Land Use & Planning Committee

Agenda

Thursday, February 19, 2015
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
Le Cite Francophone – Hall Jean-Louis Dentinger
8627 Rue-Marie Gaboury (91 Street), Edmonton

Agenda Items

1. Call to Order – Mayor Tom Flynn, Chair
2. Chair Opening Remarks
3. Approval of Agenda – Mayor Tom Flynn, Chair
4. Approval of Minutes of November 7, 2014 – Mayor Tom Flynn, Chair
5. Transportation Strategy for Alberta – Andre Corbould, Deputy Minister, AB Transportation
6. Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan – Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
   6.1 Master Plan Briefing and Stakeholder Workshop Summary
       – Thom Stubbs, Headwater Group
7. Land Use & Planning 2015/2016 Project Summary – Mayor Tom Flynn, Chair
   7.1 Land Use & Planning Projects approved by Board – Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
8. Growth Plan Update – Mayor Tom Flynn, Chair
   8.1 Joint Committees/Task Forces Consultation – Sharon Shuya, Project Manager
9. Adjournment – Mayor Tom Flynn, Chair
Land Use & Planning Committee

Friday, November 7, 2014
9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
Edmonton Petroleum Club – Rainbow Room
11110 – 108 Street, Edmonton

Members:
Tom Flynn, Sturgeon County (Chair)
Rod Shaigec, Parkland County (Vice Chair)
Ed Gibbons, City of Edmonton (alternate)
Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
David MacKenzie, City of Leduc
Clay Stumph, Leduc County
Wayne Olechow, Town of Bruderheim
Dwight Ganske, Town of Stony Plain
Lloyd Jardine, Village of Thorsby

Guests:
Leslie Chivers, Sturgeon County
Gibby Davis, City of Edmonton
Jordan Evans, Leduc County
Sylvain Losier, City of Leduc
Corey Levasseur, City of Spruce Grove
Janel Smith-Duguid, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Peter Tarnawsky, Sturgeon County

Regrets:
Amber Harris, Town of Gibbons
Lisa Holmes, Town of Morinville

CRB Staff & Consultants:
Doug Lagore, CEO
Loreen Lennon, Communications Manager
Neal Sarnecki, Project Manager
Sharon Shuya, Project Manager

Stephanie Chai, Director of Special Projects
Brandt Denham, GIS Coordinator
Lisa Saskiw, Administrative Assistant

1. Call to Order

Chair, Mayor Flynn, called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the Land Use & Planning Committee agenda be approved.
Moved by: Mayor Rod Shaigec, Parkland County
Decision: Carried unanimously
3. Approval of Minutes of August 21, 2014

Motion: That the minutes of August 21, 2014 be approved.
Moved by: Councillor Clay Stumph, Leduc County
Decision: Carried unanimously

4. 2014 Work Plan

4.1 Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan – Draft Terms of Reference

Motion: That the Land Use & Planning Committee approve the Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan Project Terms of Reference.
Moved by: Mayor Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Decision: Carried unanimously

4.2 Energy Corridors Master Plan Task Force Plan – Draft Terms of Reference

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Land Use & Planning Committee undertake the responsibility for the development of the Energy Corridors Master Plan as presented.

5. CRB 2015/2016 Project Summary

Motion: That the Land Use & Planning Committee accept the CRB 2015/2016 Project Summary as information.
Moved by: Councillor Clay Stumph, Leduc County
Decision: Carried unanimously

6. Proposed GIS Policy

Motion: That the Land Use & Planning Committee accept the Draft GIS Policy as information.
Moved by: Councillor David MacKenzie, City of Leduc
Decision: Carried unanimously

7. Growth Plan Update

It was agreed by unanimous consensus that the Land Use & Planning Committee to receive the Growth Plan Update as information.

8. Meeting Schedule

8.1 December Meeting – December 18, 2014

Motion: That the Land Use & Planning Committee cancel the December 18, 2014 meeting date.
Moved by: Mayor Gale Katchur, City of Fort Saskatchewan
Decision: Carried unanimously
8.2 2015 Meeting Schedule

**Motion:** That the Land Use & Planning Committee approve the 2015 meeting schedule.

**Moved by:** Councillor Dwight Ganske, *Town of Stony Plain*

**Decision:** Carried unanimously

9. **Adjournment**

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

Meeting adjourned at 9:40 a.m.

**Next Meeting:** February 19, 2015 at 9:00 a.m., (location TBC)

______________________________
Committee Chair, Tom Flynn
Capital Region Energy Corridor Master Plan
Briefing Summary
Draft Outline/Table of Contents of Master Plan

1.0 Introduction

This briefing summary provides a background overview and identifies current considerations and recommended approaches for the development of the Capital Region Corridor Master Plan. This summary uses the proposed Table of Contents for the Master Plan as an outline.

1.1 Purpose and Context
Describe the background of the Board, the Growth Plan, and the current environment surrounding regional energy corridors. Describe the purpose of the Master Plan.

The Provincial Government mandated through the CRB Regulation that the Capital Region Growth Plan identify the location of corridors for transportation and utilities as part of a comprehensive, integrated regional land use plan for the Region. The Growth Plan currently identifies existing infrastructure and utility corridors within the Capital Region. However, there is little direction and policy to support planning for future corridors, energy or otherwise.

The Capital Region Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework was completed in October 2014, and it supported the development of an energy corridors Master Plan and the development and implementation of an advocacy strategy with key stakeholders to address energy corridor needs.

The purpose of the Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan project is to establish policies and criteria for identification and protection of Regional Energy Corridors within the Capital Region in a manner that is consistent and compatible with the Principles and Policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan.

1.2 Objectives of the Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework Report
Describe the finding and objectives of the Framework Report including its recommendations and actions, and its role as setting the framework for the master plan.

The CRB adopted the Energy Corridors Policy Framework in 2014 to help guide future work on the management of energy corridors in the Region. The Framework identified three types of constraints to the development of energy corridors:

- Physical constraints – constraints related to corridor capacity, or existing development footprint, airports, coal extraction areas
- Policy constraints – designated growth areas (PGAs, CCRAs, Alberta’s Industrial Heartland), lands outside local jurisdiction (reserves, CFB Edmonton)
- Natural constraints – hydrology, parks, protected areas, environmentally sensitive areas; would result in fragmentation/disturbance

The Policy Framework called for a comprehensive Master Plan to guide the location and development of energy corridors within the Capital Region. Specifically, the Policy Framework identified the following needs relevant to the Master Plan:
The CRB will plan for energy corridors in the Growth Plan to ensure the needs of industry are supported and sustained.

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

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

2.0 Background

2.1 Growth Plan Principles and Policies

Review the key and related principles and policies of the Growth Plan that affect regional energy corridors and how they influence design and the location of future corridors.

Growth Plan Objectives

The intent of the Growth Plan is to manage growth within the Region. The role of energy corridors within the Growth Plan is not explicitly stated, but it has been determined that they play a significant role in achieving the Principles and Policies of the Growth Plan as they apply to economic development and the integrating and strategic approach to future growth in the Region.


Growth Plan Principles and Policies

The objectives of the Growth Plan that influence the design and location of future regional energy corridors include:

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

2.2 Planning Horizon – Regional Growth Forecasts

Describe the growth of the region, the forecast for electrical transmission and pipelines and the reasons for planning corridors in parallel with growth.

Regional growth of electrical transmission and pipeline projects across the CRB was forecast in the 2014 CRB Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework.

Future Power Transmission Projects

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

**Future Pipeline Projects**

Pipeline project growth forecast was based on the ERCB 2013 Energy Reserves Supply/Demand Outlook and interviews with industry players. Over the next ten years (2014 – 2024) the Capital Region can anticipate eight to ten additional projects. Ten to twenty years out (2025 – 2034) the Capital Region can anticipate a further four to six projects. Eight of these anticipated projects have been publicly announced and are at different stages of design, permitting or preliminary construction. The geographical locations of these projects are identifiable.

**2.3 Other Energy Corridor Plans**

*What other plans were taken into consideration and how they were used in the preparation of the master plan.*

A number of energy corridor planning works are being reviewed in preparation for the Master Plan, including:
- Edmonton Energy and Technology Park Linear Corridor Feasibility Study (2015)
- Linear Infrastructure Corridor System Proposed Pipeline Corridors (2010)
- Regional Pipeline Corridor and Setback Study (2004)

**3.0 Policy Framework**

*Review the policy framework from the policy framework report and identify the themes that the policy and criteria for the design and location of corridors will be established.*

**Policy Framework Considerations**

The update to the principles and policies of the Capital Region Growth Plan will need to consider:

- Including a graphical depiction of future pipeline and power transmission corridor needs as identified on Figures 9 and 11 of the Capital Region Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework (October 2014) report, and any updates thereto.
- Prioritize needs for pipeline and power transmission corridors. At this time there is an immediate need to address pipeline corridor constraints.
- The protection of future corridor needs when identifying or confirming Priority Growth and Cluster Country Residential Growth Areas, and the type, form of development that is to occur within Growth Areas.
- Including a safety and risk management buffer within the width of a future corridor once identified.
- Establishing and confirming the linkage between the land use needs for future energy corridors (from raw source, to product refinement, to market) has on the economic success of the Capital Region.
- Confirming policy that directs the CRB to develop strategic relationships with the Province (Ministries and Agencies), pipeline owners, industry to work collaboratively in order to identify and
prioritize future energy corridors, including developing approaches (models) from which lands can be protected and corridor management plans can be implemented.

The outcomes of the above considerations may require recommended amendments to the Capital Region Board Regulation, and the Regional Evaluation Framework. This may include:

- That energy corridors (electrical transmission and pipeline) are specifically listed as required contents of the Capital Region Growth Plan under Section 12 of the Board Regulation, thereby explicitly expanding the Board mandate to address energy corridor needs through land use.
- That the future needs of energy corridors (e.g. Figures 9 and 11 of the Capital Region Regional Energy Corridors Policy Framework, October 2014) are included as an evaluation criteria within the Regional Evaluation Framework.

**Detailed Master Plan Policies**

Detailed policies will be reviewed and considered in the following areas:

**3.1 Integration with the Capital Region’s Growth Plan**
*Develop policies around theme.*

**3.2 Minimization of Land Use Conflict**
*Develop policies around theme.*

**3.3 Reduction of Land Sterilization and Fragmentation**
*Develop policies around theme.*

**3.4 Increased Coordination and Co-Location within Corridors**
*Develop policies around theme.*

**3.5 Additional Themes?**
*Develop policies around theme.*

**4.0 Regional Energy Corridor Strategy**

**4.1 Land Use and Energy Corridor Integration**
*Using the principles and policies of the growth plan and those developed for this master plan, develop a strategy, including criteria for the locating of future corridors in the region.*

The regional energy corridor strategy that is being developed for the Master Plan is based on two key approaches:

- The development and assessment of criteria for the identification of energy corridors for future protection
- The protection of energy corridors through a series of policy and ownership approaches and models
What are the Main Issues and Considerations for Energy Corridor Planning within the Capital Region?

The following issues, constraints and considerations for energy corridors were identified in the recent development of the CRB Energy Corridor Policy Framework and in a stakeholder workshop (see Appendix B - Workshop Summary):

- Limiting the alienation and sterilization of land by focusing on corridors to meet the needs for Capital Region growth and industrial development is needed. If certain constraint areas are not addressed corridors will be developed by routing around the conflict area, expanding into other areas and alienating a larger land base.
- Maintaining industrial development energy corridor access within the region is needed to support continued growth. There is the potential that further pipeline development between the AIH and the refinery area near Edmonton could be halted with a resultant significant economic impact to Capital Region preventing future pipelines and refining facilities from bypassing the Capital Region entirely. The Capital Region is currently seeing a movement from the Fort Saskatchewan area to the Heartland, for example. Continued constraints will see further movement to other potential hubs, further out from the Heartland, to Hardisty or to North East BC (natural gas) reducing the capital investment potential of the region.
- Efforts to reduce land use planning conflicts are needed and challenged by different layers of regulatory role and responsibility.
- The co-location of pipelines and transmission lines requires extra spacing to avoid the affects induced corrosion of pipelines from AC current.
- Regional corridors assist longer range and larger energy projects, however the ‘last mile’ to industrial facilities is also a significant issue.

What criteria can be used to identify Regional Energy Corridors within the Capital Region?

Criteria will be developed and refined to identify regional energy corridors. The following draft criteria reflect the findings of the CRB Energy Corridors Framework (October 2014), the conclusions of the Stakeholder Workshop (January 2015), and the emerging themes of the policy considerations of this report.

The purpose of the criteria is to define regional energy corridors that the CRB will work to further plan for and protect as a part the Growth Plan.

Regional Energy Corridor Selection Criteria

- Reduces the net segmentation and alienation of land within the CRB.
- The corridor, as designed and located, can meet engineering construction requirements.
- Minimizes the overall impact on Priority Growth Areas and residential land within the CRB.
- Minimizes the impact on industrial land access and use within the CRB.
- Follows existing linear disturbances to the extent possible.
- Minimizes environmental impacts (water bodies, sensitive areas).
- Will support/ is required for forecast 20 year demand for energy corridor facilities.
Preferred Regional Energy Corridor Identification

The criteria for the identification and location of corridors will be used to review identified corridor need locations to assess potential corridors. An analytical table will be used to assess how corridor options meet or address the established criteria. An example is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Corridor One</th>
<th>Corridor Two</th>
<th>Corridor Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduces net Segmentation of Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets engineering ‘constructability’ requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizes impact on Priority Growth Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Preferred Corridor Development Model/ Approaches

*Analyze the various corridor development models and recommend a preferred model for the Board to advocate to the province.*

What Approach can be used to Protect Regional Energy Corridors within the Capital Region?

Energy corridors can be protected using a range of regulatory and ownership tools. However, there is no one size fits all approach or model. Most projects currently use a variation of approaches along the length of its route as it moves through different jurisdictions, land ownership and landscapes. These will be represented through different corridor models over the length of its project. For example, a pipeline may use part of the Provincial Corridor (the TUC), a single easement or, form part of a common corridor adjacent to other facilities.

A corridor can be ‘protected’ using a range of land use policy and ownership tools to influence how and where projects are located. Protection can include a combination of tools ranging from simple identification (map notation) to outright ownership (Provincial Transportation Utility Corridor).

Corridor Development Approaches

The following types of approaches can be used in combination to protect regional energy corridors:
Land Easement/Ownership

- Private Single Proponent Corridor – an easement supported by regulatory approvals that grants a single proponent development rights for their energy facility
- Private Common Corridor – an easement supported by regulatory approvals that grants adjacent individual proponent development rights for their energy facilities. Current regulations recommend the development of corridors along existing corridors
- Municipal (Publicly Owned) Corridor – Municipal land ownership set aside to secure access. Sturgeon County currently has some land set aside as a corridor, The City of Edmonton is currently considering this as one option
- Provincial (Publicly Owned) Corridor – Provincial land ownership set aside to secure access. Land protected by Restricted Development Area Regulation
- Special Purpose (Multiple private and public owners) Corridor – A combination of private and public interests establishing a special purpose corporation for the securing of land for access

Land Use Tools

- Growth Plan Designated Corridor – A map designation without land use zoning protection
- By-law Protected Corridor – A specific municipal by-law that zones and protects land for energy corridor use
- Corridor right-of-way widths and set-backs – work to narrow the land taken up in existing corridor areas to enable more work space for future linear projects

Preferred Corridor Protection Strategy

A preferred strategy will be developed for each identified corridor. The strategy will depend on the location and types of constraints that each corridor faces. There are many policy and ownership roles that different participants play with every energy corridor. These factors will be assessed and a recommended protection strategy will be identified.

4.3 Recommended Energy Corridor Plan

Using the policies and criteria above, propose a minimum of three corridor plans, including a preferred, for consideration by the Board.

A recommended Energy Corridor Plan will be developed which:

- Identifies energy corridors for the CRB to advocate further leadership and protection
- Identifies a recommended approach/model to facilitate the protection of each identified corridor
- Identifies specific Growth Plan policies to plan for and address energy corridors

5.0 Implementation

Develop an implementation strategy that includes stewardship, advocacy, and partnerships.

An implementation strategy will be developed.
6.0 Next Steps

The next steps for this project are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Review and refine regional energy corridor identification criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Identify recommended regional energy corridors for protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Refine analysis of potential corridor protection tools, approaches and models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Identify strategic actions to facilitate the protection of corridors within the CRB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Draft the Regional Energy Corridor Master Plan Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 16</td>
<td>Land Use and Planning Committee Presentation and approval of Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>CRB Board Presentation and approval of Master Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendices

Appendix A  CRB Energy Corridors Policy Framework

The CRB Energy Corridors Policy Framework commitments are outlined below.

Policy Framework

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

Recommendations

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

Appendix B – Stakeholder Workshop Summary (January 2015)

(Separate attachment)
Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan
Workshop Summary

Meeting Objective: To inform the Capital Region Board on issues and options to identify, select and protect future regional energy corridors within the Capital Region.

January 26, 2014 Workshop Notes

1.0 What petroleum product corridor needs do you see/next 20 years?
   • The forecast in the Report looks generally on track

2.0 How feasible is it to co-locate and/or create common energy corridors?
   • Pipeline co-location is facilitated by regulatory requirements to follow existing linear disturbances where feasible
   • Transmission corridor and pipeline corridor co-location is affected by the induced corrosion of pipelines from AC current. While there are engineering work-arounds (e.g. cathodic protection of pipelines), they can be expensive.

3.0 What potential locations/area needs are there for future corridors?
   • Locations include both the identified corridor constraints in the CRB study and the specific locations identified in the 2010 Stewart Weir Study
   • Access into and out of the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park
   • East-west access in the Scotford area
   • Corridor to Drayton Valley

4.0 What considerations are needed to locate energy corridors?
   • There are many participants influencing the location of a corridor, other than the proponent. Their role differs depending on the nature of the project.
   • Specific point to point routes need to be identified. The CRB report only identifies the general number of potential petroleum and transmission projects and general locations
   • The ‘last mile’ connecting corridors to specific plant or station sites needs consideration. This is partially addressed by location MOUs between companies
   • Landowner fatigue is becoming a major issue as more and more corridors are being developed
   • Designated corridors do not always reduce opposition to the location of corridors. Corridors have become accustomed to the use of corridor areas as greenbelt or park space and have resisted the development of facilities in them.

5.0 How feasible is it to co-locate and/or create common energy corridors?
   • The provincial Transportation Utility Corridor (TUC) has managed to co-locate many petroleum and transmission lines through the benefit of having a clear mandate to enable corridor access. However there are many issues and constraints in the co-location, crossings and access to corridors. Co-location is more of an engineering issue vs a land issue within the TUC to find solutions to the crossing and co-location of pipelines and transmission lines.
6.0 What corridor management models are successful to address energy corridor planning and development needs?

- A special purpose (multiple partners) corporation model (a public-private partnership, Part 9 Corporation and/or a multi-government partnership corporation).
- Provincial TUC – with Restricted Development Area (RDA) Regulation.
- Provincial TUC – without RDA – a voluntary purchase program by the province.
- Province – Strategic land acquisition (undertaken by Alberta Infrastructure historically).
- Direct Municipal purchase of a corridor. Edmonton is looking at purchasing/defining a corridor into and out of the Edmonton Energy and Technology Park similar to what Sturgeon County has done.
- Planning Model – The identification of ‘preferred’ corridor routes through the CRB Growth Plan or other regional plans – The North Saskatchewan Regional Plan (in early development stages) or the Provincial Comprehensive Regional Infrastructure Sustainability Plans (CRISP) – do help to define preferred routes. Planning designation for preferred corridors provide a base level of identification of protection. However, it was recognised that specific steps to protect and acquire corridor lands, and administer agreements for corridor users, are also needed.
- Municipal Land Use zoning designation. The City of Calgary has now defined a specific TUC Land Use Zone to better identify the purpose and uses for the corridor lands. Lands within the Edmonton TUC are almost all zoned Agricultural.
- Common regulatory set-backs in urban areas to encourage the efficient use of land.

7.0 What models are preferred for what situations?

- A model with strong provincial leadership is preferred for areas with specific constraints and multi-use corridors to facilitate the efficient development and use of land.
- Models need to be looked at from a long, medium and short term perspective. Some models will not solve the immediate problems, some may be necessary to address short term need as an interim step while the assembly of land for longer term needs is underway.
- Municipalities and industry prefer certainty. While industry will work with whatever legislation or regulatory framework is in place, having defined corridors reduces the uncertainty and challenges of establishing corridors with multiple landowners. Further, knowing the future location of corridors assists municipalities in their community planning efforts.

8.0 What criteria could be put in place to minimize energy corridor/land use conflict?

- There is more provincial influence over the siting of pipelines through the provincial Public Lands Act on green or crown area lands. There is no parallel legislation affecting corridors on private lands in the same way.
- Steps to identify more efficient allocation of corridor widths to reduce the total amount of land consumed:
  - land need should be based on projected demand over a reasonable planning horizon.
  - what’s best practice in corridor planning for future co-location of facilities (such as including working space and setbacks between facilities).
9.0 What roles can different players undertake?

- Siting issues for the location of corridors could be considered by the AER for petroleum pipelines it regulates. The AER could consider a ‘play-based’ study to review the siting and location of infrastructure corridors where there is a considered need. The AER takes a risk-based approach, it does not create policy.
- Alberta Municipal Affairs could play a role by identifying corridors as issues of a provincial interest under the Municipal Government Act.
- Alberta Municipal Affairs could consider more specific roles for corridor identification and protection as a part of its Municipal Government Act Review.
- AER/Alberta Municipal Affairs could provide more municipal regulatory or by-law making tools to manage set-backs.
- Municipalities can designate corridors and support it with zoning and by-laws.
- A Working Group/Committee may help to facilitate discussion and solutions beyond the individual project application. Examples within the region include the Edmonton Area Pipeline and Utility Operators’ Committee (EAPUOC) which focuses on safety issues and the Synergy-based Edmonton Oil and Gas Committee.

10.0 Other

- The role and impact of rail for oil transport needs consideration. Rail is now being used as an option to ship oil around congested areas within the Capital Region.
- A business case should be undertaken for the establishment of common corridors, such as the TUC, versus the current model of individual companies securing access from multiple landowners.
- Access through the Capital Region is ‘our own Keystone’.
- Revenues from existing corridors could be a potential revenue source for future corridor/pinch point land purchase.
- Consider Aboriginal consultation in corridor identification.
- Capacity of Municipalities to participate in corridor siting and regulatory process.

11.0 Conclusion

- There is no clear leader to address corridor constraints and the long term planning for corridors in the region. In many cases, leadership and a clear dialogue between the parties is needed to help better facilitate corridor development and planning.
- Corridor issues often come up as a specific project identifies a specific constraint. The evidence is that more constraints are arising as the planning for future corridors has been absent since the TUC process of the 1970s.
- Solutions for both regional corridors and ‘last’ mile corridors are needed.
- The participants saw merit in pursuing the establishment of common corridors. However, a review of the current methods of corridor acquisition vs the development/acquisition of the common corridors model is needed before going any further.

12.0 Next Steps

- Participants saw value in the discussion continuing.
- Future issues for review should be identified.
- Develop a business case for common corridor development.
- Coordinated advocacy on the issue is needed.
- Identify roles of potential parties to facilitate corridor solutions.
## Workshop Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provincial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Affairs</td>
<td>Victoria Brown</td>
<td>Manager, Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Infrastructure</td>
<td>Lyle Markovich</td>
<td>Regional Supervisor, Land Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Transportation</td>
<td>Shaun Hammond</td>
<td>ADM Safety, Policy and Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Sands Secretariat</td>
<td>Gary Haynes</td>
<td>Director, Community and Regional Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Innovates</td>
<td>Justin Riemer</td>
<td>ADM Economic Development &amp; Innovation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipalities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathcona County</td>
<td>Lori Mills</td>
<td>Energy Exploration Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturgeon County</td>
<td>Colin Krywiak</td>
<td>Development Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont County</td>
<td>Al Harvey</td>
<td>CAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland County</td>
<td>Peter Vana</td>
<td>General Manager, Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Janel Smith</td>
<td>Director, Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>Jordan Evans</td>
<td>Manager of Long Range Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leduc County</td>
<td>Dave Desimone</td>
<td>Director, Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>Ken Mamczasz</td>
<td>Economic Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>David Hales</td>
<td>Executive Director, Regional Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edmonton</td>
<td>Gibby Davis</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Electrical System Operator</td>
<td>Ata Rehman</td>
<td>Director, Transmission System Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Electrical System Operator</td>
<td>Bill Strongman</td>
<td>Director, Regional System Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Energy Regulator</td>
<td>Mark Taylor</td>
<td>Vice President, Industry Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Energy Regulator</td>
<td>David Helmer</td>
<td>Director of the Pipeline Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta’s Industrial Heartland Assoc</td>
<td>Neil Shelly</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pipeline Companies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransCanada Pipelines</td>
<td>Ryan Gugyelka</td>
<td>Sr. Land Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransCanada Pipelines</td>
<td>Scott Clark</td>
<td>Land Manager, Capital Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enbridge Pipelines Inc.</td>
<td>Kara Schwaebe</td>
<td>Senior Land and Right of Way Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enbridge Pipelines Inc.</td>
<td>Brent Kaup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Operators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AltaLink</td>
<td>Ian Johnstone</td>
<td>Manager of Siting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headwaters Group</td>
<td>Thom Stubbs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISL</td>
<td>Shauna Kuiper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opus Stewart Weir</td>
<td>Ron McGaffin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
<td>Neal Sarnecki</td>
<td>Manager, Regional Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Board</td>
<td>Stephanie Chai</td>
<td>Special Projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2015/16 Land Use & Planning Projects Summary

*Priority Listed Projects - January 2015*

*April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>Land Use &amp; Planning Projects</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>&quot;A&quot; Priority Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integrated Regional Energy Corridors Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transportation Prioritization Report (annual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>&quot;B&quot; Priority Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared February 13, 2015