriented to his/her expected duties
  ▪ Adopting prudent governance practices
    ▪ Given that board-governance is not the same as municipal governance, the CRB Board has a responsibility to adopt comprehensive governance practices which reflect its desire to exhibit prudent public governance
  ▪ Focusing on matters relating to the governance of the CRB; holding management accountable
    ▪ The Board is a governance body and not expected to be engaged in its day-to-day management; it has a role however in ensuring through its CEO that management is held accountable for delivering on the decisions of the Board and for performing their own functions well

  o Policy & Project Leadership
  ▪ Review and approval
    ▪ Reviewing & approving all policies and projects on at least a bi-annual basis
The Board should review all of its policies, projects and initiatives on a bi-annual basis to ensure that they are viable and comply with CRB’s mandate.

As a result of the Board’s review (obviously with the input of senior management and committees) the Board may determine that current policies, initiatives and projects should be changed or new programs initiated.

- **Stewardship**
  - Acting honestly & in good faith on behalf of the Region
  - As one of the key planks of “good governance” the Board must ensure that its decisions and actions reflect its commitment to act with integrity on behalf of the entire region
  - Exercising due care, diligence & skill
  - The Board has an oversight role that requires it to ensure that the appropriate checks and balances are in place
  - Being fiscally responsible regarding Board honoraria/expenses
  - The Board is aware that the “tone at the top” requires the Board to ensure that the handling of its own fees and expenses is within generally accepted principles

- **Avoiding Conflicts**
  - Acting independently & ethically & avoiding conflicts of interest
  - The Board has been specifically established as independent; it therefore has a responsibility to guide its own actions and behaviours
  - Committing to a Code of Conduct
  - A Code of Conduct provides the necessary framework for what is deemed acceptable in terms of Board member conduct

- **Board Effectiveness**
  - Understanding & evaluating Board effectiveness
  - This principle suggests that the Board has a role in assessing its own performance against reasonable or available standards
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- Evaluating performance of Board members
  - The only way a Board improves as a whole is through its attention to the performance of individual members; each needs to be provided with both the training and coaching necessary to do their “jobs” well
  - Risk Management
    - Putting risk management practices in place
      - Any governing body with the scope, mandate and resources of CRB needs to ensure that it has guarded itself against any unreasonable claims stemming from poor practice or inadequate insurance
  - Fiscal/Fiduciary Leadership
    - Reviewing/approving budgets, forecasts, financial statements
      - The Board is ultimately responsible for CRB’s financial health and this requires a high degree of involvement in the approval processes of budgets as well as the oversight needed to ensure funds are properly distributed and accounted
  - Image/Brand Awareness and Communication
    - Ensuring an integrated communication plan
      - Boards often fail because they did not communicate the good which they are doing; an integrated communication plan which includes where the Board is engaged is central to the Board’s role
  - Board Succession
    - Ensuring some form of succession planning is in place is a fundamental aspect of good governance
      - The Board ought to ensure that it has a planned orientation in place for all members of the new (2013-17) Board
      - Good governance suggests that a board ensure a reasonable and ongoing process of member turnover which is handled in a planned fashion.
10.0 Three Committee Models and the Arguments for Each

10.1 Background

Governance models are determined at the outset of most organizations, public and private, large and small. They tend to reflect either standard, traditional committee systems (e.g. finance, audit, governance) or specific mandate issues (e.g. pipeline safety, agricultural exports, innovation and research) depending on the nature of the business. Some continue that original model for years (which would include many municipalities across Canada) while others are a bit more nimble and re-orchestrate their choices as their world unfolds.

As might be expected there are a number of options when one considers governance models including the role that committees and task forces are expected to play. This is not an exact science. Rather, the resulting choices made by the governing body should reflect its best estimate of what model provides the greatest likelihood of good governance. That takes into account such matters as:

- Core business: what is it and is it properly reflected?
- Membership interests: how will the model engage the Board members; what is the likely impact on time availability; will all members be asked to serve on a committee or task force and should they be?
- Non-core business: are there areas of concern or potential mandate issues which a committee or task force should take in hand which has not been previously assigned? Who determines where it best fits?
- Administrative resources: what are they and how stretched (and therefore how useful) will they be dependent upon the choice of model?

10.2 Options

The following options which likely reflect an imperfect view of your world are based on an assessment of what currently exists and what options could be considered as workable and focused on delivering results. These are perhaps not the only options but others we considered were not put forward based on the fact that we viewed them as non-starters (e.g. no committees; task forces identified by the Board).
Option A: The Status Quo

In our opinion and unless there is some fatal flaw undermining the current system, the status quo is always an option. This option reflects the following components:

- **Five standing committees** (Governance, Advocacy & Communications, Housing, Land Use, Transit)
  - GIS folded into Land Use Committee
- **One sub-committee** (Regional Energy Infrastructure)
- **CAO Advisory Committee**
- **Four Advisory/Working Committees**
  - Housing Advisory Working Committee (Housing)
  - Planning Advisory Group (Land Use)
  - Geographic Information Services Advisory Group (Land Use)
  - Transit Advisory Group (Transit).

![Option A: The Status Quo](image)
Arguments in Favour

The arguments in favour of the status quo are generally as follows:

- The system seems to work well; there is a comfort to sameness
- The elected officials on the Board and serving on the committees understand the roles; rules of procedure; meeting expectations
- There have been a number of achievements by each committee
- Membership is quite inclusive; those who want to serve, serve
- There are still issues which the committees could tackle.

Arguments Opposed

The arguments opposed to continuing the status quo:

- The assigned projects which were approved through the Business Plan have for the most part been completed; the Growth Plan is being implemented but the work is not done
- Much of the agenda space/time is taken up with updates; a committee meeting is not needed for that
- Returning members will expect similar postings; sameness will creep in
- Size of the committees impacts progress
- Representation on committees impacts decision-making at the Board
- Costs can be or are reasonably significant: meeting space, per diems, staff preparation time
- Challenges in dealing with integration issues associated with implementation of an integrated growth plan for the Region (remove silos)
- An election marks a very suitable time in terms of making any change
- Fine-tuning or completely restructuring the committee system makes sense after having served the CRB for 5 years
- A revitalized committee system will encourage new thinking and focus on what is being achieved as opposed to a likely scenario of “steady as she goes” which generally produces more goodwill than action and results.
Option B: Reduced/Refocused Standing Committees; Task Forces as Needed

The second option results in some degree of change to the current system of standing committees but certainly not as sweeping or significant as Option C. That is, there will still be several (i.e. three) standing committees: a revised Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee (GPFC) will play a major role; a Regional Services Committee (RSC) would act as an oversight body for key regional, non-land use projects; and the Planning and Land Use Committee (PLUC) would continue with somewhat changed terms of reference. In addition the Board acting on the advice of the GPFC will be expected to establish the task forces deemed necessary/advisable by the Board’s strategic agenda and will assign those as appropriate to the three standing committees. In other words there will be a continual “one over” principle of good governance at play in order that the Board is regularly and consistently provided with the best collective advice. One of the keys will be the assurance to members that they will be represented on one of the three committees and on the various task forces either at the outset or in a regular rotation of membership which ought to occur every two years (at maximum or more frequently as the Board may decide).

Figure 2:
Option B: Reduced/Refocused Standing Committees; Task Forces as Needed
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- **Governance, Priorities & Finance Committee (GPFC)**

  This standing committee would hold responsibility for the following:
  - **Business & Budget Planning**
    - Advise the Board on the development and implementation of a three-year strategic Business Plan
    - Recommend a process to establish annual regional priorities based on the Capital Region Growth Plan and the Board’s Business Plan
    - Recommend task forces to the Board as deemed necessary to fulfill the Board’s regional plan
    - Recommend the annual budget based on the Board’s strategic priorities and the input received from committees and administration
    - Recommend a three year budget to the Board based on the Board’s strategic priorities and the input received from committees and administration
    - Advise the Board on its resource requirements to implement the Capital Region Growth Plan and the Board’s Business Plan
  - **Monitoring and Audit**
    - Monitor and review the annual audit and also report to the Board regarding financial performance on a regular basis
    - Meet with the Auditor independent of the administration at minimum on an annual basis
    - Report to the Board regularly on overall results as achieved by its committees and task forces
  - **Policy Advice**
    - Recommend new/revised policies which will guide the CRB
    - Assess current policies on an annual basis
    - Recommend that the Board establish specified committees and task forces or other instruments which enable the CRB to get its business done, based in part on the advice received from the other standing committees (this will ensure wise use of administrative resources)
    - Provide advice to the Board on governance issues
    - Provide advice to guide the development of policy and procedures for the Board (i.e. corporate policy and by-laws)
    - Recommend changes to the Board/Committee meeting procedures as deemed necessary and timely
  - **Succession Planning**
    - Advise relative to the timing and process of selection of the CRB Chair and Chief Executive Officer
    - Recommend to the Board executive any suitable training opportunities
    - Recommend a planned way of tackling Board executive succession
Regional Awareness & Relationships

- Build awareness and understanding amongst regional stakeholders of the Board’s vision, role and mandate with respect to regional planning and growth management through the development and staged implementation of an education and communications strategy
- Build effective working relationships with stakeholders which enable progress toward regional priority initiatives, implementation of the Capital Region Growth Plan as well as the achievement of the Board’s mandate and vision
- Monitor both stakeholders and the public’s general awareness and perception of the Board, its strategic direction, priorities and the Capital Region Growth Plan
- Get the message of the CRB out to the intended audiences

Planning and Land Use Committee (PLUC)

This standing committee would hold responsibility for the following:

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 which 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

Project Priorities

- Recommend priorities for future projects and initiatives to address regional land use issues
- Recommend to the Board appropriate task force(s) to guide the policy aspects of approved regional projects
- Reflect the regional vision and regional interests, while recognizing and giving due consideration to municipal issues and perspectives.

Regional Services Committee (RSC)

This standing committee would hold responsibility for the following:

- Providing policy oversight to the CRB’s involvement in various inter-municipal projects related to the CRB mandate and to provide policy guidance to any task forces which are directed to advise their respective standing committee on any of the matters in this mandate
Geographic Information Services

- Provide the leadership and guidance to CRB on the development of related GIS policies to support regional decision-making and reporting requirements of the Capital Region Growth Plan
- Recommend to the CRB the appropriate resources, policies and priorities for development and implementation of the Capital Region Geographic Information Services (CRGIS)
- Provide policy oversight to any Board-approved CRGIS projects including any collaboration with current and future Provincial entities
- Provide leadership for the identification of business requirements for each of the CRB Committees to ensure data and information is available to support evidence-based decisions
- Recommend to the Board a three-year Business Plan which includes a three-year capital and operating plan/budget

Housing

- Provide policy guidance to the implementation of the Housing Vision and Plan through a policy framework that includes the integration of all strategic priorities of the Growth Plan
- Provide policy leadership to the implementation of an effective regional planning model to facilitate a greater supply of non-market and market affordable housing, based on need and priority, throughout the Region
- Recommend effective policy leadership on behalf of the CRB to the Province with respect to the supply of housing
- Recommend to the Board appropriate strategies which will enable the Region to advocate for policy changes affecting the supply of non-market and market-affordable housing
- Provide any necessary policy leadership to the development of a monitoring and measurement framework to measure the effectiveness of housing programs in meeting regional housing priorities and needs
- Ensure that a process has been established that will enable the CRB to monitor housing trends, housing needs and changes in affordability as a basis to update the Housing Strategy and Plan
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- Work collaboratively with other committees to ensure greater coordination and integration of planning occurs to ensure Housing Plan goals are being met
- Oversee the sharing of related best practices among member municipalities
- Advise the Board as to the policy framework and appropriate approach to developing strategic partnerships with all housing stakeholders in the region
- Recommend a three year Business Plan which includes a three year capital and operating plan/budget

**Regional Transit**

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

**Regional Energy**

- Recommend the development of a CRB advocacy/communications strategy in support of transportation, petroleum processing and biofuel infrastructure that enables more diversity in markets for Canadian oil exports, optimally connected through the Capital Region hub
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- Recommend the appropriate policy framework for participation in priority regulatory processes that supports the expansion of infrastructure that transports Alberta’s oil, gas and biofuel products to tidal waters and processes oil, gas and biofuel resources into higher value petroleum products and consumer goods
- Recommend strategies that enhance existing economic development strategies in support of partnerships and investment that provide for enhanced transportation of oil, gas and biofuel in and through the Capital Region

**Potential Task Forces**

The foregoing revised committee model envisions the creation of “project specific” task forces. These would be recommended to the Board by the GPFC as a part of their mandate and/or by the administration and would likely be initially identified by the respective committee. (We note that this could be simply assigned to the Board without GPFC involvement).

The advantage of task forces is that these would lend a measure of specificity to the work of the respective committees and would likely result in a greater “results orientation”. The oversight provided by the standing committee would ensure that each task force understands that it is not independent; it has a certain terms of reference; there is a reporting deadline (admittedly adjustable); and there are expected results. Further, once the task force has delivered its mandate it would be rescinded by the Board and perhaps replaced by a new task force again depending on the will of the respective standing committee and the Board.

Such task forces would investigate the issues detailed in their terms of reference and develop a policy-oriented position(s) for presentation to their committee. With the approval of a policy/plan by the task force, relevant committee and then Board, the task would be passed to the CRB administration who would report periodically to the Board on progress. Without intending to constrain the potential for solid task force ideas to be brought forward, when we asked for suggested examples (in addition to those cited above as ongoing) the following were suggested:

- 2015 Capital Region Board Growth Plan Update (Steering Committee)
- Regional Infrastructure Study and Planning Priorities
- Transit Governance Study
- Annual Housing Symposium
Review of Committee System (Capital Region Board)

- Implementation of Our Affordable Future Report
- Board Communications Strategy- Members and Regional Stakeholders (includes public)
- Population & Employment Forecast
- Development of a Regional Economic Development Strategy
- Economic Roadmap
- Waste Management
- Growth Plan Update
- Transportation and Utilities Infrastructure Renewal.

Relative to Option B

The arguments in favour of Option B are generally as follows:

- Standing committees are retained but are fewer in number and with increased clarity as to their policy oversight nature
- The changes will see the continuance of standing committees which is a well-understood model
- The new committees and recommended task forces will ensure that all committee members (returning and new) will carefully reflect on their mandate/terms of reference
- The GPFC will ensure that the Board has identified the key strategic directions which will enhance the policy framework for these committees and task forces
- Task forces will be identified to the Board; will be established and tasked with committee members appointed; and a reporting timeframe for results
- Task forces will be established which are more focused to a single purpose rather than trying to address a multitude of issues as is the current practice with the current committee structure.

The potential arguments opposed to Option B are potentially as follows:

- The changes are not sufficiently substantive
- The standing committees regardless of being re-constituted will revert back to a “steady as she goes” mindset
- The GPFC has too much clout in relation to the other standing committees
- There is a question as to whether or not the changes will be more cosmetic in nature or actually substantive
The costs (per diems, meeting space, etc.) will be higher and there will be a heavier burden on staff resources as there would be one more Project Manager required for some of the committees/Task Forces due to their required expertise.

The task forces which seems central to this model are largely unknown at this stage.

**Option C: One Standing Committee; Task Forces to Supplement**

This third option reflects the most significant change of the three options. It is premised around the need for one omnibus standing committee which will have considerable clout and range of duties. It in turn will be supported by various task forces which will be established by the time of the 2013 municipal elections and the appointment of members to this Board. Thus, at the time of the organizational meeting following the election, the Board will have a complete list of task forces as well as the names of the recommended appointments.
Brief Background
A governance board is expected to provide a number of key functions including: strategic leadership (i.e. where are we at; where should we be going?”); policy guidance (i.e. what is the stance of this body on this significant issue?”); oversight to the business plan, budget, committees and task forces and administration; and adjudication of the primary challenges and issues which will obviously confront the body from time to time. In order to accomplish this in a reasonable, step-by-step fashion a governance board often employs a policy governance committee often consisting of some of its own members to act in an advisory capacity.

An Executive Policy Committee
Combining some of the elements of the current standing committees this revised “Executive Policy Committee” (EPC) should be expected to function as the strategic policy driver of the CRB. The proposed EPC would be a natural ally of the Board in terms of recommending a suitable approach to the CRB for thinking through its strategic agenda. It could assist the Board in the identification of key policy and project initiatives to be pursued by the CRB over the subsequent 12 month period and through discussing any areas for future inquiry which may not have been initially contemplated in the CRB mandate.
Based on those discussions, the EPC could assist in casting the task forces needed to move forward those initiatives; recommending their membership and terms of reference; setting dates for reporting on progress and a date for completing the assignment. The EPC (as noted below) could also assist in maintaining ongoing linkages to the Provincial Government to ensure that the committee/task force agendas are in sync with the priorities/budgets and CRB mandate.

Membership
The EPC’s expected membership of Board members will be set for a two year period. Permanent members would include: City of Edmonton, City of St. Albert and the Specialized Municipality of Strathcona County. The others will be rotated at the end of the two year period. The EPC roster is recommended to include: City of Edmonton, City of St. Albert, the Specialized Municipality of Strathcona County, 1 City, 2 Counties, 2 Towns, 1 Village. The initial chair for the EPC would be nominated by the
Chair of the Board for the first two year period and would subsequently be chosen from within the EPC (i.e. at the beginning of year three). The Chair of the Board and the CEO would act as ex officio without voting status.

This standing committee would hold responsibility for the following:

- **Strategic Leadership**
  - Act on behalf of the Board in coordinating the preparation of a rolling three-year Business Plan and budget, including annual updates
  - Assist the Board in establishing regional priorities based on the Capital Region Growth Plan (or any subsequent update) and the Board’s Business Plan

- **Governance**
  - Recommend new/revised policies which will guide the CRB
  - Recommend task forces or other instruments which enable the CRB to get its business done
  - Provide advice to the Board on governance issues
  - Recommend the appointment, term and duties of chairs for each task force or committee to the Board for its approval
  - Provide advice to guide the development of policy and procedures for the Board (i.e. corporate policy and by-laws)
  - Recommend changes to the Board/committee/task force meeting procedures as deemed necessary and timely

- **Provision and Care of Resources**
  - Advise the Board on its resource requirements to implement the Capital Region Growth Plan and the Board’s Business Plan

- **Audit**
  - Monitor and review the annual audit and also report to the Board regarding financial performance on a regular basis

- **Selection of Officers**
  - Assist with the recruitment and selection of the CRB Chair and Chief Executive Officer

- **Education and Awareness Building**
Recommend a plan and supporting strategies which will build awareness and understanding amongst regional stakeholders of the Board’s vision, role and mandate with respect to regional planning and growth management through the development and staged implementation of an education and communications strategy

- **Build Partnerships**
  - Identify and recommend strategies which are intended to build effective working relationships with stakeholders which enable progress toward regional priority initiatives, implementation of the Capital Region Growth Plan as well as the achievement of the Board’s mandate and vision

- **Brand Development/Communications**
  - Monitor both stakeholders and the public’s general awareness and perception of the Board, its strategic direction, priorities and the Capital Region Growth Plan
  - Recommend a plan and strategies which will facilitate the dissemination of the Board’s mandate and key messages to the intended audiences

- **Reporting and Evaluation**
  - Report to the Board regularly on overall results as achieved by the Board and its various committees and task forces
  - Ensure that the results are posted in the Annual Report.

The arguments in favour of Option C are generally as follows:

- One standing committee with sufficient breadth will streamline the advisory processes
- The EPC will still be subservient to the Board
- The EPC will clearly be agenda focused and closely aligned with the direction of the Board
- The EPC will be aware on an ongoing basis as to the impact on CRB administrative and fiscal resources which should improve operating efficiency
- The EPC will be able to distribute the workload to other task forces or committees as necessary
- The EPC will provide policy advice and be tasked with some decisions within existing policies
The EPC will be nimble and responsive based on its membership and the fact that it is intended as the only standing committee.

The EPC as a single standing committee will result in cost savings to the CRB.

The EPC should facilitate integration of the Growth Plan through its strategic direction (presuming that the Board has developed a clear strategy).

The EPC should be better able to facilitate better support for implementation of policies at a municipal level.

The EPC will consist of members of the Board and will thereby increase the engagement of Board members in the advisory process.

The arguments opposed to Option C:

- The Board may become a “rubber-stamp” by simply approving EPC recommendations.
- Management will refer matters to the EPC rather than task forces as the most expedient way to get issues moved forward.
- Those who have previously served on CRB committees will not feel as engaged as they once were.
- Non-Board members unlikely to serve on EPC.
- The range of task forces is not yet clear and thus the workload appears nebulous.

10.3 Committee and Task Force Protocols

Each committee and task force appointed by the Board should be guided by certain operating procedures or “protocols”. The initial protocols are suggested as follows:

- Terms of Reference
  - All committees and task forces will have their terms of reference approved by the Board prior to their start-up.
  - Any recommended changes to these terms of reference must be first approved by the Board.

- Frequency of Meetings
  - Meetings will be held as needed; the Board will determine the meeting schedule; any changes to the schedule of meetings for a committee or
task force must be approved by the committee or task force or in special circumstances by its chair

❖ Location and Timing
  o Meetings will be held in location(s) as determined by the administration; the start time will be determined by the chair of the committee or task force subject to the approval of its members

❖ Quorum
  o The quorum for all task forces and committees shall be deemed to be 50% plus one

❖ In Camera
  o All meetings will be deemed to be public unless the committee or task force votes to go in camera
  o In camera rules as they apply to confidentiality of items discussed will apply (see FOIPP Regulation)

❖ Membership
  o The members to any committees or task forces will be as determined by the Board or as per a process approved by the Board

❖ Chair
  o The initial chair of any task force or committee may be as appointed by the Board or as delegated
  o All chairs may be members of the EPC

❖ Chair and CEO
  o The Board Chair and CEO are deemed to be ex officio to all committees and task forces with the right of attendance and discussion but not the right to vote or to be deemed a regular member

❖ Agenda for Meetings
  o The agenda for any meetings of task forces and committees will be determined by the chair of that committee or task force who will receive input on agenda matters from the senior staff member attached to that committee or task force and from the members at prior and subsequent meetings
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- **Advisory Role**
  - Any and all committees and task forces are considered advisory to the Board

- **Role of Staff Advisor**
  - The staff advisor attached to any task force or committee will be to act in a liaison capacity, to ensure minutes are kept; to send out information to the members as expediently as possible; to advise on related agenda matters; to engage the appropriate advisory services of external agents as directed by the CEO
  - The staff advisor will be respected as an employee of the CRB reporting to the CEO

- **Reporting**
  - All committees and task forces will submit reports to the Board on a regular basis within 3 days of any committee or task force meetings

10.4 **Agendas Committee**

An “Agendas Committee” could be established which will keep the focus and pressure on priorities and progress. Such a committee, consisting of the Chair of the Board and perhaps a rotating membership of three other Board members should meet as required with the CEO and his senior staff to discuss where projects are at; what agendas need to be moved forward; and how progress can best be made while maintaining an active watch on the scarce resources associated with the CRB. This “secretariat” function may appear at first blush to be routine but it is not. If successful it would act as the eyes and ears of the Board as a whole stimulating ideas, discussions, governance refocusing (as necessary) and as central to ongoing progress. This Agendas Committee is recommended in the event that either Option A or B are approved; in the event that Option C is approved, this role could be performed by the EPC.

10.5 **The Board**

The reader will note that we have adjusted some of the current committee terms of reference to place the obligation for certain matters directly at the Board table under the assumption that the best people to address these matters are the Chair, Vice-
Chair and Board members with support by the CEO. This includes such “high level” matters as:

- **Intergovernmental Relations**
  - Provide direction relative to matters related to intergovernmental relations affecting regional issues of concern to the Board and its mandate

- **Legal Status**
  - Ensure that the Board is meeting its reporting requirements with respect to the legislative/regulatory framework (i.e. Annual Report to the Minister of Municipal Affairs) and any other legal agreements (i.e. quarterly reporting required by Grant Agreement with the Minister of Municipal Affairs)

- **Public Policy**
  - Direct any legislative, policy and program issues and opportunities affecting the Board’s mandate and priorities relative to federal/provincial governments

- **Capacity Building**
  - Advocate to orders of government (Provincial and Federal) to ensure adequate and sustainable funding is available for regional priorities as approved by the Board
  - Support committees/task forces in fulfilling their mandate
  - Formulate positions and responses to provincial and federal issues (legislative, policy and program) affecting the CRB

- **Oversight**
  - Oversee the monitoring and reporting of performance in implementing the Capital Region Growth Plan
  - Oversee the performance of the CEO; appraise annually.
11.0 Our Recommendations

11.1 We recommend that the CRB move to accept this Report “in principle”.

11.2 We recommend that the Board commend the efforts of the committee members, staff advisors, regional CAOs and others involved in adding value through the current committee system.

11.3 We recommend that the results to date through the committee system (see Sec.7.6) be acknowledged and commended.

11.4 We recommend that the committee system principles (Sec. 7.7) be accepted “for information”.

11.5 We recommend that the CRB review the basis of membership and determine whether any changes to the current composition ought to be made.

11.6 We recommend that the CRB seek legal counsel on the matter of a Board member’s duty to serve the best interests of the CRB (Sec.7.8.2) while a member of it.

11.7 We recommend that the Board review and underline its responsibility to appoint the members of CRB committees and task forces (Sec.7.8.6).

11.8 We recommend that the frequency of committee and task force meetings (Sec.7.8.8) be reviewed and that a more flexible, “need driven” approach be adopted.

11.9 We recommend that a role statement for chairs of committees and task forces (Sec.7.8.9) be developed and adopted by the Board.

11.10 We recommend that our summary observations on the current committee system (Sec.9.2) be accepted “for information”.

11.11 We recommend that the Board role descriptors (Sec. 9.3) be accepted for information.
11.12 We recommend that the committee and task force protocols (Sec. 10.3) be adopted by the Board as guidance in these instruments of governance.

11.13 We recommend that the Board retain to itself those functions described (Sec. 10.5).

11.14 We recommend that Option C be accepted by the Board and referred to the CEO and his administration for a report on its implementation.

Appendices
Appendix A: Comments Received During Interview Process

General Comments

- Many expressed their belief that the committees have added value
- Some attend out of fear that issues will be resolved without their input
- Belief that the chairs of the committees are committed and competent
- View that additional issues could warrant a committee approach
- Voting power of Edmonton cited as a challenging hurdle
- Question as to why some communities need/want to be members
- Currently relying on provincial funding; will need to put some of our own money in at some point

CRB: Achieving Objectives?

- In some ways the CRB is moving ahead, but quite slow
- Feeling that CRB has gone backwards in last couple months (attributed to the Parkland/Edmonton issue and the upcoming election)
- Focus on objectives hindered by a concentration on local borders
- What were the provincial objectives? (these seem to have been lost)
- Often focus on “low hanging fruit”; desire to make some progress
- Extracurricular to core mandate (some issues go beyond mandate)
- This is a trial for the Province (Calgary model has also struggled)
- Feeling that the CRB will reach objectives eventually
- Concept of CRB still makes sense; just too much micro-management
- Edmonton has veto power; size & importance in the region respected
- Age-old barriers to cooperation will not disappear: rural/urban; large-small; trust
- Very useful to get all the key players into the same room; type A personalities keeps it interesting; often a lot of tension
- CRB objectives are too vague; what did the Province expect; it should be consulted
- Growth Plan approved; required considerable input and compromise
- Positive: regional advocacy power, impacted Ministry of Transportation, gaining credibility, good work on pipeline, housing, transit
Committees making progress; not sure Board is moving forward
There will be a change in focus around the table as a result of the election
How well informed are other members of their Councils
Too many individual perspectives & turf protection; need more cooperation
Board members do not always let go of past issues
Need a better view of how individual issues affect the larger picture

CRB - Inhibitors

Biggest issue is trust of motive; second biggest issue is understanding Growth Plan
Turf wars an inhibitor
Edmonton veto
Myopic focus: border mentality
Lack of incentives to work together
Some philosophically opposed to being at table: and opposed to municipal contributions
People only participate when there is incentive
Some resistance to CRB adding staff
Do the municipalities see the potential of a broader impact?
Too many people attending; a factor of too large a membership
Inner circle tag team members of outer circle; often a disconnect
Smaller communities not engaged; should they be at the table
Taking a long time for consensus; tendency to focus on the here and now
Land-use committee is too big, too diverse; limits decision making
Trust/clarity; agendas are very different
People not aware as they should be
Voting structure
Thinking regionally; need broader view
Having to wear municipal hats as well
Reports are massive and technical
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- Committee reports should go to Board without change; reports are not always reflective of discussion at the committee table
- Consistency lacking in what is reported to Board

**Board moving in right direction?**

- Generally yes but a lot of trust issues
- Often focus is on “my municipality” vs. regional
- Main disconnect- small vs. large communities
- Still need for “big picture” mindset
- Had some visioning sessions (18 months ago) which captured key themes
- Plan was to be descriptive not prescriptive - tends to hinder growth
- Board should focus on sub-regions; no understanding of local issues
- Loss of local autonomy; REF process creates another level of government
- Need to give administration more time
- Need to consider frequency of meetings
- Tough for an inside Chair; very political environment
- Board now dealing with more substantive issues
- There is an unwillingness to make decisions

**Governance: Committees/Value**

- Issues seem to be addressed
- Lot of the preparatory work done in committees
- Committees not very standardized; subject to the Chair
- Some too focused on time constraints; others tend to drift
- What should be the level of engagement?
- Board - quite efficient - except REFs
- Chairs- generally good - may be too much of a hurry
- Board meetings recorded; committee meetings not recorded & rely on an overly-taxed staff member to record
- Frequency of meetings - sometimes too frequent
- How technical is the focus?
- Reflect a “burr under the saddle” approach - if someone is upset, they join
Need additional rules - what makes a functional committee?
Get a lot of value out of administration of other municipalities
Are committee reports standardized?
Intent of committees is to add value; couldn’t do much without them
Regional transportation a lot more than just transit
Land Use is struggling with role of CRB; is it a facilitator or controller?
Need more benefit for smaller communities on transit

Committee Inhibitors
- Projects potentially impact a very large region; need to think more regionally
- What committees need to exist? could some be collapsed?
- How to avoid silo mentality- some committees striving for a particular share of the budget
- Can committee members be invited in on a project-specific basis? Some issues simply need those with a stake in the matter
- How do you tailor committees to projects?
- Voting is often unpredictable; may not make a lot of sense
- Some deliberately avoid meetings to derail the process
- The impact of CAOs is not always understood
- Governance could be more useful
- Land-use becoming more powerful
- Land-use committee: large number of people, but workable
- Lots of local resources are contributed in kind; Province understands this
- New people attending; no consistency; need orientation before they come
- Interests of tiny municipalities over-represented
- Information sometimes out too late
- Could utilize more sub-committees

Committees Resourced/Right Number of People?
- Some responded “yes”; others thought added resources required; at least one person thought committees were over-resourced
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- Good administrative support generally; staff are quite helpful
- Staff are great, work hard, maybe shorthanded; need for increased tech support
- Reports are well done
- Members of administration are respected as the subject matter experts
- Packages available a week in advance
- 3 week window to get things done
- Administration can overtake project management; may not have time to get a proper handle on matter
- How do committee meetings impact productivity? some members want continual updates
- Resources became an issue when energy became a committee
- Land-use struggling re: role of CRB: is it a facilitator or controller? Is there a need for constraints?
- Need to tighten up mandates
- Land use has 15 of 24 members - almost duplication of Board
- Administration lacks resources - operating on too few dollars
- Too much material to review; but members generally well-prepared
- Need to use taskforce approach
- Consideration for other members is missing
- Consensus model - felt it worked at Capital Region Alliance
- Sense of missing out if you are not there; need to be part of decision making
- Not sure Chairs understand their role

Committees Helpful?
- Some progress just getting people around the same table
- Allows them to tap into good resources elsewhere (ADM’s and their staff)
- Need some small community representation
- As good as the people there
- Allow you to be informed
- Helps the CRB make progress
Yes, no other way - smaller bites of the pie; too many issues to handle at Board table
Board has to review committee reports thoroughly; not always the case
Smaller committees helpful; larger (i.e. Land-Use) no
Increases potential of a silo mentality
“if you can get a motion passed at Land-use it should pass at Board table”
What committee addresses infrastructure
People are not well prepared; tell by questions
Need people from Board at committee level

Committees: Equal Value?
Land-use (most meaningful); Governance most powerful
Each committee has had some value
Degree of overlap observed
What roles for sub-committees necessary???
The Board obviously where power is influenced
Governance - money!!
Advocacy can meet with Ministers
Good balance

Reason for Optimism?
Understanding broader perspectives
Make good contacts
Mayors act in a professional manner

Miscellaneous Committee Issues
What power does a committee have? What authority does the committee have to request changes?
A lot of time spent; has that been worthwhile?
Negatively impacted by a lot of turnover
Need for meaningful debate
New people want to be on committees
Is there a need for more committees; spread the workload around?
• Some meetings deal with so little
• Is there sufficient funding for use of experts
• Administrative reports generally quite good; administration has a difficult balance to maintain
• Attitude of “what is in it for me?”
• Minutes and reports are too detailed
• What results are we looking for? What are performance indicators?
• Lack of long-term vision
• If province wasn’t paying no one would come
• Small villages can vote no by mailing in, don’t have to show up; not reasonable
• Need GIS for smaller communities
Appendix B: Review of Committee Agendas

- Governance Committee
  - 2012-2014 Business Plan and Budget
    - Plans and budgets recommended for adoption by Board
  - 2012-2014 Business Planning Session Report
    - Sent to Board as information
  - 2012-2014 Business Plan Governance Committee Workplan Projects
    - Amended
  - MDP Report
    - To Board for information
  - Reverse/Allocated Funds
    - To Board to rescind previous motion
  - CRB Scorecard
    - Provided to Board as information
  - CRB Organizational Chart
  - Monthly Financial Reports
  - Monitoring and Reporting Framework
    - Motion to Board to approve consultant’s report and guidebook
  - Unallocated Funds
    - Motion to the Board to approve the transfer of unallocated funds to the various 2011 Committee/Board projects
  - RFP Audit Services
  - Presentations to the Business Industry and/or Communities regarding the Capital Region Economic Roadmap
  - Cost Sharing Formula
    - Provided to Board as information
  - CRB Meeting Procedure Policy G005
    - Changes/amendments provided to Board for approval
    - Notice of Motions
    - Motions In-Camera
    - Seconder of Motions
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- External Lobbying presentations to the Board
  - Committee Structure Review
  - Selection Process for CRB Interim Chair/Chair
    - Motion to recommend to the Board approval
  - Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee
    - Motion passed to approve and recommend to Board the transfer of unallocated funds for the operation of the Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee
  - Submission of various CRB approved plans to Province
    - Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan (IRTMP), the 30 Year Transit Service Plan, and the Integrated Regional Transportation System Study (IRTSS)
  - Request from Housing Committee
    - Allocate funds towards regional affordable housing Information and Awareness campaign
  - Economic Roadmap
    - Discussions with Province
  - 2012-2014 Capital Region Board Business Plan
    - Motion that Governance Committee approves plan
  - Capital Region Board Auditors
    - Motion to recommend appointment of consultant to provide audit services to the Board
  - Governance Committee Issues for Advocacy
  - Terms of Councillors/Mayors
  - Vision and Long Term Funding Strategy
    - Recommended proposal be approved by Board
  - Population and Employment Forecast
  - Review of Terms of Reference (Governance Committee)
  - 2011 Annual Report
    - Recommended to Board for approval
  - Leduc County - Capital Region Board Voting Structure
Direction from the Board to review the current Voting Structure

- Request for Interest from Manitoba Capital Region
- Circulating In-Camera Board Materials earlier
- Policy G003 - Remuneration and Expenses
  - Motion to amend
- Policy G005 - Board Meeting Procedures
  - Motion to amend
- Recruitment of new CRB Chief Executive Officer (CEO)
- Timelines for 2013-2015 Business Plan - update
- Policy G009 - Appointment of Auditor
  - Motion to Board to approve amendments
- FOIPP and MGA Requirements for CRB Committee Meetings
- Committee Meetings - minutes/notes on website
- Appointment of CRB Chair
  - Motion that the Board approves an extension of the appointment of the current Chair
- Policy H001 - Employee Performance Planning and Appraisal
  - Motion to Board to approve the amendments
- Policy H008 - Employee Business Expenses
  - Motion to Board to approve the amendments
- Policy F004 - Signing Authorities
  - Motion to Board to approve the amendments
- Proposed Budget Changes
  - Motion to Board to approve proposed budget adjustments
- CRB Committee’s Terms of Reference
  - Motion to Board to approve changes
- Small municipalities funding/issues
- New Member/CAO workshop
- Mechanism for performance feedback on CRB Chair
- Review Position of Governance Committee Chair
- Policy H008 - Employee Business Expenses
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- Motion to Board to approve the amendments
  - Election of Vice Chair
  - Population & Employment Forecast/Projection Models
    - Motion that the Board approves the Population and Employment Forecast Models
  - Request to Change Fiscal Year End
    - Motion that Board approves the request to Alberta Municipal Affairs to change the CRB’s financial year end
  - Update to Growth Plan - Project Plan
  - Committee’s Terms of Reference
    - Motion that the Board approves the changes to the Committee’s Terms of Reference
  - MDP Compliance with Growth Plan
  - FCM update
  - Audited Financial Statements
    - Motion that the Board approves the Audited Financial Statements
  - Annual Report
    - Motion that the Board approves the CRB’s Annual Report
  - Procurement Policy #F002
    - Motion that the Board approves the amendments
  - CAO Representation on CAO Sub-committee
  - Reps on CCRAs
  - Policy #G005 - Board Meeting Procedures
    - Motion that the Board approve the amendments
  - Alternative REF Process
  - Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee

- Advocacy and Communications Committee
  - Advocacy Priorities of CRB Committees - advocacy priorities of current and upcoming committee projects
  - AUMA Advocacy
  - Advocacy Toolkit
Advocacy Tracking Report - reflects the specific instances and topics of discussion at recent advocacy meetings (*brought to Board for information*)

- Master Briefing Note - a pre-meeting information document
- Master Presentation/PowerPoint
- Key Messages Document

- Advocacy & Communications Strategy
  - Original strategy by Calder Bateman (2010)
  - Need for new strategy (Jan 2011)
  - Strategy revisions and phased implementation

- Advocacy Committee Workplan Projects 2012-2014 (*moved and adopted that the 2012-2014 Advocacy and Communications Committee Workplan Projects be approved and forwarded to the Governance Committee to be included in the CRB 2012-2014 Business Plan*)

- Business Planning/Plan Projects
  - Media and Issue Management
  - Update & Implementation of Advocacy & Communications Strategy
  - Education and Communications

- Committee Chair/Vice Chair appointments
- Committee remuneration
- Committee meeting schedule
- Committee membership
- Committee terms of reference
- Council Briefings and Economic Roadmap
- FCM Resolution: Building Canada’s Energy Value Chain Economy
- Housing Committee Marketing and Communications Program
- Key Messages
- Leduc Intermunicipal Bus Service
- Long-Term Funding Strategy
- Meeting updates
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- MGA Meeting Requirements
- Ministerial Meetings/Requests/Updates
- Pipeline Linkages - CRB Committee Strategy - committee members considered a decision made by the Board at their September 2011 meeting which directed both the Governance Committee and the Advocacy and Communications Committee to begin preparations for the formation of a new Board Committee
- Pipeline Linkages Strategy Committee Travel Request
- Provincial Budget (2011)
- Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee - reviewed TOR (approved by Board May 2013)
- Regional Organizations Gathering - FCM Vancouver
- 2013 - 2016 Advocacy and Strategic Plan
- St. Alberta Transit Centre and Park and Ride

Transit Committee

- 30 Year Transit Service Plan (recommended to Board June 2011)
- Regional Transit Governance Study
- Regional Transit Governance Study - Business Case
- Regional Fare Strategy and Implementation Plan
- Regional Fare Strategy - Smart Card Technology
- Intermunicipal Transit Governance Study & Implementation Plan (motion that the Board approves the interim report and recommendations - Nov 2012)
- Bus Modernization Regulation
- Committee/Board priorities
- Committee meeting schedule
- Committee Terms of Reference
- GreenTRIP program/projects
- Committee Chair/Vice Chair appointments
- FCM Resolution - Transit Infrastructure
Land Use Committee

- Advisory Group Reports
- Outer Regional Ring Road
- Integrated Regional Transportation Master Plan *(recommend to Board for approval June 2011 - approved by Board, September 2011)*
- Integrated Land Use and Affordable Housing Policy Framework and Implementation Plan
- 2011 Land Use Committee Business Plan
- Land Use Framework
- North Saskatchewan Regional Plan (NSRP)
- Regional Advisory Council (RAC)
- North Saskatchewan Watershed Alliance (motion to the Board that the Committee recommends the Board approve a letter to the NSWA to support the Discussion Paper and Workbook on the Development of an Integrated Watershed Master Plan and agreement to participate in establishing a working group to assess issues of planning integration and alignment - August 2011)
- 2012-2014 Land Use Committee Business Plan
- Review REF Administration - Terms of Reference
- Capital Region Board GIS Plan Presentation
- Land Use Committee 2012-2014 Workplan Projects
- Proposed Parkland County amendment to the Capital Region Growth Plan
- Capital Region Air Quality Management Framework
- Confirmation of Committee Chair and Vice Chair 2012
- Capital Region Growth Plan Review Process
- Review REF Administration *(moved that the Land Use Committee recommends to the Board approval of the Review REF Administration Report April 2012 - notice of motion tabled for June 2012)*
- Integrated Land Use And Affordable Housing Policy Framework
- Land Use Plan +5 Year Review Process
- Regional Energy Corridors Study Terms of Reference
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- CRGIS Spatial Data Demonstration Project *(motion to request approval December 2012)*
- Wagner Natural Area Society and Big Lake Environment Support Society
- Goods Movement Strategy Presentation - City of Edmonton
- Regional Energy Corridors Study
- Intermunicipal Planning Framework
- 2013 Land Use Committee Business Plan *(motion that plan be reviewed by Governance Committee - March 2013)*
- CCRA Policy Clarification *(motion that Board approve the Cluster Country Residential Area Policy Clarification in the review of Regional Evaluation Framework submissions - May 2013)*

**Housing Committee**

- Sub Regional Planning Model/ Alternate Funding Models
- Information & Awareness Program - Marketing & Communications Strategy
- Integrated Land Use and Affordable Housing Policy Framework
- Capital Region Housing Symposium
- 2012-2014 Business Plan - Housing Committee Priorities
- Purchasing Ability of Households (regional)
- Sub Regional Non-Market Housing Governance Models Study & Recommendations
- GOA Organizational Changes and Committee Impacts
- Community Plan - Homeward Trust
- Confirmation of Committee Chair 2012
- New Committee member - Sturgeon County
- Integrated Land Use and Affordable Housing Advisory Committee
- Committee Terms of Reference
- Regional Housing Progress Report and Regional Housing Issues Discussion
- 2012 Business Plan Projects - Sub-Regional Planning Model
- Industry Representation
- Integrated Land Use and Affordable Housing Advisory Committee
Review of Committee System (Capital Region Board)

- 2013 - 2015 Business Plan
- CRB Sub-regional Planning Framework: Environmental Scan
- Committee Terms of Reference / Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair
- Letter to Province - Minister of Human Services
- “Our Affordable Future”

> GIS Committee

- Overview of the Current State of GIS Systems across the Region
- Available technology to allow interoperability across existing GIS systems
- short term and long term recommendations for minimum standards for a GIS system for all participating municipalities
- Glossary of Common Terms
- FOIP implications
- Vision and Guiding Principles (incl. workshop)
- Work Plan and Next Steps for Building the GIS Plan
- CR Ortho Photography Initiative
- Lessons Learned from a Successful Multijurisdictional Geospatial Collaborative (Twin Cities GIS Collaborative)
- Governance Model
- GIS Plan Outline (Work Plan and Schedule)
- GIS Plan (presented to Board January 2009)
- Capital Region Growth Plan Provincial Response
- 2009/ 2010 RGSC Priorities
- Committee Terms of Reference
- CR GIS Work Plan Priorities
- International GIS Day, November 18, 2009
- Re-naming of Committee, Sub-Committees
- 2010 - 2011 Work Plan Priorities
- Review RFPs for Consulting Services
- City of Edmonton Open Data Strategy
- 2011- 2013 Business Plan
- Alberta Industrial Heartland GIS Presentation
Merged with Land Use Committee in November 2010
  • Board approved all GIS activities would be part of the Land Use
  • Largely due to resource capacity being limited

Regional Energy Infrastructure Sub-Committee
  • Created from Pipeline Linkages Strategies Committees
    • Pipeline Linkages Strategies Committee was approved by the
      Board as an ad hoc committee in late 2011
    • Primary focus was the Northern Gateway Pipeline project
      following the regulatory process underway at that time and
      messaging the importance of pipelines in getting oil products to
      the global market
    • Active between December 2011 and January 2013
    • For the fiscal year of 2013, the Board did not allocate a budget
      for this Committee which rendered it inactive
  • In May 2013 the Board approved the terms of reference for this new sub-
    committee under the Advocacy & Communications Committee
    • Same membership, Chairman and Vice-Chairman as the previous
      pipeline committee but has a broader, energy related mandate
    • The sub-committee has met once in June 2013 where the
      following was covered:
      • 2013 Sub-Committee Strategy and Workplan
      • Enbridge Invitation: Video Conference Outreach
        Opportunity with BC Municipality Burns Lake
      • FCM Resolution Building Canada’s Energy Value Chain
        Economy
      • Invitation to speak at the Northern Alberta Mayors Meeting
        June 21 (Rutherford Room, Sutton Place Hotel, Edmonton)
Population and Employment Projections

Motion

That the Capital Region Board approves the updated Population and Employment Projections as recommended by Capital Region Board Administration.

Background

- The Capital Region Board Regulation requires that the Capital Region Growth Plan contain Population and Employment projections.

- The Capital Region Growth Plan was approved by the Government of Alberta in March 2010.

- The approved Population and Employment figures associated with the Growth Plan are found in the December 2009 Addendum.

- The Capital Region Board approved a motion on July 7, 2011, directing CRB Administration to begin work on the review and update of the Growth Plan’s Population and Employment Forecasts.

- The Population and Employment update was led by Governance Committee (as per the approved CRB 2012-2014 Business Plan), with assistance from the Region’s CAOs and a technical advisory committee composed of municipal administrators with expertise in economics.

- On December 17, 2012, the Governance Committee recommended that the Board approve the proposed Population and Employment Forecast models.

- On January 10, 2013, the Capital Region Board moved to refer the Population and Employment Projections to CRB Administration for further review with municipal administrations.

- In January and February 2013, Municipal administrations provided feedback related to the projections that were proposed at the January CRB meeting. This feedback was reviewed, summarized and responded to by the Consultant and CRB Administration, with minor changes to the projections being made as a result.

- In addition to the Municipal Survey Response Summary, circulated on April 17, 2013, CRB Administration provided several project status updates to the region’s CAOs.

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

---

1 February 8, 2013; March 25, 2013; April 15, 2013; June 7, 2013; August 22, 2013;
projections are intended to provide a common base of reference for CRB municipalities and other agencies engaged in infrastructure planning and programming.

- It is recommended that the Board adopt the proposed update, as the projections contained in the Growth Plan’s December 2009 Addendum understate the current populations of several CRB municipalities, and underestimate the future growth pressures facing the Region.

- CRB Administration holds the opinion that the Population and Employment projections should be reviewed and updated on a regular basis, following the completion of the Growth Plan update presenting the next clear opportunity to do so.
### Capital Region Population and Employment Projections

#### Population Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2044 Low</th>
<th>2044 High</th>
<th>Average Annual % Change 14-44</th>
<th>Average Annual % Change 14-44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>35,800</td>
<td>58,200</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmar</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>861,900</td>
<td>1,336,800</td>
<td>1,443,900</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>40,300</td>
<td>58,700</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>26,300</td>
<td>45,700</td>
<td>62,600</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>42,700</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwater</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>64,300</td>
<td>91,600</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert County</td>
<td>96,800</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>96,800</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsby</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburg</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Capital Region Population Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2044 Low</th>
<th>2044 High</th>
<th>Average Annual % Change 14-44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region Total</td>
<td>1,234,100</td>
<td>1,923,400</td>
<td>2,196,100</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Prepared for

Capital Region Board

#### Prepared by

Stokes Economic Consulting

Strategic Projections

September 2013
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Executive Summary

The Capital Region Board retained Stokes Economic Consulting Inc. (SECI) and Strategic Projections Inc. (SPI) in June of 2012 to develop updated projections of the population and employment for the Capital Region and its constituent municipalities to the year 2047.

The previous projections for the Region were developed in 2009 in the midst of a significant world-wide economic downturn. Those projections are summarized in the document The Capital Region Growth Plan Addendum (December 2009).

Since that time economic growth in the Region has resumed at a brisk pace and population estimates from the Federal Census of 2011 and from various Municipal Censuses in 2012 have become available. The passage of time and the availability of new information necessitated the need for an update to the 2009 projections at this time.

THE CAPITAL REGION SCENARIOS

This document reports on three future population and employment scenarios for the Capital Region as a whole created by Stokes Economic Consulting (SECI). The Region-wide projections are based on recent population projections for Census Division 11 produced by the Alberta Treasury Board and Finance: Alberta Population Projections by Census Division, 2012-2041 (June 2012).

Scenario Assumptions

The key assumptions made in developing the three Capital Region scenarios were as follows:

- Net in-migration in the Base scenario starts near its average of about 15 thousand over the past 10 years rising to about 21 thousand in 2047. The Low scenario starts at 11 thousand and rises to 15 thousand in 2047. The High scenario starts at 22 thousand and rises to 29 thousand in 2047.

- The agriculture industry is not expected to make a large contribution to overall growth in the Capital Region over the projection period. Real GDP in agriculture increases on average by 0.3 percent per year in the Base scenario and by 0.5 percent in the High scenario and remains at its current level in the Low scenario.

- The Low, Base, and High scenarios assume tourism industry average annual growth rates of 1.0, 1.5, and 2.0 percent, respectively, over the scenario period. These scenarios all assume an improved performance of the sector from its past performance. The growth rates for the tourism sector, particularly for business tourism, reflect the increased economic activity that takes place in the region over the scenario period described below.
The oil and gas industry – oil refineries are included under the manufacturing industry – and the oil and gas services industry make a significant contribution to the Capital Region economy. While the Region does not produce much conventional oil and gas, the oil and gas service industry is an important provider of services to the conventional oil and gas industry.

In addition, oil sands upgraders currently and in the future could make a significant contribution to the Region’s economy. Moreover, the Region’s manufacturing industry – particularly the fabricated metal and machinery industries – has been and will likely continue to be linked closely to the development of the oil sands industry.

The outlook for oil and gas GDP in the Region is in line with assumptions about the future performance of Alberta’s oil and gas industry. The Region’s growth reflects both continued growth in the oil and gas services sector as well as the construction of additional oil sands upgraders in the Region.

The Northwest upgrader is scheduled for construction over the next few years in 3 phases. In the Base scenario all 3 phases are implemented, while in the Low scenario only phase 1 is completed. In the High scenario an additional 3 upgraders, each equaling the size of the Northwest upgrader, are assumed to be added to the Region by 2040.

The outlook for oil and gas in the area reflects a downward trend in conventional production offset by significant increases in oil sands production. This outlook represents the Base Case outlook. For the High and Low Case scenarios changes in the growth rates for conventional and oil sands developments were assumed to reflect slower and more rapid growth respectively.

Assumptions made regarding future growth rates for the Region’s major trading partners – the rest of Alberta, the rest of Canada and the rest of the world – are described in detail in the main report.

In the scenarios it is assumed that the government keeps its expenditure growth constant on a per capita and inflation adjusted basis. In the case of education services expenditure growth is driven by the school-age population. For health services, expenditures remain constant on an age group weighted expenditure basis – using weights computed from expenditure information on health expenditures by age published by the Canadian Institute for Health Information. For general government services expenditures are kept constant on a per person basis.

**Scenario Results**

The key results of the scenarios for selected demographic and economic variables are tabulated in Summary Exhibit 1. The results indicate the following:
The population results are determined largely by the migration assumptions in the MOF projections. The population of the Region increases from about 1.2 million at present to 1.8, 2.0, and 2.3 million in the Low, Base, and High scenarios, respectively, in 2047.

The Region’s population grows at a rate averaging 24,400 per year between 2012 and 2047 in the Base Case, 32,600 per year in the High Case and 17,800 per year in the Low Case. Between 2001 and 2011 the Region’s population grew at an annual rate of 22,100.

Employment increases in line with population, but at a slightly slower rate, resulting from the aging of the population which shrinks the working aged share of the total population.

Job growth is determined by the growth rate in industry GDP and productivity. Employment increases from 0.7 million today to 1.2, 1.1, and 0.9 million, respectively, in the High, Base, and Low scenarios in 2047.

The growth rate of employment falls over the scenario period in line with slower economic growth. The average annual rates of growth over the period are 1.6, 1.2, and 0.9 percent, respectively, for the High, Base, and Low scenarios.

Real GDP growth averages 2.9, 2.5, and 2.1 percent, respectively, in the High, Base, and Low scenarios over the scenario period. The corresponding results for labour productivity – real GDP per employee – are 1.1, 1.0, and 0.9 percent, respectively.
THE CAPITAL REGION SCENARIOS BY MUNICIPALITY

This section of the report updates the population and employment projections to 2044 across the CRB’s 24 municipalities contained in the document *The Capital Region Growth Plan Addendum* (December 2009).

Two alternatives at the municipal level for total population and total employment (on a place-of-work basis) to 2044 are presented here:

- The High Case of this section is informed by the pace of growth for the region as a whole in the High Case projection of Section 2.
- The Low Case of this section is informed by the pace of growth for the region as a whole in the Base Case projection of Section 2.

Population Projections

The Low Case and High Case population projections by CRB municipality in Summary Exhibit 2 below were informed by the following:

- The population projections by municipality contained in the December 2009 *Growth Plan Addendum*.
- Preliminary projections by municipality prepared by Strategic Projections based on recent trends in regional growth by municipality and on the pressures for growth region-wide revealed by the Base Case and High Case projections described in Section 2.
- Comments on the preliminary projections solicited by the consultants from municipal staff.

The projections take into account municipal census information for 2012 and/or Statistics Canada revisions to the 2011 Census population counts for Bruderheim, Leduc County, Redwater and Thorsby.
### Summary Exhibit 2
**Capital Region Total Population by Municipality**
**Low and High Case 2014 to 2044**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Low 2044</th>
<th>High 2044</th>
<th>Low 14-44</th>
<th>High 14-44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>35,800</td>
<td>58,200</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmar</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>861,900</td>
<td>1,336,800</td>
<td>1,443,900</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>40,300</td>
<td>58,700</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>26,300</td>
<td>45,700</td>
<td>62,600</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>42,700</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwater</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>64,300</td>
<td>91,600</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>96,800</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsby</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburg</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>372,200</td>
<td>586,600</td>
<td>752,200</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>861,900</td>
<td>1,336,800</td>
<td>1,443,900</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Total</td>
<td>1,234,100</td>
<td>1,923,400</td>
<td>2,196,100</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Strategic Projections and CRB Staff
Employment Projections

For the purposes of this assignment the consultants developed a model of Capital Region employment by industry by place-of-work by municipality (described in detail in the main report).

At the outset it should be noted that employment by place-of-work data from the National Household Survey carried out in conjunction with the 2011 Census – as of the end of August 2013 – has not yet been made available in the format required by Strategic Projections for inclusion in this update to the projections of employment by CRB municipality. This section of the report will be revised once the new data have been made available to us and we have had an opportunity to assess their impact.

At this time therefore the 2006 Census data for employment by place-of-work by industry by municipality is the latest available regarding where jobs are distributed throughout the area.

The model distributes future employment growth by industry to each of the area’s 24 municipalities by separately projecting those jobs that primarily produce goods and services exported to other areas and those jobs that primarily serve the needs of the local population:

- The macro model determines the employment by industry growth pressures expected to be felt by the Region as a whole over the projection horizon.

- The municipal employment model allocates the economic base jobs over that span proportionally to those centres already endowed with such jobs.

- The municipal employment model allocates the projected community base jobs to those communities projected to see the greatest population gains following on consideration of the base year per capita availability of such jobs in each municipality.

Summary Exhibit 3 compares the projected 2044 total employment values of each municipality for the Low Case and High Case and the projected average annual percentage growth rate in employment for each municipality for each scenario over the 2014 to 2044 span.
## Summary Exhibit 3
Capital Region Total Employment by Municipality
Low and High Case 2014 to 2044

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Low 2044</th>
<th>High 2044</th>
<th>Low 14-44</th>
<th>High 14-44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmar</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>486,500</td>
<td>699,100</td>
<td>749,400</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>25,300</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwater</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>25,900</td>
<td>33,600</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>37,400</td>
<td>47,600</td>
<td>54,800</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsby</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburg</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>144,200</td>
<td>198,900</td>
<td>249,200</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>486,500</td>
<td>699,100</td>
<td>749,400</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Total</td>
<td>630,700</td>
<td>898,000</td>
<td>998,500</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Strategic Projections
CONCLUSIONS

The pressures for future growth today are significantly greater than they were in 2009. The Low Case here calls for population and employment growth slightly higher than the only projection put forward in 2009 while the Base and High Cases suggest the potential for growth significantly exceeds that foreseen in 2009.

The increased demands for growth faced by the Region today are likely to impact every municipality in the area. The contribution assumed for each municipality to the future growth of the Region reflects a combination of factors, most importantly recent trends and aspirations.

The municipal projections provided here are intended to reflect the range of future growth pressures faced by each municipality at this time.

Over the course of the next two years Statistics Canada and others will release information updates that by the fall of 2014, depending on the trends revealed, might trigger a refresh of the Capital Region macro projections and projections by municipality contained in this report.

Ernie Stokes of Stokes Economic Consulting Inc. and Tom McCormack of Strategic Projections Inc., the authors of this report, wish to thank the members of the Capital Region Board’s Population and Employment Technical Advisory Committee for their invaluable assistance in the preparation of the projections contained in this report.
Section 1
INTRODUCTION

The Capital Region Board retained Stokes Economic Consulting Inc. (SECI) and Strategic Projections Inc. (SPI) in June of 2012 to develop updated projections of the population and employment for the Capital Region and for each of its constituent municipalities to the year 2047.

The previous projections for the Region were developed in 2009 in the midst of a significant world-wide economic downturn. Those projections are summarized in the document *The Capital Region Growth Plan Addendum* (December 2009).

Since that time economic growth in the Region has resumed at a brisk pace and population estimates from the Federal Census of 2011 and from various Municipal Censuses in 2012 have become available. The passage of time and the availability of new information necessitated the need for an update to the 2009 projections at this time.

This document reports on three future population and employment scenarios for the Capital Region as a whole created by Stokes Economic Consulting (SECI). The Region-wide projections are based on recent population projections for Census Division 11 produced by the Alberta Treasury Board and Finance: *Alberta Population Projections by Census Division, 2012-2041* (June 2012). The assumptions behind and results of the three Region-wide scenarios are described in Section 2 of this document.

The implications of these scenarios for future population and employment growth on a municipal basis within the Region were assessed by Strategic Projections (SPI) and CRB staff. Section 3 of this document presents Low and High population and employment projection alternatives for the CRB by municipality to the year 2044 that are informed by the range of projections for the CRB as a whole described in Section 2.

Section 4 lists a number of key information sets that will be made available between now and the middle of 2014. Depending on the trends these information sets signal the Capital Region Board might consider a refresh of the projections in the fall of 2014.

The scenarios in this report were developed with the guidance of the Capital Region Board’s Population and Employment Technical Advisory Committee.
Section 2
THE CAPITAL REGION SCENARIOS

Three scenarios were created regarding the possible future demographic and economic performance of the Capital Region as a whole. The three scenarios provide a range of possibilities for the Region’s performance: Low, Base, and High. The Base scenario is often considered to be the most likely scenario.

The scenarios start in the year 2012 and end in 2047. The historical data used in developing the scenarios were obtained from Statistics Canada, Stokes Economic Consulting and Strategic Projections.

Scenario Assumptions

The basis for the three scenarios is a set of population growth alternatives recently created by the Alberta Treasury Board and Finance. In the context of the population growth specified by the Province, different assumptions were made that determine the future industrial structure of the Region. These assumptions refer to the future performance of the agriculture, oil and gas, tourism, and manufacturing sectors in the Region in light of the economic performance of the Region’s major trading partners. Additional assumptions were made about the growth of government spending.

A description of the key assumptions behind the three scenarios follows.

Migration

The migration assumptions are Based on the population projections for Census Division 11 produced by the Alberta Treasury Board and Finance in its latest set of sub-provincial population projections for the province: Alberta Population Projections by Census Division, 2012-2041 (June 2012).

The Province’s migration assumptions determine the possible growth performance of the economy by establishing the rate of overall population growth and, in turn, the rates of growth in employment, the labour force and the economy. In addition, the migration assumptions determine the rate of household formation – the change in the number of households (or occupied dwelling units) – which determines growth in the number of housing units in the Region.

Exhibit 1 shows the three migration assumptions measured in thousands of persons. The assumptions refer to net in-migration to the Region, calculated as migration into the Region minus migration out of the Region. Net in-migration in the Base scenario starts near its average of about 15 thousand over the past 10 years rising to about 21 thousand in 2047. The Low scenario starts near the bottom of the range since 1998 and rises to 15 thousand in 2047. The High scenario assumption starts just below the top of this range and rises to 29 thousand in 2047.
Agriculture

Exhibit 2 shows the outlook for real Gross Domestic Product in agriculture (GDP in agriculture adjusted for inflation measured in millions of 2002 dollars). Exhibit 2 reveals that agriculture production fell sharply starting in 1999 and did not recover to its 1998 level until 2010.
The agriculture industry is not expected to make a large contribution to overall growth in the Capital Region over the projection period. The scenario assumptions show real GDP in agriculture rising on average by 0.3 percent per year in the Base scenario and by 0.5 percent in the High scenario and remaining at its current level in the Low scenario.

Tourism
The tourism sector in the Region includes the wholesale and retail trade, transportation, accommodation and food services, and other private services industries. The latter industry includes the amusement and recreation industry.

Exhibit 3 shows the assumptions for real GDP in the tourism sector in the Region. The sector has exhibited little growth since 2000. The Low, Base, and High scenarios assume average annual growth rates of 1.0, 1.5, and 2.0 percent, respectively, over the scenario period. These scenarios all assume an improved performance of the sector from its past performance. The growth rates for the tourism sector, particularly for business tourism, reflect the increased economic activity that takes place in the region over the scenario period described below.

Exhibit 3
Real GDP ($2002 Millions), Tourism Sector, Capital Region, 2000-2047

Source: Statistics Canada 2000 to 2011, Stokes Economic Consulting 2012 to 2047

Oil and Gas
The oil and gas industry – oil refineries are included under the manufacturing industry – and oil and gas services industry make a significant contribution to the Capital Region economy. While the Region does not produce much conventional oil and gas, the oil and gas service industry is an important provider of services to the conventional oil and gas industry.
In addition, oil sands upgraders currently and in the future could make a significant contribution to the Region’s economy. Moreover, the Region’s manufacturing industry – particularly the fabricated metal and machinery industries – has been and will likely continue to be linked closely to the development of the oil sands industry.

**Exhibit 4**

**Real GDP ($2002 Millions), Oil and Gas**  
Capital Region, 2000-2047

---

The outlook for oil and gas GDP is shown in Exhibit 4. A key assumption in the scenarios is that the growth of oil and gas GDP in the Region is in line with the assumptions about the future performance of Alberta’s oil and gas industry. The Region’s growth reflects both continued growth in the oil and gas services sector as well as the construction of additional oil sands upgraders in the Region. The Northwest upgrader is scheduled for construction over the next few years in 3 phases. In the Base scenario all 3 phases are implemented, while in the Low scenario only phase 1 is completed. In the High scenario an additional 3 upgraders, each equaling the size of the Northwest upgrader, are assumed to be added to the Region by 2040.

The downward trend in conventional production is offset by significant increases in oil sands production. This outlook represents the Base Case outlook. For the High and Low Case scenarios changes in the growth rates for conventional and oil sands developments were assumed to reflect slower and more rapid growth respectively.

**Trading Partner Growth**

The outlook for the Region’s major trading partners is important to its economic performance through exports. The Region’s major trading partners are the rest of Alberta, the rest of Canada and the United States.

To create the scenarios, assumptions are set for GDP growth rates for the Region’s major trading partners. The different growth performance impacts the growth of exports of manufacturing and services to the trading partners. The GDP growth rate assumptions are based on those used in the June 2012 Provincial Economic Outlook of the Centre for Spatial Economics. These assumptions in turn are derived from the latest 2012 economic outlook publications of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the World Bank, and the United States Congressional Budget Office (CBO).

**Government**

The government plays an important role in the growth performance of the Region through its current and capital expenditures. These expenditures are largely determined by population growth and therefore driven by the Alberta Treasury Board and Finance population projection assumptions. The government, nevertheless, can increase per capita expenditures to achieve its goals.

In the scenarios it is assumed that the government keeps its expenditure growth constant on a per capita and inflation adjusted basis. In the case of education services expenditure growth is driven by the school-age population. For health services, expenditures remain constant on an age group weighted expenditure basis – using weights computed from expenditure information on health expenditures by age published by the Canadian Institute for Health Information. For general government services expenditures are kept constant on a per person basis.

**Scenario Results**

The results of the scenarios for selected demographic and economic variables are described in the following sub-sections.

**Population**

The population for the Capital Region for the three scenarios is shown in Exhibit 5 measured in thousands of persons. As mentioned above, the population results are determined largely by the migration assumptions in the MOF projections. The population of the Region increases from about 1.2 million at present to 1.8, 2.0, and 2.3 million in the Low, Base, and High scenarios, respectively, in 2047.
Population growth in percentage terms slows over the period in all three scenarios. In the Base scenario, population growth falls from an average annual rate of 2.0 percent in the period 2012 to 2017 to 1.3 percent over the 2032 to 2047 span. The average growth rate over the 2012 to 2047 period is 1.5 percent. By way of comparison the Region’s population grew at an average annual rate of 2.1 percent between 2001 and 2011. In the High scenario, population growth averages 1.9 percent for the period as a whole. In the Low scenario it averages 1.2 percent. The slowdown in the rate of population growth over the period reflects the aging of the population and lower migration rates in percentage terms.

In absolute terms the Region’s population grows at a rate averaging 24,400 per year between 2012 and 2047 in the Base Case, 32,600 per year in the High Case and 17,800 per year in the Low Case. Between 2001 and 2011 the Region’s population grew in absolute terms at an average annual rate of 22,100.

**Exhibit 5**
Population (000s), Capital Region, 2001-2047

Source: Statistics Canada 2001 to 2011, Stokes Economic Consulting 2012 to 2047

**Households**

The number of households for the scenarios is shown in Exhibit 6 measured in thousands.

Households rise in line with population, but at a slightly slower rate. They increase from about 0.5 million at present to 1.0, 0.9, and 0.8 million, respectively, in the High, Base, and Low scenarios in 2047.
The annual average change in the number of households slows over the projection period but not as quickly as population slows. The aging of the population leads to a decline in the number of persons per unit over the projection period and thus a faster pace of household growth than population growth. For the scenario period as a whole household formation per year averages 13.6, 11.0 and 8.9 thousand, respectively, in the High, Base, and Low scenarios (see Exhibit 8).

Employment

Employment for the scenarios is shown in Exhibit 7 measured in thousands. Employment increases in line with population, but at a slightly slower rate, also resulting from the aging of the population which shrinks the working aged share of persons (those 20 to 64) within the total population. Job growth is determined by the growth rate in industry GDP and productivity. Employment increases from 0.7 million today to 1.2, 1.1, and 0.9 million, respectively, in the High, Base, and Low scenarios in 2047. The growth rate of employment falls over the scenario period in line with slower economic growth. The average annual rates of growth over the period are 1.6, 1.2, and 0.9 percent, respectively, for the High, Base, and Low scenarios. Public service employment shows the strongest rates of growth reflecting the implications of the aging of the population for growth in health and social services expenditures and weak productivity growth. Employment growth in the goods and service producing industries is similar in the scenarios.

Exhibits 8 tabulates the projection results for the total population, households and employment by major sector while Exhibit 9 tabulates the projection results for real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and its expenditure components over various time periods across the projection horizon. The performance of employment is in line with average annual growth in real GDP and labour productivity. Real GDP growth averages 2.9, 2.5, and 2.1 percent, respectively, in the High, Base, and Low scenarios over the scenario period. The corresponding results for labour productivity – real GDP per employee – are 1.1, 1.0, and 0.9 percent, respectively.
Exhibit 7
Employment (000s), Capital Region, 2001-2047

Source: Statistics Canada 1998 to 2011, Stokes Economic Consulting 2012 to 2047

Exhibit 8
Average Annual Growth for Population, Households, and Employment (%)
Capital Region, 2001-2047

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (% Change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Formation (000s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (% Change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods-Producing Employment (% Change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Services-Producing Employment (% Change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services Employment (% Change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada 1998 to 2011, Stokes Economic Consulting 2012 to 2047
Business investment expenditures show the strongest performance over the projection period followed by residential investment and consumer expenditures. The relatively strong business investment expenditures reflect the results for industry production where significant capital expenditures are required to facilitate the production. The investment in the upgraders in the Region is part of these expenditures. The sharp slowdown in growth in the 2017 to 2022 period in the base and low scenarios reflects the completion of construction on the Northwest upgrader.

Residential investment is required to construct the additional housing needed for the population as well as renovation expenditures. The slowdown in growth in 2017 to 2022 reflects a downward adjustment to a significant increase in housing starts from the 2009 recession that occurs over the next few years. The reduction in household formation over the remainder of the period reduces growth in residential investment activity.

The additional employment and other income generated in the scenarios from increased industry production drive the growth in consumer expenditures. The growth in government current and capital expenditures is required to meet the needs of the increasing population in the Region.

Exhibit 9
Average Annual Growth for GDP and Expenditure Components (%)
Capital Region, 2001-2047

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Real GDP (% Change)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer Expenditures (% Change)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Construction Expenditures (% Change)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Investment Expenditures (% Change)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Current Expenditures (% Change)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Capital Expenditures (% Change)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada 1998 to 2011, Stokes Economic Consulting 2012 to 2047
Section 3
THE CAPITAL REGION SCENARIOS BY MUNICIPALITY

This section of the report updates the population and employment projections to 2044 across the CRB’s 24 municipalities contained in the document *The Capital Region Growth Plan Addendum* (December 2009).

Two alternatives at the municipal level for total population and total employment (on a place-of-work basis) to 2044 are presented here:

- The High Case of this section is informed by the pace of growth for the region as a whole in the High Case projection of Section 2.
- The Low Case of this section is informed by the pace of growth for the region as a whole in the Base Case projection of Section 2.

Population Projections

The Low Case and High Case population projections by CRB municipality summarized in Exhibits 10, 11 and 12 below were informed by the following:

- The population projections by municipality contained in the December 2009 *Growth Plan Addendum*.
- Preliminary projections by municipality prepared by Strategic Projections based on recent trends in regional growth by municipality and on the pressures for growth region-wide revealed by the Base Case and High Case projections described in Section 2.
- Comments on the preliminary projections solicited by the consultants from municipal staff.

The projections in Exhibits 10, 11 and 12 take into account municipal census information for 2012 and/or Statistics Canada revisions to the 2011 Census population counts for Bruderheim, Leduc County, Redwater and Thorsby.
## Exhibit 10
### Capital Region Total Population by Municipality
#### Low Case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population Totals</th>
<th>Average Annual % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmar</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>861,900</td>
<td>944,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>24,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>26,300</td>
<td>29,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>33,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwater</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>32,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>64,300</td>
<td>69,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>19,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>96,800</td>
<td>104,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>22,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsby</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburg</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>372,200</td>
<td>409,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>861,900</td>
<td>944,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Total</td>
<td>1,234,100</td>
<td>1,354,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Strategic Projections and CRB Staff
## Exhibit 11

**Capital Region Total Population by Municipality**

**High Case**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2044</th>
<th>14-19</th>
<th>19-29</th>
<th>29-44</th>
<th>14-44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>23,800</td>
<td>37,400</td>
<td>58,200</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmar</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>864,800</td>
<td>960,100</td>
<td>1,151,800</td>
<td>1,443,900</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>40,400</td>
<td>58,700</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>33,300</td>
<td>44,900</td>
<td>62,600</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>18,600</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>35,200</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwater</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>29,600</td>
<td>35,700</td>
<td>48,100</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>66,300</td>
<td>75,200</td>
<td>92,900</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>17,100</td>
<td>20,900</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>98,100</td>
<td>108,300</td>
<td>128,800</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>21,200</td>
<td>24,100</td>
<td>30,100</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsby</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburg</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>383,100</td>
<td>443,800</td>
<td>565,900</td>
<td>752,200</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>864,800</td>
<td>960,100</td>
<td>1,151,800</td>
<td>1,443,900</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Total</td>
<td>1,247,900</td>
<td>1,403,900</td>
<td>1,717,700</td>
<td>2,196,100</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Strategic Projections and CRB Staff
### Exhibit 12

**Capital Region Total Population by Municipality**

**Low and High Case 2014 to 2044**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2044 Low</th>
<th>2044 High</th>
<th>14-44 Low</th>
<th>14-44 High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>35,800</td>
<td>58,200</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmar</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>13,900</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>861,900</td>
<td>1,336,800</td>
<td>1,443,900</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>21,100</td>
<td>40,300</td>
<td>58,700</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>26,300</td>
<td>45,700</td>
<td>62,600</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td>19,300</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville</td>
<td>9,200</td>
<td>14,800</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>31,800</td>
<td>42,700</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwater</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>49,700</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>64,300</td>
<td>91,600</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>32,200</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>96,800</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>39,200</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsby</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburg</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>372,200</td>
<td>586,600</td>
<td>752,200</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>861,900</td>
<td>1,336,800</td>
<td>1,443,900</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Total</td>
<td>1,234,100</td>
<td>1,923,400</td>
<td>2,196,100</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Strategic Projections and CRB Staff
Employment Projections

For the purposes of this assignment Strategic Projections developed a model of Capital Region employment by industry by place-of-work by municipality.

At the outset it should be noted that employment by place-of-work data from the National Household Survey carried out in conjunction with the 2011 Census – as of the end of August 2013 – has not yet been made available in the format required by Strategic Projections for inclusion in this update to the projections of employment by CRB municipality. This section of the report will be revised once the new data have been made available to us and we have had an opportunity to assess their impact.

At this time therefore the 2006 Census data for employment by place-of-work by industry by municipality is the latest available regarding where jobs are distributed throughout the area.

The model distributes future employment growth by industry – as determined by the Region-wide projections by industry described in Section 2 – to each of the area’s 24 municipalities by separately projecting those jobs that primarily produce goods and services exported to other areas and those jobs that primarily serve the needs of the local population. We separate employment along these two lines because they are driven by different factors.

These two job types are commonly referred to as export based and community based, or economic base and population serving.

Export Based and Community Based Jobs

Jobs that primarily produce goods and services for export purposes are those found in the goods-producing industries such as agriculture, forestry, fishing, mining and manufacturing.

Jobs that primarily produce services in support of the local community are those found in construction; wholesale trade; retail trade; transportation and warehousing; information and culture; finance and insurance; real estate and leasing; professional and other business services; education; health and social services; arts, entertainment and recreation; other services; and government.

Sometimes some of these service jobs provide services to residents or businesses located in other communities, especially jobs in such industries as business services; education; health and social services; and government.

Exhibit 13 decomposes all of the jobs on a place-of-work basis by industry for the Region as a whole in 2006 into their separate economic base and community base components. Exhibit 13 reveals that:
• In 2006 118,436 jobs were identified as economic base jobs and 393,474 as community base jobs. Thus 23 percent of the 511,910 jobs found in the area in 2006 were providing goods or services to people or businesses located outside of the Capital Region.

• On an industry basis the major contributors to the economic base of the Region include manufacturing (46,255, or 39.1 percent of all the Region’s economic base jobs); government (17,023, 14.4 percent); mining, oil and gas (12,265, 10.4 percent); health and social services (8,208, 6.9 percent); wholesale trade (6,678, 5.6 percent); agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting (6,615, 5.6 percent); and education (5,697, 4.8 percent). Collectively these 7 industries accounted for 81.1 percent of all the economic base jobs in the Region in 2006.

• Exhibit 13 also reveals that most of the jobs in service sectors such as wholesale trade, education, health and social services and government are community base, not economic base, jobs. The jobs in these sectors attributed to the economic base of the Region represent those providing wholesale trade services within the Region above and beyond the needs of the Region per se (reflecting the area’s role as a major distribution hub within the province), and those providing within the Region health, education and government services above and beyond the Region’s needs (reflecting the Region’s role as a provider of higher order health, post-secondary education and provincial administration services to residents elsewhere in the province).

The decomposition of jobs for the Region into their economic base and community base components was achieved by comparing the number of jobs per capita in each industry for the Region in 2006 to the number of such jobs per capita across the rest of Alberta. Where the Region’s ratio exceeds that of the rest of the province the excess jobs are attributed to the Region’s economic base.

Exhibit 14 shows by municipality within the Region where the total population, total employment and the total economic base and community base jobs were distributed in 2006. Exhibit 14 also provides a number of calculations that help to illustrate the way the model we created allocates future employment growth by municipality throughout the Region.
## Exhibit 13
### Capital Region Total Employment by Place-of-Work by Industry
#### Economic Base and Community Base Components in 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employed by Place-of-Work by Industry</th>
<th>EB</th>
<th>CB</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total all industries</td>
<td>118,436</td>
<td>393,474</td>
<td>511,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting</td>
<td>6,615</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, oil and gas</td>
<td>12,265</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>4,675</td>
<td>5,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>25,804</td>
<td>28,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>46,255</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>6,678</td>
<td>22,002</td>
<td>28,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>59,125</td>
<td>62,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, warehousing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21,255</td>
<td>21,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information, culture</td>
<td>1,014</td>
<td>9,656</td>
<td>10,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, insurance</td>
<td>2,179</td>
<td>17,086</td>
<td>19,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate, leasing</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>10,212</td>
<td>11,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, technical services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37,035</td>
<td>37,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management services</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support, waste management</td>
<td>2,274</td>
<td>14,391</td>
<td>16,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5,697</td>
<td>32,848</td>
<td>38,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, social services</td>
<td>8,208</td>
<td>48,367</td>
<td>56,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, recreation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,215</td>
<td>9,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation, food</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35,510</td>
<td>35,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>3,104</td>
<td>25,696</td>
<td>28,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>17,023</td>
<td>19,967</td>
<td>36,990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada and Strategic Projections
## Exhibit 14

**Capital Region Total Employment by Place-of-Work by Industry**

**Economic Base and Community Base Components in 2006 by Municipality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipalities</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>POW</th>
<th>Activity Rate</th>
<th>EB Jobs</th>
<th>CB Jobs</th>
<th>EB Rate</th>
<th>CB Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRB Total</td>
<td>1,035,878</td>
<td>512,055</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>118,451</td>
<td>393,604</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>730,372</td>
<td>398,060</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>92,366</td>
<td>305,694</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>8,961</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmar</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>6,261</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1,515</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>14,957</td>
<td>7,520</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>2,275</td>
<td>5,245</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>2,642</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>1,669</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>3,905</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>16,967</td>
<td>8,280</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>6,955</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>13,135</td>
<td>15,380</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>7,440</td>
<td>7,940</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville</td>
<td>6,775</td>
<td>2,180</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>29,220</td>
<td>6,945</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>2,525</td>
<td>4,420</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwater</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>19,541</td>
<td>7,515</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>6,760</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>57,764</td>
<td>17,085</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>16,200</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>12,363</td>
<td>4,225</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>3,940</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>82,511</td>
<td>30,150</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>23,550</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>18,566</td>
<td>5,550</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>3,790</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsby</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburg</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada and Strategic Projections
Exhibit 14 reveals the following:

- The first data column shows the population of each municipality while the second shows the number of jobs provided by employers in each. The third column shows the “activity rate” for each municipality where the activity rate is equal to the number of jobs provided in each area per 1,000 residents.

- The activity rate for the Region as a whole was 494 jobs per 1,000 residents. That rate was exceeded by only 6 of the 24 municipalities within the Region. Leduc County had the highest activity rate at 1,171 jobs per 1,000 residents and was the only municipality with more jobs than residents. Warburg’s activity rate at 797, Wabamun’s at 649, Thorsby’s at 598, Edmonton’s at 545 and Fort Saskatchewan’s at 503 all exceeded the Regional average. The rates in Leduc (488), Redwater (481) and Lamont (467) all came close to the Regional average of 494. Thus within the Region job provision exceeded or came close to the Regional average in only 9 of its 24 municipalities.

The fourth and fifth data columns show the number of economic base and community base jobs in each municipality in 2006 revealing where these jobs were concentrated within the Region in 2006 in an absolute sense. The final two data columns show the economic base and community base jobs in each municipality per 1,000 residents in 2006. The final two columns add up to the value of the third data column (the overall activity rate). These rates reveal where the economic base and community base jobs were concentrated in the Region in a relative sense.

The economic base and community base jobs were concentrated in an absolute sense as follows:

- The lion’s share of economic base jobs was accounted for by Edmonton (about 92,366, or 78.0 percent of the Region’s total), Leduc County (7,440, 6.3 percent), Strathcona County (6,600, 5.6 percent), Parkland County (2,525, 2.1 percent), Fort Saskatchewan (2,275, 1.9 percent), Sturgeon County (1,760, 1.5 percent) and Leduc (1,325, 1.1 percent). These 7 collectively accounted for 96.5 percent of the exported goods and service jobs in the Region in 2006. The remaining 3.5 percent were scattered throughout the remaining 17 municipalities of the Region.

- Community base jobs are found throughout the Region, not surprisingly since they exist to serve primarily the needs of people, not businesses. Nevertheless, the number of community base jobs per 1,000 residents exceeded the Regional average of 380 in only 7 municipalities including Leduc County (604), Warburg (507), Thorsby (487), Wabamun (466), Edmonton (419), Leduc (410) and Lamont (401), and it came close to the Regional average in Redwater (375), Fort Saskatchewan (351) and Spruce Grove (346). The community base jobs ratio fell well short of the average in all of the remaining 14 municipalities indicating that the residents of these 14 municipalities travel to nearby centres to obtain many of these community based services.
The model we built to estimate job growth from 2006 to 2012 and to project job growth from 2012 to 2044 allocates that growth to the Region’s 24 municipalities as follows:

- **Region-wide employment growth in the area’s community based industries** grows in line with the population growth of each municipality based on the number of such jobs per capita in each in 2006, known and expected growth in such jobs per capita Region-wide to 2011 and to 2044, and the expected population growth of each municipality. Allocating community growth jobs in this way reflects the reality that such jobs are population serving and thus are most likely to grow in the future in tandem with the population of each community. Note that this assumption implies that under-serviced communities will remain so across the projection horizon. It is possible that some underserviced communities will improve on local service levels across that span and, therefore, that the projections here might understate employment growth in those cases.

- **Region-wide employment growth in the area’s export base industries** grows in line with where such jobs were found in the Region in 2006. So, for example, the major export base employer in the Region in 2006 was manufacturing. The macro projections described in Section 2 indicate manufacturing jobs in the Base Case projection will increase by 100 percent between 2006 and 2047, from 46,255 to 92,637. The employment model increases the number of manufacturing jobs in Edmonton (which accounted for 32,880 manufacturing jobs in 2006, or 71.1 percent of the Region’s total) by 100 percent, and the number of manufacturing jobs in Strathcona County (3,830 in 2006, 8.3 percent) and in Leduc County (3,440 in 2006, 7.4 percent) also by 100 percent. This assumption reflects the likelihood that future manufacturing job growth will occur where such jobs are already found. These three communities accounted for 86.8 percent of all the manufacturing jobs in the Region in 2006.

- In a similar vein the growth in export based jobs in health and social services (expected to grow by 150 percent) and in government services (up by 47 percent) are assumed to grow in Edmonton where all of the Region’s export based jobs in these service industries were located in 2006.

In summary, the macro model in Section 2 determines the employment by industry growth pressures expected to be felt by the Region as a whole over the projection horizon.

The municipal employment model in Section 3 allocates the economic base jobs over that span to those centres already endowed with such jobs in a manner that assumes the region-wide growth pressures by industry will be felt in a relative sense by every community endowed with such jobs in 2006.

The model allocates the projected community base job growth pressures to those communities projected to see the greatest population gains following on consideration of the base year per capita availability of such jobs in each municipality.
Exhibits 15, 16 and 17 summarize the gains in total employment expected in each community from 2012 to 2044 for the Low Case and High Case alternatives.

**Exhibit 15**

**Capital Region Total Employment by Municipality**

**Low Case**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2044</th>
<th>14-19</th>
<th>19-29</th>
<th>29-44</th>
<th>14-44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmar</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>486,500</td>
<td>519,800</td>
<td>598,200</td>
<td>699,100</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>11,800</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>16,400</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>18,900</td>
<td>20,600</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwater</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>25,900</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>37,400</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>43,100</td>
<td>47,600</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsby</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburg</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>144,200</td>
<td>153,700</td>
<td>174,800</td>
<td>198,900</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>486,500</td>
<td>519,800</td>
<td>598,200</td>
<td>699,100</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Total</td>
<td>630,700</td>
<td>673,500</td>
<td>773,000</td>
<td>898,000</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Strategic Projections
## Exhibit 16
### Capital Region Total Employment by Municipality
#### High Case

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2044</th>
<th>14-19</th>
<th>19-29</th>
<th>29-44</th>
<th>14-44</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmar</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>490,600</td>
<td>528,100</td>
<td>623,200</td>
<td>749,400</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>25,300</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>8,700</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwater</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>17,500</td>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>22,400</td>
<td>27,200</td>
<td>33,600</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>38,100</td>
<td>40,500</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td>54,800</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsby</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburg</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>148,600</td>
<td>164,400</td>
<td>201,800</td>
<td>249,200</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>490,600</td>
<td>528,100</td>
<td>623,200</td>
<td>749,400</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Total</td>
<td>639,200</td>
<td>692,500</td>
<td>825,000</td>
<td>998,500</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Totals</th>
<th>Average Annual % Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>19-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-44</td>
<td>14-44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Strategic Projections
## Exhibit 17
Capital Region Total Employment by Municipality
Low and High Case 2014 to 2044

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Low 2044</th>
<th>High 2044</th>
<th>14-44 Low</th>
<th>14-44 High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bon Accord</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruderheim</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calmar</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>486,500</td>
<td>699,100</td>
<td>749,400</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>12,800</td>
<td>19,400</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>25,300</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>9,500</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwater</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>25,900</td>
<td>33,600</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>5,800</td>
<td>10,300</td>
<td>12,700</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>37,400</td>
<td>47,600</td>
<td>54,800</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsby</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburg</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>144,200</td>
<td>198,900</td>
<td>249,200</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>486,500</td>
<td>699,100</td>
<td>749,400</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRB Total</td>
<td>630,700</td>
<td>898,000</td>
<td>998,500</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Strategic Projections
Section 4
CONCLUSIONS

Section 2 of this report assesses the macroeconomic environment and provides a range of population and employment projections for the Capital Region as a whole based on the breadth of demands for growth the Region faces. The pressures for growth today are significantly greater than they were in 2009. The Low Case in Section 2 calls for population and employment growth slightly higher than the only projection put forward in 2009 while the Base and High Cases suggest the potential for growth significantly exceeds that foreseen in 2009.

The projections for the Region by municipality developed in Section 3 suggest the increased demands for growth faced by the Region today are likely to impact every municipality in the area. The contribution assumed for each municipality to the future growth of the Region reflects a combination of factors, most importantly recent trends and aspirations. The municipal projections provided here are intended to reflect the range of future growth pressures faced by each municipality at this time.

Over the course of the next two years Statistics Canada will release information updates that by the fall of 2014, depending on the trends revealed, might trigger a refresh of these projections:

- In January of 2014 Statistics Canada will release Labour Force Survey-based annual estimates of employment by industry for the Edmonton CMA for 2013. This data source underpins the macroeconomic projections for employment described in Section 2. The projections in Section 2 are based on annual LFS data available through 2011. Published data for 2012 and 2013 will help to determine by 2014 whether the Region’s overall employment growth is on track with the Low, Base or High projections developed here.

- Over the course of the next few weeks Statistics Canada will release 2011 employment by place-of-work by industry data for each of the municipalities drawn from the new National Household Survey undertaken in connection with the 2011 Census. The 2011 and 2012 employment figures by municipality in Section 3 are estimates developed by the consulting team. This new set of data will determine how close the Section 3 estimates came to determining the level of employment in each municipality in 2011.

- In September of 2013 Statistics Canada will release postcensal population estimates for Canada and its provinces for 2011 based on its assessment of the net undercount of the 2011 Census. In February of 2014 StatsCan will release postcensal estimates at the Census Division level for 2011 based on its assessment of the 2011 undercount. The postcensal population estimates for the Capital Region underpinning the macroeconomic projections in Section 2 for this update are based on postcensal estimates that have been adjusted only for the undercount of the Census in 2006. This new data set will provide population estimates for the Region through to 2013 (and possibly to 2014) and thus will help to establish by the fall of 2014 whether the Region’s population growth is on track with the Low, Base or High projections developed here.
• Alberta Treasury Board and Finance will release updates to its population projections for the province as a whole and its constituent Census Divisions in June 2013 and June 2014.

• Between now and 2014 new information is likely to become available regarding the population of individual municipalities within the Region as the result of Municipal Censuses.

• Between now and 2014 new information regarding residential construction trends by municipality within the Region will be made available by Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. This new information will help to establish where population growth is occurring within the Region by municipality for those municipalities that do not undertake their own Censuses over this period.

All of the above suggest that a refresh of the Capital Region projections by municipality contained in this report might be considered at some point in 2014.

Ernie Stokes of Stokes Economic Consulting Inc. and Tom McCormack of Strategic Projections Inc., the authors of this report, wish to thank the members of the Capital Region Board’s Population and Employment Technical Advisory Committee for their invaluable assistance in the preparation of the projections contained in this report.
## Appendix A

**Capital Region Municipal Population Charts**  
**Historical Data 2011 to 2011**  
**Estimated and Projected Data 2012 to 2044**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
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<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morinville</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwater</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stony Plain</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorsby</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabamun</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warburg</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Source:
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Membership Review

Motion

*That the Capital Region Board accept the Cuff Report regarding the Membership Review as information.*

Background

- Mayor Gale Katchur from the City of Fort Saskatchewan presented the following Notice of Motion at the July Board meeting:

  “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.”

- With the cancellation of the August Board meeting, the CEO in consultation with the Board Chair, Mayor Crouse and the concurrence of Mayor Katchur to authorize George B. Cuff & Associates to proceed with the Review.

- The Report will be presented to the Board at the September Board meeting.
CRB Chair’s Term

Motion

That the current Chair’s term be extended until such time as a new Chair is selected in accordance with the Board’s policy subject to Ministerial approval if necessary.

Background

- Mayor Nolan Crouse’s contract as Chair of the Capital Region Board (CRB) expires October 21, 2013.

According to CRB policy, we do not select a new Chair until our November Board meeting, which will take place on November 14th. Therefore, we are in a position where there is no Chair of the CRB for the period of October 21, 2013 to November 14, 2013.

The organizational meeting for newly elected officials will not take place until late October or early November. Should Mayor Crouse not be re-elected, the extension of his term as CRB Chair will require a Ministerial Order.

The CRB policy for the selection of the new Chair does not address this void, therefore, CRB Administration will bring Policy G010 to the Governance Committee to correct this oversight.

Attachment: CRB Policy #G010 – Selection of Chair & Vice Chair/Interim Chair & Interim Vice Chair
PURPOSE

To establish the process for selecting a Chair or Interim Chair of the Capital Region Board.

POLICY

In accordance with the Capital Region Board Regulation, the Capital Region Board may select a Chair from among the representatives of the participating municipalities. The CRB Regulation also provides that the Minister of Municipal Affairs may appoint an Interim Chair of the Board who is not a representative from a participating municipality of the Capital Region Board. The process for selecting a Chair or Interim Chair will be approved by the Capital Region Board. This selection process should be carried out in sufficient time to ensure that a Chair or Interim Chair is in place prior to the conclusion of the mandate of an existing Chair or Interim Chair.

GUIDELINES

1. The Chief Executive Officer will prepare a draft process for selecting a Chair/Interim Chair for review and approval by the Governance Committee. Processes to renew an existing term for a Chair/Interim Chair, for the election of a Chair from among CRB members and a recommendation to the Minister of Municipal Affairs to appoint an external individual as the Interim Chair will be included. The Governance Committee will make its recommendation on the process to the CRB.

2. Prior to commencing a selection process, the Chief Executive Officer will obtain direction from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs about whether the Minister will consider appointing an individual as Interim Chair upon the recommendation of the CRB.

3. EXTENSION OF TERM – INTERIM CHAIR

There may be a circumstance in which an existing Interim Chair is in place and the term of the individual can be renewed. In this case the process of renewal of the term of the Interim Chair would be:

   a. The Governance Committee would consider whether or not the term of the existing Interim Chair should be renewed and make a recommendation to the CRB.

   b. At the next CRB meeting, the Vice Chair/Vice Interim Chair will ask CRB members at an in-camera session of the Committee of the Whole of the CRB by secret ballot the following questions:

      i. Do you agree with extending the term of the Interim Chair?
      ii. Should the extension be for one year or another time frame?

   CRB approval will be a majority of members.

   c. If the CRB approves the extension of the term of the Interim Chair, the Vice Chair/Vice Interim Chair will write to the Minister of Municipal Affairs communicating this decision and requesting that the re-appointment of the individual for the time period agreed to by the CRB in question 3bii.
4. SELECTION OF CHAIR OR INTERIM CHAIR
   a. If the term of an existing Interim Chair is not to be renewed, or the term of the current Chair is
      about to expire, the Vice Chair/Vice Interim Chair will ask CRB members at an in-camera session of
      the Committee of the Whole of the CRB by secret ballot to answer the following questions:
      i. Do you want to elect the Chair from within the Board members?
      ii. Do you want to select an Interim Chair external to the Board members who would be
           recommended to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for appointment?
      iii. The vote will be taken on the basis of one member one vote and a majority of members is
           required to determine the approved answer.
   b. If the majority respond in the affirmative to question 4ai, then the process for selecting a Chair of
      the CRB will be:
      i. Nominations will be solicited by the Chief Executive Officer.
      ii. The Chief Executive Officer will send an email to CRB members indicating there will be
          election of a Chair and asks for nominations.
      iii. The Chief Executive Officer will send an email with list of nominees to Board members prior to
          the meeting at which the election will take place.
      iv. Nominations will also be requested and accepted from the floor at a CRB meeting prior to the
          nomination list being circulated by the Chief Executive Officer.
      v. The Chief Executive Officer will conduct the election at the next CRB meeting at an in-camera
         session of the Committee of the Whole by secret ballot.
      vi. The vote will be taken on the basis of one member one vote and a majority of members is
          required to elect the Chair.
   c. If the majority respond in the affirmative to question 4aii, then the process for selecting an
      Interim Chair of the CRB will be:
      i. The Governance Committee will provide a recommendation to the CRB on a potential list of
         candidates for the position of Interim Chair.
      ii. The CRB may approve the list of candidates and may provide additional names for
          consideration.
      iii. The Governance Committee may appoint a subcommittee of its members to be a search
           committee for an Interim Chair.
      iv. Following a search process, the Governance Committee will make a recommendation to the
          CRB identifying a preferred candidate for Interim Chair. Approval of the candidate will be
          required by the CRB.
      v. A vote at an in-camera session of the CRB’s Committee of the Whole will be conducted by
         secret ballot.
      vi. Following approval of a candidate for Interim Chair, the Vice Chair/Vice Interim Chair will
          write to the Minister of Municipal Affairs advising of the CRB’s recommended individual for
          Interim Chair and request their appointment.

5. SELECTION OF VICECHAIR AND VICE INTERIM CHAIR
   a. If there is an Interim Chair of the CRB, the Vice Interim Chair of the CRB is the Chair of the
      Governance Committee.
   b. If there is a Chair of the CRB, the Vice Chair of the CRB is the Chair, Governance Committee.

[Signature]
Chief Executive Officer
CALL TO ORDER

Chair Mayor Fisher called the meeting to order at 9:04 am.

ADMINISTRATIVE

a) Adoption of the Agenda

Board Chair Crouse requested a few minutes at the beginning of the Agenda to address the Committee and Mayor Fisher added item 5b) Prioritization of the Transportation Master Plan Project update.
Motion: That the Committee adopts the August 29, 2013 Agenda as amended.
Moved by: Dwight Ganske, Stony Plain
Decision: Carried Unanimously

b) Committee Meeting Minutes – June 27, 2013

Motion: That the Committee adopts the June 27, 2013 Meeting Minutes, as amended.
Moved by: David MacKenzie, City of Leduc
Decision: Carried

3. ADVISORY GROUPS REPORTS

a) Planning Advisory Group (PAG) – August 12, 2013 Meeting Report

Motion: That the Committee accepts the PAG Meeting Report for information.
Moved by: Ed Gibbons, Edmonton
Decision: Carried

4. 2012 LAND USE COMMITTEE BUSINESS PLAN

a) Review REF Administration Report Implementation
   i. Recommendation 1 – CRB Administration Terms of Reference
   ii. Recommendation 2 – Pre-Application Review Policy & Procedures
   iii. Recommendation 4 – CRB Municipalities Terms of Reference

Motion: That the Pre-Application Review Policy & Procedures be amended by requiring the summary of comments by third party consultants be provided to the applicant municipality and be marked “confidential” and not shared outside the applicant municipality.
Moved by: Malcolm Parker, St. Albert
Decision: Carried

Motion: That the Committee receives the CRB Administration Terms of Reference, Pre-Application Review Policy & Procedures, as amended, and the CRB Municipalities Terms of Reference for information.
Moved by: Larry Goodhope, Beaumont
Decision: Carried

   iv. Recommendation 7 – Interpretation Guide
       1. Non-PGA Policy Clarification – Referred back to Committee by Board
Motion: Given the diversity of the rural communities, the Land Use Committee directs the Planning Advisory Group to review the following statement for inclusion in the Guide:

"Notwithstanding the difficulties in applying a standard criteria for Counties, the criteria outlined for Towns and Villages may be applied in assessing a REF application, at the request of the County submitting the REF application."

Moved by: Linda Osinchuk, Strathcona County
Decision: Carried

5. OLD BUSINESS

a) Land Use Committee Motion – May 23, 2013

“That the Land Use Committee have the Planning Advisory Committee look at the possibility of requiring Intermunicipal Development Plans in CCRAs or PGAs when statutory plans are submitted that fall on adjacent municipal borders.”

Motion: That the Land Use Committee not pursue a requirement for IDP’s in CCRAs or PGAs when statutory plans are submitted that fall on adjacent municipal borders.

Moved by: Dwight Ganske, Stony Plain
Decision: Carried

b) Prioritization of the Transportation Master Plan Project Update

CRB Administration provided a brief update on the project status.

6. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:51 a.m.
TRANSIT Committee Meeting Minutes  
August 30, 2013  
9:30 am – 11:30 am  
Edmonton Petroleum Club, Rainbow Room  
11110 – 108 Street NW, Edmonton, AB

Members:
Don Iveson, Edmonton
Len Bracko, St. Albert
John Schonewille, Leduc County
Don Rigney, Sturgeon County
Peter Wlodarczak, Strathcona County
Dana Smith, Leduc
Jeff Acker, Spruce Grove
Jacqueline Biollo, Beaumont

Consultants:
Hassan Shaheen, ISL Engineering
Scott Baker, AECOM
Eric Wolfe, KPMG
Adam Reisler, KPMG

Guests:
Colton Kirsop, Edmonton
Charlie Stolte, ETS
Georgina Fairbank, ETS
Matt Carpenter, Strathcona County
Yolande Shaw, Strathcona County
Kevin Wenzel, Leduc
Nolan Crouse, St. Albert
Wes Brodhead, St. Albert
Glenn Tompolski, St. Albert
Will Steblyk, St. Albert
Amber Nicol, Spruce Grove
Jim Simpson, Spruce Grove
Robin Benoit, Fort Saskatchewan
Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County
Terry Cashin, Sturgeon County

CRB Staff:
Doug Lagore, CEO
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Allyson Jacques, Administrative Assistant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>Approval of Agenda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motion:</strong></td>
<td>That the Transit Committee approves the Agenda for August 30, 2013 as amended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moved by:</strong></td>
<td>Jacqueline Biollo, Beaumont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carried</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>Approval of Minutes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motion:</strong></td>
<td>That the Transit Committee approves the minutes of June 28, 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moved by:</strong></td>
<td>Jeff Acker, Spruce Grove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opening Remarks
Chair Don Iveson called the meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. Chair Iveson advised the committee that this will be the last meeting prior to the 2013 election in October. He spoke to the committee of his appreciation for Peter Wlodarczak as he will not be running for council again.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>2013 Transit Committee Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Regional Transit Governance Study - Business Case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion: That the Transit Committee accepts the report as information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved by: Peter Wlodarczak, Strathcona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3.2 Regional Fare Strategy - Smart Card Technology Procurement update |
| Motion: That the Transit Committee accepts the report as information. |
| Moved by: Jeff Acker, Spruce Grove |
| Carried |

| 4.0 | Green TRIP – Prioritization Review |
| Motion: That the RTC recommends the 2013 Green TRIP project to the CRB for approval and request a letter be sent to the Minister of Transportation as an update of the Region’s transit priorities. |
| Moved by: Peter Wlodarczak, Strathcona |
| Carried |

| 5.0 | New Business |
| Chair Don Iveson shared his concern on having a GOA representative present at all Transit Committee Meetings. For the past while, there has not been a representative at the meetings and he believes it was very beneficial to have them involved. |
| Action: Recommendation to CRB Administration to send a letter to the Deputy Minister regarding this concern. |

| Roundtable |
| The committee members spoke words of thanks and appreciation to other members as well as CRB Administration for the last term and wished everyone luck if they decided to run in the upcoming election. |

| Chair Don Iveson adjourned the meeting at 11:36 a.m. |
Governance Committee
MINUTES – MEETING
August 13, 2013
9:00 a.m. – Noon
Petroleum Club, Pembina Room, Edmonton

Attendees:
Mayor Linda Osinchuk, Strathcona County
Councillor Cathy Heron, St. Albert
Councillor Ed Gibbons, Edmonton
Councillor Bill Purdy, Wabamun

Councillor Karen Shaw, Sturgeon County
Mayor Mel Smith, Redwater
Mayor Camille Berube, Chair, Beaumont

Absent:
Reeve Woldanski, Lamont County

CRB staff:
Doug Lagore, CEO
Kim Wieringa, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Brendan Pinches, Project Manager
Charlene Chauvette, Office Manager
Courtney Andrews, Executive Assistant
Allyson Jacques, Administrative Assistant

Guests:
Colton Kirsop, Edmonton
Yolande Shaw, Strathcona County
Cllr Vic Bidzinski, Strathcona County
Deputy Mayor Dwight Ganske, Town of Stony Plain
Peter Tarnawsky, Sturgeon County
Cllr Betty Glassman, Leduc County
Deputy Mayor Trina Jones, Town of Legal
Leslie Chivers, Sturgeon County
Cllr Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County
Mayor Nolan Crouse, City of St. Albert
Cllr Dana Smith, City of Leduc
Jeff Nixon, George B. Cuff & Associates
George Cuff, George B. Cuff & Associates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Call to Order &amp; Opening Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting called to order at 9:08 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Approval of Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision/Action: Motion: That the Governance Committee approve the August 13, 2013 meeting Agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes

**Decision/Action:** Motion: That the Governance Committee approve the June 17, 2013 meeting minutes.

**Moved By:** Councillor Shaw, Sturgeon County

**Motion carried unanimously**

4. New Business

a. CRB Committee Structure Review

Mr. George Cuff presented his report on the CRB Committee Structure Review based on the Board’s request to review the current Committee Structure.

Mr. Cuff provided an introduction to the report followed by a summary of the collected interview comments.

**Decision/Action:**

- **Moved By:** Mayor Osinchuk, Strathcona County
- **Motion:** That the Governance Committee accept recommendations 11.1-11.13 as presented.
  **Motion carried unanimously**

- **Moved By:** Councillor Karen Shaw, Sturgeon County
- **Motion:** That the Governance Committee table this issue until the October 8, 2013 Board Meeting.
  **Motion defeated**

- **Moved By:** Mayor Osinchuk, Strathcona County
- **Motion:** That the Governance Committee recommends Option B to the Capital Region Board.
  **Motion carried**

Administration to provide supplementary information in regards to per diems and the cost of committee meetings to the Governance Committee for the September 16, 2013 meeting.

5. Motion to move in-camera (if required)

No in-camera items.

6. Motion to revert to public session
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7.</th>
<th>Next meeting – Monday, September 16 @ 9:00 a.m. Edmonton Petroleum Club</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting Adjourned at 11:32 a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>